

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

BY THE VERY REV.
J. H. BERNARD, D.D.
DEAN OF ST. PATRICK'S, DUBLIN

II

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

BY THE REV.
FREDERIC RENDALL, M.A.

III

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

BY THE REV.
S. D. F. SALMOND, D.D.
PRINCIPAL OF THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, ABERDEEN

IV

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

BY THE REV.
H. A. A. KENNEDY, D.Sc.

V

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS

BY PROFESSOR
A. S. PEAKE, M.A.

LONDON
HODDER AND STOUGHTON
27 PATERNOSTER ROW
1903

THE EXPOSITOR'S
GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC

VOLUME III.

LONDON
HODDER AND STOUGHTON
27 PATERNOSTER ROW
1903

THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. In the case of no book of the New Testament is it more essential to a true understanding of its language, that we should have a clear view of the circumstances under which it was composed, than in the case of 2 Corinthians. It is the most autobiographical of all St. Paul's letters, and it abounds in personal allusions, which it is difficult, at this distance of time, to appreciate, and of which some will probably always remain obscure. It glows with the heat of fervid life,[1] and was evidently written under the influence of strong emotion. And, if we do not assign it to its true place in St. Paul's life, we are likely to miss a good deal of the force of its earnest and eager words. It is, therefore, desirable to enter into more detail as to the occasion of its composition than was necessary in the case of a treatise like the Epistle to the Romans, the arguments of which are largely independent of the circumstances of the author at the time when it was written.

2. In the nineteenth chapter of the *Acts* we find that Ephesus has become St. Paul's headquarters; the centre of interest has been shifted from Jerusalem and Antioch, and the Apostle's labours are being mainly spent upon Asia Minor. Corinth, however, occupies a considerable share in his thoughts; and, during the period of over two years which he spends at Ephesus, communications with the Corinthian Church are being carried on. It is the sequence of events during this period and the subsequent six months that we have to examine. Such an examination of the *order* in which events followed one another might be made without any determination of the absolute dates of any; but it is convenient to

[1] See Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 98.

indicate here the system of chronology which has been adopted. Provisionally, the dates assigned to the principal events of St. Paul's life by Mr. Turner[1] will be taken as a basis for investigation. It is now pretty generally agreed among scholars that the dates formerly accepted, *e.g.*, by Wieseler and Lightfoot, are two years too late; but this does not, of course, affect materially the accuracy of Lightfoot's conclusions as to the order in which the several incidents of the Apostle's career took place. Indeed, the scheme of reconstruction of St. Paul's history while at Ephesus, which has approved itself to the present editor, is in the main that put forward by Lightfoot,[2] although his *dates* have not been followed. This scheme is not without difficulties; but it is dependent on fewer subsidiary hypotheses than any other which has been proposed, and it possesses special claim to consideration from the fact that it is an attempt to explain the documents as they stand without resort to the heroic measures of dissection which some critics have found it necessary to adopt.

3. I start, then, with the assumption that St. Paul's sojourn of over two years at Ephesus[3] (Acts xix. 10) lasted from December, 52, or January, 53, to March or April, 55, and I proceed to examine his communications with Corinth during that period. The Church at Corinth had been founded by the Apostle on his second missionary journey, late in the year 50 (Acts xviii. 1 f.);[4] but, all too soon after its foundation, it became apparent that the laxity of morals, for which Corinth was notorious, was showing itself in the lives of the Christian converts. Men do not easily shake themselves free from evil traditions and associations; and the power of the new faith took time to establish itself there as elsewhere. When the restraints imposed by the Apostle's presence were removed, various scandals betrayed the moral weakness of these clever Greeks who had welcomed the new teaching but a short time before. It would appear that while St. Paul was at Ephesus bad news reached him from Corinth as to the morals of his converts; and in consequence of this he paid to that city a brief disciplinary visit, of which indeed no account has been given by St. Luke, but which is alluded to in St. Paul's Epistles (see especially 2 Cor. xii. 21, where we are informed

[1] See article "Chronology of N.T." in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

[2] See *Biblical Essays*, pp. 222, 274.

[3] It is probable that the "three months" of ver. 8 is to be reckoned in addition to the "two years" of ver. 10; *cf.* τριετίαν, Acts xx. 31.

[4] On the Church at Corinth, see the first chapter of Prof. Findlay's *Introduction to 1 Corinthians* (vol. ii., p. 729 ff.).

that it was in consequence of the lax morality of the Corinthians that he visited them in grief).

4. The reasons for holding that this visit (which we shall call the "Intermediate Visit") took place are as follows. We have seen that St. Paul's first visit to Corinth is recorded in Acts xviii. Another visit is mentioned in Acts xx. 3, *viz.*, that which was subsequent to the two Canonical Epistles to the Corinthians, and which was in contemplation while he was writing both. Its date was 55-56. But it appears from 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, that this was his *third* visit;[1] and hence a visit to Corinth must have been paid between the years 50 and 55 (probably towards the end of the period, say in the autumn of 54), of which no account is given in the *Acts*.[2] It is all but impossible to fit in this visit if we do not suppose it to have been paid from Ephesus; and it would have been an easy matter for St. Paul to have undertaken this. Ephesus was only a week or ten days' sail from Corinth, and on the receipt of ill news it would have been the most natural thing in the world that he should thus cross the Ægean hastily to set matters right. It appears distinctly from 2 Cor. ii. 1 that this visit was a painful one, and such as he would not wish again to have experience of. And, further, the language of xii. 21, xiii. 2, suggests that the trouble which caused this Painful Visit was not faction or schism, but unchastity of life among his converts.

5. St. Paul thereafter returned to Ephesus and wrote, probably after no long interval, a letter which is now lost. It is mentioned in 1 Cor. v. 9; and it contained, he tells us, injunctions to the Corinthian Christians "to keep no company with fornicators," injunctions (probably) suggested to him by what he had seen on his recent visit. That visit had been one of stern rebuke rather than of counsel; and it is quite intelligible that on his return he should desire to put in writing his deliberate advice. There is no indication that anything had happened up to this point which suggested the rise of schisms or of party spirit at Corinth. Indeed it may well have been that his visit, ἐν λύπῃ (2 Cor. ii. 1), was the proximate cause of the schisms with which the Church at Corinth was soon to be troubled; for the attempt to enforce discipline for lapses in morality

[1] This, indeed, has been denied by Paley (*Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. iv., § xi.) and, recently, by Prof. Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 275) and Dr. Robertson (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 494); but I cannot think that their explanations of 2 Cor. xii. 14, xiii. 1, as alluding to a visit intended, but not paid, are satisfactory.

[2] The language of 1 Cor. xvi. 7, οὐ θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἄρτι ἐν παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν, seems to suggest that his last visit to Corinth had been a brief and hasty one.

would naturally stir up party opposition, and would stimulate dis affection on the part of the less stable members of the little community. The Lost Letter, then, consisted mainly of rules as to conduct, and was not concerned, so far as we know, with the question of schism, which had probably not yet arisen.[1] Two other topics, however, it may have touched upon, *viz.*, the Apostle's plans of travel and the collection for the poor Judæan Christians. We must not lose sight of the fact that St. Paul's plans were in the main determined during these years by his purpose of making a collection to relieve the needs of the poorer converts in Judæa and of bringing it in person to Jerusalem. Now, as to his plans of travel, it is plain that the route mentioned in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, and actually adopted in the sequel (Acts xix. 21), was not the route which the Corinthians expected him to take. At one time he had wished to travel from Ephesus to Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth—Jerusalem, a route which would twice give them the benefit and the privilege of seeing him while he was in Europe (2 Cor. i. 15, 16). This plan seems to have been communicated to them before 1 Corinthians was written; and it is obvious to suggest that it was announced in the Lost Letter. Again, it will appear (see § 7) from a consideration of the structure of the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians that the Corinthians in *their* letter which preceded it had asked for details about the manner in which the collection for the Judæan Christians was to be made. In other words, they had already been informed by St. Paul that such a collection was being organised; and so we are led round to the suggestion that this information also was contained in the Lost Letter.

6. We now proceed with the history. Some time after the Lost Letter had been despatched bad news again came from Corinth, and this of two kinds. First, members of Chloe's household (οἱ Χλόης, 1 Cor. i. 11, *cf.* also 1 Cor. xi. 18) reported that factions had arisen, and that a Peter party and an Apollos party were setting themselves up in opposition to the party of Paul. Some indeed went so far as to call themselves, *par excellence*, the "Christ party" (1 Cor. i. 12). And, secondly, a rumour reached Ephesus that an abominable case of incest had occurred among the Christians at Corinth (1 Cor. v. 1). This was much worse than any of the moral lapses which the Apostle had previously rebuked in person or by letter; it was a wickedness

[1] This is an argument which should not be overlooked for placing the Intermediate Visit before the Lost Letter, or at any rate before the First Canonical Epistle.

which even the heathen did not tolerate.[1] About the same time that these distressing reports reached Ephesus, a dutiful message to St. Paul was brought from Corinth by Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17). These envoys seem to have brought with them a letter asking for advice on certain points of conduct and discipline, *viz.*, about Marriage, Celibacy, the use of Idol-meats, the Gifts of the Spirit, and the Collection,[2] with each of which the Apostle deals separately in his reply under a distinct heading, beginnning **περὶ δέ** . . . It is interesting, because so natural,[3] that the Corinthians seem to have made no mention in their letter of the schisms and disorders which had arisen among them.[4]

7. It was in consequence of the reports which had reached him, as well as in reply to this letter of the Corinthian Church, that St. Paul wrote the First Canonical Epistle. Of this the early part is entirely taken up with warnings against schism (chaps. i.-iv.), and with a stern rebuke for the sins of the flesh into which they had fallen, and of which the Church had not taken cognisance (chaps. v., vi.). The remainder of the Epistle is mainly occupied with the letter of the Corinthians to him, taking up their points in order: **περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι** (1 Cor. vii. 1); **περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων** (1 Cor. vii. 25); **περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων** (1 Cor. viii. 1); **περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν** (1 Cor. xii. 1); **περὶ δὲ τῆς λογίας** (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It thus appears, and it is important to bear it in mind, that chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 *Corinthians* are of the nature of an appendix or excursus, and that chaps. i.-vi. constitute the letter proper, as containing the Apostle's special message to the Corinthian Church at this juncture. His language in reference to the party spirit which was manifesting itself is grave and uncompromising (1 Cor. iii. 12-15), and he writes about his own position in a spirit of depression (1 Cor.

[1] See Cicero, *pro Cluentio*, 6, 15.

[2] Lewin (*St. Paul*, vol. i., p. 386) and Findlay (*Expositor*, June, 1900) have tried to reconstruct this letter; but beyond the general fact that it dealt with certain topics we have no data upon which to go.

[3] See Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. iii., § i.

[4] Mention may be made here of an apocryphal letter of the Corinthians to St. Paul and his supposed reply, which are extant in Armenian and in Latin. An English translation by Lord Byron will be found in Stanley's *Corinthians*, vol. ii., p. 305. These letters do not correspond in any way to the lost correspondence discussed above (1 Cor. v. 9, xvi. 17), and, although they were admitted into the Armenian and Syrian canon, have no claim to authenticity or genuineness. They were originally incorporated in the apocryphal *Acts of Paul* (see Sanday, *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 907).

iv. 11-13); but when he begins to speak of the bad living of his converts, and to comment on the shocking news which had reached him, his tone is one of severe and unsparing rebuke. He is astounded that such a scandal as has been mentioned to him (1 Cor. v. 1) should be endured for a moment, and he bids them excommunicate the offender at once (1 Cor. v. 5). In the Lost Letter he had warned them against associating with persons who lived impure lives, but now it has actually become necessary to rebuke them for tolerating the company of a man who is living unchastely with his stepmother (1 Cor. v. 1). They must "put away the wicked person" from among themselves (1 Cor. v. 13). It is their duty to "judge them that are within," and it is a scandalous thing that such wrongs as a Christian father endures when his son has robbed him of his wife should be brought for adjudication before heathen tribunals.[1] The Christian community should exercise its own spiritual prerogative (1 Cor. v. 4), and decide such cases without the interference of heathen lawyers (1 Cor. vi. 1-7). The wickedness of sins of the flesh only appears in its true light when judged on Christian principles (1 Cor. vi. 15 ff.), and it is by these that the fitting punishment should be determined.

8. Such is the language and the drift of the body of 1 *Corinthians*. The allusions to the Passover feast (1 Cor. v. 7, 8, *cf.* xv. 20, 23) make it probable that it was written about Easter, and the year was, according to the system we have adopted, 55 A.D. This is a consequence of 1 Cor. xvi. 8, from which it appears that when it was composed it was St. Paul's intention to leave Ephesus after the ensuing Pentecost. Thus the letter was written during the last months of his stay at that city.[2] Nothing is said as to the bearers of the letter; but 2 Cor. xii. 18 seems to indicate that Titus

[1] The Roman law under which a prosecution for adultery would be made was the *lex Julia de adulteriis*, passed by Augustus, 17 B.C. It is probable, however, that native Greek law would be enforced at Corinth. This also recognised adultery as an indictable offence; the damages allowed in any special case being assessed at the discretion of the judges.

[2] The subscription in the received text states that it was written at Philippi; but this is a manifest mistake, probably due to a misunderstanding of the words Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχομαι in 1 Cor. xvi. 5. Ver. 8 of the same chapter is conclusive as to the place of writing. This subscription further adds that the letter was carried to Corinth by the envoys Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus along with Timothy; but this again seems to be a misapprehension, although there is some justification in 1 Cor. xvi. 18 for the supposition that the envoys who had brought the Corinthian letter to Ephesus took back the answer (see above). For Timothy's movements see § 13 note.

and an unnamed brother (see note *in loc.*) were entrusted with it. This is confirmed by 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 6, passages which explain how St. Paul's grave anxiety as to the reception which the Corinthians would give to his letter of warning and rebuke was allayed by the news which Titus brought him about it (see notes *in loc.*).[1]

9. I have already remarked that the directions about the collection to be made at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 1) were given in answer to enquiries on the subject sent by the Corinthian Christians, and presuppose that his correspondents were already sensible of the obligation which rested upon them of helping the poor brethren of Judæa. It is only the *manner* in which the collection is to be made that is now prescribed for the first time (Easter, 55). And we have also seen (§ 5) that the information as to St. Paul's plans of travel given in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 was such as to cause the Corinthians keen disappointment.[2] He then announces that he will come *viâ* Macedonia, and that he may possibly winter at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 6). This plan was carried into effect. He left Ephesus about April, 55, shortly after the riot which was stirred up by Demetrius, and proceeded to Macedonia (Acts xx. 1) *viâ* Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12). Here he had arranged to meet Titus on the return of the latter from his mission to Corinth; but he was disappointed. We do not know how long he waited for Titus; but after an interval during which "a door was opened unto him" (2 Cor. ii. 12) he crossed over to Macedonia in much anxiety of spirit. At last they met at some undefined point in St. Paul's Macedonian tour of inspection (Acts xx. 2), not improbably at Philippi, as Neapolis the port of Philippi was the natural place of embarkation for Troas. Thus St. Paul would be likely to meet Titus at Philippi on his way to their rendezvous. Further, Philippi was a place where St. Paul

[1] See, on this question, Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 280 f. Titus is mentioned nine times in 2 *Corinthians*, and evidently had a special interest in and connexion with Corinth. That his name does not appear in 1 *Corinthians* is no more surprising than that it does not appear in *Acts*. It is likely that it was the ability with which he conducted himself as the bearer of 1 *Corinthians*, and as St. Paul's representative at that critical moment at Corinth, that first marked him out as fit to be a leader in the Church.

[2] Dr. Robertson says (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 493) that 1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6 is "a passage totally out of correspondence with the situation presupposed in 2 Cor. i. 23. Moreover, in defending his change of plan (2 Cor. i. 15-23) St. Paul would not have failed to appeal to the clear statement of his intentions in 1 Cor. xvi. 5." I cannot understand where the difficulty comes in. The Corinthians took umbrage at the message of 1 Cor. xvi. 5; appealing to it would have had no point. St. Paul's line of defence is quite sound (see § 12 below).

had many good and staunch friends; and it was a suitable centre from which to visit the Christian communities formerly founded by him.[1]

10. Titus reported in the first instance that the Corinthians had loyally responded to the appeal made by St. Paul in 1 Cor. v. and vi. as to their treatment of the case of incest. They had taken the case into their own hands, and had punished the offender with extreme severity (2 Cor. ii. 6 ff.). They had gone so far in their zeal to assert the spiritual prerogative of the Church, in which St. Paul deemed himself to have an important share (2 Cor. vii. 12; *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 4, **συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος**), that it was now desirable to offer counsels of forbearance (2 Cor. ii. 6 f.) rather than to inflame their indignation against the offender. The really important end which the Apostle had in view when writing 1 Cor. v. had been gained, *viz.*, he had convinced the members of the Church that it was *their* duty to take cognisance of grave moral offences. Quite possibly the civil courts might have decided equitably as to the measure of the penalty to be inflicted for the **ἀδικία**; but the primary purpose of his sharp rebuke was not to secure due retribution in this particular instance (**οὐχ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος οὐδὲ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος**, 2 Cor. vii. 12), although this was doubtless necessary, but to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church to pass judgment in all cases of moral lapse, as was its inherent right and privilege. The Church at Corinth was an Apostolic Church. It had been founded by St. Paul. Though "absent in body" he was "present in spirit" at the deliberations of its members (1 Cor. v. 3). And to vindicate the spiritual authority of the Church founded by him was, in effect, to vindicate *his* authority. Thus he can go so far as to say that the main purpose of his stern letter of rebuke (1 Cor.) was **ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ** (2 Cor. vii. 12, where see note). To manifest their zeal for St. Paul's authority was to manifest their sense that Christian standards of living were widely different from heathen standards, and it was further to recognise that the Church has spiritual authority "to bind and to loose". In exhibiting their zeal for him, their founder, they had made clear their recognition of this great principle. If it be said that to read this into 2 Cor. vii. 12 is to go beyond the tenor of the words used, it must be replied

[1] The subscription to 2 Corinthians, **Πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων τῆς Μακεδονίας διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκᾶ**, would be a confirmation of this conclusion, if any reliance could be placed on these colophons to the Epistles. See notes on 2 Cor. viii. 18, xiii. 14.

that St. Paul's language in the earlier letter sufficiently shows the high spiritual authority which he would have the Corinthians attach to the deliberate decisions of their assembled leaders. "In the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. v. 4). The words "and my spirit" indicate not only his sympathy for them, but his assurance that the decisions to which such an assembly would be guided would be even as the decisions promulgated by his own apostolic authority which was "not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father".[1]

11. The second matter which Titus reported was not so satisfactory to St. Paul. Titus explained, as it would seem, that the Corinthians were much distressed at the news that the Apostle's plans of travel had been changed (2 Cor. i. 16, 17), and that they were ready in consequence to impute to him instability of purpose which amounted to fickleness. St. Paul's answer is found in 2 Cor. i. 23, ii. 4. He did not carry out his former intention of crossing direct from Ephesus to Corinth because he thought it better that there should be a short interval, during which they might mend their ways, before he again addressed them. His last visit (the "Intermediate Visit") had been ἐν λύπῃ; and it was undesirable that his next visit should be of the same character. So instead of visiting them at once, he wrote a severe letter (1 Cor.), and proceeded to Macedonia in the first instance, reserving his visit to Corinth until they should have had time to profit by his written rebukes. In this change of plan there was no display of fickleness; his one desire was to edify them and to do what was best for their true welfare.

12. And, thirdly, Titus had no good news to bring about the factions in Corinth, concerning which St. Paul had already written (1 Cor. i. 12-18, iii. 1-6). When he despatched the First Canonical Epistle he was already aware that his authority had been called in question at Corinth, and that some were passing unfavourable judgments upon his acts (1 Cor. iv. 3-5). Already he had bidden the rebellious party not to be too ready to judge by the superficial appearance of things, but to distrust their hasty conclusions about him (1 Cor. iv. 5, 10-14). He had written mildly, but with authority, as became an Apostle. "Be ye imitators of me" he had twice repeated (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1). And he had assured them that when he came, as he certainly would come (1 Cor. xi. 34), to Corinth, those who had ventured to rebel would be treated with severity, if they did not

[1] Gal. i. 1.

repent (1 Cor. iv. 18-21). But Titus seems to have reported that the factious opposition to St. Paul's authority was even more bitter than it was before 1 Corinthians was written. The Apostle's postponement of his visit gave the malcontents courage to break out into open defiance (2 Cor. x. 10-12).

13. On learning all these facts from Titus, in part consoling, in part most distressing, St. Paul wrote the Second Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians, associating the name of Timothy with his own in the address at the beginning.[1] The principal person entrusted with the carriage of the letter was, as was natural, Titus (2 Cor. viii. 17), whose former mission had been so prudently and honourably discharged (2 Cor. xii. 17, 18). With Titus were associated two

[1] It will be convenient to state at this point the view of Timothy's movements which has been adopted. We learn from 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, that he was supposed by St. Paul to be on his way to Corinth when the First Canonical Epistle was written, and that the Apostle expected him to return to Ephesus with "the brethren" who were the bearers of that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 11). It does not appear that he was entrusted with any special mission to the Corinthian Church, the language of 1 Cor. iv. 17, "who shall put you in remembrance of my ways which be in Christ," being suggestive rather of informal conference than of a formal embassy, and that of 1 Cor. xvi. 10, 11 implying, as it would seem, that Timothy is to be welcomed at Corinth only as a passing visitor on his way back to the Apostle's side. Now it is natural to identify this journey made by Timothy with that recorded in Acts xix. 22, where St. Paul is said during the last weeks of his stay in Ephesus to have "sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus". Timothy had been associated with St. Paul on his first visit (about the year 50) to the cities of Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14, 15, xviii. 5), and he was evidently a suitable lieutenant to send in advance to prepare the way for the Apostle's second visit. Most probably the business of the collection in Macedonia was entrusted to him to organise. And the date of this journey of Timothy to Macedonia (January or February, 55) well agrees with the date which must be assigned to the journey referred to in 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10. The plan seems to have been to visit the churches of Macedonia (this, the important purpose of the journey, is all that is mentioned in Acts) and then to return to Ephesus by sea from Corinth (this, as the only point in the journey interesting to the Corinthians, is alone mentioned in 1 Cor.). Erastus, Timothy's fellow-traveller on this occasion, bore the same name as the city treasurer at Corinth, whom we find there about February, 56 (Rom. xvi. 23), as well as at a later period (2 Tim. iv. 20); and it is highly reasonable to identify him with this important member of the Corinthian Church, and to suppose that when we find him with Timothy he was on his way home. Timothy is also found at Corinth in St. Paul's company when the Epistle to the Romans was written (Rom. xvi. 21); but we have nothing to show us whether or no he had got so far during the preceding spring. It is on the whole probable that he found so much to do in Macedonia that he stayed there during the whole spring and summer of 55 (so Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 276 f.). At any rate we meet with him next in Macedonia (and probably, as we have seen, at Philippi) in St. Paul's company about the month of November, 55, when 2 Corinthians was despatched (2 Cor. i. 1).

others, possibly Luke and Barnabas, but of their names we cannot be certain (2 Cor. viii. 18, 22, where see notes). The Epistle being despatched, St. Paul travelled slowly through Macedonia, arriving at Corinth in due course as he had promised (1 Cor. xvi. 5, 6), and staying there three months (Acts xx. 3). This period probably covered December, 55, and January and February, 56. In consequence of a Jewish plot he then returned through Macedonia instead of sailing direct for Syria as he had intended to do (Acts xx. 3); and starting from Philippi "after the days of unleavened bread" (Acts xx. 6), *i.e.*, March 18-25, he arrived in Jerusalem in time for the Pentecost festival of the year 56.

14. The account which has been given above of the sequence of events during St. Paul's sojourn at Ephesus assumes that the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians is the "Painful Letter" to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, 12; and it has been urged by several critics that it does not answer to the description there given.[1] The two allusions are as follows: "For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you" (2 Cor. ii. 4); and "For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it although I did regret; for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. . . . So although I wrote unto you, I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong nor for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your zeal on our behalf might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God" (2 Cor. vii. 8, 12). It is said that "from beginning to end of 1 Corinthians there are no traces of anguish of heart and much affliction, either in utterances expressing these feelings or in the style of the Epistle itself".[2] I believe that the passages which have been quoted in § 8 demonstrate the inaccuracy of any such assertion. Critics have strangely overlooked in this connexion the fact that chaps. vii.-xvi. of 1 Corinthians are mainly taken up with answering the queries which his correspondents had put to St. Paul; and that the body of the letter proper is contained in chaps. i.-vi. It is in these earlier chapters that we are to look for traces of mental anguish and depression, and I hold that they are plainly there to be found, and that the note of identification afforded by 2 Cor. ii. 4 is answered by such passages

[1] *E.g.*, this objection was raised by Klöpper (1870) and has been repeated by Waite in the *Speaker's Commentary*, by Robertson (Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 494) and by Kennedy (2 *and* 3 *Corinthians*, p. 64 f.), as well as by others.

[2] Kennedy, *loc. cit.*, p. 65.

as 1 Cor. iii. 12-15, iv. 11-13, v. 1-6, 13, vi. 5, 9-11. Had the structure of 1 Corinthians been sufficiently attended to, I cannot think that this objection would ever have seemed forcible. And so with 2 Cor. vii. 8. It has been urged against the identification of the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians that "it is scarcely comprehensible that St. Paul should have said, even in a moment of strong excitement, of so costly a monument of Christian truth as the First Epistle is, that he repented for a while of ever having written it".[1] But this is to exaggerate the measure of the Apostle's regret. He merely says (2 Cor. vii. 8) that for a moment he regretted having given them pain by what he had written, *i.e.*, he regretted the severe sentences which he had penned; but not that he lamented the composition of the whole Epistle. The earlier part of the Epistle, which is, I repeat, the core of the letter, is extremely severe, and especially chaps. v. and vi.[2] In the phrase "the Painful Letter" there is, in fact, a latent fallacy. The language of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, would be sufficiently accounted for if *any* part of the letter to which he refers seemed to St. Paul (for the moment) to be unduly severe, or if *any* section of it had caused unexpected grief to the Corinthians.

15. An objection of a somewhat similar character is that the language used in 2 Cor. ii. 6-11 cannot be taken as referring to the punishment of the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1-5, inasmuch as the mild treatment suggested by St. Paul in the later Epistle would be quite inadequate to the offence.[3] Not to dwell on the fact that unrelenting severity is not a Christian virtue, and that Titus may have reported some extenuating circumstances of which we know nothing, I believe that the considerations brought forward above in § 10 go a long way to break the force of this objection. The intimate connexion between the fifth and sixth chapters of 1 Corinthians has not been sufficiently recognised by commentators, and thus the primary purpose of St. Paul's message of rebuke has been misconceived. He was more anxious to awaken the sleeping conscience of the Church at Corinth, and to prevail upon its members to exercise their powers of spiritual discipline, than to adjudicate between the wronged father and the offending son. Excommunication was the only suitable penalty for the latter's grave offence, but St. Paul had never meant

[1] Waite, *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 383.

[2] Compare also the great severity of the incidental remark in 1 Cor. xv. 2. ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε. That he should suggest such a possibility shows how much he is depressed as he writes.

[3] This is urged by Schmiedel and Jülicher amongst others.

to convey (although the Corinthians had misunderstood his counsel) that the ban could not be taken off by the same authority which had imposed it, if evidence of penitence were forthcoming. Indeed the identification of ὁ ἀδικήσας in 2 Cor. vii. 12 with the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1 seems to be not doubtful when the language and purport of the earlier passage are considered. I have already pointed out (§ 10) that the aim of the Apostle in writing 1 Cor. v. and vi. was not merely that the offender should be excommunicated, but that the scandal of such a case being brought by Christians before a heathen court should be avoided. Consider, further, St. Paul's language. Some persons, he says (1 Cor. iv. 18, 19), "were puffed up" (ἐφυσιώθησαν) as though he were not coming; *i.e.*, they made little of his authority in his absence. The same word (πεφυσιωμένοι) is used (1 Cor. v. 2) of the action, or rather the inaction, of the Christian community in reference to the case of incest; and in this matter he declares "Your boasting is not good" (οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν, 1 Cor. v. 6). That is to say, their καύχημα consisted in their resistance to his apostolic authority; they were "puffed up," and so they had not dealt with the offender as they would have done had they followed his teachings (1 Cor. v. 2). It is with reference to this that he says in the later letter, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα, ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοί ἐστε (2 Cor. ii. 9). Again, the sentence which he directs to be pronounced upon the offender is παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but when he bids them be merciful and forgive, his reason is ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ (2 Cor. ii. 11). The man was only "delivered over to Satan," εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός (1 Cor. v. 5); but care must be taken lest Satan rob the Church of his soul (2 Cor. ii. 11). The reference to Satan in the later Epistle is pointless, unless we bear in mind the tenor of the sentence in the earlier one. And there is another phrase perhaps worthy of attention. The offender is called ὁ ἀδικήσας in 2 Cor. vii. 12, and the injured person is ὁ ἀδικηθείς. If we turn back to 1 Cor. vi. we find that the words ἀδικεῖν and ἄδικος (1 Cor. vi. 8, 9) are specially used of the carnal offences which St. Paul has there in view. The point of his rebuke in that chapter is that it would have been better for the offended father to have suffered wrong (ἀποστερεῖσθε; *cf.* for the force of this 1 Cor. vii. 5) than to have brought the matter before the heathen tribunals. And when St. Paul speaks of the Corinthians as having proved themselves in the end to be ἁγνοὺς τῷ πράγματι (2 Cor. vii. 11), the last words recall the ἐν τῷ πράγματι of 1 Thess. iv. 6, where the reference is to adultery, the language used being strikingly like that of

1 Cor. vi. 8. There are also some other links connecting the "Painful Letter" with 1 Corinthians which should not be overlooked. In 2 Cor. ii. 4 St. Paul is careful to explain that the letter which was written with tears was written οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε ἣν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς. It might be expected therefore that the Painful Letter should exhibit some trace of this overflowing ἀγάπη. And such a trace is conspicuously present in the last words of 1 Corinthians, ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (1 Cor. xvi. 24). No other letter of St. Paul's has so affectionate a farewell. It was plainly added for some special reason. But if we identify this letter with the "Painful Letter," 2 Cor. ii. 4 gives an excellent reason for its addition. And, once more, the reference in 2 Cor. iii. 1 f. to a former self-commendation which the Apostle had indited finds its best and simplest explanation if we bring it into connexion with 1 Cor. ix. 1 f.

16. Something must now be said about other schemes of reconstruction of the history which have been proposed by recent writers. It is unnecessary to rehearse them all,[1] but the discussion of one or two of the most plausible may serve to bring the difficulties of the problem into clearer relief, and to supply tests by which the adequacy of the solution that has been adopted may be estimated. In England, the editor of 1 *Corinthians* in this Commentary, Professor Findlay,[2] and Professor Sanday[3] (not to speak of German writers) interpolate a *second* lost letter from St. Paul to the Corinthians between the First and Second Canonical Epistles. They hold it probable that the embassy of Timothy to Corinth *viâ* Macedonia (Acts xix. 22, 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10) succeeded so far as this, that Timothy reached Corinth, but that his mission was not a success as regards the healing of disorders there. In consequence of the bad report brought back by Timothy, St. Paul wrote a *second* lost letter and sent it by the more capable hands of Titus.[4] It is the return of Titus from this mission which St. Paul awaited with such anxiety at Troas (2 Cor. i. 13), and the missive which Titus bore was the Painful Letter to which the Apostle alludes in 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8.

[1] An elaborate account of the various theories which have been propounded will be found in an article by Hilgenfeld in his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* (1899), and a comparative table is given by Schmiedel in the *Hand Kommentar*, pp. viii, ix. *Cf.* also Jülicher's *Einleitung* for a good discussion.

[2] See vol. ii., p. 736 f., and Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. iii., p. 711 ff., *s.v.* "Paul".

[3] *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 901 f.

[4] On this hypothesis Titus was not the bearer of 1 *Corinthians*.

Another scheme agreeing with this, in so far as it refuses to identify the Painful Letter with 1 *Corinthians*, has recently been expounded by Dr. Robertson.[1] This writer holds that after the despatch of 1 Corinthians by the hands of Titus, St. Paul changed the plan of travel announced in that letter (1 Cor. xvi. 5) and decided to take the route Ephesus—Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth, which would give the Corinthians a δευτέρα χαρά; that painful news having been brought back by Titus from Corinth, the Apostle reverted to the plan announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, as he was unwilling to visit Corinth so soon under the circumstances; that he wrote a severe letter, now lost, of which Titus was again the bearer; and that it was on Titus' report of the result of this second mission that 2 Corinthians was written and entrusted to the same capable messenger.

17. On both these theories the same observation may be made at the outset. They are highly complicated. Quite apart in the one case from the assumption (for which there is no evidence) that Timothy reached Corinth and that his mission there was a failure, and from the assumption in the other case[2] that the language of 2 Cor. i. 15 cannot be explained unless we suppose St. Paul to have changed his mind as to his route *twice* after the despatch of 1 *Corinthians*, both theories presuppose events and documents of which no historical trace has survived. Doubtless we must not assume that all the facts have been recorded; it may be necessary to introduce some hypotheses in order to co-ordinate the fragments of history at our disposal. Nevertheless, the theory which depends on the fewest hypotheses has the best claim to acceptance, provided that it covers the facts. Now the writers whose theories have been indicated in § 16 agree in interpolating a letter between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians, which has utterly vanished out of knowledge. Such an interpolated letter was suggested by Bleek as long ago as 1830, and its actuality has been assumed by many critics since in Germany as well as in England. No doubt the phenomena may be accounted for by an artifice of this sort. We may put anything we please into a letter of which we know nothing; there is no way of proving our speculations to be wrong. But the necessity for so large an hypothesis must be glaringly evident before the hypothesis can be justified.

[1] Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 495, *s.v.* "2 Corinthians".

[2] Dr. Sanday seems also to favour this idea of a double change of intention as to his route on the part of St. Paul (*Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 903). See § 16 above.

And it has not been proved, as we have seen (§§ 14, 15), that the "Painful Letter" of 2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8, cannot have been the First Canonical Epistle to the Corinthians. It is upon this supposed impossibility that the whole edifice of theory rests, and the base does not appear—to the present writer at least—to be broad enough to bear the superstructure.

CHAPTER II.

THE INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

1. Our discussion has hitherto taken for granted the *unity* of the Epistle (2 Cor.) with which we have to do. But this has been repeatedly questioned, and the arguments alleged in support of the composite character of the document require to be considered in detail. So far back as 1767 Semler urged that the Epistle could be resolved into three parts: (1) chaps. i.-viii. + Rom. xvi. 1-20 + chap. xiii. 11-13; (2) chaps. x.-xiii. 10; (3) chap. ix.; of which he held (2) to be posterior to (1). After a struggling existence the analysis attracted fresh interest when Hausrath in 1870 took it up in part and advocated the distinctness of chaps. x.-xiii. from chaps. i.-ix. Schmiedel (in the *Hand Kommentar*) defended this view in 1890, and Clemen has since adopted it, and indeed regards it as an established result of criticism.[1] The theory has not had many advocates in England, but it has been vigorously supported by Dr. J. H. Kennedy in his work entitled *The Second and Third Epistles to the Corinthians* (1900). By no writer has the matter been more carefully and acutely investigated, and his arguments demand attention.

2. Dr. Kennedy's view of the sequence of events during St. Paul's stay at Ephesus is as follows: 1. Titus was sent on a mission to Corinth to preach and to continue St. Paul's work (2 Cor. xii. 18) at some period after the Apostle's first visit (Acts xviii. 1). 2. Lost Letter to the Corinthians. 3. Mission of Timothy to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 5). 4. 1 *Corinthians* written from Ephesus about April, 54. 5. St. Paul stayed at Ephesus because of the greatness of the opportunity there (1 Cor. xvi. 8). 6. He formed a fixed purpose of visiting Jerusalem with the offerings which were being collected (Acts xix. 21). 7. Bad news came from Corinth. 8. St. Paul accordingly paid a brief disciplinary visit

[1] See *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22nd Dec., 1900; and *cf.* Clemen's work entitled *Die Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe.*

to that city. 9. On his return he wrote from Ephesus the Painful Letter, of which the end is preserved to us in 2 Cor. x.-xiii. 10. Mission of Timothy to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22). 11. Mission of Titus to Corinth to subdue the rebels there. 12. On Titus' report of the success of his mission St. Paul wrote from Macedonia about November, 55, a letter of which we have the beginning preserved in 2 Cor. i.-ix., the rest being lost. 13. This letter was forwarded to Corinth by Titus and two unnamed companions, the bearers being entrusted also with the business of the collection (2 Cor. viii. 6). It will be recognised at once that this is a highly complicated scheme. Dr. Kennedy has to assume *three* missions of Titus to Corinth instead of two, the number which commentators have generally recognised; and he has, in like manner, to find room for *two* missions of Timothy, one to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17) and a second, quite distinct from this, to Macedonia (Acts xix. 21). In addition, he has to push back the date of 1 *Corinthians* by a year, in order to give time for all the incidents of which he finds traces in the Epistles; and he splits up 2 Corinthians into two fragmentary letters. We shall consider these points separately.

3. First, then, as to the missions of Titus. Dr. Kennedy takes in close connexion the two verses 2 Cor. viii. 6, 7, and translates (p. 122), "I summoned (?exhorted) Titus that as he had made a beginning, so he might accomplish in you this grace also; yea that as ye abound in everything, in faith and utterance, and in all diligence, and in your love towards us, so ye may abound in this grace also". This translation is probably right (see note *in loc.*); but the inference which its author derives from it is by no means inevitable. Dr. Kennedy holds that the words prove that the furtherance of the collection for Jerusalem was the purpose of Titus' later visit only, and formed no part of his commission in the earlier visit. But this cannot be maintained. Such an interpretation will harmonise with Dr. Kennedy's scheme of Titus' visits (see above); but the passage is quite consistent with the other view that Titus' two visits to Corinth were made as the bearer of the two Canonical Epistles. For in what St. Paul says, the emphasis is on the contrast between προενήρξατο and ἐπιτελέσῃ. A beginning had been made by Titus in the matter of the collection; he is now to finish his work, that the Corinthians may be as conspicuous for their liberality as they already are for other graces. Dr. Kennedy objects to this that it is inconceivable that St. Paul when sending Titus with a strong message of rebuke should also have instructed him to obtain money contributions. 'Such a course," he says, "would have been as inconsistent

with wise diplomacy as with the self-respect which formed so marked a feature in St. Paul's character."[1] But to argue thus is to overlook the fact that St. Paul's instructions about the collection in 1 Cor. xvi. 1-5 were given in answer to queries addressed to him on the subject by the Church of Corinth. The first part of the letter which Titus carried was taken up with rebuke; but there was nothing undiplomatic in the fact that St. Paul sent his answers to these queries by the same hand. In fact to have withheld his answer would have only given offence.[2]

4. We have now to consider the evidence adduced for the dissection of 2 Corinthians. First, it is urged that there is not only a change of tone at x. 1, but that the way in which the chapter opens shows that something has been lost which immediately preceded it. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ are the first words, and δέ (it is said) marks an antithesis. The passage "contains an allusion to an objection which had been brought against the Apostle, which it brings before us not as if the subject were now for the first time introduced, but as if it had been already mentioned".[3] Rather should we say that δέ marks the transition to a new subject, a usage to which we have an exact parallel in viii. 1 of this very Epistle; where after the words which conclude chap. vii., χαίρω ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν, St. Paul passes to his next topic with the words γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν. Another parallel is found at 1 Cor. xv. 1, where in like manner a new subject is introduced by the words γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν. It is unnecessary to assume, as some have done, that the change of tone here was caused by the arrival at this point of a messenger from Corinth bringing tidings later and less favourable than that brought by Titus. This may, indeed, be so; but the hypothesis is not needed. It is hardly likely that any of St. Paul's more important letters were written or dictated at a single sitting; and the change of tone is sufficiently accounted for by a change of mood such as every busy and over-burdened man is subject to, especially

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 124.

[2] These considerations also break the force of Dr. Kennedy's main argument for the early date of 1 *Corinthians*. It is plain that the business of the collection had been set on foot *before* the date of that letter, in which counsel is given as to the best method of carrying it on; and thus the phrase ἀπὸ πέρυσι (2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2), in which so much difficulty has been found, receives adequate explanation. The Corinthians would truly be said in November, 55, to have "made a beginning" a year ago, and St. Paul's boast to the Macedonian Christians that Achaia had been "prepared for a year past" was quite justifiable (see note *in loc.*).

[3] Kennedy, *loc. cit.*, p. 96.

if his health is not very robust (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 8, 9, and xii. 7). The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is not a formal treatise like the Epistle to the Romans; it is a personal letter, and in such letters we have no reason to expect either systematic arrangement of topics or pedantically uniform treatment.

5. This consideration helps us, too, to dispose of the difficulty that the last four chapters contemplate an openly rebellious minority at Corinth, the existence of which is not emphasised in the first nine chapters. It was entirely natural that Titus' report being of a mixed character, partly good and partly bad, St. Paul's letter based upon it should show traces at once of his gratification and of his grief. And, indeed, chaps. i.-ix. are not without indications that his authority was not cheerfully accepted by *all* the Corinthian Christians. His defence against the charge of fickleness (i. 15-17) shows that the charge had been made; the mention of οἱ πλείονες in ii. 6 (*cf.* iv. 15) shows that a minority did not heartily concur in the sentence which was inflicted, although, as a matter of fact, all had acquiesced in his view that the Church should take cognisance of the moral scandal which had occurred;[1] he more than hints in ii. 17 that οἱ πολλοί make merchandise of the word of God, and his remark loses point if none such were to be found at Corinth; that τινες, "some persons," make use of commendatory letters (iii. 1) is brought up to their disparagement; the comparison between the ministries of the Old and New Covenants in iii. 6 f. is indirectly aimed at the Judaising party (xi. 22, 23); so, too, those who boast ἐν προσώπῳ καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ (v. 12) are his Corinthian opponents; and, lastly, the force of the antitheses in vi. 8-10 depends on the fact that corresponding statements to his discredit were being made at Corinth. The situation was simply this. The Church as a whole (and, indeed, unanimously, *cf.* vii. 15, 16) had taken the action he desired in the case of the offender; but there remained a turbulent minority who resisted his authority in other matters. The evil of unchastity does not here need special consideration; it was *always* present at Corinth.

6. It is time to adduce the passages upon which defenders of the theory that chaps. x.-xiii. constitute a part of the Painful Letter mainly depend. The case is best put by Dr. Kennedy,[2] who produces

[1] I cannot think that Dr. Kennedy's view (*loc. cit.*, p. 102) that the "minority" here indicated were out-and-out supporters of St. Paul who were anxious to go arther even than he, will commend itself to many minds.

[2] *Loc. cit.*, p. 81 f.

three pairs of parallels between the first nine and the last four chapters of the Epistle. (*a*) In xiii. 10 the Apostle wrote διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὼν γράφω, ἵνα παρὼν μὴ ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι; and to this it is said that ii. 3, καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτὸ, ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην ἔχω, refers. But this reference is by no means inevitable; it is quite as natural to suppose that the effect of the Painful Letter (which I take to be 1 *Corinthians*) having been so salutary, as is indicated in ii. 3, the Apostle would again try the effect of a written threat of severe dealing. (*b*) In xiii. 2 we have προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω ὡς παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν τοῖς προημαρτηκόσιν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν οὐ φείσομαι, to which i. 23 corresponds well if we suppose it written at a later date, *viz.*, φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον. On the other hand, it is plain that the texts may be taken up by another handle; and we may understand their sequence to be that the Apostle having said at i. 23 that he had not come to Corinth before as he wished to spare them, he explains at xiii. 2 with plain sternness that when he does come he will *not* spare. There is nothing gained in lucidity or in force by the hypothesis that xiii. 2 represents the earlier statement and i. 23 the later. (*c*) Again, in x. 6, St. Paul says of himself: ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή, while at ii. 9 he writes, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοί ἐστε. Here it is not to be gainsaid that an excellent sense emerges from counting x. 6 to be prior to ii. 9, which seems, when taken in connexion with vii. 15, 16, to speak of unanimous obedience on the part of the Christians at Corinth. But the character of this obedience has been indicated above in § 4. So far as the specific case as to which St. Paul had written the Painful Letter was concerned, the "obedience" had been that of "all"; but there remained a faction which was disobedient at heart, and until they should have yielded to his authority it could not be said that their "obedience" was "fulfilled". As to these three pairs of parallel passages, then, it is not the case that a satisfactory explanation can be provided only by the expedient of recognising chaps. x.-xiii. as prior to chaps. i.-ix.; on the contrary, they yield a consistent sense when the Epistle is interpreted as a continuous whole. A remarkable commentary upon the danger of relying too much on coincidences of language of this sort is afforded by the fact that exactly an opposite inference to that with which we have been dealing has been drawn by another critic, Drescher. This writer, like Schmiedel and Clemen and Kennedy, regards chaps. x.-xiii. as distinct from chaps. i.-ix.; but he is led from internal evidence, as it appears to him, to count the Nine Chapters

as *earlier* in date than the Four.[1] When internal evidence leads competent scholars to such entirely divergent conclusions, it is a natural inference that the arguments on which they rely do not amount to demonstration.

7. It is further to be borne in mind that the theory which regards chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. as parts of distinct letters which have been joined together by mistake depends on the concurrence of several improbable hypotheses. We have to suppose not only that chaps. i.-ix. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its concluding pages, and that chaps. x.-xiii. are a fragment of a longer letter which has lost its opening pages, but that in each case the mutilation happened to come at a point where a new sentence began a new page. This is a most unlikely thing to happen. Take any book or manuscript at random and count the number of places where the tearing away of pages does not leave a clause incomplete. The number will be small indeed.[2] But the measure of the improbability of this happening must be twice repeated before we reach the improbability of 2 Cor. i.-ix. and 2 Cor. x.-xiii. being *both* fragments. For neither 2 Cor. ix. 15 nor 2 Cor. x. 1 is an incomplete sentence. It has been argued indeed (see above, § 4) that 2 Cor. x. 1, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ . . . , points to some preceding argument which is not to be found in 2 Cor. ix. The argument is unconvincing; but what is here dealt with is the improbability that a tearing of the MS. should have left no trace on the grammatical coherence of the sentence which followed the mutilation. In fact, it is not too much to say that the phenomena of the existing document cannot be explained as resulting from the mere juxtaposition of two fragments of other letters. We have to postulate, in addition, an editor who trimmed the ragged edges and brought the end of chap. ix. and the beginning of chap. x. into grammatical sequence by emendation of the texts which the two fragments presented. And beside all this we have yet to reckon with the improbability, be it great or small, that the two fragments belonging to distinct letters should have become joined together under the mistaken impression that they were parts of one whole.

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, Jan., 1897. Krenkel takes the same view, and holds that chaps. x.-xiii. form a letter later in date than chaps. i.-ix. This was also Semler's view.

[2] A good illustration is afforded by the end of St. Mark's Gospel. It is generally (though not universally) believed that a page has been lost at the end, and that the present conclusion is by another hand. But one of the strongest arguments for this view is that ver. 8 is incomplete, and that it ends ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ, *i.e.*, "for they were afraid to . . . ". There is no such incompleteness apparent at 2 Cor. ix. 15.

Under these circumstances we fall back on the *primâ facie* case, which is that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is an *ens integrum*, and we proceed to bring forward some of the positive data which point to its unity.

8. First, attention should be directed to passages in chaps. x.-xiii. which point back to passages in chaps. i.-ix. (*a*) In xi. 15 St. Paul writes that the false apostles, whom he calls Satan's διάκονοι, are trying to pass themselves off as διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, *i.e.*, as ἀπόστολοι Χριστοῦ (ver. 13). Now there is nothing in the context to suggest such a phrase as διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, and it does not, as a matter of fact, occur in any other of St. Paul's letters or in the N.T. outside this Epistle or in the LXX. The one passage which explains it is iii. 7-11, where the Ministry of the Old Covenant is declared to be less glorious than that of the New, and where ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης is set over against ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως. Unless the readers of xi. 15 were aware that St. Paul used the phrase "the ministry of Righteousness" as descriptive of the ministry of the Gospel, the title διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης would have had no special meaning for them. Thus we conclude that the discussion of iii. 7-11 is presupposed by the use of the title in xi. 15. (*b*) The charge which his opponents brought against St. Paul at Corinth is thus described by him in xii. 16, ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. They had called him a πανοῦργος, "a crafty man," and suggested that his dealings in the matter of money were full of guile (δόλος). At iv. 2 he refers to the same charge, μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. The meaning of the latter clause, "handling deceitfully the word of God," is fixed by the parallel in ii. 17, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which shows that the δόλος repudiated by him was crooked dealing in regard to money, "making a traffic" of the Gospel. (*c*) The passages just cited from the earlier part of the letter have other echoes in the later part. In ii. 17 those who make merchandise of the word of God at Corinth are οἱ πολλοί, and he speaks of his opponents again as πολλοί in xi. 18. His declaration in ii. 17 is that he preaches ἐξ εἰλικρινείας (*cf.* i. 12), and in iv. 2 that it is τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας; so in xi. 6 he says of himself, ἐν παντὶ φανερώσαντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς. And, lastly, the asseveration of his sincerity in ii. 17, κατέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν, is repeated in xii. 19, the only other place where it occurs in his Epistles. (*d*) In x. 5 he speaks of bringing every thought into captivity, εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and of his readiness to avenge all disobedience, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή. Seven verses before, in ix. 13, he had written of the ὑποταγὴ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ

εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ; and the language is sufficiently similar to suggest that x. 5 was written while the phrases of ix. 13 were still in his mind. (*e*) The concluding summary of the Epistle (xiii. 11) is important (see note *in loc.*). The exhortations χαίρετε . . . παρακαλεῖσθε are specially noteworthy, for they exactly reproduce the two leading thoughts of its earlier part, *Rejoice . . . be comforted.* It is difficult to understand how the words are to be explained on the hypothesis that they sum up the message of the Painful Letter. They are entirely harmonious with chaps. i.-ix., but not harmonious at all with chaps. x.-xiii. "Comfort in affliction" is (as Dr. Plummer points out[1]) the keynote of the first part of the Epistle, "boasting in weakness" being the keynote of the second part. παρακαλεῖσθε is an appropriate summing up of much that is contained in chaps. i.-ix., but is irrelevant as regards chaps. x.-xiii.[2] And thus, as we find in xiii. 11 a summary of 2 Corinthians as a whole, we conclude that it is a single document, and is not made up of parts of two letters which have been joined together by mistake.

9. In the next place the linguistic parallels between chaps. i.-ix. and chaps. x.-xiii. are in many instances so close as to render it difficult to believe that the Epistle is not an *ens integrum.* (*a*) The phrase ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνειν only occurs once in the N.T. outside 2 Corinthians, *viz.*, at Gal. ii. 18, and there the meaning is quite different (παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω = "I prove myself a transgressor") from anything in 2 Corinthians. Not only does the phrase occur in both parts of this Epistle (iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18), but it always implies a bad kind of self-commendation, as contrasted with the similar phrase συνιστάνειν ἑαυτὸν (iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11), which is used throughout in a favourable sense. (*b*) ὑπόστασις only occurs twice in St. Paul, and each time in the same phrase, ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ [*s.c.*, τῆς καυχήσεως], which is found once in the earlier (ix. 4) and once in the later (xi. 17) part of 2 Corinthians. (*c*) St. Paul uses ταπεινός of himself in vii. 6 and x. 1; the word only occurs once again in the Pauline letters (Rom. xii. 16). (*d*) νόημα occurs five times in 2 Corinthians and in both parts of the Epistle (ii. 11, iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3), and is always used in a bad sense. In the only other place of its occurrence in the N.T. (Phil. iv. 7) there is no suggestion that νοήματα must be bad. (*e*) ἀγρυπνία

[1] Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 657.

[2] Semler seems to have had some suspicion of this, for he joins on chap. xiii. 11-13 to the first part of the Epistle in his scheme of dissection.

occurs in vi. 5 and xi. 27, but nowhere else in the N.T. (*f*) προσαναπληροῦν occurs in ix. 12 and xi. 9, but nowhere else in the N.T. (*g*) ἕτοιμος occurs both in ix. 5 and x. 6, 16; only once again in St. Paul (Tit. iii. 1). (*h*) δυνατεῖν is found in ix. 8 and xiii. 3; only once again in St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 4). (*i*) θαρρεῖν occurs in v. 6, 8, vii. 16 and x. 1, 2, but not elsewhere in St. Paul. It is true that in x. 1, 2 it is used to express stern confidence in himself (θαρρῶ εἰς ὑμᾶς), and in vii. 16 to express hopeful confidence in his correspondents (θαρρῶ ἐν ὑμῖν); but this does not alter the fact that he does not use the word in any sense in any other Epistle. (*j*) πλεονεκτεῖν occurs in ii. 11, vii. 2 and xii. 17, 18; only again in St. Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 6. (*k*) παρακαλεῖν occurs thirteen times in chaps. i.-ix. and four times in chaps. x.-xiii.; that is, with unusual frequency in both parts of the Epistle. It is the word used throughout of the Apostle's directions to Titus (viii. 6, 17, ix. 5 and xii. 17). Other words and phrases occur with marked frequency in both parts of the Epistle, such as ἐν παντί, καυχάομαι, περισσότερος (-ως), etc.; but while such phenomena fall in with the conclusion we have already reached, they are hardly significant enough to be registered as supplying independent arguments. But, on the whole, the linguistic facts powerfully support the traditional view, *viz.*, that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is a single document and not a patchwork of two or more detached pieces.

10. It is further to be borne in mind that neither MSS. nor versions lend any countenance to these disintegrating theories. They all, from the earliest times, treat the Epistle as a whole, as Irenæus explicitly does more than once. He quotes ii. 15, 16 (*Hær.*, IV., xxviii., 3) and xiii. 7, 9 (*Hær.*, V., iii., 1) as alike contained in the *secunda ad Corinthios*. No doubt the union of fragments is supposed to have taken place long before his time. Nevertheless the fact that there is no trace of it in literature is significant. "The attestation of the N.T. text is so varied and so early that a displacement of this magnitude could hardly fail to bear traces of itself." [1]

11. One section of the Epistle (vi. 14-vii. 1) has been regarded as an interpolation by many writers who accept the Epistle in other respects as a complete document from the hand of St. Paul. And it is not to be denied that this section comes in awkwardly in its present place. It is much more like what we would expect a fragment of the Lost Letter (1 Cor. v. 9) to be than a genuine part of the Epistle before us. Nevertheless, I am not satisfied that a case

[1] Sanday, *Encycl. Biblica*, vol. i., p. 906.

has been made out for its rejection; and I have given (in the notes *in loc.*) the reasons which seem to me to justify the Pauline authorship of the section, and plausibly to explain its insertion at this particular point. It is not impossible (though for the hypothesis there is no external authority) that the section is a marginal gloss which has crept into the text at a very early period, or a postscript written in the margin by St. Paul or his amanuensis. But, on the whole, I believe that it ought to be retained.

CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORY STYLE AND CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE.

1. The external tradition as to the circulation and authority of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is abundant from the year 175 onward. It is quoted by Irenæus of Gaul repeatedly (*e.g.*, *Hær.*, iii., 7, "aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse," etc.); by Athenagoras of Athens (*de resurr. morte*, xviii.); by Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.*, i., 12, iii., 14); by Tertullian of Carthage (*de Pudicitia*, 13 *et passim*); by Clement of Alexandria (frequently, *e.g.*, *Strom.*, iii., 14, iv., 6), witnesses representing Churches widely separated from each other. Again, the Epistle is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment; it was in Marcion's Canon, and there is no evidence that it was absent from any list of N.T. books or any collection of Pauline letters. Before 175 A.D. the evidence is not copious, but it is distinct. The letter to Diognetus (v. 12) quotes chap. vi. 8-10; and the elders cited by Irenæus, who represent (at latest) the generation preceding him, quote chap. xii. 4 (*Hær.*, V., v., 1). Finally, Polycarp (*ad Phil.*, ii., 4, and vi., 1) quotes chap. iv. 14 and viii. 21, thus providing proof of the use of the Epistle before the year 120. That it seems to have been used by the Sethites and and Ophites would point to a similar conclusion.[1]

[1] It is somewhat remarkable that the Epistle is not quoted by Clement of Rome when writing to the Church at Corinth. He cites (§ xlvii.) the First Epistle, and the Second, if known to him, would have supplied him with many apposite texts, powerfully supporting his appeal for unity. But no solid argument can be based on Clement's silence, especially when it is remembered that we should look in vain in his letter for traces of Galatians, Colossians, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians, as well as of 2 Corinthians. These letters may not have been known in Rome at the time; or Clement may have been personally unacquainted with them; or he may not have been familiar enough with their contents to quote from them. Any of these explanations is adequate, without resorting to the hypothesis (*cf.* Kennedy, 2 *and* 3 *Corinthians*, p. 142 ff.) that Clement does not quote the canonical 2 Corinthians because it was not yet in existence as a whole, but only survived in the form of fragments of the great Apostle's correspondence with Corinth.

2. External evidence is, however, of little importance in the case of a letter which so clearly betrays its authorship as 2 Corinthians does. It is unmistakably Pauline, in the tone and character of its teaching, no less than in its style and vocabulary. No Epistle lets us see more of the working of the Apostle's mind, or gives us a clearer view of his personality (see above, chap. i., § 1). It is distinctively a *letter* rather than an *epistle*; that is, it was written to meet an emergency that had arisen at Corinth, and there is no trace that the writer was conscious that it would take a permanent place in literature. Herein lies at once its charm and its difficulty; and herein, too, is the explanation of the absence of systematic and consistent arrangement, such as might fairly be expected in a formal treatise. It reflects the varying moods of the writer; and the broken constructions and frequent anacolutha show that it was written at a time of mental agitation and excitement.

3. We count it unnecessary to produce here the proofs of the Pauline character of the style and diction of the Epistle.[1] They are apparent throughout, and the marginal references to the text have been specially prepared with a view of bringing out the linguistic parallels between 2 Corinthians and the other Pauline letters.[2] Among the words peculiar in the N.T. to this Epistle are the following: ἀβαρής, ἀγανάκτησις, ἁγνότης, ἀγρυπνία, ἁδρότης, ἄμετρος, ἀνακαλύπτειν, ἀνεκδιήγητος, ἀπαρασκεύαστος, ἀπειπεῖν, ἀπόκριμα, ἄρρητος, αὐγάζειν, αὐθαίρετος, βελίαρ, δίψος, δόλιος, δυσφημία, ἐγκρίνειν, ἐκδαπανᾶσθαι, ἐκδημεῖν, ἐκφοβεῖν, ἐλαφρία, ἐντυποῦν, ἐπενδύεσθαι, ἑτεροζυγεῖν, εὐφημία, ἱκανότης, καθαίρεσις, κάλυμμα, καπηλεύειν, καταβαρεῖν, κατάκρισις, καταναρκεῖν, κατάρτισις, κατοπτρίζεσθαι, μετοχή, μολυσμός, μωμεῖσθαι, νυχθήμερον, ὀχύρωμα, παραυτίκα, παραφρονεῖν, πεντάκις, πέρυσι, προαμαρτάνειν, προενάρχεσθαι, προκαταρτίζειν, προσαναπληροῦν, προσκοπή, πτωχεύειν, σαργάνη, σκῆνος, σκόλοψ, στενοχωρεῖσθαι, συγκατάθεσις, συλᾶν, συμπέμπειν, συμφώνησις, συναποστέλλειν, συνυπουργεῖν, συστατικός, ὑπερέκεινα, ὑπερεκτείνειν, ὑπερλίαν, φειδομένως, φωτισμός, ψευδαπόστολος, ψιθυρισμός.

4. That the Epistle falls of itself into three parts is evident to the most casual reader. (1) From i. 1 to vii. 16 the writer is

[1] Those who desire to learn what has been urged against the Pauline authorship may be referred to Dr. Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, chap. ii., "Recent Attacks upon the Hauptbriefe"; see especially p. 192. But it is quite outside the plan of this commentary to take notice of every extravagance of criticism. (See also vol. ii., p. 753 above.)

[2] Note that in the marginal references the LXX numbering of the Psalms and of the other O.T. books has been followed; and that "here only" means that the word so designated does not occur again in the N.T.

occupied with the reflections which are suggested by the report brought by Titus as to the response of the Corinthian Church to the injunctions of the First Epistle in the matter of the incestuous man. In this section there is a digression of great doctrinal importance on the Ministry of the New Covenant (iii. 7-iv. 15), followed by some profound thoughts about the life after death (iv. 16-v. 10); and a minor digression (vi. 14-vii. 1) about the dangers of intermarriage with the heathen; but the main topic of these chapters is his thankfulness at the news he has received, which consoles him in his many troubles. Again and again he bids them be sure of his sincerity and single-mindedness. (2) Chapters viii. and ix. deal with the collection which was being made for the poor Christians in Judæa, a subject which had been much in his thoughts during the preceding year. (3) The last four chapters are taken up with a vindication of his apostolic authority, which was necessary to put forward plainly before his next visit to Corinth. There was a party in that city calling themselves by the name of Christ (x. 7), who made light of St. Paul's apostolic claims and were trying to undermine his authority. The Church as a whole had acquiesced in St. Paul's directions given in 1 Cor. v.; but a minority of malcontents were troublesome and calumnious, and needed repression. A detailed analysis of the letter is subjoined.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE.

I. The obedience of the Corinthians to the instructions of the First Epistle.

Introductory—
- Address (i. 1, 2).
- God's consolations and the sympathy of sorrow (i. 3-7).
- His recent peril (i. 8-11).

His sincerity of purpose—
- They must acknowledge it (i. 12-14).
- His change of plan was not due to fickleness (i. 15-22).
- The real reason of the postponement of his visit (i. 23-ii. 4).

The offender has been sufficiently punished (ii. 5-11).
He rejoices to hear that his reproof has been loyally received (ii. 12-17).
The Corinthians are his "Letter of Commendation" (iii. 1-3).
His success, however, is due to God (iii. 4-6).
Digression on the Ministry of the New Covenant—
- It is more glorious than that of the Old (iii. 7-11).
- It is more open (iii. 12-18).
- He, accordingly, delivers his message plainly (iv. 1-6).

His bodily weakness does not annul the effects of his ministry (iv. 7-15).
He is sustained by a glorious hope (iv. 16-18).
His expectation of a glorified body hereafter, and his desire to survive until the Second Advent (v. 1-5).
In any case to be with Christ is best (v. 6-8).
We must remember the Judgment to come (v. 9, 10).
He reiterates his sincerity of purpose (v. 11-13).
The constraining power of his ministry (v. 14-16).
In Christ all is new (v. 17-19).
As Christ's ambassador he prays them to be reconciled to God (v. 20-vi. 3).
The conditions and characteristics of his ministry (vi. 4-10).
He affectionately declares his sympathy and claims the same from them (vi. 11-13).
[Parenthetical warning against familiar association with the heathen (vi. 14-vii. 1).]
He claims their sympathy again (vii. 2-4).
He repeats his joy that his reproof has been loyally received (vii. 5-12).
Titus also rejoiced to bring such tidings (vii. 13-16).

II. The Collection for the Judæan Christians.

The liberality of the Macedonian Churches (viii. 1-7).
He counsels, though he will not command, the imitation of it (viii. 8-15).
The mission of Titus and his two companions (viii. 16-24).
Its purpose, that the collection may be made ready (ix. 1-5).
Liberal giving is (*a*) blessed of God (ix. 6-11), and (*b*) calls forth the blessings of the recipients (ix. 12-15).

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority.

He entreats them not to force him to use his authority (x. 1-6).
Despite all appearances it is weighty and is Divinely given him (x. 7-18).
He begs them to bear with the statement of his claims at length (xi. 1-4).
He is in no way inferior to his adversaries (xi. 5-15).
His Apostolic labours and trials (xi. 16-33).
His vision, of which he could boast, if he chose (xii. 1-6).
His "thorn in the flesh" (xii. 7-10).
This testimony should have proceeded from the Corinthians (xii. 11-13).
That he did not claim maintenance was disinterested (xii. 14-18).
The purpose of this "glorying" is their edification (xii. 19-21).
If he comes again, he will not spare (xiii. 1, 2).
Christ is his strength: let them see to it that He is theirs also (xiii. 3-10).
Conclusion—
Final exhortations (xiii. 11).
Salutations and benediction (xiii. 12, 13).

CHAPTER IV.

THE TEXT.

1. The uncial manuscripts whose readings are cited, in all important cases, in the critical notes are the following:—

ℵ. Codex Sinaiticus (sæc. iv.), now at St. Petersburg, published in facsimile type by its discoverer, Tischendorf, in 1862. The symbol ℵ[c] is used to indicate the corrections introduced by a scribe of the seventh century, ℵ* denoting the autograph of the original scribe.

A. Codex Alexandrinus (sæc. v.), at the British Museum, published in photographic facsimile by Sir E. M. Thompson (1879); it is defective from chaps. iv. 13 to xii. 7 of our Epistle.

B. Codex Vaticanus (sæc. iv.), published in photographic facsimile in 1889 under the care of the Abbate Cozza-Luzi.

C. Codex Ephraemi (sæc. v.), the Paris palimpsest, edited by Tischendorf in 1843. The text of our Epistle is wanting from chap. x. 8 to the end.

D. Codex Claromontanus (sæc. vi.), a Græco-Latin MS. at Paris, edited by Tischendorf in 1852. D[b] and D[c] denote the readings introduced by correctors of the seventh and ninth centuries respectively. The Latin text is represented by d; it follows the Old Latin version with modifications.

E. Codex Sangermanensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., now at St. Petersburg, formerly belonging to the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Its text is largely dependent upon that of D. The Latin version, e (a corrected copy of d), has been printed, but with incomplete accuracy, by Belsheim (1885).

F. Codex Augiensis (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Trinity College, Cambridge, edited by Scrivener in 1859. Its Greek text is almost identical with that of G, and it is therefore

not cited save where it differs from that MS. Its Latin version, f, presents the Vulgate text with some modifications.

G. Codex Boernerianus (sæc. ix.), a Græco-Latin MS., at Dresden, edited by Matthæi in 1791. Written by an Irish scribe, it once formed part of the same volume as Codex Sangallensis (δ) of the Gospels. The Latin text, g, is based on the O.L. translation.

H. Codex Coislinianus (sæc. vi.), fragments of which survive in several libraries. Of our Epistle chap. iv. 2-7 is at St. Petersburg, and chaps. x. 18-xi. 6 and xi. 12-xii. 2 at Mount Athos. These latter fragments were edited by Duchesne in 1876; the readings of the former are given by Tischendorf.

K. Codex Mosquensis (sæc. ix.), edited by Matthæi in 1782.

L. Codex Angelicus (sæc. ix.), at Rome, collated by Tischendorf and others.

M. Codex Ruber (sæc. ix.), at the British Museum; it derives its name from the colour of the ink. It contains of this Epistle chaps. i. 1-15 and x. 13-xii. 5.

O. This is a fragment (sæc. vi.), at St. Petersburg, containing chaps. i. 20-ii. 12.

P. Codex Porphyrianus (sæc. ix.), at St. Petersburg, collated by Tischendorf. Its text is deficient for chap. ii. 13-16.

R. Codex Cryptoferratensis (sæc. vii.), a palimpsest fragment containing chap. xi. 9-19, edited by Cozza in 1867, and cited by Tischendorf.[1]

The tendency of these MSS. to fall into groups will be apparent on a cursory inspection of the *apparatus criticus*. The readings of DEG are, as a rule, "Western"; while אB represent (as usual) a weight of authority that cannot be rejected without much hesitation. The lacunæ in A and C prevent the affinities of the "Alexandrian" group אACLP from being as apparent here as in other Epistles (*cf.* Sanday-Headlam, *Romans*, p. lxxi).

[1] The following uncial authorities for our Epistle are as yet inedited:—

S. At Mount Athos (sæc. viii.?), contains, *inter alia*, chaps. i. 1-xi. 23.

Ψ. A ninth-century Codex at Mount Athos. It is said to be complete.

ב. Codex Patiriensis (sæc. v.), at Rome (Vat. Gr. 2061). It contains chaps. iv. 7-vi. 8 and vii. 15-x. 6 of our Epistle.

2. The minuscule or cursive manuscripts are very numerous, and only a few of special interest are occasionally cited in the critical apparatus. 17, the "queen of cursives" (sæc. ix.), is at Paris; 37 (sæc. xv.) is the well-known Leicester Codex = Ev. 69; and 73 (sæc. xi.) is at Upsala.

3. *Versions*. Of these the Latin claims special attention. The versions d, e, f, g have been described above. We have also of the Old Latin the fragmentary Codex Frisingensis (r) of the sixth (?) century, containing of our Epistle chaps. i. 1-ii. 10, iii. 17-v. 1, vii. 10-viii. 12, ix. 10-xi. 21, xii. 14-21, xiii. 2-10. The symbol m marks the readings found in the *Speculum*, which represents the text of the Spaniard Priscillian. The Vulgate (vg) of the Pauline Epistles differs but little from the præ-Hieronymian Latin.

In Syriac we have the Peshitto (sæc. iii.?) and the Harclean version (sæc. vii.). The margin of the latter often preserves better readings than are found in its text.

Of Egyptian versions we have the Bohairic or the North Coptic, and the Sahidic or South Coptic, the language of Upper Egypt. These versions are to be dated probably about the third century.

It has not come within the scope of this edition to cite the patristic authorities for the variants recorded; for a full conspectus the student must be referred to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Græce* (8th edit.), on which the following *apparatus criticus* is based.

4. In accordance with the general plan of the *Expositor's Greek Testament* the "received text" (see vol. i., p. 52) is printed at the head of the page; but the commentary follows the reading, which has appeared to the editor to be, on the whole, most probably original.

Among the Patristic Commentaries on the Epistle perhaps the most important are those of Chrysostom, Ambrosiaster and Primasius. Modern commentaries are very numerous. Stanley's notes are often illuminating and picturesque; Alford is careful and thorough, as usual; and Waite (in the *Speaker's Commentary*) provides a useful discussion of the main questions which the Epistle suggests. Of German commentaries Schmiedel's (in the *Hand Kommentar*) is by far the most complete. It is a brilliant and scholarly piece of work, and is indispensable to the student who wishes to have detailed information as to the various schemes by which St. Paul's history has been reconstructed for the years 53-55 A.D. Schmiedel's general view (see p. 19 above) that chaps. x.-xiii. constitute part of a letter distinct from and later than chaps. i.-ix. has not commended itself to the present editor; but his notes are full of

learning and suggestiveness. Schnedermann's edition of the Epistles to the Corinthians (in Strack-Zöckler's *Kommentar*) has also been found useful at some points. Bengel's *Gnomon* and Field's detached *Notes* have, of course, been diligently consulted.[1]

In this edition the interpretation which has seemed on the whole the best has been set down, without (as a rule) discussing at length the rival theories. It would have been easy to crowd the notes with references to other editors; but it has seemed better to economise space in this direction, and so to find room for a larger number of references to St. Paul's other writings.

September, 1900.

[1] See also Prof. Findlay's account of the Commentaries on 1 Corinthians vol. ii., p. 752 above).

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ.

I. 1. **ΠΑΥΛΟΣ** ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] [a]διὰ [a]θελήματος [a]Θεοῦ, καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς, τῇ [b]ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ [b]Θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ,

a Rom. xv. 32; 1 Cor. i. 1; chap. viii. 5; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1. b Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. i. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 14, etc.

[1] ADEGKL and most vss. have Ἰησ. Χρ.; better Χριστου Ἰησου with ℵBMP 17.

Chapter I. Address, vv. 1, 2.—The usual form of address at the beginning of a Greek letter was A. B. **χαίρειν** (see Acts xxiii. 26); and this is adopted by St. James in his Epistle (Jas. i. 1), and is followed, among other Christian writers, by Ignatius in his letters (**πλεῖστα χαίρειν** is his ordinary formula). St. Paul, original in this as in all else, struck out a form for himself. He replaces **χαίρειν** by **χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη** (1 Thess.), which in subsequent letters is expressed more fully, as here, **χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.** (In 1 and 2 Tim. he adds **ἔλεος**.) The simple greeting of ordinary courtesy is thus filled with a deep religious meaning. *Grace* is the keynote of the Gospel; and *peace*, the traditional and beautiful salutation of the East, on Christian lips signifies not earthly peace merely, but the peace of God (Phil. iv. 7). The first instance of the combination of **χάρις** with **εἰρήνη** is noteworthy, *viz*., they are coupled in the Priestly Benediction at Num. vi. 24.—**ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰη.**: St. Paul's letters are all semi-official, except perhaps that to Philemon; and thus they usually begin with the assertion of his apostolic office. This it would be especially necessary to emphasise in a letter to Corinth, where his authority had been questioned quite recently (x. 10 ff.), and where the names of Apollos and Peter had formerly been set in opposition to his (1 Cor. i. 12).—**διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ**: he is ever anxious (see reff.) to explain that his apostleship was not assumed of himself; it is a *mission* from God; he is a **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς**.—**καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός**: Timothy now occupies the place at St. Paul's side which was filled by Sosthenes when 1 *Cor*. was written (1 Cor. i. 1). Timothy had been despatched to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22) to go on to Corinth (1 Cor. iv. 17), but St. Paul seems to have had a suspicion that he might be prevented from arriving there (1 Cor. xvi. 10). From the facts that we now find him in Macedonia, and that there is no mention of him in chap. xii. 16-18, it is likely that he was prevented from reaching Corinth by some causes of which we are unaware.—**τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: the letter is addressed primarily to the Christian congregation at Corinth, and secondarily to the Christians throughout Achaia. It is thus a circular letter, like that to the Galatians or Ephesians, and so at the end we do not find salutations to individuals, as in 1 *Cor*. and in the other letters addressed to particular Churches. The words **τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ** suggest the idea of *settled* establishment; the Church at Corinth had now been for some time in existence.—**ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ**: the

σὺν τοῖς [c] ἁγίοις πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

3. [d] Εὐλογητὸς ὁ [e] Θεὸς καὶ [e] πατὴρ τοῦ [e] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [e] Ἰησοῦ [e] Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν [f] οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ [g] Θεὸς πάσης [g] παρακλήσεως, 4. ὁ [h] παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ [i] θλίψει ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει, διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς

c Acts ix. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; chap. viii. 4, ix. 12; Phil. i. 1, etc.
d Ps. lxxxviii. 53; Lk. i. 68; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, etc.
e Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; chap. xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3. f Isa. lxiii. 15, 16; Rom. xii. 1. g Rom. xv. 5; Phil. ii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 16. h Isa. li. 12, lxvi. 13. i Ver. 8; chaps. ii. 4, iv. 17, vi. 4, viii. 2, 13.

Roman province of Achaia included the whole country which we call Greece (excluding Macedonia), and it is in this large sense that the name is used here (*cf.* ix. 2 below).

Ver. 2. **ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς κ.τ.λ.**: this coupling of the names of *God our Father* and *the Lord Jesus Christ* as alike the source of *grace and peace* is most significant in its bearing upon St. Paul's Christology (*cf.* xiii. 13).

I. The Obedience of the Corinthians to the Instructions of the First Epistle (i. 3—vii. 16). This is the main topic of the first section of this Epistle. Vv. 3-7: Thanksgiving; God's Consolations and the Sympathy of Sorrow. St. Paul's habit is to begin his letters with an expression of thankfulness for the Christian progress of his correspondents. The only exceptions are the Epp. to Titus and to the Galatians (in this case he had received bad news from Galatia). In 1 Tim. i. 12 the cause of his thankfulness is the exhibition of the Divine mercy to himself; and this Epistle begins with a like thought, from which he passes (ver. 14) to his confident belief that the Corinthian Christians are still his **καύχημα**. It was especially important that a letter which was so largely taken up with rebuke and with the assertion of his apostolical authority should begin with a message of sympathy and hopefulness (vv. 11 ff.).

Ver. 3. **εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *blessed is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Note that **τοῦ Κυρίου** is dependent on **Θεός** as well as on **πατήρ**; *cf.* Eph. i. 17, and John xx. 17, Rev. i. 6. This is the starting-point of the Christian revelation, that the Supreme is "the God and Father" of Jesus Christ; He is **εὐλογητός** (בָּרוּךְ), the Object of His creatures' blessing. The verb is not expressed, but the analogy of 1 Pet. iv. 11 would indicate that **ἐστίν** rather than **ἔστω** should be understood. A doxology is not a prayer, but (*cf.* Matt. vi. 13, and John xii. 13, a close parallel) a thankful and adoring statement of the Divine goodness and power.—**ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν**: *the Father of mercies, sc.*, from whom merciful acts proceed; **οἰκτιρμός**, *compassion*, is the very characteristic of a Father's providence; see reff. and Luke vi. 36.—**καὶ Θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως**: *and God of all comfort, sc.*, from whom every consolation proceeds. We have **παράκλησις** applied to God in O.T., *e.g.*, in Ps. xciii. 19, **αἱ παρακλήσεις σου ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχήν μου**; and the word is adopted in the N.T. for the Divine comfort not only by St. Paul (see reff.), but by St. Luke (ii. 25 and Acts ix. 31), and by St. John, who describes alike the Spirit (John xiv. 16, xv. 26, xvi. 7) and the Son (1 John ii. 1) as the **παράκλητος**.

Ver. 4. **ὁ παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who comforteth us in all our affliction* (the def. art. indicating trials actually existing). The verb **παρακαλεῖν** has three shades of meaning, (*a*) *to beseech*, eighteen times in St. Paul, (*b*) *to exhort*, seventeen times, (*c*) *to comfort*, thirteen times, of which seven are in this Epistle, where the word occurs altogether seventeen times. *Cf.* ver. 6, ii. 7, 8, v. 20, vi. 1, vii. 6, 7, 13, viii. 6, ix. 5, x. 1, xii. 8, 18, xiii. 11.—**εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that we may be able to comfort them that are in any affliction* (*sc.*, any that may happen to arise). This is the final purpose of God's gifts of grace, *viz.*, that they may not only be a blessing to the individual, but through him and as reflected from him to his fellows.—**ἧς παρακαλούμεθα**: *through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are being comforted of God.* **ἧς**, for **ἥν**, has been attracted into the case of **παρακλήσεως** (*cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 19, chap. x. 13, Eph. ii. 10).

Ver. 5. **ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει κ.τ.λ.**: *for as Christ's sufferings flow over abundantly to us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ.* That the Christian is a fellow-sufferer with Christ is frequently urged by St. Paul (Rom.

παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ · 5. ὅτι καθὼς περισσεύει τὰ [k] παθήματα [1] τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς, οὕτω διὰ Χριστοῦ [2] περισσεύει καὶ ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν. 6. εἴτε δὲ [k] θλιβόμεθα, [k] ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας,[3] τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν [l] ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν · εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας [4] · 7. καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν [m] βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν · εἰδότες ὅτι ὥσπερ [5] [n] κοινωνοί ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτω

k Cf. Chap. iv. 15; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 10.
l Chaps. vi. 4, xii. 12.
m Rom. iv. 16; cf. ver. 21.
n 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 4.

[1] DE have το παθημα.

[2] The uncials have του Χριστου; του is omitted by a few minuscules only.

[3] B 17 omit the first και σωτηριας.

[4] The order of clauses in the latter part of the verse is variously given in the MSS. The received text (followed by the A.V.) is devoid of MS. authority and was manufactured by Erasmus. The choice lies between (1) ειτε παρακαλουμεθα υπερ της υμων παρακλησεως (omitting και σωτηριας) της ενεργουμενης εν υπομονη των αυτων παθηματων ων και ημεις πασχομεν και η ελπις . . . υμων, which is attested by ℵACMP, r, the Peshitto and Bohairic vss.; and (2) της ενεργουμενης εν υπομονη των αυτων παθηματων ων και ημεις πασχομεν, και η ελπις ημων βεβαια υπερ υμων · ειτε παρακαλουμεθα, υπερ της υμων παρακλησεως και σωτηριας, which is the order of BDEGKL, d, e, f, g, and the Harclean. We follow (1), which is adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the R.V.

[5] For ωσπερ (DbcKL, etc.) read ως, with ℵABCD*E*MP, etc.

viii. 17, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24; see esp. chap. iv. 10, 11 below, and *cf.* Matt. xx. 22). Here he dwells on the thought that this fellowship in suffering implies also the consolation and strength which flow from union with Christ; *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 13.

Vv. 6, 7. We follow the reading of the Revisers (see crit. note) and translate: *But whether we be afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient endurance of the same things which we also suffer: and our hope for you is steadfast; knowing that as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort.* This is an expansion of the **εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.** of ver. 4: the Apostle's afflictions and consolations alike are for the sake of his converts; they and he have a common fellowship in Christ, with all which that involves of sympathy with each other. The nearest parallel (see reff.) is Eph. iii. 13, **διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐνκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν.** For the constr. **εἴτε . . . εἴτε** *cf.* chap. v. 13 and 1 Cor. xii. 26. Note that **ἐνεργεῖσθαι** is always in the N.T. *middle*, not *passive*, and is used intransitively (see Rom. vii. 5, chap. iv. 12, Gal. v. 6, Eph. iii. 20, Col. i. 29, 1 Thess. ii. 13); when the verb is used of God it is always in the active voice (1 Cor. xii. 6, Gal. ii. 8, etc.).—**ἐν ὑπομονῇ**: **ὑπομονή** means *expectation* or *hopeful waiting* in the canonical books of the LXX; but is often used for *steadfast endurance* in Ecclus. and in 4 Macc. (see 4 Macc. xvii. 12). It is a favourite word with St. Paul in this latter sense, in which it is always used in the N.T. (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Luke xxi. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 11); for the juxtaposition of **ὑπομονή** and **παράκλησις** see Rom. xv. 5.—**τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων**: the sufferings which the Corinthian brethren must endure are here represented as *the same* as those of the Apostle; *i.e.*, the reference is not to any special affliction such as that alluded to in ver. 8, but to the troubles which came upon him in the general discharge of his Apostolic office and upon all those who were engaged in the struggle against Judaism on the one side and heathendom on the other.

Ver. 7. **καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ.**: *and our hope for you is steadfast, knowing* (we should expect **εἰδότων**, but *cf.* Rom. xiii. 11) *that as ye are partakers of the sufferings* (see reff. for **κοινωνός** with a *gen. objecti*), *so also are ye of the comfort.* The main idea of this section is well given by Bengel: "Communio sanctorum . . . egregie representatur in hac epistola".

Vv. 8-11. His Recent Peril. Ver. 8. **οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for we would not have you ignorant, brethren, about* (for **ὑπέρ** with gen. in this sense, *cf.*

καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως. 8. οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ[1] τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἡμῖν[2] ἐν τῇ [o] Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ' [p] ὑπερβολὴν [q] ἐβαρήθημεν[3] ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, ὥστε [r] ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν· 9. ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ [s] ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχήκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ [t] πεποιθότες ὦμεν [t] ἐφ' [t] ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλ' [u] ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ [v] ἐγείροντι[4] τοὺς νεκρούς· 10. ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου [w] ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύεται,[5] [x] εἰς ὃν [x] ἠλπίκαμεν ὅτι[6] καὶ ἔτι[7]

o Acts xix. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 32.
p Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 31; chaps. iv. 7, 17, xii. 7; Gal. i. 13 only.
q Chap. v. 4; 1 Tim. v. 16.
r Chap. iv. 8 only.
s Here only.
t Lk. xviii. 9.
u Ps. ii. 12; Jer. xvii. 7.
v Chap. iv. 14; Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 14, etc.
w Rom. vii. 24; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10.
x John v. 45; 1 Pet. iii. 5.

[1] BKLM have **υπερ της θλ.**, probably the autograph; but **περι** (a natural alteration) has the support of ℵACDEGP 17.

[2] ℵ^c D^{bc} EKL, the Syriac and Bohairic give **ημιν**; om. **ημιν** ℵ*ABCD*GMP 17 and the Latins.

[3] DEGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. and the Syriac vss. give **εβαρ. υπερ δυν.**; better **υπερ δυναμιν εβαρηθημεν**, with ℵABCMP 17, r.

[4] G has **επι Θεον τον εγιροντα.**

[5] D^c EGKLM, f, vg. and the Harclean give **ρυεται**; **ρυσεται** has the stronger support of ℵBCP 17, g, and the Bohairic.

[6] **οτι** is omitted in BD*M; G, g insert it after **και**; all other authorities support received text.

[7] D^b G and a few cursives omit **ετι.**

chap. viii. 23, xii. 8, 2 Thess. ii. 1) *our affliction which happened in Asia, that we were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life.* Having spoken in general terms of the Divine comfort in times of trouble, he goes on to mention his own particular case, the "affliction which befel him in Asia". What was this? *Asia* almost certainly means *Ephesus*, where he had lately been exposed to many adversaries (1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 9). We naturally think of the tumult recorded in Acts xix. 23 ff.; but the language here used is so strong that he must have been exposed to something worse than a temporary riot. He was "weighed down beyond his power" (**ὑπὲρ δύναμιν**, a phrase which he never uses elsewhere, and which is specially remarkable from the pen of one who always gloried in the Divine **δύναμις** granted to him, of which he said **πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με**, Phil. iv. 13); he "despaired of life," and yet he describes in this very Epistle (iv. 8) his general attitude in tribulation as "perplexed, yet *not* despairing". Nor have we knowledge of any persecution at Ephesus so violent as to justify such language, though no doubt the allusion *may* be to something of the kind. Whatever the "affliction" was, the Corinthians were acquainted with it, for St. Paul does not enter into details, but mentions it only to inform them of its gravity, and to assure them of his trust in his ultimate deliverance. On the whole, it seems most likely that the reference is to grievous bodily sickness, which brought the Apostle down to the gates of death (see ver. 9, and *cf.* chap. iv. 10 and xii. 7 ff.). Such an affliction would be truly **ὑπὲρ δύναμιν**; and it would be necessary to contemplate its recurrence (ver. 10). St. Paul in this Epistle, with unusual frequency, uses the plural **ἡμεῖς** when speaking of himself; sometimes this can be explained by the fact that Timothy was associated with him in the writing of the letter (i. 1), but in other passages (*e.g.*, ver. 10, v. 13, 16, x. 7, 11, 15, xi. 21) such an explanation will not suit the context, which demands the individual application of the pronoun.

Ver. 9. **ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *nay, we ourselves had the sentence of death in ourselves; i.e.*, the danger was so great that the sentence of death had been already pronounced, as it were. **ἀπόκριμα** might mean "answer," as the Revisers translate it (they give *sentence*, with the A.V., in their margin); *cf.* the verb **ἀποκρίνειν.** But in the other places where this rare word is found (*e.g.*, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv. 10, 6, and an inscription of 51 A.D., quoted by Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 85) it stands for an official *decision* or *sentence. Cf.* **κρίμα θανάτου**, "the sen-

[y] ῥύσεται, 11. [z] συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν [1] ὑπὲρ [2] ἡμῶν [3] τῇ δεήσει, ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν [a] προσώπων [4] τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν [b] εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.[5]

12. Ἡ γὰρ [c] καύχησις ἡμῶν αὕτη ἐστὶ, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς [d] συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐν ἁπλότητι [6] καὶ [e] εἰλικρινείᾳ Θεοῦ,[7] οὐκ [8] ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι Θεοῦ [f] ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, περισσο-

y 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18.
z Here only.
a Prov. viii. 30 and reff. below.
b Chaps. iv. 15, ix. 12.
c 1 Cor. xv. 31; chaps. vii. 4, 14, viii. 24, xi. 10, 17.
d Eccl. x. 20; Wisd. xvii. 11 only in LXX; *cf.* Rom. ii. 15.
e 1 Cor. v. 8; chap. ii. 17 only; *cf.* Phil. i. 10.
f Ezek. xix. 6; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 15.

[1] A has **ημων** for **υμων**.

[2] D*G have **περι** for **υπερ**.

[3] AG have **υμων** for **ημων**.

[4] GM, d, e, g, give **εν πολλῳ προσωπῳ**.

[5] **ευχ. υπερ ημων** is read by ℵACD*GM 17 and the vss.; BD^cEFKLP have **υμων**.

[6] **απλοτητι** ℵ^cDEGL, the Latin and Syriac vss.; but the better supported reading is **αγιοτητι** of ℵ*ABCKMP 17, 37, 73, and the Bohairic (see note).

[7] ℵABCDEM have **του Θεου**; GKLP omit **του**.

[8] BM 37, 73, f, vg. and the Harclean read **και ουκ εν**; W.H. place **και** in brackets.

tence of death" (Ecclus. xli. 3). The tense of **ἐσχήκαμεν** is noteworthy; it seems to be a kind of historical perfect, used like an aorist (*cf.* chap. ii. 13, xi. 25, Rev. v. 7, viii. 5, for a similar usage).—**ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες κ.τ.λ.**: *i.e.*, "the gravity of the danger was such as to impress upon me the vanity of putting my trust anywhere save in God, who has the power of life and death". God can "raise the dead" (see chap. iv. 14); much more can He bring back the dying from the gates of death.

Ver. 10. **ὃς ἐκ τηλικ. κ.τ.λ.**: *who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver* (reading **ῥύσεται**). The form of words recalls Rom. xv. 31 and 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, which would give some support to the theory that the great peril in question was persecution at the hands of opponents; but (as we have said on ver. 8) it seems more probable that the Apostle's deliverance was from a dangerous illness. It is possible, indeed, that we have here a reminiscence of Job xxxiii. 30, **ἐρύσατο τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐκ θανάτου,** which would confirm this interpretation. Note that the preposition is **ἐκ,** not **ἀπό**; **ἀπό** would only indicate *deliverance from the neighbourhood of* a danger; **ἐκ** indicates *emergence from* a danger to which one has actually been exposed (see Chase, *Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 71 ff.). *Cf.* with the whole phrase 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, **ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος, ῥύσεταί με ὁ κύριος κ.τ.λ.**—**εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκαμεν**: *towards whom we have set our hope.* **εἰς** with the acc. (see reff.) expresses the direction *towards* which hope looks; **ἐπί** with the dat. after **ἐλπίζειν** (1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17) rather indicates that *in* which hope rests. *Cf.* Ps. iv. 6, **ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ κύριον.** The perfect **ἠλπίκαμεν** here has its full force, *viz.*, "towards whom we have set our hope, and continue to do so"; *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 19, 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17.—**καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται**: the force of **ἔτι** (if indeed it be part of the true text: see crit. note) is to carry the mind on to the perils of the future, as distinguished from those of the present: *He will continue to deliver us.*

Ver. 11. **συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication*; *i.e.*, apparently, "helping *me*". St. Paul claims that the sympathy of his converts with him shall be exhibited by their prayers for him. **δέησις** is prayer for a particular object, as contrasted with the more general **προσευχή** (Eph. vi. 18).—**ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων κ.τ.λ.**: *that from many faces* (*sc.*, as if upturned in thanksgiving) *thanks be given on our behalf through many for the gift bestowed on us.* **πρόσωπον** came to mean "person" in later Greek, but it never can be thus translated in the N.T., save in the phrase **λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον** (Luke xx. 21, Gal. ii. 6) or **θαυμάζειν πρόσωπα** (Jude 16), "to respect the person" of anyone. Even in these passages **λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον** is a Hebraism which originally meant "raise the face" (see Plummer on Luke xx. 21). **πρόσωπον** is used ten times elsewhere in this Epistle in its ordinary sense of "face" (chap. ii. 10, iii. 7, 13, 18, iv. 6, v. 12, viii. 24, x. 1, 7, xi. 20; *cf.* also 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xiv. 25, Gal. i. 22). Hence we cannot follow the English versions in translating **ἐκ**

g 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xiv. 37, xvi. 18; chaps. vi. 9, xiii. 5.

τέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 13. οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα γράφομεν ὑμῖν ἀλλ'[1] ἢ[2] ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε, ἢ[3] καὶ [g] ἐπιγινώσκετε, ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι καὶ[4] ἕως τέλους

[1] BG om. αλλ'. [2] A om. η α.

[3] B and a few cursives omit η και επιγνωσκετε (through homœoteleuton); GK, the Latin, Peshitto and Bohairic vss. omit η.

[4] ℵABCD*EG and most vss. omit και; ins. D^cKLMP and the Harclean.

πολλῶν προσώπων "by many persons" in this verse, an additional difficulty in the way of such a rendering being that it would require ὑπό, not ἐκ. πρόσωπον is a *face*, and the image in the writer's mind is that of faces upturned in prayer, the early Christian (and the Jewish) attitude of prayer being one of standing with uplifted eyes and outstretched arms (*cf.* Ps. xxvii. 2, Matt. vi. 5, 1 Tim. ii. 8, and Clem. Rom., § 29). The general thought, of the united thanksgivings of many persons, is found twice again in the Epistle in somewhat similar contexts (see reff.). χάρισμα and εὐχαριστεῖν (the passive is found here only in N.T.) are favourite words with St. Paul, the former occurring sixteen times in his Epistles and only once elsewhere in the N.T. (1 Pet. iv. 10).

Vv. 12-14. THEY MUST ACKNOWLEDGE HIS SINCERITY OF PURPOSE. He claims that he has always been frank and open in his dealings with the Corinthian Christians: *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 3.—ἡ γὰρ καύχησις κ.τ.λ.: *for our glorying is this.* Note καύχησις, not καύχημα, as at ver. 14, which is rather the thing boasted of than the act of boasting. καυχάομαι and its cognates are peculiarly frequent in this Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 27).—τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν: *viz.*, *the testimony of our conscience.* μαρτύριον is the thing testified to by conscience, as contrasted with μαρτυρία, the act of testimony. συνείδησις, "conscientia," represents the self sitting in judgment on self, a specially Greek idea, and taken over by St. Paul from Greek thought; the word is a favourite one with him, both in his Epistles and in his speeches (Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16).—ὅτι ἐν ἁγιότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ Θεοῦ: *that in holiness and sincerity of God* (*cf.* chap. iv. 2). The received reading, ἁπλότητι, probably arose from the fact that while ἁπλότης occurs four times in this Epistle, and is a specially Pauline word, ἁγιότης is rare, only occurring in the Greek Bible twice elsewhere (2 Macc. xv. 2, Heb. xii. 10). The etymology of εἰλικρινεία (see reff.) is uncertain; but the meaning is not doubtful. The force of the genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ is somewhat the same as in the phrase δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ (Rom. iii. 21); the *holiness* and *sincerity* which St. Paul claims as characterising his conduct are Divine qualities, and in so far as they are displayed in men they are God's gift, as he goes on to explain.—οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ κ.τ.λ.: *not in fleshly wisdom, but in God's grace, sc.*, which had been vouchsafed to him for the due discharge of his apostolic office (Rom. i. 5, xii. 3, xv. 15, 1 Cor. iii. 10, Eph. iii. 2). Especially in the Corinthian letters does St. Paul insist on this, that his power is not that of human wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 4, 13, chap. x. 4). The word σαρκικός is found five times in his letters, and only twice elsewhere in N.T. It signifies that which belongs to the nature of the σάρξ of man, as contrasted with σάρκινος, "made of flesh," which is the stronger word (*cf.* iii. 3 below).—ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: *did we behave ourselves in the world, sc.*, the heathen world (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 10, Phil. ii. 15).—περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς: *and more abundantly to you-ward, sc.*, perhaps because his opportunities at Corinth had been greater than elsewhere of displaying the holiness and sincerity of the Christian life.

Ver. 13. οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα κ.τ.λ.: *for we write none other things unto you than what ye read* (ἀναγινώσκειν always means "to read" in St. Paul's Epp. and throughout the N.T.) *or even acknowledge; i.e.*, there is no hidden meaning in his letters; he means what he says, as to which doubts seem to have been prevalent at Corinth (chap. x. 10, 11). The play upon words ἀναγινώσκετε . . . ἐπιγινώσκετε cannot be reproduced in English. St. Paul is fond of such paronomasia; see, *e.g.*, γινωσκομένη . . . ἀναγινωσκομένη, chap. iii. 2; φρονεῖν, ὑπερφρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν, Rom. xii. 3; συνκρίνω, ἀνακρίνω, 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; ἐργαζόμενοι . . . περιεργαζόμενοι, 2 Thess. iii. 11; *cf.* for other illustrations 1 Cor. vii. 31, xi. 31, xii. 2, Phil. iii. 2, Eph. v. 15, and chaps

ἐπιγνώσεσθε, 14. καθὼς ⸂καὶ ἐπέγνωτε⸃ ἡμᾶς [h] ἀπὸ [h] μέρους, ὅτι [i] καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν, καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου [1] Ἰησοῦ.[2] 15. καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ [k] πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην πρὸς [3] ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν πρότερον,[4] ἵνα δευτέραν χάριν [5] ἔχητε,[6] 16. καὶ [l] δι' ὑμῶν διελθεῖν [7] εἰς Μακεδονίαν, καὶ πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας ἐλθεῖν

h Jos. xviii. 20; Rom. xi. 25, xv. 15, 24; chap. ii. 5 only.
i Chaps. v. 12, ix. 3.
k Chaps. iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 4 only.
l Num. xx. 18; Rom. xv. 28.

[1] **του κυριου ημων** is read by ℵBGMP, f, g, vg., the Bohairic and Peshitto. **ημων** is (wrongly) omitted by ACDEKL, d, e and most cursives.

[2] D*EGMP and nearly all vss. add **Χριστου** after **Ἰησου**; om. ℵ*ABCD[bc]KL (rightly).

[3] DEGKL and most vss. have **ελθειν προς υμας**; but ℵABCMP and the Harclean support the received order.

[4] **προτερον** should come after **εβουλομην**, with nearly all the uncials; the received text follows the order of KL and the Bohairic.

[5] We retain **χαριν**, which is found in ℵ*ACDEGK; but ℵ[c]BLP have **χαραν**, which is adopted by W.H., and is mentioned in R.V. margin.

[6] **εχητε** ADEGKL; better **σχητε** with ℵBCP (see on ii. 3).

[7] AD*GP have **απελθειν**; **διελθειν** ℵBCD[c]EKL.

iv. 8, x. 12 below. **ἀλλ' ἢ** is equivalent to "except"; *cf.* Job vi. 5, Isa. xlii. 19.—**ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *and I hope that ye will acknowledge unto the end*, *sc.*, unto the day of the Lord's appearing (as in 1 Cor. i. 8), when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

Ver. 14. **καθὼς καὶ ἐπέγνωτε κ.τ.λ.**: *as also ye did acknowledge us in part*; *i.e.*, *some* of them made this acknowledgment, but not all (1 Cor. iii. 4).—**ὅτι καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμεν**: *that* (not "because") *we are your glorying* (*cf.* v. 12); that is, the Corinthian Church was proud of its connexion with the great Apostle, and still "gloried" in him.—**καθάπερ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *as ye also are ours, in the day of our Lord Jesus*. Lest this assertion of his single-mindedness and integrity should seem to claim any undue superiority to his fellow Christians at Corinth, he hastens to add, parenthetically, with remarkable tact, that if he is their "glory" so are they his. He constantly thinks thus of his converts; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Phil. ii. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 19, 20.—**ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ**: "A day of the Lord," "The Day of the Lord" are common expressions in the prophets; *cf.* Isa. xiii. 6, 9, Jer. xlvi. 10, Ezek. xxx. 3, Zech. xiv. 1, Joel i. 15, ii. 1, 11, 31 (cited Acts ii. 20), etc. And the phrase is taken up by St. Paul (1 Thess. v. 2, 1 Cor. i. 8, v. 5; *cf.* Phil. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 12), and is applied to the Second Advent of Christ; *cf.* also 2 Pet. iii. 10, and Matt. xxiv. 42.

Vv. 15-22. His Change of Plan was not Due to Fickleness. **καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πεποιθήσει ἐβουλόμην κ.τ.λ.**: *and in this confidence* (*sc.*, that they would acknowledge his sincerity) *I was minded to come before* (*sc.*, before he went to Macedonia) *unto you, that ye might have a second benefit*. The circumstances seem to have been as follows. While St. Paul was at Ephesus (Acts xix.) his intention had been to cross the Ægean to Corinth, thence to visit Macedonia, and then to come back to Corinth on his way to Judæa with the contributions which he had gathered (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4). The Corinthians would thus have enjoyed a "second benefit" (*cf.* Rom. i. 11, xv. 29), inasmuch as he would have visited them both on his way to Macedonia, and on his return journey. This project he had communicated to them, probably in the letter which is lost (1 Cor. v. 9). But he received bad news from Corinth (1 Cor. i. 11), and he wrote 1 *Cor.* in reply. In this letter (1 Cor. xvi. 5) he incidentally mentioned that he had changed his plans, and that he now proposed to travel from Ephesus to Corinth *viâ* Macedonia, the route which he adopted in the sequel (Acts xx. 1 ff., chap. ii. 12, vii. 5). When the Corinthians heard of this, they began to reproach him with fickleness of purpose (chap. i. 17), and the charge came to his ears. We have his defence in the verses (15-22) before us.

Ver. 16. **προπεμφθῆναι**: "to be set forward on my journey". The practice

πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν [m] προπεμφθῆναι εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν. 17. τοῦτο οὖν βουλευόμενος [1] μή τι ἄρα τῇ [n] ἐλαφρίᾳ ἐχρησάμην; ἢ ἃ [o] βουλεύομαι, [p] κατὰ [p] σάρκα βουλεύομαι, ἵνα ᾖ παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ [q] ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ; 18. πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἐγένετο [2] ναὶ καὶ οὔ· 19. ὁ γὰρ [3] τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς [4] ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν [r] κηρυχθεὶς, δι' ἐμοῦ καὶ Σιλουανοῦ καὶ

m Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11; Tit. iii. 13.
n Here only; *cf.* chap. iv. 17.
o Here only in Paul.
p John viii. 15; Rom. viii. 4, 12, 13; chaps. v. 16, x. 2, xi. 18.
q Mt. v. 37; Jas. v. 12.
r 1 Tim. iii. 16.

[1] The better reading is **βουλομενος,** with ℵABCGP, f, vg. and the Bohairic; **βουλευομενος** DEK, d, e, g and the Syriac.

[2] **εγενετο** of ℵcDbcEKL is probably a (mistaken) correction of **εστιν,** which is read by ℵ*ABCD*GP 17, the Latin and the Bohairic vss.

[3] ℵABCP, 17 have **ο του Θεου γαρ**; text follows the later authorities DEGKL.

[4] **Ἰη. Χρ.** has the support of ℵcBDEGKLP; but ℵ*AC (a strong combination) give **Χρ. Ἰη.** The order of words is therefore doubtful, but we prefer **Χρ. Ἰη.** on the whole.

of speeding fellow-Christians on their journeys, of "seeing them off" in safety, is often mentioned in *Acts*, and is inculcated more than once as a duty by St. Paul (see reff.).

Ver. 17. **τοῦτο οὖν βουλόμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *when therefore I was thus minded, did I shew fickleness?* The article **τῇ** before **ἐλαφρίᾳ** can hardly be pressed so as to convey the meaning "*that* fickleness which you lay to my charge"; it is merely generic.—**ἢ ἃ βουλεύομαι κ.τ.λ.**: *or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that there should be with me the Yea, yea, and the Nay, nay?* That is, "Are my plans made like those of a worldly man, that they may be changed according to my own caprice, *Yes* to-day, *No* to-morrow?" His argument is that, although the details of his original plan had been altered, yet in spirit and purpose it was unchanged; there is no room for any charge of inconsistency or fickleness. His principles of action are unchangeable, as is the Gospel which he preaches. He had promised to go to Corinth, and he would go. For a similar use of the phrase **κατὰ σάρκα** see reff., and *cf.* chap. v. 16. The reduplication **ναὶ ναὶ . . . οὒ οὔ** is not altogether easy to explain; but we have **ναὶ ναὶ** repeated similarly in Matt. v. 37, and perhaps we may also compare the **Ἀμὴν, Ἀμήν** of St. John's Gospel (*e.g.*, x. 1). Some critics (*e.g.*, Steck) have regarded **ναὶ ναὶ . . . οὒ οὔ** here as an actual quotation from Matt. v. 37. But apart from the fact that this opinion rests on a quite untenable theory as to the date of this Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 12), the context of the words will not lend itself to any such interpretation (see above).

Ver. 18. **πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *but as God is faithful, our word, etc.* For the construction, *cf.* the similar forms of asseveration **ζῇ κύριος ὅτι,** "as the Lord liveth" (1 Sam. xx. 3, 2 Sam. ii. 27), and **ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ ὅτι,** "as the truth of Christ is in me" (xi. 10). For **πιστός** as applied to God, see Deut. vii. 9, 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 13, 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 13, and *cf.* 1 Sam. xv. 29.—**ὁ λόγος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἔστιν Ναὶ καὶ Οὔ**: *our word* (*sc.*, my personal communications about my journey, as well as the message of the Gospel) *towards you is not Yea and Nay.* I do not deceive you or vacillate in my purpose: *cf.* ii. 17.

Ver. 19. He has appealed to the faithfulness of God, and this suggests the thought of the unchangeableness of Christ.—**ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *for the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who was proclaimed among you by us.* The position of **τοῦ Θεοῦ** before **γάρ** (as in the true text) brings out the sequence of thought better, as it brings **Θεοῦ** (the connecting word) into prominence.—**δι' ἐμοῦ καὶ Σιλουανοῦ καὶ Τιμοθέου**: *even by me and Silvanus and Timothy.* These three brought the Gospel to Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), and were closely associated during the Apostle's labours in that city (1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1). *Silvanus* is only another form of the name *Silas;* he was a prophet (Acts xv. 32), and apparently, like St. Paul, a Roman citizen (Acts xvi. 37), and shared the

Τιμοθέου, οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν· 20. ὅσαι γὰρ ˢἐπαγγελίαι ˢΘεοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ, καὶ [1] ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμὴν, τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς δόξαν δι' ἡμῶν. 21. ὁ δὲ ᵗβεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς [2] σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν, καὶ ᵘχρίσας ἡμᾶς, Θεός· 22. ὁ [3] καὶ ᵛσφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς, καὶ δοὺς τὸν ʷἀῤῥαβῶνα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

s Rom. iv. 20; Gal. iii. 21. t Rom. xv. 8, 1 Cor. i. 6, 8; Col. ii. 7; *cf.* Phil. i. 7. u Acts iv. 27, x. 38; Heb. i. 9. v John vi. 27; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, 4. w Gen. xxxviii. 17; chap. v. 5; Eph. i. 14.

[1] **και εν αυτῳ** DbcEKL and the Harclean; **διο και δι' αυτου** has the stronger support of ℵABCGP 17, the Peshitto and the Bohairic.

[2] C and the Harclean stand almost alone in reading **υμας συν ημιν**; B has **υμας συν υμιν** and **υμας** at the end of the verse.

[3] ℵcBCcDELO have **ο και σφρ.**; G and the Latins have **και ο σφρ.**; while ℵ*AC*KP 17 and the Bohairic omit **ο** altogether. Tisch. retains it before **και**, but W.H. enclose it in brackets.

Apostle's perils during the whole of his second missionary journey (Acts xv. 40—xviii. 18). We hear of him again at Rome (1 Pet. v. 12).—**οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὔ, ἀλλὰ ναὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γέγονεν**: *was not Yea and Nay, but in Him is* (*sc.*, has been and continues to be) *Yea*. There is no doubtfulness or vacillation in the words of Christ (Matt. vii. 29, John xii. 50); and He continually emphasised the positive and certain character of His teaching by the introductory formula **Ἀμὴν, ἀμήν**. More than this, however, is involved here. Christ, who is the Object and Sum of St. Paul's preaching, is unchangeable (Heb. xiii. 8), for He is not only "true" (Rev. iii. 7), but "the Truth" (John xiv. 6): He is, in brief, **ὁ Ἀμήν** (Rev. iii. 14), and so it may be said that an Eternal "Yea" has come into being (**γέγονεν**, through His incarnate Life) in Him.

Ver. 20. **ὅσαι γὰρ ἐπαγγελίαι κ.τ.λ.**: *for how many soever be the promises of God, in Him is the Yea*. Not only was Christ a **διάκονος περιτομῆς . . . εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων** (Rom. xv. 8), but He is Himself, in His own Person, the true fulfilment and recapitulation of them all (*cf.* Gal. iii. 8).—**διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἀμὴν κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore also through Him is the "Amen," to the glory of God, through us*. The reading of the received text conceals the force of these words. It is because Christ is the consummation, the "Yea" of the Divine promises, that the "Amen" is specially fitting at the close of doxologies in public worship (1 Cor. xiv. 16). The thought of the fulfilment of God's promises naturally leads to a doxology (Rom. xv. 9), to which a solemn **Ἀμήν**, the Hebrew form of the Greek **ναί**, whose significance as applied to Christ has just been expounded, is a fitting climax. **δι' ἡμῶν** in this clause includes, of course, both St. Paul and his correspondents; it refers, indeed, to the general practice of Christians in their public devotions.

Ver. 21. **ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *now He that stablisheth us with you into Christ and anointed us is God*, etc. For the form of the sentence *cf.* chap. v. 5. The ultimate ground of St. Paul's steadfastness in Christ is God Himself; and having been led on to say this, he adds **σὺν ὑμῖν**, in order to introduce (as he does at every opportunity in the early part of the Epistle) the idea of unity between him and his Corinthian converts. The play on words **Χριστόν . . . χρίσας** is obvious; the only other place in the N.T. where the idea is found of the "anointing" of the Christian believer by God is 1 John ii. 20, 27, **ὑμεῖς χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου**. Deissmann has pointed out (*Bibelstudien*, p. 104) that **βεβαιόω** and **ἀρραβών** (see note below) are both technical terms belonging to the law courts (*cf.* Lev. xxv. 23, LXX), and that **βεβαιῶν** is here deliberately used rather than **κυριῶν** (Gal. iii. 15), or any other such word.

Ver. 22. **ὁ καὶ σφρ. ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who also sealed us* (*sc.*, all Christians), *and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts*. The aorists, **σφραγισάμενος . . . δούς**, point to acts completed at a definite moment in the past; and this can only mean the moment of *baptism*. This, too, is the best explanation of the parallel passages, Eph. i. 13, iv. 30. The gift of the Holy Spirit is repeatedly mentioned as consequent on baptism (Acts ii. 38, xix. 6); and the **σφραγίς**, or "seal" of baptism, is a common image in early Christian literature (*e.g.*, [2 Clem.,] § 8,

23. ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν, ὅτι [x] φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκέτι[1] ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον· 24. [y] οὐχ ὅτι [z] κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν[2] τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ συνεργοί ἐσμεν τῆς χαρᾶς ὑμῶν,

x 1 Cor. vii. 28; chaps. xii. 6, xiii. 2.
y Chap. iii. 5; Phil. iii. 12, iv. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9.
z Rom. vi. 9, 14, vii. 1, xiv. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 15.

[1] G has **ουκ**, which also seems to have been read by the Peshitto, Bohairic and d, e, g of the Latins.

[2] DEG and the Latins give the order **της πιστεως υμων**.

τηρήσατε . . . τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον). The "seal" of the Church is given by St. Paul (2 Tim. ii. 19) as "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (Num. xvi. 5), and "Let every one that nameth the Name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness" (Isa. lii. 11; *cf.* Num. xvi. 26, Isa. xxvi. 13). The **ἀρραβών** (see an exhaustive note in Pearson, *On the Creed*, viii.), *i.e.*, עֵרָבוֹן, is a first instalment, given in pledge of full payment in due course; see reff. and *cf.* Rom. viii. 16, **τὸ πνεῦμα συνμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα Θεοῦ**: here is the **ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος** (Rom. viii. 23). For the constr. **διδόναι ἐν** *cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 26, John iii. 35, Acts iv. 12, chap. viii. 1, 16.

Ver. 23—ii. 4. The Real Reason of the Postponement of his Visit to Corinth was that he did not wish his next Visit to be Painful, as the last had been.—Ver. 23. **ἐγὼ δὲ μάρτυρα τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικ. κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (*sc.*, whatever my opponents may say) *I invoke God as a witness against my soul*, *sc.*, if I speak falsely; *cf.* Rom. i. 9, Gal. i. 20, Phil. i. 8, 1 Thess. ii. 5, 10. For **ἐπί** used in this way *cf.* **εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς** (Luke ix. 5). The A.V. and R.V. "*upon* my soul" do not bring out the sense clearly.—**ὅτι φειδόμενος ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *that to spare you I came not again to Corinth*, *i.e.*, "I paid no fresh visit," "I gave up the thought of coming". The A.V., "I came not *as yet*," is here quite misleading (*cf.* xiii. 2 and 1 Cor. iv. 21).

Ver. 24. This verse is parenthetical, and introduced to guard against misunderstanding. **οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως**: *not that we have lordship over your faith*. This is not the department of his Apostolic authority (*cf.* Luke xxii. 25, 1 Pet. v. 3).—**ἀλλὰ συνεργοί κ.τ.λ.**: *but we are* (only) *fellow-workers in* (producing) *your joy;* a parenthesis within a parenthesis, not necessary to the sense, but added to emphasise once more his sense of the common ties between him and the Corinthians (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 3, chap. viii. 23, Col. iv. 11).—**τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἑστήκατε**: *for by your faith ye stand*. If it were dominated by the authority of another, it would not be thus the instrument of their steadfastness. Another (inferior) interpretation is, "As regards your faith ye stand," *i.e.*, "I have no fault to find with you so far as your faith is concerned"; but the parallel, Rom. xi. 20, seems to fix the dative as instrumental.

Chapter II.—Ver. 1. **ἔκρινα δὲ ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *but I decided this for my own sake, that I would not come again to you with sorrow; i.e.*, I determined that my next visit should not be painful, as my last was. The juxtaposition of **πάλιν** with **ἐν λύπῃ** (see crit. note) requires that interpretation. Hence the former visit in St. Paul's mind could not have been his *first* visit to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1 ff.), for that was not **ἐν λύπῃ**. And thus we are forced to conclude that another visit was paid from Ephesus, of which no details have been preserved (*cf.* xii. 14, xiii. 1). The conditions of the scanty evidence available seem best satisfied by supposing that St. Paul's second visit to Corinth was paid from Ephesus during the period Acts xix. 10. Alarming news had probably reached him, and he determined to make enquiries for himself. On his return to Ephesus he wrote the letter (now lost) alluded to in 1 Cor. v. 9, in which he charged the Corinthians "to keep no company with fornicators". Subsequently to this he *again* received distressing intelligence (1 Cor. i. 11, v. 1, etc.), whereupon he wrote the first canonical Epistle (see *Introd.*, p. 7).

Ver. 2. **εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ.**: *for if I make you sorry, who then is he that makes me glad, but he who is made sorry by me?* His argument is: When I make you sorry, it is that you may repent (see chap. vii. 9), and so gladden me: my change of purpose was not prompted by the desire of giving pain, but on the con-

[a] τῇ γὰρ [a] πίστει [a] ἑστήκατε· II. 1. [a] ἔκρινα δὲ [1] ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, [a] τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν [2] ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 2. εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς, καὶ τίς ἐστιν [3] ὁ [b] εὐφραίνων με, εἰ μὴ ὁ λυπούμενος ἐξ ἐμοῦ; 3. καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν [4] [c] τοῦτο [5] [c] αὐτὸ, ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην [6] ἔχω [7] ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν· [d] πεποιθὼς [d] ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἡ ἐμὴ χαρὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐστιν. 4. ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς [e] θλίψεως καὶ [f] συνοχῆς καρδίας ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν [8] ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε ἣν ἔχω περισσοτέρως εἰς [9] ὑμᾶς.

5. Εἰ δέ τις λελύπηκεν, οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν, ἀλλ' [g] ἀπὸ [g] μέρους,

a Rom. xi. 20; *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 13.
a Rom. xiv. 13.
b Rom. xv. 10; Gal. iv. 27.
c Rom. xiii. 6; chap. vii. 11.
d 2 Thess. iii. 4.
e Reff. i. 4.
f Job xxx. 3; Lk. xxi. 25.
g Reff. i. 14.

[1] B 17, the Bohairic and Harclean have **γαρ**; D* has **τε**; all other authorities **δε**.

[2] ℵABCKLOP place **ελθειν** after **υμας**; DEG and the Peshitto read **ελθειν προς υμας**, and the Bohairic has **το μη ελθειν προς υμας εν λυπῃ** (omitting **παλιν**). The received order is found in a few cursives only.

[3] ℵcDEGKLOP, etc., give **εστιν**; om. ℵ*ABC and the Bohairic.

[4] ℵcCcDEGKL, the Syriac and (most) Latin vss. have **υμιν**, which is omitted by ℵ*ABC*OP 17 and the Bohairic.

[5] CO give **αυτο τουτο** (*cf.* vii. 11); A and the Bohairic omit **αυτο**.

[6] DEG and a few other authorities have **λυπην επι λυπην** (from a reminiscence of Phil. ii. 27).

[7] **εχω** ℵcDEGKL; better **σχω**, ℵ*ABOP (see on i. 15).

[8] G has **ινα γνωτε την αγαπην**.

[9] G has **προς υμας**.

trary by my fear that, if I visited you as I had intended, you would sadden me: I should have had to grieve, and be grieved by those who are the source of my purest joy. With the introductory **καὶ τίς**, "Who then," the implied answer being "No one," *cf.* Mark x. 26, **καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι**, and chap. ii. 16.

Ver. 3. **καὶ ἔγραψα τοῦτο αὐτὸ**: *and I wrote this very thing; i.e.*, I communicated my change of plan (1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff.). So **ἔκρινα τοῦτο** in ver. 1. (The translation "just for this reason," taking **τοῦτο αὐτό** adverbially, is also admissible; *cf.* 2 Pet. i. 5).—**ἵνα μὴ ἐλθὼν λύπην κ.τ.λ.**: *lest when I came I should have sorrow from them from whom I ought to rejoice.* **ἀφ' ὧν** is for **ἀπ ἐκείνων ἀφ' ὧν**; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12, iii. 16.—**πεποιθὼς ἐπὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all; i.e.*, having confidence in the perfect sympathy between himself and his correspondents. He could only be made glad if they were made glad; and so to visit them for the purpose of rebuking them would be as painful to him as to them. Observe the repeated **πάντας . . . πάντων**: despite the factions in Corinth (1 Cor. iii. 4) *he* must think of them *all* as his friends (*cf.* xiii. 13).

Ver. 4. **ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως κ.τ.λ.**: *for out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears.* This describes the state of mind in which he wrote 1 *Cor.*, if the view of the situation which has been adopted in this commentary be correct (see *Introd.*, p. 13).—**διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων**: we have **διά** used, somewhat similarly, with the genitive of the attendant circumstances, in Rom. ii. 27, iv. 11, viii. 25, xiv. 20, chap. v. 7, Heb. xii. 1, Rev. xxi. 24, etc.—**οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε κ.τ.λ.**: *not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye should know the love which I have so abundantly to you.* **ἀγάπη**, as a grace especially to be exhibited in Christian intercourse, is repeatedly dwelt on by St. Paul. The word has been described as "ecclesiastical" and as having been first introduced to literature in the LXX. But it has been recently found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 81), and it thus appears that the LXX only took over a word already current in the speech of Greek Egypt. Here the position of **ἀγάπην** *before* **ἵνα** gives it special emphasis; *cf.*, for a like order, Acts xix. 4, Rom. xi. 31. **περισσοτέρως** *may* mean "more abundantly," *sc.*, than to other Churches; but it is

ἵνα μὴ [h] ἐπιβαρῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς. 6. [i] ἱκανὸν τῷ [k] τοιούτῳ ἡ [l] ἐπιτιμία αὕτη ἡ ὑπὸ [m] τῶν [m] πλειόνων· 7. ὥστε [n] τοὐναντίον μᾶλλον [1] ὑμᾶς [o] χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι, μήπως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ [p] καταποθῇ ὁ τοιοῦτος. 8. διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς [q] κυρῶσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην. 9. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα,[2] ἵνα γνῶ τὴν [r] δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν,[3] εἰ [4] εἰς

h 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8 only. i 1 Cor. xv. 9; chaps. ii. 16, iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2. k 1 Cor. v. 5; chaps. x. 11, xi. 13. l Wisd. iii. 10 only; *cf.* 2 Macc. vi. 13. m 1 Cor. ix. 19, x. 5, xv. 6; chaps. iv. 15, ix. 2; Phil. i. 14. n Gal. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9 only; 3 Macc. iii. 22. o Chaps. ii. 10, xii. 13; Eph. iv. 32; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13; Lk. vii. 42. p 1 Cor. xv. 54 (Isa. xxv. 8); chap. v. 4. q Gal. iii. 15; Gen. xxiii. 20; Lev. xxv. 30. r Rom. v. 4; chaps. viii. 2, ix. 13, xiii. 3; Phil. ii. 22 only.

[1] AB and the Peshitto (which W.H. follow here) omit **μαλλον**, but it is found in all other authorities; DEG 17 place it after **υμας**.

[2] G inserts **υμων** (*vobis*, f, g, and so the Bohairic) after **εγραψα**.

[3] G, g prefix **παντων** to **υμων**.

[4] AB 17 have **η**, which W.H. place in their margin; almost all other authorities have **ει**.

quite legitimate to take it as used without any special comparative force (*cf.* x. 8).

Vv. 5-11. The Offender has been sufficiently punished: the Apostle acquiesces in their remission of the penalty of 1 Cor. v. 1-5.—Ver. 5. **εἰ δέ τις λελύπηκεν κ.τ.λ.**: *but if any one*, *sc.*, the incestuous person of 1 Cor. v. 1, his name being suppressed with a rare delicacy of feeling, *hath caused sorrow*, *he hath caused sorrow*, *not to me*, *sc.*, I am not the person directly aggrieved, *but to some extent* (*that I press not too heavily on him*) *to you all*. That is to say to the words **ἀπὸ μέρους** are added by the Apostle **ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ** (*sc.*, **αὐτόν**). The sentence has been otherwise construed "he hath not caused sorrow to me [alone], but [only] in part [having caused sorrow to you also]: [this I add] that I may not press heavily on you all," *sc.*, by representing myself as the only person aggrieved. But this would require **εἰ μή** instead of **ἀλλά**, and, further, does not suit the context so well as the rendering given above, which treats **ἵνα μὴ ἐπιβαρῶ** as parenthetic.

Ver. 6. **ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *sufficient to such an one* (the word used in 1 Cor. v. 5 to indicate the offender) *is this punishment* (*which was inflicted*) *by the majority*. The directions given by the Apostle for dealing with the offender had probably been carried out with harshness and severity; he now suggests that the punishment might be remitted, and the guilty man forgiven. **ἐπιτιμία** in the Attic orators is used for "the possession of political rights," but it came to mean (see reff.) *penalty* or *requital*; the punishment (see 1 Cor. v. 5) would seem to have been of a *disciplinary*, and not merely *punitive*, character; it was probably like the formal excommunication of a later age (*cf.* also 1 Tim. i. 20), and involved the exclusion of the guilty person from the privileges of the Christian Society. That it was inflicted only by "the majority" (for so we must translate **τῶν πλειόνων**; see reff.) is sufficiently accounted for by remembering the presence of an anti-Pauline party at Corinth, who would not be likely to follow the Apostle's instructions. The construction **ἱκανὸν . . . ἡ ἐπιτιμία** (**ἐστι**, rather than **ἔστω**, is the verb to be supplied) affords an instance of a neuter adjectival predicate set over against a feminine subject (*cf.* Matt. vi. 34); **ἱκανὸν** seems to be used here like the Latin *satis*.

Ver. 7. **ὥστε τοὐναντίον μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.**: *so that contrariwise ye should rather forgive him and comfort him* (*cf.*, for the sentiment, Ecclus. viii. 5, Col. iii. 13, Eph. iv. 32). We should expect some verb like **δεῖν**, but it is perhaps sufficiently suggested by **ὥστε**. **χαρίζεσθαι** is generally found in the N.T. in the sense of "to bestow a favour"; but it conveys the special meaning "to forgive" in the passages referred to above.—**μήπως τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ κ.τ.λ.**: *lest such an one should be swallowed up with his excessive sorrow*, *sc.*, should be driven to despair through overmuch severity. Again (see on ver. 4 above) we are not to press the comparative force of **περισσοτέρᾳ**.

Ver. 8. **διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore I beseech you* (or "exhort you," see on i. 4) *to confirm your love toward him*. Authority "to bind" and "to loose" had been committed to the Apostles (Matt. xviii. 18); St. Paul had exercised the former function (1 Cor. v. 5), and he now discharges the latter. The various meanings of **παρακαλεῖν**

πάντα [s] ὑπήκοοί ἐστε. 10. ᾧ δέ τι [t] χαρίζεσθε, καὶ ἐγώ· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ εἴ[1] τι κεχάρισμαι, ᾧ κεχάρισμαι, δι' ὑμᾶς, ἐν [u] προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, 11. ἵνα μὴ [v] πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ [w] Σατανᾶ· οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ [x] νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν.

12. Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς[2] τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ

s Acts vii. 39; Phil. ii. 8 only.
t Reff. ii. 7.
u Reff. i. 11.
v Chaps. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18; 1 Thess. iv. 6 only.
w Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Cor. v. 5, vii. 5; chaps. xi. 14, xii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 20, v. 15.
x Chaps. iii. 14, iv. 4, x. 5, xi. 3; Phil. iv. 7 only; Bar. ii. 8; 3 Macc. v. 30.

[1] The better reading is **και γαρ εγω ο κεχαρ. ει τι κεχαρ.**, with ℵABCGO, etc.; received text DbKL 17, the Harclean, etc.

[2] G and the Latin vss. have **δια το ευαγγελιον**; DE **δια τον ευαγγελιον**.

have been noted above (on i. 4); it is interesting to observe here how the word is used in one sense in ver. 7, and in another in close sequence in ver. 8 (*cf.* the two senses of **παραδίδωμι** in 1 Cor. xi. 23). For **ἀγάπη** see on ver. 4 above.

Ver. 9. **εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for to this end also did I write, viz., that I might know the proof of you, whether ye were obedient in all things; i.e.*, his object in writing the former letter (1 *Cor.*) was not only the reformation of the offender, but the testing of the Corinthians' acceptance of his apostolic authority (*cf.* vii. 12). For the constr. **εἰς τοῦτο γάρ . . . ἵνα . . .** *cf.* Rom. xiv. 9. It is hard to decide between the readings **εἰ**, "whether," or **ᾗ**, "whereby" (see crit. note); but the general sense is the same in both cases. A comparison of this verse with vii. 12 has led some critics to doubt whether chaps. ii. and vii. really refer at all to the offender of 1 Cor. v. 1; for the expressed object of St. Paul's communication was to prove the loyalty of the Corinthians to himself. And thus it is supposed that the individual in view is some bitter personal opponent of St. Paul (see Tertullian, *de Pudic.* xiii. f.). But vv. 5-9 seem quite consecutive, and we find it more natural to interpret ver. 5 in reference to 1 Cor. v. 1 ff. And vii. 12 seems clearly to distinguish **ὁ ἀδικηθείς** from St. Paul himself (see *Introd.*, p. 15).

Ver. 10. **ᾧ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε κ.τ.λ.**: *but to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for what I also have forgiven* (*if I have forgiven anything*) *for your sakes have I forgiven it in the face of Christ.* This is not a general principle, but a statement of the Apostle's feelings at the present juncture; if they are willing to forgive the offender, so is he. Whether he advocates punishment or forgiveness it is always **δι' ὑμᾶς**, "for your sakes," and it is **ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ**, "in the sight of Christ". **πρόσωπον** (see on i. 11) is a "face," and so **ἐν προσ. Χρ.** is a stronger way of saying **ἐνώπιον Χριστοῦ** (*cf.* chap. iv. 2, viii. 21, Gal. i. 20); the Apostle claims that his acts of condemnation and forgiveness are done as "in the presence of Christ". Both A.V. and R.V. render "in the person of Christ," which would mean that St. Paul had acted as Christ's delegate. But the usage of **πρόσωπον** in 2 *Cor.* is against this interpretation.

Ver. 11. **ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *lest we, sc.*, you and I together, *be robbed by Satan; i.e.*, lest we drive sinners to despair and so let Satan capture them from us. "The offender was to be delivered over **τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός** (1 Cor. v. 5)—care must be taken lest we **πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ**, and his soul perish likewise" (Alford). Observe that in St. Paul's writings (except chap. xii. 7; see reff.) **Σατανᾶς** takes the article, "the Satan," the adversary; it has not yet come to be regularly used as a proper name (but *cf.* Matt. iv. 10, Mark iii. 23).—**οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we are not ignorant of his devices.* **νόημα** (see reff.) is generally (always in this Ep.) used in a bad sense, of the thoughts of man's unregenerate heart. Here **τὰ νοήματα** are the designs of the adversary of souls.

Vv. 12-17. He was disappointed at not meeting Titus in Troas, but he rejoices now to learn that his message of reproof has been loyally received in Corinth.—Ver. 12. **ἐλθὼν δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (the particle **δέ** marking the resumption of his original subject) *when I came to Troas, for the purposes of the Gospel of Christ* (*cf.* ix. 13). He stayed there seven days preaching and teaching on his return from Greece (Acts xx. 6-12). We are not to press the article and translate "the Troad"; *cf.* Acts xx. 5, 6, where we have **ἐν Τρῳάδι** and **εἰς τὴν Τρῳάδα** used of the same

y 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Col. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 8; *cf.* Isa. xlv. 1.
z Rom. xvi. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 1; Eph. ii. 21.
a Acts xxiv. 23; chaps. vii. 5, viii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 7 only.

ʸ θύρας μοι ʸ ἀνεῳγμένης ᶻ ἐν ᶻ Κυρίῳ, 13. οὐκ ἔσχηκα ᵃ ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου, τῷ[1] μὴ εὑρεῖν[2] με Τίτον τὸν ἀδελφόν μου· ἀλλὰ ᵇ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, ἐξῆλθον εἰς Μακεδονίαν. 14. ᶜ τῷ δὲ ᶜ Θεῷ ᶜ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε ᵈ θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν[3] τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ τὴν ᵉ ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ ᶠ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ. 15. ὅτι Χριστοῦ ᵉ εὐωδία ἐσμὲν τῷ[4] Θεῷ ἐν τοῖς ᵍ σωζομένοις καὶ ἐν

b Mk. vi. 46; Lk. ix. 61, xiv. 33; Acts xviii. 18, 21 only. c Rom. vi. 17, vii. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 57; chaps. viii. 16, ix. 15. d Col. ii. 15 only. e John xii. 3; Eph. v. 2; Phil. iv. 18 (Gen. viii. 21; Lev. i. 9) only; *cf.* Cant. i. 3. f Chaps. iii. 3, iv. 10, 11, v. 10, 11, vii. 12, xi. 6. g Acts ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 18, xv. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 21.

[1] Most authorities have **τῳ μη ευρειν**; **το** LP; **του** ℵ*C² 73; **εν τῳ** DE 17.
[2] **ευρισκειν** D*. [3] 17, 37, 73 have **εν Χριστῳ Ἰησου.** [4] K omits **τῳ Θεῳ.**

place in consecutive verses. Troas would be a natural place of rendezvous, as it was the point of embarkation for Macedonia (see Acts xvi. 8); and here St. Paul had expected to meet Titus, who had been sent from Ephesus to Corinth, with an unnamed companion, as the bearer of 1 *Cor.* (see *Introd.*, p. 9).—**καὶ θύρας μοι ἀνεῳγμένης ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *and a door was opened for me in the Lord.* This is not the "door of faith" (Acts xiv. 27), but the door of opportunity at Troas (see reff. above), which he describes here as "opened," a phrase which he had used a short time before of his prospects of usefulness at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 9). It is open **ἐν Κυρίῳ**; that is the sphere, as it were, of his apostolic labours (see reff.).

Ver. 13. **οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πν.**: *I had no relief for my spirit.* So he says again (vii. 5) **ἐλθόντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν.** We are not to lay much stress on **πνεῦμα** being used here and **σάρξ** there (yet *cf.* chap. vii. 1); **σάρξ** in the later passage is used of the whole mortal nature of man, which is subject to distress and disappointment; and **πνεῦμα** here is a general term for the "mind" (*cf.* Rom. i. 9, viii. 6, xii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, xiv. 14, chap. vii. 1, 13, etc., for St. Paul's use of **πνεῦμα** for the human spirit, and see on iii. 6 below). For the tense of **ἔσχηκα**, see on i. 9.—**τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them* (*sc.*, the disciples at Troas) *I went forth into Macedonia.* **ἐξέρχεσθαι** is the word used in Acts xvi. 10, xx. 1 of "going out" of Asia to Macedonia; *cf.* viii. 17.

Ver. 14. **τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις κ.τ.λ.**: *but thanks be to God, etc.* Instead of giving details of the information which Titus brought to him in Macedonia (chap. vii. 6), he bursts out into a characteristic doxology, which leads him into a long digression, the main topic of the Epistle not coming into view again until vi. 11.—**τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι**: *who always*, *sc.*, even in times of anxiety and distress, *leadeth us in triumph in Christ.* **θριαμβεύειν**, "to lead as captive in a triumphal procession," occurs again in this sense Col. ii. 15. The rendering of the A.V., "which causeth us to triumph," though yielding a good sense here (and despite the causative force of verbs in **-εύω**), must be abandoned, as no clear instance of **θριαμβεύειν** in such a signification has been produced. The splendid image before the writer's mind is that of a Roman triumph, which, though he had never seen it, must have been familiar to him as it was to every citizen of the Empire. He thinks of God as the Victor (Rev. vi. 2) entering the City into which the glory and honour of the nations (Rev. xxi. 26) is brought; the Apostle as "in Christ"—as a member of the Body of Christ—is one of the captives, by means of whom the knowledge and fame of the Victor is made manifest. He rejoices that he has been so used by God, as would appear from the tidings which Titus has brought him.—**καὶ τὴν ὀσμὴν τῆς γνώσεως κ.τ.λ.**: *and maketh manifest through us the savour of the knowledge of Him* (*sc.*, of Christ) *in every place*, *sc.*, at Corinth as well as in Troas and Macedonia. It is possible that the metaphor of the **ὀσμή** is suggested by and is part of that of the triumph; *e.g.*, Plutarch (*Æmil. Paul.* c. 32) says that the temples were "full of fumigations" during the passage of the procession. But **ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας** is a frequent LXX phrase (see reff.).

Ver. 15. **ὅτι Χρ. εὐωδία κ.τ.λ.**: *for*

τοῖς [h] ἀπολλυμένοις· 16. οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ [1] θανάτου [2] εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὀσμὴ [1] ζωῆς [2] εἰς ζωήν, καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς [i] ἱκανός; 17. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν, ὡς οἱ [3] [k] πολλοὶ [l] καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς [4] ἐξ [m] εἰλικρινείας, ἀλλ' [5] ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ, κατενώπιον [6] τοῦ [7] Θεοῦ, [n] ἐν [n] Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.

h 1 Cor. i. 18; Chap. iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10, etc.
i Reff. ver. 6.
k Rom. v. 15, 19, xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, 33.
l Here only. m Reff. i. 12. n Rom. ix. 1; chap. xii. 19.

[1] οσμην DE.

[2] θανατου . . . ζωης DEGKL, etc.; better εκ θανατου . . . εκ ζωης ℵABC 17 and the Bohairic.

[3] οι λοιποι DEGL, g and the Syriac vss.; better, as in text, οι πολλοι, with ℵABCK, d, e, f, vg. and the Bohairic.

[4] G, the Latin and Bohairic vss. omit the second ως.

[5] G, d, e, f, g and the Harclean omit the second αλλ'.

[6] ℵcDEGKL have κατενωπιον; better κατεναντι (*cf.* Rom. iv. 17 and chap. xii. 19) with ℵ*ABCP 17.

[7] ℵcDbcEGKLP give του Θεου; better om. του with ℵ*ABCD* (*cf.* xii. 19).

we are a sweet savour of Christ unto God. Not only "through us" is the ὀσμή made manifest; we ourselves in so far as we realise and manifest our membership of Christ are, in fact, that εὐωδία. The influence of the lives of the saints is sweet and penetrative, like that of incense. From this verse comes the phrase "the odour of sanctity".—ἐν τοῖς σωζομένοις καὶ κ.τ.λ.: *among them that are being saved and among them that are perishing.* It is difficult to understand why the American Committee of Revisers objected to this rendering, and translated "are saved . . . perish". The force of the present participles ought not to be overlooked (see reff.); men in this world are either in the way of life or the way of death, but their final destiny is not to be spoken of as fixed and irrevocable while they are in the flesh. Free will involves the possibility alike of falling away from a state of grace, or of repentance from a state of sin. But for men of either class is a Christian life lived in their midst, a εὐωδία Χριστοῦ.

Ver. 16. οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ κ.τ.λ.: *to the one a savour from death unto death; to the other a savour from life unto life;* and yet it is the same ὀσμή in both cases; *cf.* Luke ii. 34. ἐκ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον may be illustrated by Rom. i. 17, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (see also chap. iii. 18); emphasis is gained, according to the Hebrew idiom, by repeating the important word. The Rabbinical parallels given by Wetstein and others show that the metaphor of this verse was common among Jewish writers; they called the Law an *aroma vitae* to the good, but an *aroma mortis* to the evil.—καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα τίς ἱκανός: *who then is sufficient for these things? sc.*, to fill such a part as has been just described (for καὶ . . . τίς see on ver. 2 above). St. Paul's answer is not fully expressed, but the sequence of thought is this: "it might be thought that no one is sufficient for such a task; and yet *we* are, for we are not as the many," etc.; an answer which he is careful to explain and qualify in ver. 5 of the next chapter, lest he should be accused of undue confidence.

Ver. 17. οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς κ.τ.λ.: *for we are not as the many, viz.*, the ordinary teachers with whom you meet. The *indirect* reference is to his opponents at Corinth, though they are not named. At least he is more worthy to fill the high office of which he has been speaking than many who would be only too glad to usurp his authority; *cf.* chap. iv. 2, 1 Thess. ii. 3, 5 for similar comparisons.—καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ: *who adulterate the word of God, i.e.*, the Divine message as revealed in the Gospel (the *usual* sense in the N.T. of ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ; *cf.* iv. 2 and 2 Tim. ii. 15). κάπηλος (Ecclus. xxvi. 29) is "a huckster," and is used in Isa. i. 22 of one who adulterates wine; so the primary sense of καπηλεύειν is "to make merchandise of" (R.V. margin), which readily passed into "to corrupt" or "adulterate" for the purposes of trade.—ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας κ.τ.λ.: *but as of sincerity* (our subjective attitude of mind), *but as of God* (the objective source of our message

III. 1. ᾿ΑΡΧΟΜΕΘΑ πάλιν [a] ἑαυτοὺς [a] συνιστάνειν [1]; εἰ [2] μὴ χρῄζομεν, ὥς [3] τινες, [b] συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν συστατικῶν [4]; 2. ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν ὑμεῖς ἐστε, [c] ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν,[5] γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων· 3. [d] φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἐγγεγραμμένη [6] οὐ μέλανι, ἀλλὰ Πνεύματι [e] Θεοῦ [e] ζῶντος, οὐκ ἐν [f] πλαξὶ [f] λιθίναις, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν [g] πλαξὶ [h] καρδίας [7] [h i] σαρκίναις.

a Chaps. v. 12, x. 12, 18; *cf.* chaps. iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11.
b Here only.
c Ver. 3; Lk. x. 20 only; 1 Macc. xiii. 40.
d Reff. ii. 14.
e Deut. v. 26; Acts xiv. 15; Rom. ix. 26; chap. vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15, etc.
f Exod. xxxi. 18; Deut. iv. 13, etc.
g Heb. ix. 4 only.
h Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26.
i Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Heb. vii. 16 only.

[1] BD* 17 have **συνισταν**; FG **συνισταναι**; all other authorities **συνιστανειν**.

[2] **ει μη** AKLP; better **η μη** with ℵBCDEG and the primary vss.

[3] AD* have **ωσπερ**.

[4] D*EGKLP, d, e, g and the Syriac have **συστατικων** (G, g add **επιστολων**); better om. with ℵABC 17 and the Bohairic.

[5] ℵ 17 have **καρδιαις υμων**.

[6] B 67**, f, vg. have **και εγγεγρ**.

[7] FK and most vss. support **καρδιας**; better **καρδιαις** with ℵABCDEGLP and the Harclean. W.H. suggest that the second **πλαξι** was introduced through a primitive clerical error.

and of our commission to speak), *in the sight of God* (*sc.*, in the consciousness of His presence; *cf.* ver. 10 above), *speak we in Christ*, *sc.*, as members of Christ's Body, in fellowship with Him. This solemn and impressive confirmation of what has been said is repeated, chap. xii. 19, **κατέναντι Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν.**

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-3. THE CORINTHIANS ARE ST. PAUL'S "EPISTLE OF COMMENDATION".—Ver. 1. **ἀρχόμεθα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστ.**: *are we beginning again* (*sc.*, as, for instance, in 1 Cor. ix. 15, xiv. 18, xv. 10, or possibly he alludes to i. 12 above; *cf.* chap. v. 12, x. 18 below) *to commend ourselves?* His opponents seem to have made this charge, which he is careful to repudiate again (x. 12; *cf.* xii. 11). The phrase **ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνειν** (or **συνιστάναι**, for both forms occur) is found four times in this Epistle (see reff.), and always in a bad sense, the prominent place of **ἑαυτὸν** signifying that there has been undue egotism; on the other hand, **συνιστάνειν ἑαυτὸν**, which occurs three times (see reff.), is always used in a good sense, of that legitimate commendation of himself and his message which every faithful minister will adopt. Neither form occurs elsewhere in the N.T. (unless Gal. ii. 18, **παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω**, be regarded as an exception).—**ἢ μὴ χρῄζομεν κ.τ.λ.**: *or do we need, as some do* (*i.e.*, the **οἱ πολλοί** of ii. 17; **τινες** is his usual vague description of opponents; see 1 Cor. iv. 18, xv. 12, chap. x. 2, Gal. i. 7, 1 Tim. i. 3, 19), *epistles of commendation to you or from you?* Greek teachers used to give **ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαί** (Diogenes Laert., viii. 87); for such commendatory mention *cf.* Acts xv. 25 (of Judas and Silas to the Church at Antioch), Acts xviii. 27 (of Apollos to the Church at Corinth), Rom. xvi. 1 (of Phœbe to the Church at Rome), chap. viii. 16-24 (of Titus and his companions to the Church at Corinth); *cf.* also 1 Cor. xvi. 3. St. Paul scouts the idea that he, who first brought the Gospel to Corinth, should need to present formal credentials to the Corinthian Church; and it would be equally anomalous that he should seek recommendations *from* them (**ἐξ ὑμῶν**). He has testimonies to his character and office far superior to any that could be written on papyrus. These can be pointed to if any object that his Apostolic office was self-assumed, and that he delivers the Gospel message in his own way and on his own authority (Gal. i. 12).

Ver. 2. **ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye are our epistle.* They are his credentials. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 2, where he tells them that they are the "seal" of his apostleship. Note the emphasis laid on **ἐπιστολή** by its position in the sentence.—**ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν**: *written in our hearts*, *i.e.*, in the heart of me, Paul (*cf.* vii. 3); a somewhat unexpected, and, as it were, parenthetic application of the metaphor, suggested by the memory of

4. [k] Πεποίθησιν δὲ τοιαύτην ἔχομεν [1] διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν [1]· 5. οὐχ ὅτι [l] ἱκανοί ἐσμεν ἀφ᾽ [2] ἑαυτῶν λογίσασθαί [3] τι, [4] ὡς [5] ἐξ ἑαυτῶν, [6] ἀλλ᾽ ἡ [m] ἱκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 6. ὃς καὶ [n] ἱκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς [o] διακόνους [p] καινῆς [p] διαθήκης, οὐ [q] γράμματος, [7] ἀλλὰ [q] πνεύ-

k Reff. i. 15.
l Reff. ii. 6.
m Here only.
n Col. i. 12 only.
o Cf. Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23.
p Mt. xxvi. 28; Lk. xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25; Heb. viii. 8 (Jer. xxxi. 31), ix. 15.
q Rom. ii. 29, vii. 6.

[1] A has εχω.

[2] αφ εαυτων is placed as in text by KL and the Harclean, and after λογισασθαι τι by ADEGP and the Latins; its true place is before ικανοι εσμεν with ℵBC 73 and the Bohairic; 17 and the Peshitto omit αφ᾽ εαυτων altogether.

[3] CDEG give λογιζεσθαι for λογισασθαι of ℵABKLP.

[4] B om. τι; P has the order τι λογιζεσθαι.

[5] C om. ως as unnecessary for the sense.

[6] αυτων BG for εαυτων.

[7] 17 has ου γραμματι αλλα πνευματι, which the Latin vss. follow.

his labours among them which had left an indelible impression upon his heart.—γινωσκ. καὶ ἀναγινωσκ. κ.τ.λ.: *known and read of all men.* This is the legitimate application of the metaphor, and is expanded in the next verse. The letter written on St. Paul's heart was not open to the world; but the letter written on the heart of the Corinthians by Christ through St. Paul's ministry was patent to the world's observation, as it was reflected in their Christian mode of life. Facts speak louder than words. For the jingle γινωσκομένη . . . ἀναγινωσκομένη *cf.* Acts viii. 30, γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις, and see the note on i. 13 above.

Ver. 3. φανερούμενοι ὅτι ἐστὲ κ.τ.λ.: *being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ* (*sc.*, written by Christ), *ministered by us* (the Apostle conceiving of himself as his Master's amanuensis).—ἐγγεγραμμένη οὐ μέλανι κ.τ.λ.: *written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone but in tables that are hearts of flesh.* This "writing" which the Corinthians exhibit is no writing with ink on a papyrus roll, but is the mystical imprint of the Divine Spirit in their hearts, conveyed through Paul's ministrations; *cf.* Jer. xxxi. 33, Prov. vii. 3. And this leads him to think of the ancient "writing" of the Law by the "finger of God" on the Twelve Tables, and to contrast it with this epistle of Christ on tables that are not of stone but are "hearts of flesh" (see reff.). For σάρκινος (*cf.* λίθινος, ὀστράκινος) see on i. 12 above.

Vv. 4-6. His success in the Ministry of the New Covenant is altogether due to God.—Ver. 4. πεποίθησιν δὲ τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.: *and such confidence have we through Christ towards God* (*cf.* Rom. iv. 2, v. 1 for a like use of πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). That is "*we* are sufficient for these things" (see ii. 16, 17); but he hastens to explain the true source of his confidence.

Ver. 5. οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοί κ.τ.λ.: *not that we are sufficient of ourselves to judge anything as from ourselves; sc.*, to judge rightly of the methods to be followed in the discharge of the Apostolic ministry; there is no thought here of the natural depravity of man, or the like. For the constr. οὐχ ὅτι . . . *cf.* i. 24 and reff. λογίζεσθαι is here used in its widest sense of carrying on any of the ordinary processes of reasoning (*cf.* x. 7, xii. 6). The repetition ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν . . . ἐξ ἑαυτῶν emphasises the statement of the need of God's grace. St. Paul's habit of dwelling on a word and coming back to it again and again (an artifice which the Latin rhetoricians called *traductio*) is well illustrated in this passage. We have ἱκανοί, ἱκανότης, ἱκάνωσεν; γράμμα (following ἐγγεγραμμένη in ver. 2); διακονηθεῖσα, διάκονος, διακονία; and δόξα eight times between vv. 7-11. With the sentiment ἡ ἱκανότης ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10 and chap. xii. 9.

Ver. 6. ὃς καὶ ἱκάνωσεν κ.τ.λ.: *who also* ("qui idem"; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 8) *made us sufficient as ministers of the New Covenant*—[ministers] *not of the letter* (*i.e.*, the Law), *but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.* The Apostle's opponents at Corinth were probably Judaisers (xi. 22), and thus the description of his office as the διακονία καινῆς διαθήκης leads him to a comparison and a contrast of the Old Covenant and the New. The "covenants" (Rom.

ματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει,[1] τὸ δὲ [r] πνεῦμα [r] ζωοποιεῖ. 7. εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν,[2] [s] ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν[3] λίθοις, ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ, [t] ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι [u] ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ [u] εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσέως[4] διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου

r John vi. 63; Rom. viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 45; *cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 18 and Rom. viii. 10.
s Here only.
t Exod. xxxiv. 29-35.
u Acts i. 10, iii. 4, vi. 15, vii. 55, xi. 6, xiii. 9.

[1] B has αποκτειvει; but ℵGKP 17 have αποκτεννει, and ACDEL αποκτενει; Lachmann conjectured αποκταινει.

[2] BD*G and the Peshitto have γραμματι.

[3] ℵcDbcEKL, d, e, f support εν λιθοις; om. εν ℵ*ABCD*GP 17, g.

[4] The more accurate spelling is Μωυσεως (ℵBCGKL, etc.); and so at vv. 13, 15.

ix. 4, Eph. ii. 12) between Jehovah and Israel were the foundation of Judaism. They began (not to speak of the Covenant with Noah) with the Covenant of Circumcision granted to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 2) and repeated more than once (Gen. xxii. 16, xxvi. 3), which is often appealed to in the N.T. (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, etc.). This was not abrogated (Gal. iii. 17) by the Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xix. 5; *cf.*, for its recapitulation in Moab, Deut. xxix. 1), which, as the National Charter of Israel, was pre-eminently to a Hebrew "the Old Covenant". The great prophecy of a Deliverer from Zion (Isa. lix. 21) is interpreted by St. Paul (Rom. xi. 27) as the "covenant" of which the prophet spoke in the next verse; and Jeremiah, in a passage (xxxi. 31-33) from which the Apostle has just now (ver. 3 above) borrowed a striking image, had proclaimed a New Covenant with Israel in the future. The phrase had been consecrated to the Gospel, through its employment by Christ at the Institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 28, Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 25); and in that solemn context it bore direct allusion to the Blood of Sprinkling which ratified the Old Covenant of Sinai (Exod. xxiv. 8). It is of this "New Covenant" that St. Paul is a **διάκονος** (Christ is its **μεσίτης**, Heb. ix. 15); *i.e.*, he is a **διάκονος οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος**, not of the letter of the Law (as might be wrongly inferred from his statement in ver. 3 that the **ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ** was "ministered" [**διακονηθεῖσα**] by him), but of the "Spirit of the living God" (ver. 3). This is a much more gracious **διακονία**, inasmuch as the Law is the instrument of Death (*cf.* Rom. v. 20, vii. 9, viii. 2, in all which passages the Apostle brings into closest connexion the three thoughts of the *Law*, *Sin*, and *Death*), but the Spirit of God is the Giver of Life (see reff. and *cf.* Gal. iii. 21, where he notes that the law is not able, **ζωοποιεῖν**, "to give life"). It will be observed that the article is wanting before **καινῆς διαθήκης**, as it is before **γράμματος** and **πνεύματος**; but we need not on that account with the Revisers translate "*a* new covenant". The expression "New Covenant," like the words "Letter" (for the Law) and "Spirit" for the Holy Spirit, was a technical phrase in the theology of the day; and so might well dispense with the article. The contrast between "letter" and "Spirit" here (so often misunderstood, as if it pointed to a contrast between what is verbally stated and what is really implied, and so justified an appeal from the bare "letter" of the law to the principles on which it rests) is exactly illustrated by Rom. vii. 6, where St. Paul declares that the service of a Christian is **ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος**, *i.e.*, "in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter". And (though not so plainly) the same contrast is probably intended in Rom. ii. 29. In St. Paul's writings **πνεῦμα**, when used for the human spirit, is contrasted with **σῶμα** (1 Cor. v. 3), **σάρξ** (2 Cor. vii. 1) and **νοῦς** (1 Cor. xiv. 14), but *never* with **γράμμα**. This is a technical term for the "Law" (like **γραφή**, Scripture; *cf.* ver. 7, **ἐν γράμμασιν**), and is properly set over against the "Spirit" of God, whose office and work were first plainly revealed in the Gospel.

Vv. 7-11. Digression on the Ministry of the New Covenant. It is (*a*) more glorious than that of the Old.—Ver. 7. **εἰ δὲ ἡ διακονία κ.τ.λ.**: *but if the Ministration of Death* (see ver. 6), *written, and engraven in stones, came into existence in glory, etc.* The reference is to the glory on the face of Moses (see reff.) when the Tables of the Law were brought down from Mount Sinai.

αὐτοῦ τὴν καταργουμένην, 8. πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος ἔσται ἐν δόξῃ; 9. εἰ γὰρ ἡ[1] διακονία τῆς [v] κατακρίσεως δόξα,[2] [w] πολλῷ [w] μᾶλλον περισσεύει[3] ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐν[4] δόξῃ. 10. καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ[5] δεδόξασται τὸ δεδοξασμένον [x] ἐν [x] τούτῳ τῷ [x] μέρει, ἕνεκεν[6] τῆς [y] ὑπερβαλλούσης δόξης. 11. εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, [z] πολλῷ [z] μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ.

v Chap. vii. 3 only.
w Rom. v. 9, 10; 1 Cor. xii. 22; Phil. i. 23, ii. 12 and ver. 11.
x Chap. ix. 3; *cf.* Col. ii. 16.
y Chap. ix. 14; Eph. i. 19, ii. 7, iii. 19 only; 2 Macc. iv. 13.
z Reff. ver. 9.

[1] BD[b]EKLP, f, g and the Bohairic support η διακ.; τῃ διακονιᾳ ℵACD*G 17, d, e and the Syriac vss. The external evidence is thus evenly balanced, but the form of the sentence inclines us to the received text.

[2] D*EG supply εστιν after δοξα.

[3] DE, d, e, g and the Syriac vss. give περισσευσει.

[4] ℵ[c]DEGKLP support εν δοξῃ; ℵ*ABC omit εν.

[5] Only a few cursives (and d, e, f, g) support ουδε; all uncials and the Bohairic have ου.

[6] For ενεκεν read εινεκεν with ℵABDEGP.

St. Paul argues that for two reasons the glory of the New Covenant is greater, (i.) the former διακονία was one of condemnation, the latter of righteousness (ver. 9), and (ii.) the glory of the former was only a transient gleam, while that of the latter abides for ever (ver. 11). Of the first Tables which Moses broke in anger it is said that the writing was γραφὴ Θεοῦ κεκολαμμένη ἐν τοῖς πλαξίν (Exod. xxxii. 16); it is merely said of the second Tables that Moses wrote upon them "the words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments" (Exod. xxxiv. 28). Nevertheless the tradition (see Philo, *Vit. Mos.*, iii., 2) was that the second Tables, like the first, were not only "written" but "engraven" (ἐντετυπωμένη), as the Apostle has it.—ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι κ.τ.λ.: *so that the Children of Israel could not* (*sc.*, through fear, Exod. xxxiv. 30) *look steadfastly upon the face of Moses on account of the glory of his face, transient as it was.* καταργεῖσθαι is nearly always, if not always (for 1 Cor. ii. 6 is doubtful), passive in St. Paul (Rom. vi. 6, vii. 2, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xv. 26, Gal. v. 4), and as it must be taken passively in ver. 14 below, there is a good deal to be said for regarding it as passive here and in vv. 11, 13 (as the A.V. does; note, however, that the translation "which was *to be* done away" in this verse is wrong). Yet the sense seems to require the middle voice "which was passing away," *sc.*, even as he spoke to the people. The position of τὴν καταργουμένην gives it emphasis. Pfleiderer is guilty of the extravagant supposition that the whole story of the Transfiguration (*cf.* Luke ix. 28 ff.) is built up on the basis of this passage (*cf.* μεταμορφούμεθα, ver. 18), the disappearance of Moses and Elijah, leaving Jesus alone with His disciples, indicating that the glory of the Old Covenant was passing away (καταργουμένην)!

Vv. 8, 9. πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.: *how shall not rather the Ministration of the Spirit be with glory? For if the Ministration of Condemnation be glory* (if we read τῇ διακονίᾳ we must render, with the American Revisers, "*has* glory"), *much rather doth the Ministration of Righteousness exceed in glory. Cf.* Rom. v. 16, τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα, and Rom. viii. 1, οὐδὲν γὰρ νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χρ. Ἰη. The phrase διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης is used again at xi. 15, as descriptive of the ministers of the New Covenant; it is an essential point of Pauline theology that "righteousness" is not of the "law" (Gal. iii. 21). The argument is *a minori ad majus.*

Ver. 10. καὶ γὰρ οὐ δεδόξασται: *for that which hath been made glorious, sc.*, the Ministration of the Old Covenant, *hath not* [really] *been made glorious in this respect, viz., on account of the surpassing glory* (of the Ministration of the New Covenant); *i.e.*, the surpassing glory of the second made the glory of the first seem nought. The phraseology of Exod. xxxiv. 35 (τὸ πρόσωπον Μωσῆ . . . δεδόξασται) is still in the Apostle's mind. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει has been otherwise explained as equivalent to "in this in-

12. ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην ἐλπίδα, πολλῇ [a] παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα· 13. καὶ οὐ καθάπερ [b] Μωσῆς ἐτίθει [c] κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ [b] πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ,[1] πρὸς τὸ μὴ [d] ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ [d] εἰς τὸ[2] τέλος[3] τοῦ καταργουμένου· 14. ἀλλ' [e] ἐπωρώθη τὰ [f] νοήματα αὐτῶν· ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον[4] τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα ἐπὶ[5] τῇ [g] ἀναγνώσει τῆς [h] παλαιᾶς [h] διαθήκης μένει μὴ [i] ἀνακαλυπτόμενον, ὅ[6] τι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται·

a Chap. vii. 4; Eph. iii. 12, vi. 19; Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 13.
b Exod. xxxiv. 33, 35.
c Here only.
d Reff. ver. 7.
e Mk. vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7 only.
f Reff. ii. 11.
g Acts xiii. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 13 only; Neh. viii. 8.
h Here only.
i Ver. 18 only; *cf.* Job xii. 22.

[1] ℵDEK support **εαυτου**; better **αυτου** ABCGLP 17. (Yet B has **εαυτου**, Exod. xxxiv. 35.)

[2] D*G om. **το** before **τελος**.

[3] A, f have **προσωπον** for **τελος** (a manifest error due to the **προσωπον** in the line before).

[4] Better **σημερον ημερας** (*cf.* Acts xx. 26, Rom. xi. 8) with ℵABCDEGP and most vss.; the received text in omitting **ημερας** follows KL and the Peshitto.

[5] DEG have **εν** for **επι**. [6] **ο τι** should be written **οτι**, as by Tisch. and W.H.

stance of Moses"; but it seems (see ref.) to be merely a redundant phrase, added for the sake of emphasis, introducing **ἕνεκεν τῆς ὑπερβ. δόξ.**

Ver. 11. **εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for if that which passes away was with glory, much more that which abideth is in glory*. The difference of prepositions **διὰ δόξης . . . ἐν δόξῃ** should not be overlooked; the Ministration of the Old Covenant was only *with* a transient flush of glory, that of the New abides *in* glory (*cf.* esp. Heb. xii. 18-27). It is true that St. Paul sometimes changes his prepositions in cases where we find difficult to assign a sufficient reason (*e.g.*, **διά** and **ἐκ**, Rom. iii. 30, Gal. ii. 16); but that is no reason for confusing the force of **διὰ** and **ἐν**, when the preservation of the distinction between them adds point to the passage (*cf.* Rom. v. 10, where **διὰ** and **ἐν** are again confused in the A.V.). See further on vi. 8.

Vv. 12-18. THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW COVENANT IS (*b*) OPEN, NOT VEILED, AS WAS THAT OF THE OLD. The illustration from the O.T. which is used in these verses has been obscured for English readers by the faulty rendering of the A.V. in Exod. xxxiv. 33. It would appear from that rendering, *viz.*, "*till* Moses had done speaking with them he put a veil on his face," that the object of the veil was to conceal from the people the Divine glory reflected in his face. But this is to misrepresent the original Hebrew, and is not the rendering given either by the LXX or by modern scholars. The R.V. substitutes *when* for *till* in the verse just quoted, thus bringing out the point that the veil was used to conceal *not* the glory on the face of Moses, but its *evanescence;* it was fading even while he spoke, and this by his use of the veil he prevented the people from perceiving. When he "went in unto the Lord" again he took the veil off. The Apostle applies all this to the Israel of his day. Still a veil is between them and the Divine glory—a veil "upon their hearts" which prevents them from seeing the transitoriness of the Old Covenant; yet, as it was of old, if they turn to the Lord, the veil is removed, and an open vision is granted. St. Paul is fond of such allegorisings of the history of the Exodus; *cf.*, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. x. 2, Gal. iv. 25.

Ver. 12. **ἔχοντες οὖν τοιαύτην κ.τ.λ.**: *having therefore such a hope* (*sc.*, of the glorious Ministration of the Spirit, ver. 8; *cf.* ver. 4) *we use great boldness of speech.* The verses which follow are parenthetical down to ver. 18, where the subject is again *we*, *i.e.*, all Christian believers, as contrasted with Jews.

Ver. 13. **καὶ οὐ καθάπερ κ.τ.λ.**: *and* (we put no veil upon our face) *as Moses put a veil upon his face.* The construction is broken, but the sense is obvious; *cf.*, for a somewhat similar abbreviation, Mark xv. 8, **ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς.—πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that the children of Israel should not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away*, *sc.*, the evanescence of the glory on Moses' face. The A.V., "could not steadfastly look to the end of that which

15. ἀλλ' [k] ἕως [k] σήμερον, ἡνίκα [1] ἀναγινώσκεται [2] Μωσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται [3]· 16. [l] ἡνίκα δ' [4] ἂν [m] ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς [l] Κύριον, [l] περιαιρεῖται τὸ [l] κάλυμμα. 17. ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ Πνεῦμά

k Ecclus. xlvii. 7; Matt. xxvii. 8; cf. Deut. xxix. 4.
l Exod. xxxiv. 34.
m Exod. xxxiv. 31.

[1] DEGKLP support ηνικα αναγιν.; better ηνικα αν αναγιν. with ℵABC 17.

[2] GKL support αναγινωσκεται; better αναγινωσκηται with ℵABCDEP.

[3] D*EG, the Latins and the Bohairic place κειται before επι την καρδιαν αυτων.

[4] ℵcBDEGKLP support δ' αν; but ℵ*A 17 give δε εαν. C omits αν.

was abolished," evidently takes τέλος as standing for Christ, the fulfilment of the Mosaic law (Rom. x. 4). But this is not suitable to the context. πρὸς τό with an infinitive is sometimes found to express the aim or intention (*never* the mere result), as, *e.g.*, Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8.

Ver. 14. **ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν**: *but their minds were blinded*, *sc.*, in reference to what they saw (*cf.* Rom. xi. 25); they took the brightness for an abiding glory (*cf.* Deut. xxix. 4). **πῶρος**, which primarily means a kind of marble, came to mean, in medical writers, a hardening of the tissues; and hence we have **πωρόω**, (1) *to petrify*, (2) *to become insensible* or *obtuse*, and so (3) it comes to be used of insensibility of the organs of vision, *to blind*. (See J. A. Robinson in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct., 1901, and *cf.* reff. above.)—**ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ.**: *for until this very day at the reading of the Old Covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted* (*for it is* only *done away in Christ*). (1) Some commentators take **μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον** as a nominative absolute, and translate "the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed that it (*sc.*, either the veil or the Old Covenant) is done away in Christ". But the order of the words seems to force us to take the present participle with **μένει**—it having a merely explanatory force and being almost redundant. (2) Again both A.V. and R.V. (text), while translating the first part of the clause as we have done, render **ὅ τι ἐν Χρ. καταργεῖται** "which veil is done away in Christ". But it seems indefensible thus to take **ὅ τι** as equivalent to **ὅ**. (3) Field arrives at yet another rendering by taking **κάλυμμα** *per synecdochem* for the *thing veiled*, which is here declared to be the fact that the Old Covenant is done away in Christ. He renders "the same mystery remaineth unrevealed, *namely*, that it is done away in Christ". But it is a grave objection to this that **τὸ κάλυμμα** has to be taken in a sense different from that which it has all through the rest of the passage. (4) We prefer, therefore (with Schmiedel and Schnedermann), to read **ὅ τι** as **ὅτι**, *for*, and to regard the phrase **ὅτι ἐν Χρ. καταργεῖται** as parenthetical: "until this day the veil remains unlifted (for it is only in Christ that it is done away)"; *i.e.*, the Jews do not recognise the vanishing away of the glory of the Law, which yet is going on before their eyes. How completely Judaism was dissociated in St. Paul's mind from Christianity is plain from the striking phrase **ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη** (here only found; but *cf.* ver. 6), by which he describes the religious system of his own early manhood, which had only been superseded by **ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη** thirty years before he wrote this letter. **ἀνάγνωσις** is (see reff.) the public reading of the Law in the synagogues; it seems, however, unnecessarily ingenious to see here, with Schmiedel, an allusion in **τὸ κάλυμμα** to the covers in which the Synagogue Rolls were preserved.

Ver. 15. **ἀλλ' ἕως σήμερον κ.τ.λ.**: *but unto this day, whensoever Moses* (*sc.*, the Law; *cf.* Acts xv. 21) *is read, a veil lieth upon their heart*. It will be observed that the image has been changed as the application of Exod. xxxiv. 29 ff. proceeds: in that history the veil was upon *the face of Moses;* here it is upon *the heart of the people*, as God speaks to them through the medium of the Law (see above on ver. 2 for a similar change in the application of the metaphor suggested by the word **ἐπιστολή**).

Ver. 16. **ἡνίκα δ' ἂν κ.τ.λ.**: *but whensoever it, i.e.*, Israel, *shall turn to the Lord, the veil is taken away;* a paraphrase of Exod. xxxiv. 34, **ἡνίκα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο Μωσῆς ἔναντι Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιῃρεῖτο τὸ κάλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι.**

Ver. 17. **ὁ δὲ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν**: *but the* LORD, *i.e.*, the Jehovah of Israel,

ἐστιν· οὗ δὲ τὸ [n] Πνεῦμα [n] Κυρίου,[1] ἐκεῖ [2] [o] ἐλευθερία. 18. ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες, [p] ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν [q] δόξαν Κυρίου [r] κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν [s] εἰκόνα [t] μεταμορφούμεθα [3] ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν,

n 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; Isa. lxi. 1 (Lk. iv. 18); Acts v. 9, viii. 39. o Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 29; Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13. p Reff. ver. 14. q *Cf.* Exod. xxxiii. 19. r Here only. s Rom. viii. 29; 1 Cor. xi. 7, xv. 49; chap. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, iii. 10. t Matt. xvii. 2; Mk. ix. 2; Rom. xii. 2 only.

[1] L has **το αγιον** instead of **Κυριου**, and two cursives omit **Κυριου**. Hort suggested that **Κυριου** is a primitive error for **Κυριον**; but this seems quite unnecessary; see note below and reff.

[2] Om. **εκει** ℵABCD* 17, r, the Peshitto and the Bohairic; it is thus inadequately supported and, moreover, is not in St. Paul's style (*cf.* Rom. iv. 15, v. 20).

[3] A **μεταμορφουμενοι**.

spoken of in the preceding quotation, *is the Spirit*, the Author of the New Covenant of grace, to whom the new Israel is invited to turn (*cf.* Acts ix. 35). It is quite perverse to compare 1 Cor. xv. 45 (where it is said that Christ, as "the last Adam," became **πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν**) or Ignatius, *Mag.*, § 15, **ἀδιάκριτον πνεῦμα ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός**, and to find here an "identification" of Christ with the Holy Spirit. **ὁ Κύριος** is here not Christ, but the Jehovah of Israel spoken of in Exod. xxxiv. 34; and in St. Paul's application of the narrative of the Veiling of Moses, the counterpart of **ὁ Κύριος** under the New Covenant is the Spirit, which has been already contrasted in the preceding verses (vv. 3, 6) with the letter of the Mosaic law. At the same time it is true that the identification of "the Lord" (*i.e.*, the Son) and "the Spirit" intermittently appears afterwards in Christian theology. See (for reff.) Swete in *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, iii., 115*a*.—**οὗ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ.**: *and where the Spirit of the Lord is*, there *is liberty*; *sc.*, in contradistinction to the servile fear of Exod. xxxiv. 30; *cf.* John viii. 32, Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 7, in all of which passages the freedom of Christian service is contrasted with the bondage of the Law. The thought here is not of the freedom of the Spirit's action (John iii. 8, 1 Cor. xii. 11), but of the freedom of access to God under the New Covenant, as exemplified in the removal of the veil, when the soul turns itself to the Divine glory. "The Spirit of the Lord" is an O.T. phrase (see reff.). We now return to the thought of ver. 12, the openness and boldness of the Apostolical service.

Ver. 18. **ἡμεῖς δὲ πάντες κ.τ.λ.**: *but we all*, *sc.*, you as well as I, all Christian believers, *with unveiled face* (and so not as Moses under the Old Covenant), *reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord*, *sc.*, of Jehovah (see reff.), which is the glory of Christ (*cf.* John xvii. 24), *are transformed into the same image*, *sc.*, of Christ (see reff.), *from glory to glory* (*i.e.*, progressively and without interruption, and so unlike the transitory reflection of the Divine glory on the face of Moses; *cf.* Ps. lxxxiv. 7, and on chap. ii. 16 above), *as from* (not "by" as the A.V.) *the Lord the Spirit*; *sc.*, our progress in glory is continuous, as becomes the work of the Spirit from whom it springs (John xvi. 14, Rom. viii. 11). The meaning of **κατοπτρίζεσθαι** (which is not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible) is somewhat doubtful. (i.) The analogy of 1 Cor. xiii. 12, of Philo, *Leg. All.*, iii., 33 (a passage where Exod. xxxiii. 18 is paraphrased, and which therefore is specially apposite here), and of Clem. Rom., § 36, would support the rendering of the A.V., "beholding as in a glass" (*i.e.*, a mirror). This is also given in the margin of the R.V., and is preferred by the American Revisers. But such a translation is not appropriate to the context, for the Apostle's thought is not of any indirect vision of the Divine glory, but of our freedom of access thereto and of perception thereof. It seems better therefore (ii.) to render with the R.V. (following Chrysostom) *reflecting as in a mirror*. And so the image conveyed is "that Christians having, like Moses, received in their lives the reflected glory of the Divine presence, as Moses received it on his countenance, are unlike Moses in that they have no fear, such as his, of its vanishing away, but are confident of its continuing to shine in them with increasing lustre (*cf.* iv. 6 below); and in this confidence present themselves without veil or disguise, inviting enquiry

καθάπερ[1] **ἀπὸ Κυρίου Πνεύματος. IV. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔχοντες τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην, καθὼς**[b] **ἠλεήθημεν, οὐκ** [a] **ἐκκακοῦμεν,**[2] **2. ἀλλ'** [b] **ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ** [c] **κρυπτὰ τῆς** [d] **αἰσχύνης, μὴ** [e] **περιπατοῦντες** [e] **ἐν** [f] **πανουργίᾳ, μηδὲ** [g] **δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῇ** [h] **φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας** [i] **συνιστῶντες**[3] [i] **ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν** [k] **συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων** [l] **ἐνώπιον τοῦ** [l] **Θεοῦ. 3.** [m] **εἰ δὲ** [m] **καὶ ἔστι κεκαλυμμένον τὸ** [n] **εὐαγ-**

a Lk. xviii. 1; Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 13; and ver. 16.
b Here only; Job x. 3.
c Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5, xiv. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 4.
d Phil. iii. 19; Jude 13; *cf.* Rom. vi. 21; Eph. v. 12.
e Acts xxi. 21; Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 2; Col. iii. 7, etc.
f Chap. xi. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 19; Eph. iv. 14; *cf.* chap. xii. 16.
g Here only; Ps. xiv. 3, xxxv. 3.
h 1 Cor. xii. 7 only.
i Chap. vi. 4, vii. 11; *cf.* chap. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18.
k Reff. i. 12.
l Rom. xiv. 22; chap. vii. 12; Gal. i. 20; 1 Tim v. 4, 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* chap. viii. 21.
m 1 Cor. iv. 7; *cf.* chap. iv. 16, v. 16, vii. 8.
n 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 14; *cf.* Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] B has **καθωσπερ.** [2] The better orthography is **εγκακουμεν** ℵABD*G 17.

[3] DcEKL give **συνιστωντες**; better **συνισταντες** ℵCD*G 17, followed by Tisch., or **συνιστανοντες** A(?)BP, adopted by W.H.

instead of deprecating it, with nothing to hold back or to conceal from the eager gaze of the most suspicious or the most curious" (Stanley). The words **Κυρίου πνεύματος** will bear various renderings: (*a*) *the Lord of the Spirit*, which is not apposite here, (*b*) *the Spirit of the Lord*, as the A.V. takes them and the Latin commentators generally, (*c*) *the Spirit, which is the Lord*, the rendering of Chrysostom, which is given a place in the R.V. margin, and (*d*) *the Lord, the Spirit*, **πνεύματος** being placed in apposition to **Κυρίου,** neither word taking the article, as the first does not after the prep. **ἀπό.** We unhesitatingly adopt (*d*), the rendering of the R.V., inasmuch as it best brings out the identification of **Κύριος** and **πνεῦμα** in ver. 17. It is worth noticing that the phrase in the "Nicene" Creed **τὸ πνεῦμα . . . τὸ Κύριον τὸ ζωοποιόν** is based on the language of this verse and of ver. 6 above.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-6. HE DELIVERS WITH FRANKNESS HIS MESSAGE OF CHRIST THE TRUE LIGHT.—Ver. 1. **διὰ τοῦτο ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, having this Ministration, sc.*, of the New Covenant, *even as we received mercy* (*i.e.*, "even as we were mercifully granted it," a favourite thought with St. Paul; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, 1 Tim. i. 13, 16), *we faint not; cf.* 2 Tim. i. 7, **οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας.** He is still answering the question, "Who is sufficient for these things?" (ii. 16); but he, again, in the verses which follow, diverges from this main thought to answer the charge of insincerity which his opponents had brought against him. The tone of vv. 1-6 is very like that of 1 Thess. ii. 1-12, which offers several verbal parallels.

Ver. 2. **ἀλλ' ἀπειπάμεθα τὰ κρυπτὰ κ.τ.λ.**: *but we have renounced* (the "ingressive aorist"; *cf.* **ἐσίγησεν,** Acts xv. 12) *the hidden things of shame; cf.* Rom. xiii. 12, Eph. iv. 22. The stress is on **τὰ κρυπτά**; it is the openness and candour of his ministry on which he insists (*cf.* John iii. 20).—**μὴ περιπατ. κ.τ.λ.**: *not walking in craftiness* (see x. 3 and reff. above; **περιπατεῖν** = *versari*), *nor handling deceitfully* (**οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ,** 1 Thess. ii. 3, *cf.* chap. ii. 17) *the Word of God, sc.*, the Divine message with which we have been entrusted (*cf.* the charge brought against him and referred to in xii. 16, *viz.*, that being **πανοῦργος** he had taught the Corinthians **δόλῳ**); *but by the manifestation of the truth* (*cf.* vi. 7, vii. 14), *sc.*, by plain statement of the truths of the Gospel in public preaching, *commending ourselves* (here is our Letter of Commendation, iii. 1, and *cf.* note there) *to every man's conscience* (lit. "to every conscience of men," *i.e.*, to every possible variety of the human conscience; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 22) *in the sight of God.* The appeal to conscience can never be omitted with safety, and any presentation of Christianity which is neglectful of the verdict of conscience on the doctrines taught is at once un-Apostolic and un-Christlike. These verses (1-6) have been chosen as the Epistle for St. Matthew's Day, probably on account of the apparent applicability of ver. 2 to the circumstances of St. Matthew's call and his abandonment of a profession which was counted shameful. But of course **ἀπειπάμεθα** does not imply that St. Paul had ever been guilty of using crafty artifices such as he here repudiates once and for all.

γέλιον [n] ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς [o] ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκαλυμμένον· 4. ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου [p] ἐτύφλωσε τὰ [q] νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, εἰς τὸ μὴ [r] αὐγάσαι [1] αὐτοῖς [2] τὸν [s] φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[3] ὅς ἐστιν [t] εἰκὼν τοῦ [t] Θεοῦ.[4] 5. οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς [u] κηρύσσομεν, ἀλλὰ [u] Χριστὸν [5] Ἰησοῦν Κύριον· ἑαυτοὺς δὲ δούλους

o *Cf.* chap. ii. 15. p John xii. 40; 1 John ii. 11 only; Isa. xlii. 19. q Reff. ii. 11. r Here only; *cf.* Lev. xiii. 24, xiv. 56. s Ver. 6 only; *cf.* Job iii. 9; Ps. xxvi. 1, lxxxix. 8, etc. t Wisd. vii. 26; reff. iii. 18. u Acts viii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 23; Phil. i. 15.

[1] ℵBGKLP support **αυγασαι**; CDEH have **καταυγασαι**, and A 17 **διαυγασαι**.

[2] D^bcEKLP and the Syriac vss. add **αυτοις** after **αυγ.**; om. ℵABCD*GH 17, d, e, f, g, r, etc.

[3] C has **κυριου** for **Χριστου**.

[4] ℵ^cLP and the Harclean add **του αορατου** (from Col. i. 15) after **Θεου**.

[5] BHKL, the Peshitto and Bohairic support **Χρ. Ἰησ.**; ℵACDE, the Harclean, d, e, f, r, etc., give **Ἰη. Χρ. Κυ.**; G, g give **Κυ. Ἰη. Χρ.**; P has **Ἰη. Χρ.** (omitting **Κυ.**).

Ver. 3. **εἰ δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but even if our gospel* (*sc.*, the good news we preach; see reff.) *is veiled* (returning again to the metaphor of iii. 12-18), *it is veiled in them that are perishing; i.e.*, the fault lies with the hearers, not with the preacher (*cf.* vi. 12, and see Rom. i. 28). Blass (*Gram. of N.T. Greek*, § 41, 2) points out that **ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις** is almost equivalent to "*for* them that are perishing" (*cf.* chap. viii. 1 and 1 Cor. xiv. 11 for a like use of **ἐν**).

Ver. 4. **ἐν οἷς ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος**: *among whom the god of this world*, *sc.*, Satan. **αἰών** is an "age," a certain limit of time, and so **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτός** (1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6) is "this present age," over which the devil is regarded as having power (*cf.* Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12). We have the expression **αἱ βασιλεῖαι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου** in Ignatius (*Rom.*, 6). Wetstein quotes a Rabbinical saying, "The true God is *the first God*, but Sammael (*i.e.*, the evil angel who was counted Israel's special foe) is *the second God*". Many early writers, beginning with Origen and Irenæus, through dread of Gnostic speculations, dissociate **ὁ Θεός** from **τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου**, which they join with **τῶν ἀπίστων**. But this is a mere perversity of exegesis, suggested by controversial prejudice. Beliar is twice called "the ruler of this world" in the *Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. Charles, pp. 11, 24).—**ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων**: *hath blinded* (the "ingressive aorist" again; *cf.* ver. 2) *the minds* (*cf.* iii. 14) *of the unbelieving*. Out of sixteen occurrences of the word **ἄπιστος** in the Pauline Epistles, fourteen are found in the Epp. to the Corinthians; it consistently means "unbelieving," and is always applied to the *heathen*, not to the Jews (except, perhaps, Titus i. 15).—**εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *to the end that the light* (lit. "the illumination") *of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the Image of God, should not dawn upon them.* This is the force of **αὐγάσαι**, even if, as we seemingly must do, we omit **αὐτοῖς** from our text; **αὐγή** is the "dawn," and **αὐγάσαι** is to be taken intransitively. The R.V. marginal rendering "that they should not see the light," etc., does not suit the context so well. The A.V. "the light of the glorious gospel of Christ" is inadequate, as it does not bring out the force of the phrase **τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης**. **δόξης** is the genitive of *contents* (*cf.* the similar phrase, 1 Tim. i. 11); the substance of the good tidings preached is the **δόξα**, the glorious revelation of Christ (*cf.* ver. 6 below). That Christ is the Image or **εἰκών** of God is the statement of St. Paul which approaches most nearly in form to the **λόγος** doctrine of St. John (see reff. and, for the general sense, 1 Cor. xi. 3, Phil. ii. 6; *cf.* Heb. i. 3). P. Ewald, who maintains that St. Paul was acquainted with a Johannine tradition of our Lord's words, finds in vv. 3, 4 reminiscences of conversations reported in the Fourth Gospel. Thus we have in consecutive verses (John viii. 44, 45) **ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ . . . οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι**, and the expression **ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου** is comparable with **ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου** (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11). The parallels are certainly interesting; *cf.* also the phrase **εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ** with John viii. 19, 42.

Ver. 5. **οὐ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς κ.τ.λ.**: *for we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus*

ὑμῶν[1] διὰ Ἰησοῦν.[2] 6. ὅτι ὁ[3] Θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς [v] λάμψαι,[4] ὃς[5] ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς [v] γνώσεως τῆς [v] δόξης τοῦ[6] Θεοῦ ἐν [w] προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ[7] Χριστοῦ.

7. Ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν [x] θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν [y] ὀστρακίνοις [y z] σκεύεσιν, ἵνα ἡ [a] ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν· 8. [b] ἐν [b] παντὶ [b] θλιβόμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ [c] στενοχωρούμενοι· [d] ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ [e] ἐξαπορούμενοι· 9. διωκόμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ [f] ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι·

v Cf. Hab. ii. 14.
w See on i. 11.
x Col. ii. 3; cf. Mk. x. 21.
y 2 Tim. ii. 20; Lev. vi. 28.
z Ps. ii. 29; Acts ix. 15; Rom. ix. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
a Reff. i. 8.
b Chap. vii. 5; reff. below.
c Chap. vi. 12 only; cf. chap. vi. 4, xii. 10, and Josh. xvii. 15; Isa. xlix. 19.
d John xiii. 22; Acts xxv. 20; Gal. iv. 20 only.
e Chap. i. 8 only.
f Rom. ix. 29 (Isa. i. 9); 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16; Heb. xiii. 5 (Josh. i. 5); Deut. iv. 31; Ps. xxxvi. 25.

[1] ℵ 17 have **ημων**, a mere blunder.

[2] **Ἰησουν** is supported by A*BDEGHKLP and the Syriac vss. (*cf.* ver. 11); ℵ*A**C 17, the Latins and Bohairic give **Ἰησου**, which does not yield so impressive a sense.

[3] B om. **ο** before **Θεος**.

[4] Better **λαμψει** with ℵ*ABD* and the Syriac vss.; **λαμψαι** is supported by the remaining uncials and the Latins.

[5] D*G and the Old Latin vss. omit **ος** before **ελαμψ**.

[6] Instead of **του Θεου** C*D*G, d, e, g, r supply **αυτου**.

[7] ℵCHKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic support **Ἰησ. Χρ.**; DEG and the Latins give **Χρ. Ἰη.**; AB 17 (followed by Tisch. and W.H.) omit **Ἰησου** (see ii. 10 above).

as Lord (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 3, "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit"), *and ourselves your slaves for Jesus' sake* (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 19 and chap. i. 24 above; see also xi. 20 **καταδουλοῖ**).

Ver. 6. **ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing it is God who said "Light shall shine out of darkness"* (a paraphrase of Gen. i. 3; *cf.* Ps. cxii. 4), *who shined in our hearts to illuminate* (others) *with the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Christ.* That is to say, there is nothing secret or crafty in the Ministration of the New Covenant; it is the proclamation of a second *Fiat Lux* (St. John i. 4, viii. 12) in the hearts of men (2 Pet. i. 19). The image of iii. 18 is thus preserved in this verse; we reflect the light which shines upon us from the Divine Glory, as manifested in Christ.

Vv. 7-15. His Bodily Weakness does not annul the effects of his Ministry.—Ver. 7. **ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν κ.τ.λ.**: *but, sc.*, in contrast to the glowing and exultant phrases of ver. 6, *we have this treasure, sc.*, of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God," *in earthen vessels.* The comparison of man, in respect of his powerlessness and littleness in God's eyes, to an earthen jar made by a potter for his own purposes and of any shape that he wills is common in the O.T. (Job x. 9, Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xix. 11; see 2 Esdras iv. 11), and St. Paul works out the idea in Rom. ix. 20 ff. He also distinguishes here and at 2 Tim. ii. 20 between different kinds of **σκεύη**, illustrating thereby the difference between men; while he himself is elsewhere called **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς**, and St. Peter calls woman **ἀσθενέστερον σκεῦος** (see reff.). In the present passage **σκεῦος** seems to be used specially for the human *body* (*cf.* 2 Esdras vii. [88], *vas corruptibile*), as the thought in the Apostle's mind is (mainly) of his own *physical* infirmities; the figure being derived from the ancient custom of storing gold and silver in earthenware pots. The treasure of the Gospel light is contained in an "earthen vessel," a frail body which may (seemingly) at any moment succumb (*cf.* Job iv. 19 and see v. 1 below). This may appear surprising, that so great a treasure should seem to be exposed to the mishaps which may befall the perishable jar in which it is contained; but yet (though St. Paul does not pursue this line of thought here) it is the very principle of the Incarnation that the heavenly is revealed and received through the earthly, for "the Word became flesh" (St. John i. 14).—**ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως κ.τ.λ.**: *that the exceeding greatness of the power, sc.*, which triumphs over all obstacles, *may be God's and not from ourselves.* The weakness of the instru-

[g] καταβαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι· 10. πάντοτε τὴν [h] νέκρωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ[2] ἐν τῷ σώματι[3] [i] περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ[4] ἐν τῷ[5] σώματι ἡμῶν [k] φανερωθῇ. 11. ἀεὶ[6] γὰρ ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ

g Heb. vi. 1 only; 2 Kings iii. 19.
h Rom. iv. 19 only; cf. Col. iii. 5; Heb. xi. 12.
i Mk. vi. 55; Eph. iv. 14 only; 2 Macc. vii. 27.
k Reff. ii. 14.

[1] KL and the Harclean give **Κυριου**, but it is not found in the best authorities and should be omitted.

[2] For **Ἰησου** D*G, d, e, f, g read **Χριστου**.

[3] DEG, the Peshitto, Bohairic and Latin vss. add **ημων** after **σωματι**.

[4] D*G, d, e, g give **Ἰησου Χριστου**.

[5] ℵ, r, vg. give **τοις σωμασιν** (adopted by Tisch.); the received text follows the bulk of the authorities; A and the Bohairic place **φανερωθῃ** before **εν τῳ σωματι ημων**.

[6] G, f, g and the Peshitto give **ει** for **αει**.

ment is to demonstrate the Divinity of the power which directs it (*cf.* chap. xii. 9 and 1 Cor. ii. 5).

Vv. 8, 9. **ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: with a sudden change of metaphor, the Apostle now thinks of himself as a soldier engaged with an apparently stronger foe, and at every moment on the point of defeat; and in four pairs of antithetical participles he describes his condition: *in every direction pressed hard, but not hemmed in; bewildered, but not utterly despairing; pursued, but not forsaken* (*i.e.*, abandoned to the pursuing foe); *struck down* (as by an arrow; *cf.* Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 3, 14 for this use of **καταβάλλειν**), *but not destroyed.* The general sense is much like that of Prov. xxiv. 16, Mic. vii. 8; *cf.* also chap. xi. 23-30. **στενοχωρία** is nearly always (in N.T.) coupled with **θλῖψις** (*cf.* Rom. ii. 9, viii. 35, chap. vi. 4, and Isa. viii. 22, xxx. 6). With the play on words **ἀπορούμενοι . . . ἐξαπορούμενοι**, which it is difficult to reproduce in English, see on i. 13 above. The phrase **ἐν παντί** occurs no less than nine times again in this Epistle (see chap. vi. 4, vii. 5, 11, 16, viii. 7, ix. 8, 11, xi. 6, 9), though only once elsewhere (1 Cor. i. 5) in St. Paul's writings.

Vv. 10, 11. The climax of the preceding antithesis is now reached: "Dying, yet living" (*cf.* vi. 9). **πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν κ.τ.λ.**: *always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body; for we which live are ever being delivered over to death* (*cf.* xi. 23 below) *for Jesus' sake, that the Life also of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh.* The key to the interpretation of ver. 10 is to observe that ver. 11 is the explanation of it (**ἀεὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**); the two verses are strictly parallel: "our mortal flesh" of ver. 11 is only a more emphatic and literal way of describing "our body" of ver. 10. Hence the bearing about of the **νέκρωσις** of Jesus must be identical with the continual deliverance to death for His sake. Now the form **νέκρωσις** (see reff.) is descriptive of the process of "mortification"; and the **νέκρωσις τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** must mean the **νέκρωσις** to which He was subject while on earth (*gen. subjecti*). The phrase **περιφέρειν τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** conveys, then, an idea comparable to that involved in other Pauline phrases, *e.g.*, "to die daily" (1 Cor. xv. 31), "to be killed all the day long" (Rom. viii. 36, a quotation from Ps. xliii. 22), "to know the fellowship of His sufferings, becoming conformed unto His death" (Phil. iii. 10), "to fill up that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh" (Col. i. 24), the conception of the intimate union in suffering between Christ and the Christian having been already touched on in i. 5. And such union in suffering involves a present manifestation in us of the Life of Christ, as well as ultimate union with Him in glory (Rom. viii. 17, *cf.* John xiv. 19). The phrases "if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His resurrection," and "if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him" (Rom. vi. 5, 8), though verbally similar, are not really parallel to the verse before us, for *they* speak of a death to sin in baptism, while *this* has reference to actual bodily suffering in the flesh. And the inspiring thought of vv. 10, 11

Ἰησοῦ[1] φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ [l] θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν. 12. ὥστε ὁ μὲν[2] θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν. 13. ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, [m] "Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα,"[3] καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν· 14. εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ [n] ἐγείρας τὸν Κύριον[4] Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς διὰ[5] Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ, καὶ [o] παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν. 15. τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἡ χάρις [p] πλεονάσασα διὰ [q] τῶν [q] πλειόνων τὴν [r] εὐχαριστίαν [s] περισσεύσῃ εἰς

l Rom. vi. 12, viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; chap. v. 4 only.
m Ps. cxv. 1.
n Reff. i. 9.
o Rom. xiv. 10; chap. xi. 2; Eph. v. 27; Col. i. 22; *cf.* Jude 24.
p Rom. v. 20; chap. viii. 15; Phil. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iii. 12, etc.
q Reff. ii. 6.
r Acts xxiv. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; chap. ix. 11, 12; Phil. iv. 6; 2 Macc. ii. 27.
s Chap. ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12; Eph. i. 8.

[1] C has **Χριστου**; D*G, d, e, g **Ἰησου Χριστου**.

[2] KL and the Harclean give **μεν**, but it is omitted by the best uncials and vss.

[3] ℵG and the Syriac vss. have **διο και ελαλησα**; om. **και** (with LXX) BCDEKLP and the Latins.

[4] B 17, r om. **κυριον**, but it is attested by overwhelmingly preponderating authority.

[5] ℵcDcKL and the Syriac vss. support **δια Ἰησου**; better **συν** with ℵ*BCDEGP, the Latins and Bohairic.

of the present chapter is that Union with Christ, unto death, in life, has as its joyful consequence Union with Christ, unto life, in death. It is the paradox of the Gospel over again, **ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν** (Matt. x. 39). It will be observed that the best MSS. give in ver. 10 **τοῦ Ἰησοῦ**. It is worth noticing that while in the Gospels the proper name **Ἰησοῦς** *generally* takes the article, in the Epistles it is generally anarthrous. In addition to the example before us, the only other passage where St. Paul writes **ὁ Ἰησοῦς** is Eph. iv. 21 (*cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, § 46. 10).

Ver. 12. The manifestation of Christ's Life in the Apostle's daily **νέκρωσις** is thus visible to the world and especially to his converts.—**ὥστε ὁ μὲν θάνατος κ.τ.λ.**: *so then Death worketh in us* (see on i. 6), *but Life in you*, *i.e.*, the Risen Life of Christ, the source of present grace as of future glory. It is this latter aspect of **ζωή**, *viz.*, as the life after death, to which his thoughts now turn.

Ver. 13. **ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πν. κ.τ.λ.**: *but*, *sc.*, despite our bodily weakness and the "working of death in us" of ver. 12, *having the same spirit of faith*, *sc.*, as the Psalmist, *according to that which is written*, "*I believed*, *and therefore I spoke*," *we also believe*, *and therefore also we speak*, *sc.*, as the Psalmist did. The exact meaning of Ps. cxv. 1 in the original is hard to fix; but the context would not naturally suggest the beautiful thought here read into it. That faith must find expression, that it cannot be silent, is the Apostle's adaptation of the words. With **τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως** *cf.* Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. iv. 21, Gal. vi. 1, Eph. i. 17, 2 Tim. i. 7, etc. Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 78) illustrates the introductory formula of citation here employed by the legal formula **κατὰ τὰ προγεγραμμένα** which occurs in a Fayyûm papyrus of 52 A.D.

Ver. 14. Despite the contrast between *death* in us and *life* in you (ver. 12), we trust that we too shall share in that Risen Life of Christ. **εἰδότες ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: *knowing that He who raised up the Lord Jesus* (see reff.) *shall raise up us also with Jesus*, *sc.*, on the Day of the general Resurrection (1 Thess. iv. 14), *and shall present us with you* (see reff.). Observe that the A.V. "shall raise up us also *by* Jesus" depends on a wrong reading, and perverts the sense. It would appear from this passage that the Apostle did not hope to be alive at the Second Advent of Christ (*cf.* i. 8, 1 Cor. xv. 52), although at an earlier period he seems to have cherished such an expectation (1 Thess. iv. 15).

Ver. 15. **τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι' ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: (With you, I say) *for all things* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22) *are for your sakes* (*cf.* i. 6), *that the grace*, *being multiplied*, *sc.*, to me, *through the* (prayers of the) *greater number of you*, *may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the glory of God*. *Cf.* i. 11, a closely parallel passage, and Phil. i. 19. Except that we have deemed it necessary to translate **τῶν πλειόνων** literally (see on

τὴν [t]δόξαν τοῦ [t]Θεοῦ. 16. διὸ οὐκ [u]ἐκκακοῦμεν[1]· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος [v]διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἔσωθεν[2] [w]ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ. 17. τὸ γὰρ [x]παραυτίκα [y]ἐλαφρὸν[3] τῆς [z]θλίψεως ἡμῶν[4] καθ' [a]ὑπερβολὴν εἰς[5] ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον [b]βάρος δόξης [c]κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, 18. μὴ [d]σκοπούντων[6] ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα· τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα [e]πρόσκαιρα,[7] τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπό-

t Rom. xv. 7; 1 Cor. x. 31; Phil. ii. 11; *cf.* chap. viii. 19. u Reff. ver. 1. v Lk. xii. 33; 1 Tim. vi. 5. w Col. iii. 10 only; *cf.* Rom. xii. 2; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. vi. 6. x Here only; Ps. lxix. 4; Tobit iv. 14. y Matt. xi. 30 only; Exod. xviii. 26; *cf.* chap. i. 17. z Reff. i. 4. a Reff. i. 8. b Gal. vi. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 6. c Chap. v. 5, vii. 10, 11, ix. 11, xii. 12, etc. d Rom. xvi. 17; Gal. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 4, iii. 17. e Matt. xiii. 21; Mk. iv. 17; Heb. xi. 25 only; *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17.

[1] See crit. note on iv. 1.

[2] DbcEKL support **ο εσωθεν**; better **ο εσω ημων** with ℵBCD*GP.

[3] D*EG, the Latins and Peshitto have **προσκαιρον και ελαφρον**.

[4] BC[2] and the Peshitto omit **ημων**.

[5] ℵ*C*K, the Bohairic and Harclean omit **εις υπερβολην**.

[6] D*G, d, e, g have **σκοπουντες** (an anacolouthon) for **σκοπουντων ημων**.

[7] G, g, r give **προσκαιρα εστιν**.

ii. 6), the above is the rendering of the R.V. The A.V. "that the abundant grace might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God" can hardly be possible, and the position of **πλεονάσασα** in the sentence seems to require that the words be connected as in R.V. For the transitive significance of **περισσεύω** see reff.

Vv. 16-18. He is sustained by a Glorious Hope.—Ver. 16. **διὸ οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, sc.*, because of the thought in ver. 14, *we faint not* (repeated from ver. 1); *but even though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is being renewed day by day.* That is, even though (note **εἰ καί** with the indicative as introducing not a mere contingency, but a matter of fact; see reff. ver. 3) the "earthen vessel" (ver. 7) of my body is subject to a continual **νέκρωσις** (ver. 10) and decay, yet my true self is daily renewed by Divine grace; it is in hope of the consummation of this "renewal" that I faint not (*cf.* Isa. xl. 30). The contrast between **ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος** and **ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος** has verbal parallels in Rom. vii. 22, Eph. iv. 22, 23, Col. iii. 9 (*cf.* also 1 Pet. iii. 4), but they are not quite apposite, as in those passages the thought is of the difference between the lower and higher nature, the "flesh" and the "spirit," whereas here the decay of the bodily organism is set over against the growth in grace of the man himself; *cf.* the expression of Plato, **ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος** (*Republ.*, ix., p. 589). The phrase **ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ** is a Hebraism; it is not found in this exact form in the LXX, but it might well be a rendering of יום יום (*cf.* Gen. xxxix. 10, Ps. lxviii. 19, Esther iii. 4).

Ver. 17. **τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα κ.τ.λ.**: *for our present light burden of affliction worketh out for us more and more exceedingly an eternal heavy burden of glory; cf.*, for the thought (ever full of consolation to the troubled heart), Ps. xxx. 5, Isa. liv. 7, Matt. v. 11, Heb. xii. 11, 1 Pet. i. 6, v. 10, and especially Rom. viii. 18. **παραυτίκα** does not refer (as the A.V. and R.V. would suggest) to the brief duration of temporal affliction, but only to its being present with us *now*, as set over against the *future* glory (see reff.). **τὸ ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως** offers a good instance of "the most classical idiom in the language of the N.T." (Blass)—especially frequent in St. Paul—according to which a neuter singular adjective is used as if it were an abstract noun; *cf.* chap. viii. 8, Rom. viii. 3, 1 Cor. i. 25, Phil. iii. 8, etc., for a like construction. **καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν** is another Hebraism (see last verse), מאד מאד = "exceedingly"; it cannot qualify **βάρος** (as the A.V. takes it) or **αἰώνιον**, but must go with **κατεργάζεται**, as above (*cf.* Gal. i. 13). Stanley points out that the collocation **βάρος δόξης** may be suggested by the fact that the Hebrew כָּבֵד means both "to be heavy" (Gen. xviii. 20, Job vi. 3) and "to be glorious" (Job xiv.

μενα αἰώνια. V. 1. οἴδαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ [a] ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ [b] σκήνους [c] καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομὴν[1] ἐκ Θεοῦ ἔχομεν, οἰκίαν [d] ἀχειροποίητον, αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 2. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ [e] στενάζομεν, τὸ [f] οἰκητήριον ἡμῶν τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ [g] ἐπενδύσασθαι [h] ἐπιποθοῦντες·

a John iii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 40; Phil. ii. 10, iii. 19; Jas. iii. 15 only. b Ver. 4 only; Wisd. ix. 15 only. c Matt. xxiv. 2; Mk. xiv. 58; Acts vi. 14; Gal. ii. 18, etc. d Mk. xiv. 58; Col. ii. 11 only; *cf.* Acts xvii. 24. e Rom. viii. 23. f Jude 6 only. g Ver. 4 only; *cf.* John xxi. 7. h Rom. i. 11; chap. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8, ii. 26; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 4.

[1] DEG, d, e, f, g have **οτι οικοδομην.**

21); *cf.* the ambiguity in the Latin *gravitas*.

Ver. 18. **μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα κ.τ.λ.**: *while we look not at the things which are seen* (*cf.* chap. v. 7), *but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal*, *sc.*, for the moment, *but the things which are not seen are eternal*, *sc.*, for the ages; *cf.* Rom. viii. 24, Heb. xi. 1. Wetstein quotes a good parallel to this splendid sentence from Seneca (Ep. 59): "Ista imaginaria sunt, et ad tempus aliquam faciem ferunt. Nihil horum stabile nec solidum est . . . mittamus animum ad ea, quae aeterna sunt."

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-5. HIS EXPECTATION OF A GLORIFIED BODY HEREAFTER; AND HIS DESIRE TO SURVIVE UNTIL THE SECOND ADVENT.—Ver. 1. **οἴδαμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for* (in explanation of iv. 17) *we know*, *sc.*, we Christians (*cf.* Rom. vii. 14, 1 Cor. viii. 1), *that if our earthly* (**ἐπίγειος** as contrasted with **ἐπουράνιος**; see reff.) *tabernacle-house be dissolved*, etc. Despite the fact that he was himself a **σκηνοποιός** (Acts xviii. 3), this is the only place where St. Paul employs any of the terms correlative to **σκηνή**. It is natural to think of the temporary character of the **σκῆναι** used by the Chosen People in the desert wanderings, an idea which is probably present in 2 Pet. i. 14, **ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός μου**; but the use of **σκῆνος** as a depreciatory term for the "bodily frame" (R.V. mg.) is borrowed, as Field has shown, from the Pythagorean philosophy. It is the "tenement house," the "earthen vessel" (see iv. 7), and is called in Wisd. ix. 15, **τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος. καταλύειν** (see reff.) is often used of the "destruction" of a house; and the application of the word "dissolution" for death is probably derived from this passage.—**οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: *we have* (*i.e.*, at the very moment of bodily dissolution, when the Resurrection takes place, according to the Apostle's thought here; see Charles' *Eschatology*, pp. 395, 400) *a building from God*, *sc.*, not built up by the natural processes of growth but the direct gift of God, *a house not made with hands* (this being added to emphasise its "supernatural" character; the **σκῆνος** of the natural body is *also*, of course, **ἀχειροποίητον**, and so the idea is not as fitly in place as at Heb. ix. 11, 24, but it is suggested by the word **οἰκία**. It is just possible that his own trade of tent-making may have been in his mind at the moment), *eternal*, *in the heavens*. *Cf.* Luke xvi. 9, **αἰωνίους σκηνάς**; as he has just said (iv. 18) **τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰωνία.** It will be observed that here **αἰωνίος** is used with the special intention of emphasising the *permanent* character of the heavenly house, in contrast with the earthly house which is dissolved; it is therefore not accurate to say (as is sometimes said) that **αἰωνίος** *never* connotes length of time, although it is true that in St. John it is a "qualitative" rather than a "quantitative" term.

Vv. 2, 3 and ver. 4 form two parallel sentences, both introduced by **καὶ γάρ**, of which either may be used to elucidate the other. Both bring out the Apostle's shrinking from death, *i.e.*, the act of dying, and his half-expressed anxiety that he may survive until the Day of Christ (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 15).

Ver. 2. **καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *for indeed in this*, *sc.*, in this tabernacle (*cf.* ver. 3), *we groan*, *sc.*, being weighed down by the body, *longing to be clothed upon*, *i.e.*, to have the heavenly body put on in addition, like an outer garment over our mortal flesh, *with our habitation which is from heaven*, *sc.*, which is brought thence by the Lord at His Coming (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 16, Rev. xxi. 2, and *Ascension of Isaiah* (ed. Charles), iv. 16, ix. 17). The verb **ἐπιποθεῖν** always expresses in St. Paul a yearning for home; here it is used of the heavenly home-sickness of the saints.

Ver. 3. **εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: *if so be that* (**εἴ γε** = *siquidem*; *cf.* Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, Col. i. 23) *we shall be found*

3. εἴ[1] γε καὶ [i] ἐνδυσάμενοι[2] οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα. 4. καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκήνει[3] στενάζομεν [k] βαρούμενοι,[4] ἐπειδὴ[5] οὐ θέλομεν [l] ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα [m] καταποθῇ τὸ [n] θνητὸν[6] ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς. 5. ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος[7] ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο Θεός,[8] ὁ καὶ[9] δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν [o] ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ [o] Πνεύματος. 6. [p] θαρροῦντες οὖν πάντοτε, καὶ εἰδότες ὅτι [q] ἐνδημοῦντες[10] [r] ἐν τῷ [r] σώματι [q] ἐκδη-

i 1 Cor. xv. 54, etc.
k Reff. i. 8.
l Here only in Paul.
m Reff. ii. 7.
n Reff. iv. 11.
o Reff. i. 22.
p Ver. 8; chaps. vii. 16, x. 1, 2; Heb. xiii. 6 only.
q Vv. 8, 9 only; *cf.* viii. 19.
r Chap. xii. 2, 3; Heb. xiii. 3.

[1] ℵCKLP support **ει γε**; BDEG 17 have **ειπερ**.

[2] D*, d, e, g have **εκδυσαμενοι**; G **εκλυσαμενοι**.

[3] DEG, d, e, f, g, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. give **σκηνει τουτῳ**.

[4] D*G have **βαρυνομενοι**.

[5] **επειδη** is found in a few cursives only; the uncials give **εφ' ῳ**.

[6] G, g and the Bohairic have **θνητον τουτο**.

[7] DEG, d, e, f, g, m **κατεργαζομενος**.

[8] ℵ* has **ο Θεος**.

[9] ℵcDbcEKL and the Harclean insert **και** before **δους**; the better authorities omit it.

[10] D*G have **επιδημουντες**.

also clothed, *sc.*, with the heavenly body (note **ἐνδυσ.**, not **ἐπενδυσ.**, which would only be appropriate of the body to be "superindued" in the case of one surviving to the Second Advent), *not naked*, *sc.*, disembodied spirits at the Day of His Appearing, a condition from the thought of which he shrinks. **γυμνός** was commonly used in this sense in Greek philosophy; Alford quotes Plato, *Cratyl.*, p. 277*c.*, **ἡ ψυχὴ γυμνὴ τοῦ σώματος** (see 1 Cor. xv. 37); *cf.* also Philo *de Hum.*, 4, **τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπογυμνουμένης**.

Ver. 4. **καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὄντες κ.τ.λ.**: *for indeed we who are in the body* (see ver. 1) *groan, being burdened* (*cf.* Wisd. ix. 15, **φθαρτὸν σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχήν**), *not for that* (**ἐφ' ᾧ**; *cf.* Rom. v. 12) *we would be unclothed* (*cf.* 2 Esdras ii. 45) *but clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life*, *i.e.*, that the mortal body may, without passing through death, be absorbed, as it were, in the heavenly body which is to be superindued (*cf.* Isa. xxv. 8). The double metaphor in these verses from that of a *house* to that of a *garment* is quite in St. Paul's manner. Stanley finds the explanation of both "in the image which both from his occupation and his birthplace would naturally occur to the Apostle, the tent of Cilician haircloth, which might almost equally suggest the idea of a habitation and of a vesture" (*cf.* Ps. civ. 2). The truth is that no single metaphor could possibly convey to the mind a true conception of heaven or of the condition of the blessed. We may speak of the heavenly home as a *place* (**οἰκητήριον**), but we have to remind ourselves that it is rather a *state* here expressed by the image of heavenly vesture.

Ver. 5. **ὁ δὲ κατεργασάμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *now He that worked us up for this very thing*, *sc.*, the change from mortality to life, *is God* (*cf.* iv. 6 and especially i. 21 for the form of the sentence), *who gave to us the earnest of the Spirit; cf.* Rom. viii. 11. The "Holy Spirit of promise" is "an earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. i. 14; see above on i. 22).

Some theologians, *e.g.*, Martensen, take a somewhat different view of vv. 1-5, and interpret them as implying St. Paul's belief in a body of the intermediate state between death and judgment, distinct at once from the "earthly tabernacle" and the "heavenly house," which latter will be "superindued" at the Second Advent. But (*a*) there is no hint elsewhere in the N.T. of such an *ad interim* body; (*b*) the "house" which "we have" at death is described in ver. 1 not as temporary, but as "eternal". This it is which enables him to face death with courage; he would shrink from any **γυμνότης** or disembodied condition, and—so far as the "body" is concerned—he does not contemplate any further change at the Day of Judgment. If it might be so, he is reverently anxious to live until the Parousia, and then to be "superindued"; but even if he is to pass through the gate of death he is content. See Salmond's *Christian Doctr. of Immortality*, p. 565 ff.

μοῦμεν[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου[2]· 7. διὰ πίστεως γὰρ [s] περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ[3] διὰ [t] εἴδους· 8. θαρροῦμεν[4] δὲ, καὶ [u] εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ[5] τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον.[6]

9. Διὸ καὶ [v] φιλοτιμούμεθα, εἴτε[7] ἐνδημοῦντες, εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες, [w] εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι. 10. τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς [x] φανερωθῆναι δεῖ [y] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ [z] βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα [a] κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ[8] διὰ[9] τοῦ σώματος, πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν, εἴτε κακόν.[10]

s Reff. iv. 2.
t Lk. iii. 22, ix. 29; John v. 37; 1 Thess. v. 22 only; Exod. xxiv. 17.
u Rom. xv. 26, 27; chap. xii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 12.
v Rom. xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 11 only.
w Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18; Eph. v. 10; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20; Wisd. iv. 10, ix. 10.
x Reff. ii. 14.
y Matt. x. 32, xxv. 32; Lk. xxi. 36; Acts xviii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 3, ii. 19, iii. 9, 13.
z Matt. xxvii. 19; Acts xviii. 12, xxv. 6; Rom. xiv. 10, etc.
a Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25; 2 Macc. viii. 33.

[1] DEG have **αποδημουμεν**.

[2] D*G, d, e, g and the Bohairic give **Θεου** for **Κυριου**.

[3] G, f, g have **και ου δια**.

[4] ℵ 17 have **θαρρουντες**.

[5] ℵ* om. **εκ**.

[6] D* 17 have **Θεον** for **Κυριον**.

[7] The Peshitto and f, g give the order **ειτε εκδ. ειτε ενδ.**

[8] D*G have **α δια του σωματος επραξεν**.

[9] The Latin vss. (*propria corporis*) testify to a variant **ιδια** for **δια**.

[10] BDEGKLP have **κακον**; ℵC 17 have **φαυλον** (probably an early correction introduced from Rom. ix. 11; it is, however, adopted by Tisch. and W.H.).

Vv. 6-8. In any case to be with Christ is best.—Ver. 6. **θαρροῦντες οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *being therefore*, *sc.*, on account of "the earnest of the Spirit" (ver. 5), *always*, *sc.*, in any event, whether we die before the Day of Christ or survive to see it in the flesh, *of good courage, and knowing that whilst we are at home in the body* (see reff.) *we are absent from the Lord*, *sc.*, from Christ, our true home. The O.T. phrase that man is a sojourner only (**παρεπίδημος**) on the earth (Ps. xxxviii. 13; *cf.* Heb. xi. 13) is verbally comparable with this **ἐνδημοῦντες . . . ἐκδημοῦμεν**; but the idea here is rather that of the *body* as the temporary habitation of the man's self (*cf.* ver. 1). We are citizens of earth, but our true **πολίτευμα** is **ἐν οὐρανοῖς** (Phil. iii. 20).

Ver. 7. **διὰ πίστεως γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we walk by faith* (*cf.* John xx. 29, and chap. iv. 18), *i.e.*, in a state of faith (see note on **διά** with the gen. of attendant circumstances ii. 4), *not by appearance* (**εἶδος**, as the reff. show, must be thus translated = *quod aspicitur*; but nevertheless the rendering of A.V. and R.V. "not by sight," though verbally inexact, conveys the sense. *Cf.* Heb. xi. 1, **ἔστιν δὲ πίστις . . . πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων**, and 1 Cor. xiii. 12). The verse is parenthetical and explanatory of the sense in which we are "absent from the Lord".

Ver. 8. **θαρροῦμεν δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *nay* (the **δέ** is resumptive of the thought in ver. 6, which has been interrupted by ver. 7, the grammatical structure involving an anacoluthon), *we are of good courage* (for this is demanded even of the most faithful by the prospect of death) *and are well-pleased* (see reff. for cases where **εὐδοκεῖν** is used of men, not of God) *rather to be away from the home of the body and to be at home with the Lord* (*cf.* John i. 1 for such a use of **πρός**). Even if we must die before the Second Advent, we would say, we are content, for this absence from the body will be presence with Christ (*cf.* Luke xxiii. 43, Phil. i. 21-23), though the glory of that Presence shall not be fully manifested until the Day of the Parousia.

Vv. 9, 10. We must remember the Judgment to come.—Ver. 9. **διὸ καὶ φιλοτιμούμεθα κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore also we make it our ambition* (see reff.), *whether at home or away from home*, *sc.*, whether at His coming He finds us "in the body" or "out of the body," *to be well pleasing to Him*; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 8, Phil. i. 20, 1 Thess. v. 10.

Ver. 10. **τοὺς γὰρ πάντας κ.τ.λ.**: *for* (explanatory of the reason of our desire to be "well-pleasing" to Him) *we all* (**τοὺς πάντας** is emphatic, not only Paul who has been speaking of himself as **ἡμεῖς**, but "all of us" *quick* as well as

11. εἰδότες οὖν τὸν [b] φόβον τοῦ [b] Κυρίου, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, Θεῷ δὲ πεφανερώμεθα· ἐλπίζω δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς [c] συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι. 12. οὐ γὰρ [1] πάλιν [d] ἑαυτοὺς [d] συνιστάνομεν ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ [e] ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ἡμῖν [2] καυχήματος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,[3] ἵνα ἔχητε

b Acts ix. 31; cf. Gen. xxxv. 5; chap. vii. 1 and Eph. v. 21.
c Reff. i. 12.
d Reff. iii. 1.
e Rom. vii. 8, 11; chap. xi. 12; Gal. v. 13; 1 Tim. v. 14 only; Prov. ix. 9; 3 Macc. iii. 2.

[1] DcEKL support γαρ; om. all vss. and ℵBCD*G.

[2] B*, d, e support διδοντες ημιν; better υμιν with all other authorities.

[3] ℵB 17 have (wrongly) υμων; ημων all other authorities.

dead) *must be made manifest*. The A.V. "appear" weakens the force of the word; the Day of Judgment is to be a day when men's characters shall be made patent to the world, and to themselves, as they have always been to God; *cf.* Mark iv. 22, Rom. ii. 16, xiv. 10, 1 Cor. iv. 5, Rev. xx. 12.—**ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *before the judgment-seat of Christ*. In the N.T. (see reff.) **βῆμα** is always used (except in the quotation Acts vii. 5) of the official seat of a judge, although twice in the LXX (Neh. viii. 4, 2 Macc. xiii. 26), as generally in classical Greek, it stands for the pulpit from which a formal speech is made.—**ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος κ.τ.λ.**: *that each one may receive*, *i.e.*, obtain the wages of (see reff.), *the things done through the medium of the body* (*cf.* Plato's phrase **αἰσθήσεις αἱ διὰ τοῦ σώματος**, cited by Meyer; there is no need to identify **διὰ τοῦ σώματος** with **ἐν τῷ σώματι** of ver. 6 as the A.V. and R.V. do) *according to what he did*, *sc.*, in this present life (note the aorist and *cf.* Luke xii. 47), *whether it be good or bad* (*cf.*, for this constr. of **εἴτε . . . εἴτε**, Eph. vi. 8, Phil. i. 18). Similar expressions are used of a future judgment, at, *e.g.*, Ps. lxi. 13, Prov. xxiv. 12, Jer. xvii. 10, xxxii. 19 (*cf.* Job xxxiv. 11?) in the O.T., and in the N.T. at Rom. ii. 6, xiv. 12, 1 Pet. i. 17, in all of which passages the power of judgment is ascribed to the Eternal Father. But He "hath given all judgment unto the Son" (John v. 22), and thus Christ is repeatedly spoken of as the future Judge of men, *e.g.*, Matt. xvi. 27, Acts xvii. 31, Rev. ii. 23, xxii. 12, and esp. Matt. xxv. 31-46. *Cf.* Luke xxi. 36, **σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου**. And so (from the present verse) the variant **Χριστοῦ** has crept into the parallel passage, Rom. xiv. 10, **πάντες γὰρ παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ**. A reference to the O.T. parallels makes it tolerably plain that the statement that men will be judged according to their works is a broad and general one, and that to find a difficulty, as the Fathers did, in the case of the death of infants (whether baptised or unbaptised), who are incapable of self-conscious and voluntary actions, is quite perverse.

Vv. 11-13. Reiteration of his sincerity of purpose.—Ver. 11. **εἰδότες οὖν τὸν φόβον κ.τ.λ.**: *knowing, therefore*, *sc.*, because of the conviction expressed in ver. 10, *the fear of the Lord*, *sc.*, as Judge (*cf.* Heb. x. 31), *we persuade men*, *sc.*, of our sincerity, *but we have been* (already) *made manifest to God*, as we shall be at the Day of Judgment (see ver. 10). To regard **πείθομεν** (*cf.* Acts xii. 20, Gal. i. 10) as referring to a "persuading" of the truths of Christianity is to depart from the context. He is now returning to the question at iii. 1, and he has explained the motives of his ministry and the obligations to sincerity of speech which bind him. We should expect (in classical Greek) **ἀνθρώπους μὲν πείθ. κ.τ.λ.**, but the omission of **μέν** does not destroy, though it obscures, the antithesis. It would be out of place to speak of "persuading" God of our sincerity; to Him we are "made manifest" whether we will or no.—**ἐλπίζω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and I hope* (as we say, "I trust") *we have been made manifest also in your consciences*; see iv. 2 for a similar appeal.

Ver. 12. **οὐ γὰρ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.**: *we are not again* (see iii. 1, and the note there; he takes up this theme again after a long digression) *commending ourselves to you, but* [write these things] *as giving you occasion of glorying on our behalf*. We must understand in the latter clause some such words as **γράφομεν ταῦτα**: there are similar *anacolutha* at vii. 5, viii. 18.—**ἵνα ἔχητε πρὸς τοὺς κ.τ.λ.**: *that ye may have it*, *sc.*, some **καύχημα** or matter of glorying, *against those who glory in outward appearance and not in heart*, *sc.*, against his opponents at Corinth.

πρὸς τοὺς ἐν [f] προσώπῳ καυχωμένους, καὶ οὐ [1] [f] καρδίᾳ.[2] 13. εἴτε γὰρ [g] ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ· εἴτε [h] σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν. 14. ἡ γὰρ [i] ἀγάπη τοῦ [i] Χριστοῦ [3] [k] συνέχει ἡμᾶς, 15. [l] κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰ[4] εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον· καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν,[5] ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες μηκέτι ἑαυτοῖς ζῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν

f *Cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17 and on chap. i. 11.
g Here only in Paul; *cf.* Mk. iii. 21.
h Rom. xii. 3; Tit. ii. 6.
i Rom. viii. 35; Eph. iii. 19.
k Phil. i. 23 only in Paul; *cf.* Lk. viii. 37, xii. 50; Acts xviii. 5.
l *Cf.* Acts xv. 19.

[1] CDcEKLP have **ου** (D*G have **ουκ**); better **μη** with ℵB 17.

[2] CDcEKLP give **καρδιᾳ**; better **εν καρδ.** with ℵBD*G 17.

[3] CP 17 and the Harclean have **Θεου** for **Χριστου**.

[4] ℵcC*, f and the Bohairic insert **ει**; om. ℵ*BC²DEGKLP, d, e, g and the Syriac vss. (it may have been dropped through inadvertence before **εις**).

[5] G, f, g, etc. give **απεθανεν Χριστος**.

The phrase **προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ** occurs in 1 Thess. ii. 17 in the sense of **πνεύματι οὐ σώματι** (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 3, Col. ii. 5); but a better parallel for the present passage is 1 Sam. xvi. 7, where Samuel is told that while *man* looks **εἰς πρόσωπον**, *God* looks **εἰς καρδίαν**. So St. Paul here refers to teachers who lay stress on the outward appearance and the "face" (see note i. 11) of things, such as a man's enthusiasms and visions (xii. 1 and ver. 13), or his eloquence (chap. x. 10), or his letters of commendation (iii. 1), or his Jewish birth (xi. 22), or his personal intimacy in the flesh with Christ (ver. 16)—rather than on the inward motive and "heart" of his message.

Ver. 13. **εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for whether* (see on i. 6 for constr.) *we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you* (note the *dat. commodi*). At a later period Festus told Paul that he was mad (Acts xxvi. 24), so impressed was he with the Apostle's enthusiasm; and it is probable that the anti-Pauline party at Corinth were not slow to point to the "visions and revelations of the Lord" which St. Paul claimed for himself (chap. xii. 1-6), and to the facility with which he spoke "with tongues" (1 Cor. xiv. 18), as proofs of his madness. A similar accusation was made against his Master (Mark iii. 21). But St. Paul bids them (ver. 12) look a little deeper, and not judge by mere outward phenomena such as these. He repeatedly asks them to bear with his seeming foolishness (chap. xi. 1, 16, 17, xii. 6, 11). It is possible that a charge of a contrary nature had been also made by his opponents, and that his regard for other men's prejudices (1 Cor. ix. 20), and the "craftiness" with which he caught the Corinthians "with guile" (chap. xii. 16), were urged as savouring more of worldly wisdom than of true piety. His answer to both charges is contained in this verse. If he has exceeded the bounds of moderation, it is in his moods of highest devotion, when he is pouring out his soul to God and not to man; if he has exercised a sober prudence in his dealings with his converts, it is all for their sakes, and not for selfish ends.

Vv. 14-16. IT IS NOT THE KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST IN HIS EARTHLY LIFE, BUT THE LOVE WHICH CHRIST HAS FOR MAN THAT IS THE CONSTRAINING POWER OF PAUL'S PREACHING.—Ver. 14. **ἡ γὰρ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for the Love of Christ constraineth us, sc.*, within the limits laid down in ver. 13. The words are often quoted as meaning that the love which Christians bear to Christ is the supreme motive of the Christian life; but however true this is in itself, it is not the meaning of the Apostle here. The genitive of the person after **ἀγάπη** is in St. Paul's Epistles always *subjective* (*cf.* **ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ**, Rom. v. 5, viii. 39, chap. xiii. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 5, and *cf.* also Rom. xv. 30, Eph. ii. 4, Col. i. 13, and for **ἡ ἀγ. τοῦ Χρ.** reff. above); *i.e.*, "the Love of God" and "the Love of Christ" signify with him the love which God and Christ bear towards (**εἰς**) man. (St. Paul often uses the verb **ἀγαπάω** to express man's love to God, but never the substantive **ἀγάπη**). St. John's usage varies, the genitive sometimes being *objective* and sometimes *subjective* (*cf.* John v. 42 and 1 John ii. 5, 15, iii. 17, iv. 9, v. 3;

ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι. 16. ὥστε ἡμεῖς [m] ἀπὸ [m] τοῦ [m] νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν [n] κατὰ [n] σάρκα· εἰ δὲ [1] καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ [2] σάρκα Χριστόν,

m Ps. cxii. 2; Lk. i. 48; John viii. 11; Acts xviii. 6. n Reff. i. 17.

[1] The best supported reading is ει και ℵ*BD* 17; G, the Latins and the Peshitto have και ει; ℵcC²DbcEKL and the Harclean ει δε και; K and the Bohairic ει δε.

[2] DE, d, e and the Bohairic have Χρ. κατα σαρκα.

see also Luke xi. 42), but St. Paul's is not doubtful. The "Love of Christ" here, then, is the love which Christ has for us, not the love which we bear to Him; the constraining power of Christian ministration and service is more effective and stable than it would be if it sprang from the fickle and variable affections of men (*cf.* John xv. 16).

Ver. 15. **κρίναντας τοῦτο ὅτι εἷς κ.τ.λ.**: *judging this; that One died for all* (*cf.* Rom. v. 15), *therefore all died, and He died for all, that they who live* (see iii. 11) *should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who died and rose again for them.* To die **ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ** is the greatest proof that anyone can offer of his love (John xv. 13). The proof to us of the Love of Christ to all is that He died **ὑπὲρ πάντων.** Of this Death two consequences are now mentioned: (*a*) one objective and inevitable, quite independent of our faith and obedience; (*b*) another subjective and conditional. (*a*) **ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον,** *then all died, sc.*, in Him who is the "recapitulation" of all humanity, Jew and Greek, bond and free, faithless or believing. We must not weaken the force of **οἱ πάντες**: the Incarnation embraces all men (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 22). The A.V. "then were all dead" (the same mistranslation occurs Rom. vi. 2, Col. iii. 3) does not bring out the sense, which is that the Dying of Christ on the Cross was in some sort the dying of all mankind. But (*b*) the purposes of the Atonement are not completely fulfilled without the response of man's faith and obedience; *He died for all,* **ἵνα οἱ ζῶντες κ.τ.λ.** This is the frequent exhortation of St. Paul (Rom. vi. 11 and see 1 Pet. iii. 18); the purpose of Christ's Death is to lead us to Life, a life "unto God" (*cf.* Rom. vi. 11, xiv. 7, 8)—the "life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19) which must be begun here if it is to be perfected hereafter. The preposition **ὑπέρ**, "on behalf of" (*cf.* chap. xii. 10), employed in these verses is the one usually employed in the N.T. to express the relation between Christ's Atoning Death and our benefit: it was "for our sake," "on our behalf" (*e.g.*, Luke xxii. 19, 20, John x. 15, xi. 51, Rom. v. 6, 1 Cor. i. 13, Gal. iii. 13, Eph. v. 2, Heb. ii. 9, 1 John iii. 16). It is not equivalent to **ἀντί**, "instead of" (although in Philemon 13 its meaning approximates thereto), and ought not to be so translated; although the preposition **ἀντί** is used of our Lord's Atoning Work in three places (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, 1 Tim. ii. 6), and the implied metaphor must have a place in any complete theory of the Atonement. But here **ὑπέρ** is (as usual) used, and the rendering "instead of," even if linguistically possible (which it is not), is excluded by the fact that in the phrase **ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀποθανόντι καὶ ἐγερθέντι, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν** is governed by *both* participles. Christ rose again "on our behalf"; He is never said to have risen "instead of us".

Ver. 16. **ὥστε ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν κ.τ.λ.**: *so that, sc.*, because of our conviction, that we should not live unto ourselves but unto Christ (ver. 15), *we, sc.*, Paul as contrasted with his opponents at Corinth, *from henceforth, sc.*, this conviction having mastered us, *know no man after the flesh, i.e.*, are quite indifferent as to his mere external qualifications as a preacher of the Gospel, his eloquence, Jewish birth, etc.: we are not like those who glory **ἐν προσώπῳ** and not **ἐν καρδίᾳ** (ver. 12); *cf.* Gal. ii. 6.—**εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *even though we have known* (the distinction between **οἴδαμεν** and **ἐγνώκαμεν** is hardly to be pressed) *Christ after the flesh, i.e.*, though there was a time in my life when I, like my Judaising opponents now, laid great stress on the local and hereditary, and, so to speak, fleshly "notes" of the Messiah who was to come, *yet now we know Him so no more, i.e.*, I know better now, for I have learnt since my conversion that the national Messiah of the Jews is Himself the Incarnate Word, to whom every race of men is alike related, for He is the Christ of the Catholic Church of God. In per-

ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκ ἔτι γινώσκομεν.[1] 17. ὥστε εἴ τις [o] ἐν [o] Χριστῷ, [p] καινὴ [p] κτίσις· τὰ [q] ἀρχαῖα [r] παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονε καινὰ τὰ[2] πάντα.

o Rom. xvi. 7; chap. xii. 2; Gal. i. 22; 1 Pet. v. 14; cf. Rom. viii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. ii. 10, 13. p Gal. vi. 15 and see below. q Here only in Paul. r Here only in Paul.

[1] DEG, d, e, g add κατα σαρκα (to clear up the sense) after γινωσκ.

[2] D^bc EKLP and the Harclean support καινα τα παντα; the stronger combination, ℵBCD*G, the Latins and the Bohairic, omit τα παντα.

sonal religion the merely *historical* must yield precedence to the *mystical* element; it is of great interest and of real value to learn all that can be known about the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, but it is the *present* Life of Christ, "in whom" we may be found if we will, that is of religious import, as is further explained in ver. 17. This "is the same feeling which appears in the fact . . . that no authentic or even pretended likeness of Christ should have been handed down from the first century; that the very site of His dwelling place at Capernaum should have been entirely obliterated from human memory; that the very notion of seeking for relics of His life and death, though afterwards so abundant, first began in the age of Constantine. It is the same feeling which, in the Gospel narratives themselves, is expressed in the almost entire absence of precision as to time and place" (Stanley). Beyschlag and others (see Knowling, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 2) conclude from the words εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν that St. Paul had seen, and possibly heard, Jesus during His public ministry at Jerusalem (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1); on this interpretation the words would be introduced at this point to indicate that, however much stress the other Apostles and their adherents might lay on such outward knowledge, yet to St. Paul, though he could lay claim to it as well as they, this did not seem the essential matter. But (*a*) the words do not necessarily imply this; it is noteworthy that he says Χριστόν, not Ἰησοῦν, which we should expect on Beyschlag's hypothesis. (*b*) The explanation given above is quite in accordance with the usage of κατὰ σάρκα with a verb (see reff.), and the order of the words here and in the preceding clause does not allow us to take κατὰ σάρκα with οὐδένα in the one case and with Χριστόν in the other. (*c*) As Schmiedel points out, if St. Paul really had had personal experience of the public ministry of Jesus, he would hardly have failed to mention it in the great apologetic passage, chap. xi. 22-33. Other writers, *e.g.*, Jowett, explain the latter clause of this verse by supposing that the Apostle is contrasting his more mature preaching with his preaching at an earlier stage of his Christian ministry when he had not yet emancipated himself from Jewish prejudices. But of his consciousness of such a "development" in his views, subsequently to his conversion, there is no trace in the Epistles. The contrast is really between Saul the Pharisee and Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Vv. 17-19. In Christ all is new, as from God who reconciled the world to Himself in Christ.—Ver. 17. ὥστε εἴ τις κ.τ.λ.: *so that* (a consequence of the higher view of Christ explained in the last verse) *if any man* (note the universality of the doctrine which he expounds) *be in Christ, there is a new creation.* To be ἐν Χριστῷ is a very different thing from claiming to be Χριστοῦ "of Christ," *sc.*, of the Christ-party (1 Cor. i. 12, chap. x. 7); this indeed is exactly the distinction which St. Paul has had in mind in the last verse. The expression "a new creation" was a common Rabbinical description of a converted proselyte (see Wetstein *in loc.*); but its meaning was enriched in the religion of the Incarnation (*cf.* John iii. 3, Rom. vi. 4, Eph. ii. 10, iv. 23, Col. iii. 10, etc.). The Vulgate "si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura," which takes τις with κτίσις, is plainly a mistake.—τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.: *the old things have passed away; behold, they are become new*, *sc.*, not only the ancient customs of Jewish ritual observance, but the old ways of conceiving of the Messiah who was to come; more generally, the old thoughts of God and of sin and salvation have received fresh colouring—they are "become new" (*cf.* Heb. viii. 13). The words of Isa. xliii. 18, 19 offer a close verbal parallel: τὰ ἀρχαῖα μὴ συλλογίζεσθε· ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ποιῶ καινά (*cf.* Isa. lxv. 17, Rev. xxi. 4, 5), but the parallel is rather in words than in sense.

18. τὰ δὲ [s] πάντα [s] ἐκ τοῦ[1] [s] Θεοῦ, τοῦ [t] καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ[2] Χριστοῦ, καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς [u] καταλλαγῆς· 19. [v] ὡς [v] ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ [w] παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν

s Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6, xi. 12.
t Rom. v. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 11, and vv. 19, 20 only; Jer. xxxi. 39 (LXX); 2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33, viii. 29; *cf.* Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20, 21.
u Rom. v. 11, xi. 15, 19 only; Isa. ix. 5; 2 Macc. v. 20.
v Chap. xi. 21; 2 Thess. ii. 2 only.
w Matt. vi. 14; Rom. iv. 25, etc.

[1] D*G om. **του**.

[2] DcEKL support **Ἰησ. Χρ.**; ℵBCD*GP and the vss. om. **Ἰησου**.

The thought of the new interpretation of life offered in the Incarnation carries us a step beyond the prophets of the Old Covenant. St. Paul's words show how completely he regarded "the Death of Christ as a new epoch in the history of the human race. Had he foreseen distinctly that a new era would be dated from that time; that a new society, philosophy, literature, moral code, would grow up from it over continents of which he knew not the existence; he could not have more strongly expressed his sense of the greatness of the event than in what is here said" (Stanley).

Ver. 18. **τὰ δὲ πάντα κ.τ.λ.**: *but all things*, *sc.*, all these new things, *are of God*. See reff. St. Paul is especially anxious in this Epistle to trace up spiritual blessings to their true source; see chap. i. 21, iv. 6, v. 5, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 23, **ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ.**—**τοῦ καταλλάξαντος κ.τ.λ.**: *who reconciled* (note the aorist) *us*, *sc.*, all mankind, *to Himself through Christ*. The words **καταλλάσσω, καταλλαγή** should be studied (see reff.) in all the contexts where they occur. The verb signifies (i.) *to exchange* and (ii.) *to reconcile*, *i.e.*, to re-establish friendly relations between two parties who are estranged, no matter on which side the antagonism exists. Thus in Matt. v. 24 it is the brother who has *given* offence (not he who has *received* it) that is spoken of as "being reconciled" to the other (*cf.* also 1 Sam. xxix. 4). And so too St. Paul's usage is to speak of man being reconciled to God, not of God being reconciled to man; but far too much has been made of this distinction. In fact, in 2 Macc. (see reff.) the usage is the other way, for God is *there* always spoken of as "being reconciled" to His servants. It is, no doubt, more reverent in such a matter to keep as close to the language of the N.T. as we can, and to speak nakedly of God "being reconciled" to man might readily suggest false and unworthy views as to the Supreme. But that St. Paul would have felt any difficulty in such a phrase is very unlikely. The important point to observe in the present passage is that it is God Himself who is the ultimate Author of this Reconciliation; *cf.* Rom. v. 8, viii. 31, 32, and especially John iii. 16. That the Reconciliation is "through Christ" is the heart of the Gospel of the Atonement (*cf.* Rom. iii. 24, Col. i. 20, etc.).—**καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *and gave to us*, *sc.*, to me, Paul (he is not now thinking of others), *the Ministry of Reconciliation; cf.* chap. iii. 9, **ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης**, the genitive in both cases being, of course, of the thing ministered.

Ver. 19. **ὡς ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν κ.τ.λ.**: *viz.*, *that God was reconciling the world*, *sc.*, the whole human race (*cf.* Rom. iv. 13, xi. 12, and note the absence of the article), *to Himself in Christ* (*cf.* Gal. ii. 17). The pleonastic **ὡς ὅτι** is not classical, but it is found in late authors (see reff.). The A.V., "God was in Christ, reconciling," etc., is not accurate; **ἦν** goes with both **καταλλάσσων** and **θέμενος**, **ἦν** with a participle being more emphatic than a simple imperfect (*cf.* Luke iv. 44). If we take **ἦν** with **ἐν Χριστῷ**, we should have to treat **θέμενος κ.τ.λ.** as a parallel clause to **λογιζόμενος κ.τ.λ.**, which it is not.—**μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *not reckoning unto them their trespasses*, a parenthetical sentence explanatory of **καταλλάσσων**; *cf.* Rom. iv. 8 (Ps. xxxii. 2).—**καὶ θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *and had placed in our hands* (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12; the verb is specially used of the Divine purposes) *the Word of Reconciliation*, *i.e.*, the Divine Message which speaks of reconciliation to God; *cf.* Acts xiii. 26, **ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης**, 1 Cor. i. 18, **ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ**, Phil. ii. 16, **λόγος ζωῆς**, etc.

Vv. 20-vi. 3. As Christ's Ambassador he entreats the Corinthians to be Reconciled to God.—Ver. 20. **ὑπὲρ**

τὸν[1] λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς. 20. [x]ὑπὲρ[2] Χριστοῦ οὖν [y]πρεσβεύομεν, ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν· [z]δεόμεθα[3] [x]ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε[4] τῷ Θεῷ· 21. τὸν γὰρ[5] μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα[6] [a]δικαιοσύνη [a]Θεοῦ

x Eph. vi. 20; Phil. i. 29.
y Eph. vi. 20 only.
z Rom. i. 10; chaps. viii. 4, x. 2; Gal. iv. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
a Rom. i. 17, iii. 5, 21, 22, x. 3; Jas. i. 20; 2 Pet. i. 1 only

[1] D*EG, g have (του) ευαγγελιου τον λογον.

[2] D*G, d, e, g have ον υπερ Χρ. for υπερ Χρ. ουν.

[3] D*G, d, e, g have δεομενοι.

[4] D*G, d, e, g and the Harclean margin give καταλλαγηναι.

[5] ℵ^cD^cEKLP and the Syriac vss. insert γαρ; better om. γαρ with ℵ*BCD*G 17, the Latins and Bohairic.

[6] Only a few minuscules give γινωμεθα; all the uncials have γενωμεθα.

Χριστοῦ οὖν πρεσβεύομεν κ.τ.λ.: *we are ambassadors therefore*, *sc.*, because to us has been committed the Ministry of Reconciliation, *on behalf of Christ*, as Christ's representative (see on ver. 15 above for the force of **ὑπέρ**), *as though God were entreating by us* (*cf.* vi. 1 and see on i. 4). The construction of **ὡς** followed by a genitive absolute is found also at 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Pet. i. 3.—**δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *we beseech you on behalf of Christ*, *Be ye reconciled to God.* The imperative **καταλλάγητε** is much more emphatic than the infinitive **καταλλαγῆναι** (see crit. note) would be; all through we perceive the Apostle's anxiety that the Corinthians should turn from the sin which beset them, whatever it might be in any individual case (*cf.* ii. 16, iv. 1, vi. 1, xi. 3). Note that the appeal, "Be ye reconciled to God," is based on the fact (ver. 18) that God has already "reconciled us to Himself through Jesus Christ".

Ver. 21. The very purpose of the Atonement was that men should turn from sin.—**τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν κ.τ.λ.**: *Him who knew no sin* (observe **μή** rather than **οὐ**, as it is not so much the bare fact of Christ's sinlessness that is emphasised, as God's knowledge of this fact, which rendered Christ a possible Mediator) *He made to be sin on our behalf.* Two points are especially deserving of attention here: (i.) That any man should be sinless (*cf.* Eccl. viii. 5) was an idea quite alien to Jewish thought and belief; and therefore the emphasis given to it by St. Paul, and the absolutely unqualified way in which it is laid down in a letter addressed to a community containing not only friends but foes who would eagerly fasten on any doubtful statement, show that it must have been regarded as axiomatic among Christians at the early date when this Epistle was written. The claim involved in the challenge of Christ, **τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (John viii. 46), had never been disproved, and the Apostolic age held that He was **χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας . . . ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν** (Heb. iv. 15, vii. 26), and that **ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν** (1 John iii. 5; *cf.* St. Peter's application of Isa. liii. 9 at 1 Pet. ii. 22). That He was a moral Miracle was certainly part of the primitive Gospel. (ii.) The statement **ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν** is best understood if we recall the Jewish ritual on the Day of Atonement, when the priest was directed to "place" the sins of the people upon the head of the scapegoat (Lev. xvi. 21). **ἁμαρτία** cannot be translated "sin-offering" (as at Lev. iv. 8, 21, 24, 34, v. 9-12), for it cannot have two different meanings in the same clause; and further it is contrasted with **δικαιοσύνη**, it means "sin" in the abstract. The penalties of sin were laid on Christ **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**, "on our behalf," and thus as the Representative of the world's sin it becomes possible to predicate of Him the strange expression **ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν** (**ποιέω** being used here as at John v. 18, viii. 53, x. 33). The nearest parallel in the N.T. is **γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα** (Gal. iii. 13); *cf.* also Isa. liii. 6, Rom. viii. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 24.—**ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα κ.τ.λ.**: *that we might become*, *sc.*, as we have become (note the force of the aorist), *the righteousness of God in Him* (*cf.* Jer. xxiii. 6, 1 Cor. i. 30, Phil. iii. 9, and reff.). "Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of God Himself. Let it be counted folly or frenzy or

ἐν αὐτῷ. VI. 1. [a] Συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν[1] μὴ [b] εἰς [b] κενὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ δέξασθαι ὑμᾶς[2]· 2. (λέγει[3] γάρ, "Καιρῷ [c] δεκτῷ [d] ἐπήκουσά σου, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας [e] ἐβοήθησά σοι·" ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς [f] εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας·) 3. μηδεμίαν [g] ἐν [g] μηδενὶ διδόντες [h] προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ [i] μωμηθῇ ἡ διακονία[4]·

a Mk. xvi. 20; Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Jas. ii. 22 only.
b Gal. ii. 2; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 5 only; Isa. lxv. 23.
c Lk. iv. 19, 24; Acts x. 35; Phil. iv. 18 (Isa. lvi. 7) only.
d Here only; *cf.* Ps. xix. 2.
e Here only in Paul; *cf.* Acts xvi. 9, xxi. 28.
f Rom. xv. 16, 31; chap. viii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 5 only.
g Chap. vii. 9; Phil. i. 28.
h Here only; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 9.
i Chap. viii. 20 only; Prov. ix. 7; Wisd. x. 14 only; *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 13.

[1] D*E*G, d, e, g give **παρακαλουντες**.

[2] D* om. **υμας**; ℵ*C 17 have **ημας**.

[3] D*G, d, e, g give **καιρῳ γαρ λεγει**.

[4] DEG 73, the Latin, Sahidic and Syriac vss. add **ημων** after **διακ**.

fury or whatsoever. It is our wisdom and our comfort; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned and God hath suffered; that God hath made Himself the sin of men, and that men are made the righteousness of God" (Hooker, *Serm.*, ii., 6).

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. **συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *and working together* (that is, with God, as is plain from chap. v. 20, and also in connexion with 1 Cor. iii. 9; *cf.* Acts xv. 4), *we*, *sc.*, I, Paul, *entreat also* (*cf.* chap. v. 20, **Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν**) *that ye receive not the grace of God* (a general phrase, frequently used by St. Paul to express the favours and privileges offered to the members of the Church of Christ, not to be limited to grace given at any special moment, as, *e.g.*, at baptism) *in vain* (see reff. and *cf.* Heb. xii. 15). Note that "the grace of God" *may* be "received" in vain; it is offered, independently of man's faith and obedience, but it will not profit without these. The choice in the Anglican Liturgy of vv. 1-10 as the Epistle for the First Sunday in Lent, when the Ember Collect is said on behalf of those to be ordained in the next week, is especially happy; the magnificent description of the characteristics and the conditions of a faithful Christian ministry (vv. 4-10) being prefaced by the solemn warning of vv. 1-3.

Ver. 2. **λέγει γάρ, Καιρῷ δεκτῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *for He*, *sc.*, God, *saith* (*cf.* Rom. ix. 15, Gal. iii. 16), "*At an acceptable time I hearkened to thee, and in a day of salvation did I succour thee*" (Isa. xlix. 8). The whole verse is parenthetical, and is introduced to remind the Corinthians that the present dispensation is that dispensation of grace of which the prophet speaks; Stanley pointed out that **δέξασθαι** of ver. 1 may well have suggested **δεκτός**, which in its turn suggested the quotation. The words in their original context are addressed by Jehovah to His Servant, while St. Paul takes them as addressed by God to His people; but, inasmuch as the Servant in the latter portion of Isaiah is the Representative of Israel, the application made by the Apostle is easily explicable.—**ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος κ.τ.λ.**: *behold now is the* "*Acceptable Time*," *behold now is the* "*Day of Salvation*". This is St. Paul's comment. Observe that he does not say **σήμερον** (*cf.* Heb. iii. 7 ff.), but **νῦν**—not "to-day," but "the present dispensation". His point here is *not* (as it is often represented) that the only day of grace which we can reckon on is the present (gravely true though this is), but that the Christian dispensation is the one spoken of by the O.T. prophet in familiar words. It will be remembered that Christ applied to Himself and His ministry in like manner the words of Isa. lxi. 2, **καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν** (Luke iv. 19). We are not to draw any distinction here between **δεκτός** and **εὐπρόσδεκτος**; the latter is the usual word in secular authors, and (see reff.) is always used by St. Paul, except (Phil. iv. 18) in a quotation from the LXX.

Ver. 3. **μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *giving no occasion of stumbling* (see reff.; Alford aptly quotes Polybius, xxvii., 6, 10, **διδόναι ἀφορμὰς προσκοπῆς**) *in anything, that our ministration be not blamed*. The clause is parallel with ver. 1, **διδόντες** corresponding to **συνεργοῦντες**, both being descriptive of the way in which **παρακαλοῦμεν**, etc.; *cf.*, for like sentiments, 1 Cor. viii. 13, ix. 12, 22, x. 33. We have **μηδεμίαν . . . μηδενί** rather than **οὐδεμίαν . . . οὐδενί**, as it is the thought or intention of the preacher which is the point to be brought out.

4. ἀλλʼ [k] ἐν [k] παντὶ [l] συνιστῶντες [1] [l] ἑαυτοὺς ὡς [m] Θεοῦ [m] διάκονοι,[2] ἐν [n] ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν [o] θλίψεσιν, ἐν [p] ἀνάγκαις, ἐν [q] στενοχωρίαις, 5. ἐν [r] πληγαῖς, ἐν [r] φυλακαῖς, ἐν [s] ἀκαταστασίαις, ἐν [t] κόποις, ἐν [u] ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν [v] νηστείαις, 6. ἐν [w] ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν [x] μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν [y] χρηστότητι, ἐν [z] πνεύματι [z] ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ [a] ἀνυποκρίτῳ,

k See on iv. 8.
l Reff. iv. 2.
m Rom. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 2.
n Reff. i. 6.
o Reff. i. 4.
p 1 Cor. vii. 26; chap. xii. 10; 1 Sam. xxii. 2.
q Rom. ii. 9, viii. 35; chap. xii. 10; *cf.* chap. iv. 8.
r Acts xvi. 23; chap. xi. 23; *cf.* Heb. xi. 36.
s Lk. xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 33; chap. xii. 20; Jas. iii. 16 only; Prov. xxvi. 28; Tobit iv. 13.
t 1 Cor. iii. 8; chaps. x. 15, xi. 23, 27; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 5.
u Chap. xi. 27 only; 2 Macc. ii. 26.
v Lk. ii. 37; Acts xiv. 23, xxvii. 9; chap. xi. 27 only; Dan. ix. 3.
w Chap. xi. 3 only.
x Gal. v. 22; Eph. iv. 2; Col. i. 11, iii. 12; 2 Tim. iii. 10, iv. 2.
y Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12.
z *Cf.* Rom. xv. 19; 1 Thess. i. 5.
a Rom. xii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 22; Jas. iii. 17 only; Wisd. v. 18, xviii. 16 only.

[1] ℵᶜDᶜEKL give **συνιστωντες**; Tisch. reads **συνισταντες** with ℵ*CD*G 17; W.H. read **συνιστανοντες** with BP (*cf.* iii. 1).

[2] D* has **διακονους**; also f, g, vg.

Vv. 4-10. The Conditions and the Characteristics of his Apostolic Ministry. We have in this noble description of his service a characteristic outburst of impassioned eloquence on a topic in which the Apostle felt an intense personal interest. But its fervour has not been permitted to interfere with the careful choice of words: the balanced antitheses, the rhythmical cadences and assonances, which abound throughout, betray the literary training of the writer, and recall at once such passages as Rom. viii. 31-39, 1 Cor. xiii. 1-13. Indeed many of the phrases which follow suggest an acquaintance with the Stoic paradoxes expressive of the **αὐτάρκεια** of the ideal sage. Compare also chap. xi. 22-28, where he recounts in more detail the trials of his Apostolic ministry.

Ver. 4. **ἀλλʼ ἐν παντὶ συνιστάντες κ.τ.λ.**: *but in everything* (the details being given in the following verses) *commending ourselves* (see note on iii. 1) *as God's ministers do.* We now come to the description of the conditions under which and the means by which God's minister commends himself to those to whom his message is addressed. The description naturally divides itself into four sections: he commends himself (i.) in outward hardships, vv. 4ᵇ, 5, (ii.) in inward graces, vv. 6, 7ᵃ, (iii.) by the armour of righteousness, whether he be well or evil spoken of, vv. 7ᵇ, 8ᵃᵇ, (iv.) having indeed a character the reverse of that ascribed to him by his opponents, vv. 8ᶜ-10.

(i.) The general description here is **ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ**: *in much patience* (see note on i. 6 and *cf.* xii. 12); and this is further amplified and explained in the three triplets which follow. (*a*) **ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις**: *in afflictions*, *in necessities*, *in distresses* (see reff. and *cf.* Acts ix. 16), *i.e.*, such trials as sickness (see i. 6, xii. 7), or loss of friends (2 Tim. iv. 10), or perplexity (iv. 8, where see note), or any of the thousand chances (as we call them) of a troubled and anxious life. "The prevailing idea is that of pressure and confinement: each stage narrower than the one before, so that no room is left for movement or escape" (Stanley).

Ver. 5. (*b*) These outward hardships are next more definitely exemplified from the opposition and persecution which St. Paul encountered from opponents during his missionary experiences. **ἐν πληγαῖς, ἐν φυλακαῖς, ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις**: *in stripes* (see reff. and *cf.* Acts xxii. 24), *in imprisonments* (see on xi. 23), *in tumults* (*cf.* Acts xiii. 50, xiv. 5, 19, xvi. 22, xvii. 5, xviii. 12, xix. 29, xxi. 30). **ἀκαταστασία** might mean *inward disorder*, rather than *external tumult* (see reff., LXX, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11), but the latter meaning best suits the context here. (*c*) Next the Apostle enumerates the bodily hardships, voluntarily undertaken, which his work made it necessary to endure.—**ἐν κόποις, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν νηστείαις**: *in labours*, *sc.*, probably his labours in preaching the Gospel (see reff., but *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, where **κόπος** is used of the manual labour he underwent in working for a livelihood; see also 1 Cor. iv. 11 **ἀστατοῦμεν καὶ κοπιῶμεν**), *in watchings*, *sc.*, in nights rendered wakeful by anxiety or press of work (Acts xx. 31) or urgency of prayer (Acts xvi. 25 and *cf.* Eph. vi. 18 **ἀγρυπνοῦντες**), *in fastings*. Some expositors explain these **νηστεῖαι** as the voluntary fastings of religion (so Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, v., lxxii., 8; and *cf.* Acts xiii.

7. ἐν [b] λόγῳ [b] ἀληθείας, ἐν [c] δυνάμει [c] Θεοῦ, διὰ τῶν [d] ὅπλων τῆς [d] δικαιοσύνης τῶν [e] δεξιῶν καὶ [e] ἀριστερῶν, 8. διὰ δόξης καὶ [f] ἀτιμίας, διὰ [g] δυσφημίας καὶ [g] εὐφημίας· ὡς [h] πλάνοι, καὶ ἀληθεῖς· 9. ὡς [i] ἀγνοούμενοι, καὶ [k] ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι· ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες, καὶ ἰδοὺ

b Eph. i. 13; Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15.
c Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 5; chap. xiii. 4; 2 Tim. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 5.
d Rom. vi. 13; *cf.* Rom. xiii. 12; chap. x. 4.
e 1 Chr. xii. 2.
f Chap. xi. 21, etc.
g Here only.
h 1 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 13.
i Gal. i. 22.
k Reff. i. 13.

2, 3). And it is true that **νηστεία** (see reff.) and **νηστεύω** are *always* (outside this Epistle) used of fasting as a devotional observance. But in the parallel passage xi. 27 **νηστεῖαι** is clearly used of involuntary abstinences from food; and this meaning seems better to suit the context here also (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12) (§ 23). The triplet (*c*), then, means "in toil, in sleeplessness, in hunger".

Vv. 6, 7. (ii.) The inward gifts and qualities by the display of which the Christian minister commends himself are now enumerated. (*a*) We have, first, four graces, each described by a single word: **ἐν ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι**: *in pureness, sc.*, not only chastity, but purity of intention and thought in general (*cf.* chap. vii. 11, Jas. iii. 17, 1 John iii. 3), *in knowledge, sc.*, of Divine things (the **λόγος γνώσεως** is one of the gifts of the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 8), *in long-suffering* (a grace specially needful for a Christian missionary; in Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22, 1 Tim. i. 16, St. Paul speaks of God's **μακροθυμία**, but generally he applies it to man; see Prov. xxv. 15), *in kindness* (see reff.; it is a *Divine* attribute in Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22, Eph. ii. 7, Tit. iii. 4; *cf.* Matt. xi. 30).—(*b*) We have next four qualifications, each described in two words: **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ, ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας, ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ**: *in the Holy Spirit* (this ought to stand at the head of the list, but the order in which the various graces are mentioned is determined rather by sound and rhythm than by strictly logical considerations), *in love unfeigned, sc.*, love to man, not love to God (see note on chap. v. 14 and *cf.* **ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος**, Rom. xii. 9), *in the Word of Truth, sc.*, the message of the Gospel (see reff. and *cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2), *in the Power of God*, which (Rom. i. 16, 1 Cor. i. 18) he declares the Gospel itself to be. This, of course, is not the force of the phrase here; nor are we to think solely of "miraculous" powers (Acts viii. 10, 1 Cor. ii. 5), which were "signs of an Apostle" (Rom. xv. 19, chap. xii. 12), but of the Divine grace given him for his special work (see reff.). "In verbo veritatis, in virtute Dei" may still stand for the watchword of Christian preaching.—(iii.) We have now three clauses beginning with **διά**; the preposition in the first of them being *instrumental*, in the other two expressing a state or condition.—(*a*) **διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν**: *by the weapons of Righteousness on the right hand and on the left, sc.*, both offensive and defensive armour—the sword on the right and the shield on the left. See Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. v. 8 for St. Paul's more detailed description of "the panoply of God"; the idea being apparently taken from Wisd. v. 18 ff.; *cf.* for **ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης** Rom. vi. 13.

Ver. 8. (*b*) **διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας**: *by glory* (*cf.* John v. 41) *and dishonour, by evil report and good report*. To misrepresentation and slander St. Paul was much exposed, and he evidently felt it deeply (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 12).—(iv.) Finally, he proceeds to specify the charges made against him by his opponents; he can afford to neglect them, inasmuch as in each case they are quite opposed to the real facts. Towards the close he adds one or two antitheses to the list, which may not have been *directly* suggested by the current calumnies about him, but which are yet quite in keeping with the rest. There are seven antitheses in all.—**ὡς πλάνοι καὶ ἀληθεῖς**: *as deceivers* (so his opponents said of him, as it was formerly said of his Master, John vii. 12; *cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2) *and yet true*. In the Clementines St. Paul is expressly described by his adversaries as **πλάνος** and as disseminating deceit (**πλάνην**).

Ver. 9. **ὡς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι**: *as unknown, sc.*, an obscure person without proper credentials (*cf.* iii. 2, x. 10), *and yet well known* (*cf.* xi. 6).—**ὡς ἀποθνήσκοντες καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶμεν**: *as dying* (as was doubtless often reported when he was ill; see on i. 8 above, and *cf.* xi. 23, where he speaks of the continual hazards of his life), *and behold we live* (*cf.* iv. 10, where the death of the body is contrasted with the daily manifestation of the true life).—**ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ**

ζῶμεν· ὡς [l] παιδευόμενοι,[1] καὶ μὴ [m] θανατούμενοι· 10. ὡς λυπούμενοι, ἀεὶ δὲ [n] χαίροντες· ὡς πτωχοὶ, πολλοὺς δὲ [o] πλουτίζοντες· ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ πάντα [p] κατέχοντες.

11. Τὸ [q] στόμα ἡμῶν [q] ἀνέῳγε πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Κορίνθιοι,[2] ἡ [r] καρδία ἡμῶν [3] [r] πεπλάτυνται· 12. οὐ [s] στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς [t] σπλάγχνοις ὑμῶν· 13. τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν [u] ἀντιμισθίαν (ὡς

l 1 Cor. xi. 32; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Heb. xii. 7, 10. m Rom. vii. 4, viii. 13, 36. n Rom. xii. 12; Phil. iv. 4; 1 Thess. v. 16. o 1 Cor. i. 5; chap. ix. 11 only. p 1 Cor. vii. 30, xi. 2, xv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21. q Ps. lxxvii. 2; Prov. xxix. 45; *cf.* Eph. vi. 19. r Deut. xi. 16; Ps. cxviii. 32. s Chap. iv. 8 only. t Chap. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 1; Col. iii. 12; Philm. 7, 12. u Rom. i. 27 only.

[1] D*G, d, e, g have **πειραζομενοι** for **παιδευομ.**

[2] **ω Κορινθιοι** G, f, vg. and the Bohairic. [3] ℵB have **η καρδ. υμων.**

θανατούμενοι: *as chastened*, *sc.*, as a punishment for his sins, which had very probably been said of him when the news of his grievous sickness (i. 8, etc.) reached his foes at Corinth, *but not killed*. He does not deny that he has been "chastened" (see reff. and *cf.* chap. xii. 7-9), but he recalls in thankfulness the words of Ps. cxvii. 18, **παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέν με Κύριος, καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ παρέδωκέν με.**

Ver. 10. **ὡς λυπούμενοι, ἀεὶ δὲ χαίροντες**: *as sorrowful* (this charge in one sense was no doubt quite true), *yet alway rejoicing*. This, which is frequently spoken of by the Apostle as a Christian duty (see reff.), is specially prominent in this Epistle; *cf.* chap. i. 24, vii. 4, and the note on ii. 2, 3. St. Paul's words are an echo of the farewell words of Christ (John xvi. 22), **ὑμεῖς οὖν νῦν μὲν λύπην ἔχετε . . . τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς ἀρεῖ ἀφ' ὑμῶν.—ὡς πτωχοί, πολλοὺς δὲ πλουτίζοντες**: *as poor*, *sc.*, as a pauper—the word is stronger than **πένης** (the taunt seems to have been thrown at him; *cf.* Phil. iv. 12 and chap. xi. 7), *and yet making many rich*, *sc.*, in the heavenly riches; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5, Matt. v. 3, and esp. Prov. xiii. 7 (a passage which seems to have been in the Apostle's mind), **εἰσὶν οἱ πλουτίζοντες ἑαυτοὺς μηδὲν ἔχοντες, καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ ταπεινοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πολλῷ πλούτῳ.—ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες**: *as having nothing and yet possessing all things*; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22, "all things are yours". **κατέχειν** (see reff.) is a stronger word than **ἔχειν**; it is "to hold fast" or "to possess," as, *e.g.*, the land of promise (Josh. i. 11).

Vv. 11-13. Affectionate declaration of his frankness and sympathy, and an appeal that the Corinthians should show the same.—Ver. 11. **τὸ στόμα ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *our mouth is open* (**ἀνέῳγα = ἀνέῳγμαι**, as often in later Greek; observe its *present* signification, as at 1 Cor. xvi. 9) *unto you*, *O Corinthians*, *i.e.*, I am speaking quite candidly and freely to you (see reff.). Only here and at Gal. iii. 1, Phil. iv. 15, does St. Paul call his correspondents by name; here it emphasises the affectionate nature of his appeal, and it singles out the Corinthians from the wider circle to whom the letter was addressed (i. 1).—**ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *our heart is enlarged*, which is indeed the reason of his freedom of speech, for **ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ** (Matt. xii. 34). By enlargement of heart is meant here a widening of sympathy, and not the expansiveness of joy (Isa. lx. 5) or an increase in intelligence and wisdom (1 Kings iv. 29).

Ver. 12. **οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.**: *ye are not straitened in us* (this carries on the metaphor of **πεπλάτυνται**), *but ye are straitened in your own affections*; *i.e.*, his adversaries at Corinth may have said that he was a man of narrow sympathies, and that there was no room in his heart for his Corinthian converts, but, in fact, the lack of sympathy was on *their* side—it is *they* that are "narrow-minded". **τὰ σπλάγχνα** = the upper viscera, *i.e.*, the heart, lungs and liver, the vital parts, and so may be rendered "the affections".

Ver. 13. **τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν κ.τ.λ.**: *now for a recompense in like kind* (an accus. abs.)—*I speak as unto children*, *sc.*, who should respect and imitate their parents (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 14)—*be ye also enlarged*, *sc.*, in heart.

Vv. 14-vii. 1. Parenthetical.—He warns them against too familiar association with their Heathen Neighbours. These verses are somewhat perplexing, inasmuch as they seem to interrupt the appeal of vv. 11-13 by

τέκνοις λέγω) πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς. 14. Μὴ[1] γίνεσθε [v] ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις[2]· τίς γὰρ [w] μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ[3] καὶ [x] ἀνομίᾳ; τίς[4] δὲ [y] κοινωνία φωτὶ[5] πρὸς σκότος; 15. τίς δὲ [z] συμφώνησις Χριστῷ[6] πρὸς [a] Βελίαρ[7]; ἢ τίς [b] μερὶς πιστῷ[8] μετὰ ἀπίστου;

v Here only; cf. Lev. xix. 19. w Here only; Ps. cxxi. 3; cf. 1 Cor. x. 17, 21. x Rom. iv. 7, vi. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Tit. ii. 14. y Chaps. viii. 4, ix. 13, xiii. 13, etc.; cf. Ecclus. xiii. 17. z Here only; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 5; Lk. v. 36. a Here only. b Col. i. 12; cf. 1 Kings xii. 16.

[1] G, d, e, f, g and the Peshitto have **και μη**. [2] G has **μετα απιστων**.

[3] G has **δικαιοσυνης μετα ανομιας**; D* **δικαιοσυνης και αδικιας**; DcE **δικαιοσυνη και αδικια**.

[4] K and the Harclean text have **τις δε**; better **η τις** with the principal uncials and vss.

[5] D*, d, e give **φωτος**.

[6] DEGKL, g and the Syriac vss. give **Χριστῳ**; better **Χριστου** with ℵBCP 17, d, e, f and the Bohairic.

[7] **Βελιαρ** is the right spelling; D*EK have **βελιαν** and G **βελιαβ**; **βελιαλ** appears in a few cursives only, and in f, g, vg.

[8] B 17 and the Bohairic have **πιστου** for **πιστῳ**.

the introduction of an irrelevant warning. If they be omitted, the argument is quite consecutive, vii. 2 f. being in close and evident connexion with vi. 11-13. And it has been supposed that the whole section is an interpolation either (*a*) added by St. Paul after the arrival of Titus, in consequence of the news he had received as to the state of the Corinthian Church; or (*b*) belonging to another Pauline letter (possibly the Lost Epistle of 1 Cor. v. 9), and inserted here at a later date when a collection of Pauline letters began to be made; or (*c*) it has been regarded (*e.g.*, by Heinrici) as a fragment of an ancient homily, *not* by St. Paul, which has found a resting place here. It is urged in favour of the non-Pauline authorship of the section that (α) it contains a considerable number of words which do not occur elsewhere in St. Paul. To this it may be replied that **ἑτεροζυγεῖν** and **βελίαρ** have their origin in O.T. phraseology, while **μολυσμός** is a LXX word (see reff.); and that, as to the words **μετοχή, συμφώνησις, συγκατάθεσις,** it is not surprising that some of the synonyms which are found in this section should be comparatively rare. It is not easy to find (as has here been done, with no small skill) *five* distinct terms to convey almost the same idea. (β) Schmiedel urges that the phrase **μολυσμός σαρκός** (vii. 1) is quite un-Pauline, and that it is inconsistent with St. Paul's psychology to speak of being "cleansed" from it, inasmuch as for him the **σάρξ** is always tainted by sin. But there is no thought here of the taint of sin which remains in fallen man; **μολυσμός** is always used in the LXX (see reff.) of a too intimate association of the chosen people with heathen nations, and such "contamination" is exactly what it stands for in this place. As an argument on the other side, there occur in this section several quite common Pauline ideas and phrases, *e.g.*, the contrast of Christianity and heathendom as light and darkness (ver. 14), the description of Christians as God's temple (ver. 16), the phrases "the living God" (ver. 16) and "the fear of God" (vii. 1), the introduction of the term **ἀγαπητοί** (vii. 1), etc. We regard, therefore, the section as undoubtedly Pauline; and, further, its connexion with what precedes reveals itself on a close inspection of the phraseology. The Apostle has bidden the Corinthians "Be ye enlarged in heart". But he is reminded that this phrase has a bad meaning in the Law (Deut. xi. 16; see Chase, *Classical Review*, 1890, p. 151), where it is applied to that excessive tolerance which should permit the worship of other gods beside Jehovah; and so he hastens to give a warning (parenthetically introduced) to the Corinthians that he does not mean by enlargement of heart any undue tolerance of or contaminating association with their heathen neighbours (see on iv. 4 above for **ἄπιστος**).

Ver. 14. **Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες κ.τ.λ.**: *be not* (mark that the pres. tense **γίνεσθε** indicates the beginning of a state, *sc.*, "do not become") *unequally yoked with unbelievers*, the constr. being "be not unequally yoked, as you would be if

16. τίς δὲ [c] συγκατάθεσις ναῷ Θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ὑμεῖς[1] γὰρ [d] ναὸς[2] [d e] Θεοῦ ἐστε[1] [e] ζῶντος, καθὼς[3] εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, "[f] Ὅτι [f] ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ [g] ἐμπεριπατήσω· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν[4] Θεός, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι[5] λαός". 17. [h] διὸ "ἐξέλθετε[6] ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε," λέγει Κύριος, "καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅπτεσθε·" "κἀγὼ [i] εἰσδέξομαι ὑμᾶς, 18. καὶ [k] ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας," [l] λέγει [l] Κύριος [l] παντοκράτωρ.

c Here only; *cf.* Lk. xxiii. 51.
d 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Thess. ii. 4; *cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 19; Eph. ii. 21.
e Reff. iii. 3.
f Rom. viii. 11; Col. iii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 5, 14 only.
g Lev. xxvi. 12.
h Isa. lii. 11.
i Ezek. xx. 34; *cf.* Zeph. iii. 20.
k 2 Sam. vii. 14; *cf.* Isa. xliii. 6.
l 2 Sam. vii. 8; *cf.* Rev. iv. 8, etc.

[1] ℵ^cCD^cEGK, f, g and the Syriac vss. (probably from 1 Cor. iii. 16) support **υμεις . . . εστε**; better **ημεις . . . εσμεν** with ℵ*BD*LP, d, e and the Bohairic.

[2] ℵ* has **ναοι**.

[3] For **καθως ειπεν** D*EG, d, e, g have (wrongly) **λεγει γαρ** (see note).

[4] GP, g have **αυτοις** for **αυτων**.

[5] DEGKL, vg. read **μοι**; better **μου** with ℵBCP 17.

[6] DEKLP give **εξελθετε**; better **εξελθατε** with ℵBCG 17.

you were yoked with unbelievers". The most obvious application of such a prohibition would be to intermarriage with the heathen, which was continually forbidden to the chosen people (see Deut. vii. 3, Josh. xxiii. 12, Ezra ix. 2, Neh. xiii. 25), and this is probably the main thought here (see ref. Lev. for **ἑτερόζυγος**); but to indulge in *any* excessive familiarity of intercourse would be "to be enlarged in heart" in a way which the Apostle strongly deprecates (*cf.* 1 Macc. i. 15). He enforces this by five contrasts which illustrate the incongruity between Christianity and heathendom.—**τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ κ.τ.λ.**: *for what fellowship have righteousness and lawlessness? or what communion has light with darkness? Cf.* Eph. v. 7, **μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν· ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ**, and *cf.*, for the same image, Acts xxvi. 18, Rom. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5 and chap. iv. 6, xi. 14.

Ver. 15. **τίς δὲ συμφώνησις κ.τ.λ.**: *and what concord has Christ with Belial? or what portion has a believer, sc.*, a Christian (see Acts xvi. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2, etc.), *with an unbeliever, sc.*, a heathen (see on iv. 4 above)? בְּלִיַּעַל = *worthlessness* is frequently rendered **παράνομος** (Deut. xiii. 13, 1 Kings xx. 13) or **ἀνομία** (Ps. xvii. 5) by the LXX; they never treat it as a proper name, although Theodotion does so at Judges xix. 22, and it is so regarded in later literature (*e.g.*, *Test. XII. Patriarch.* and *Orac. Sibyll.*, iii., 63, 73). Here it is the personification of **ἀνομία**, just as Christ is the personification of **δικαιοσύνη**; the contrast is that between Christ and Satan (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 21). See Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. lv. ff., for the identification of Beliar with Satan. The Hebrew form, *Belial*, with a substitution of *r* for *l*, is written **βελίαρ** in the best Greek MSS. (see crit. note).

Ver. 16. **τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις κ.τ.λ.**: *and what agreement has the Temple of God with idols?* It is quite unnecessary to mark the absence of the article by translating "*a* temple of God": **ναὸς Θεοῦ** has become anarthrous, as a quasi-technical phrase, and in the Apostle's thought there is only one such Temple, which is built up by the whole body of believers (see reff.).—**ἡμεῖς γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we are the Temple of a God who is alive* (see reff.); note that **ζῶντος** as the emphatic word is placed last.—**καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *as God said, "I will dwell in them* (these words are only a paraphrase of Lev. xxvi. 11; the quotation begins with ver. 12) *and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be My people"* (*cf.* Exod. vi. 7, Jer. xxxi. 33, Ezek. xi. 20, Zech. viii. 8, xiii. 9, etc., where the promise is reiterated). Several passages of the O.T., *viz.*, Lev. xxvi. 12, Isa. lii. 11, Ezek. xx. 34 and 2 Sam. vii. 14 are here combined; and it is worth noticing that the first, second and fourth of these are marked as distinct quotations by the introductory formulæ which precede them in the O.T. in each case, *viz.*, **καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Θεός** from Lev. xxvi. 12, **λέγει Κύριος** from Isa. lii. 5 (or Ezek. xx. 33), and **λέγει Κύριος παντοκράτωρ** from 2 Sam. vii. 8.

VII. 1. Ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, [a] ἀγαπητοί, [b] καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς [c] μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, [d] ἐπιτελοῦντες [e] ἁγιωσύνην ἐν [f] φόβῳ [f] Θεοῦ.

2. [g] Χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς· οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα [h] ἐφθείραμεν,

a Rom. xii. 19; 1 Cor. x. 14, xv. 58; chap. xii. 19; Phil. ii. 12, iv. 1. b Eph. v. 26; Tit. ii. 14 only in Paul. c Here only; Jer. xxiii. 15; 1 Esdras viii. 33; 2 Macc. v. 27 only; *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 7. d Rom. xv. 28; chap. viii. 6, 11; Gal. iii. 3; Phil. i. 6. e Rom. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13 only. f Rom. iii. 18 only (Ps. xxxv. 2); Isa. xi. 3; *cf.* chap. v. 11. g Gen. xiii. 6; John ii. 6. h 1 Cor. iii. 17, xv. 33; chap. xi. 3; Eph. iv. 22.

Ver. 17. **διὸ ἐξέλθετε κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, "Come out from among them and be separate," saith the Lord, "and touch not an unclean thing and I will receive you."* So, too, the Heavenly Voice of the Apocalypse cried "Come out of her" to those who were in danger of contamination with the sins of pagan Rome (Rev. xviii. 4). But the command must not be misapplied. St. Peter was wrong in "separating" himself from his Gentile brethren (Gal. ii. 12), as he was wrong in calling that "unclean" which God had cleansed (Acts x. 14). And St. Paul *never* counsels any at Corinth to "separate" himself from the body of his fellow Christians on account of their sinful lives. (1 Cor. v. 13 is a direction to the Church to excommunicate a sinful member, a quite different thing.) To the Apostle separation from *heathendom* was imperative, but separation from the *Christian Church* was a schism and a sin.

Ver. 18. **καὶ ἔσομαι κ.τ.λ.**: *and "I will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to Me sons and daughters," saith the Lord Almighty.* The ideal relation of Israel to Jehovah was that of a son to a father (Exod. iv. 22, Jer. xxxi. 9, Hos. i. 10); but the full meaning of such words was reserved for Him to teach who came to reveal the Father (Matt. xi. 27), as their full blessedness can be realised only by the heir of the Father's kingdom who "overcomes" at last (Rev. xxi. 7).

CHAPTER VII.—Ver. 1. **ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *having therefore these* (note the emphasis given to **ταύτας** by its position) *promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all contamination of flesh and spirit* (*cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 11, 1 John iii. 3). We find the construction **καθαρίζειν ἀπό** again in Ecclus. xxxviii. 10 and Heb. ix. 14 (see also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 44). We have already pointed out (on vi. 14) that **μολυσμός** is always used of the defilement which springs out of evil (and especially heathen) associations; this may affect the **πνεῦμα** (see on ii. 13) as well as the **σάρξ**.—**ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην κ.τ.λ.**: *perfecting holiness in the fear of God, sc.*, the fear that man ought to feel towards God (see v. 11), which is, indeed, one of the gifts of the Divine Spirit (Isa. xi. 3), and which was repeatedly commended to the chosen people (Deut. vi. 2, Ps. cxi. 1). The practical issue of belief in the promises of the Old Covenant (which have a yet larger meaning under the New) is *positive* as well as *negative*, sanctification as well as separation. St. Paul's word for man's sanctification is **ἁγιασμός**, the *result* of which process is here expressed by **ἁγιωσύνη** (see reff.); this is especially an attribute of God in the O.T. (Pss. xcv. 6, xcvi. 12, cxliv. 5, 2 Macc. iii. 12).

Vv. 2-4. HE CLAIMS THEIR SYMPATHY AGAIN. He now resumes the appeal which is interrupted at vi. 13 by the parenthetical warning vi. 14-vii. 1.—Ver. 2. **χωρήσατε ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *make room for us, sc.*, in your hearts, *i.e.*, let there be no **στενοχωρία** (vi. 12); *we wronged no man, we corrupted no man, we took advantage of no man.* Apparently accusations of this sort had been laid to his charge (see esp. chap. xii. 16, 17), and he is, as ever (chap. ii. 17, Acts xx. 33), careful to assert their baselessness. It is an excessive refinement of exegesis which finds here distinct charges hinted at in the three words **ἠδικήσαμεν, ἐφθείραμεν, ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν.** They are used quite generally, the only one that offers any ambiguity being the second, **φθείρειν** often (see reff.), though not always, carrying a reference to bodily defilement through lust; here (as at 1 Cor. iii. 17) it seems to connote injury of any sort.

Ver. 3. **πρὸς κατάκρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I do not say this by way of condemnation* (*i.e.*, do not think that I accuse *you* of mistrusting me); *for I have said before* (*viz.*, in iii. 2, vi. 11) *that ye are in our hearts* (*cf.* Phil. i. 7) *to die together and to live together* (*cf.* i. 6), *i.e.*, your image is in my heart in life and in death. Where there is such a wealth of sympathy as this, there can be no thought of "condemnation". Wetstein gives a good verbal parallel from Athenæus (vi., 249), **τούτους**

οὐδένα [i] ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν. 3. οὐ[1] πρὸς [k] κατάκρισιν λέγω· [l] προείρηκα γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἐστε[2] εἰς τὸ [m] συναποθανεῖν καὶ [n] συζῆν. 4. πολλή μοι [o] παῤῥησία πρὸς[3] ὑμᾶς, πολλή μοι [p] καύχησις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· πεπλήρωμαι τῇ παρακλήσει, [q] ὑπερπερισσεύομαι τῇ[4] χαρᾷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ[5] τῇ [r] θλίψει ἡμῶν. 5. καὶ γὰρ ἐλθούντων ἡμῶν εἰς Μακεδονίαν, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν[6] [s] ἄνεσιν ἡ σάρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' [t] ἐν [t] παντὶ [t] θλιβόμενοι[7]· ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι. 6. ἀλλ' ὁ [u] παρακαλῶν τοὺς [u v] ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ [w] παρουσίᾳ Τίτου· 7. [x] οὐ [x] μόνον [x] δὲ[8] ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, [x] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει ᾗ παρεκλήθη ἐφ' ὑμῖν, ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν[9] τὴν ὑμῶν [y] ἐπιπόθησιν, τὸν ὑμῶν [z] ὀδυρμόν, τὸν ὑμῶν [a] ζῆλον

i Reff. ii. 11.
k Chap. iii. 8 only.
l Chap. xiii. 2.
m Mk. xiv. 31; 2 Tim. ii. 11 only.
n Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 11 only.
o Reff. iii. 12.
p Reff. i. 12.
q Rom. v. 20 only.
r Reff. i. 4.
s Reff. ii. 13.
t Reff. iv. 8.
u Isa. xlix. 13; see reff. i. 4.
v Matt. xi. 29; Lk. i. 52; Rom. xii. 16; chap. x. 1; Jas. i. 9, iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5 only.
w 1 Cor. xvi. 17; chap. x. 10; Phil. i. 26, ii. 12.
x Rom. v. 3, 11, viii. 23, ix. 10; chap. viii. 19, etc.
y Ver. 11 only; *cf.* reff. v. 2.
z Matt. ii. 18 (Jer. xxxi. 15); 2 Macc. xi. 6 only.
a Rom. x. 2; chaps. vii. 11, ix. 2, xi. 2; Phil. iii. 6; Col. iv. 13.

[1] **ου προς κατακρ.** is the order of DEGKL, etc.; better **προς κατακρ. ου** with ℵBCP.

[2] B om. **εστε**.

[3] D*E, d, e and the Peshitto have **προς υμας εστιν**.

[4] B has **εν τη χαρᾳ**.

[5] After **παση τη** D*E* have **πολλη**.

[6] ℵCDELP have **εσχηκεν**; BGK have **εσχεν**; CG and the Syriac vss. put **εσχ.** after **ανεσιν**.

[7] D*, d, e give **θλιβομενος**.

[8] G, g and the Peshitto omit **δε** after **μονον**.

[9] ℵ*D* have **αναγγ. υμιν**.

δ' οἱ βασιλεῖς ἔχουσι συζῶντας καὶ συναποθνησκόντας.

Ver. 4. **πολλή μοι παρρησία κ.τ.λ.**: *great is my boldness of speech towards you* (*cf.* vi. 11), *great is my glorying on your behalf*, *sc.*, on account of the good news of their conduct (*cf.* i. 14, iii. 2), *I am filled with comfort* (for the constr. *cf.* Luke ii. 40, Rom. i. 29, 2 Macc. vii. 21), *sc.*, with *the* comfort (note the article) which Titus had brought, *I overflow with joy* (*cf.* Phil. ii. 17, Col. i. 24) *in all our affliction* (see vi. 10).

Vv. 5-12. He was comforted to learn from Titus that his Rebuke had been profitable. *Cf.* throughout 1 Thess. iii. 1-8, a passage strikingly like this in its human sympathy and kindliness.—Ver. 5. **καὶ γὰρ ἐλθόντων κ.τ.λ.**: *for even when we were come into Macedonia* (he has explained in ii. 12 his anxiety when he was at Troas, but it remained with him even when he had crossed into Europe) *our flesh had no relief* (see note on the similar phrase, ii. 13), *but* [*we were*] *afflicted on every side*. Note the anacoluthon, the participle **θλιβόμενοι** being used as if it were a finite verb (*cf.* v. 12 for a like constr.).—**ἔξωθεν μάχαι κ.τ.λ.**: *without were fightings*, *sc.*, with adversaries (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32), *within were fears*, *sc.*, the anxieties which the Apostle would feel for his converts, especially those at Corinth (*cf.* chap. xi. 28). It will be noticed that the familiar cadence "fightings within and fears without" is a misquotation.

Ver. 6. **ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν κ.τ.λ.**: *but He that comforteth the lowly* (see ref. Isa.), *even God* (to whom he is especially careful in this Epistle to trace up all grace and consolation), *comforted us by the coming of Titus*. **παρουσία** is often used for the Advent of Christ, but also (see reff.) for the advent of St. Paul or his companions. This is the first explicit mention of St. Paul's meeting with Titus in Macedonia (but *cf.* ii. 13) which was the occasion of the letter being written.

Ver. 7. **οὐ μόνον δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and not by his coming only*, *but also* (see reff. for constr.) *by the comfort wherewith he was comforted in respect of you* (*cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 7 for constr.), *i.e.*, "I was comforted, not only by his coming, but by the good news which he brought"; *while he told us your longing*, *sc.*, to see me, *your mourning*, *sc.*, at the rebuke which I sent you, *your zeal on my behalf*. **ζῆλος** may either mean "zeal," in a good

ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ὥστε με [1] μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. 8. Ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ,[2] οὐ [2] [b] μεταμέλομαι, εἰ [3] καὶ μετεμελόμην· βλέπω γὰρ [4] ὅτι ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη, εἰ καὶ [c] πρὸς [c] ὥραν, ἐλύπησεν [5] ὑμᾶς. 9. Νῦν χαίρω, οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς [d] μετάνοιαν· ἐλυπήθητε γὰρ [e] κατὰ [e] Θεόν, ἵνα [f] ἐν μηδενὶ [g] ζημιωθῆτε ἐξ ἡμῶν. 10. ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν [h] ἀμεταμέλητον κατεργάζεται [6]· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον [i] κατεργάζεται. 11. ἰδοὺ γὰρ [k] αὐτὸ [k] τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς,[7] πόσην κατειργάσατο [8] ὑμῖν [9] [l] σπουδήν, ἀλλὰ [m] ἀπολογίαν, ἀλλὰ [n] ἀγανάκτησιν, ἀλλὰ φόβον, ἀλλὰ [o] ἐπιπόθησιν, ἀλλὰ [o] ζῆλον, ἀλλ' [p] ἐκδίκησιν. [q] ἐν [q] παντὶ [r] συνεστήσατε [r] ἑαυτοὺς [s] ἁγνοὺς εἶναι [t] ἐν [10] τῷ [t] πράγματι.

b Matt. xxi. 30, 32, xxvii. 3; Heb. vii. 21 (Ps. cix. 4) only.
c John v. 35; Gal. ii. 5; Philm. 15 only; *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 17.
d Acts xx. 21, xxvi. 20; Rom. ii. 4; ver. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 25; *cf.* chap. xii. 21; Acts xvii. 30.
e Rom. viii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; *cf.* chap. xi. 17. f Reff. vi. 3. g 1 Cor. iii. 15; Phil. iii. 8. h Rom. xi. 29 only. i Reff. iv. 17. k Reff. ii. 3. l Rom. xii. 8, 11; ver. 12; chap. viii. 7, 8, 16. m 1 Cor. ix. 3; Phil. i. 7, 16; 2 Tim. iv. 16. n Here only; *cf.* Mk. x. 14. o Reff. ver. 7. p Rom. xii. 19 (Deut. xxxii. 35); 2 Thess. i. 8 (Isa. lxvi. 15). q Reff. iv. 8. r Reff. iv. 2. s Chap. xi. 2; Phil. iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. ii. 5; *cf.* vi. 6. t 1 Thess. iv. 6.

[1] DE have μαλλον με; G μαλλον χαρηναι με; K om. με.

[2] After επιστ. D*EG, d, e, f, g add μου and the Harclean adds μου πρωτη.

[3] B has ει δε και.

[4] BD*, d, e, vg. om. γαρ; Lachmann and Hort think that vg. (*videns*) has alone preserved the true reading, *viz.*, βλεπων (see note below).

[5] G, f, g, vg. have υμ. ελυπησεν.

[6] ℵcGKL give κατεργαζεται; better (here) εργαζεται with ℵ*BCDEP.

[7] ℵcDEKLP, d, e, vg. read υμας; better om. with ℵ*BCG 17, g.

[8] ℵB³CGKLP have κατειργασατο; B*DE have κατηργασατο.

[9] ℵcCGP, f, g, vg. and the Syriac give εν υμιν; om. εν ℵ*BDEKL.

[10] DbcEKLP, d, e give εν τῳ πραγμ.; better om. εν with ℵBCD*G, f, g, harsh though the resulting constr. is.

sense, as here (see reff.), or "jealousy," in a bad sense (see reff. xii. 20).—**ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι**: *so that I rejoiced yet more*, *sc.*, than at the mere coming of Titus with his news (*cf.* ver. 13).

Ver. 8. **ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα κ.τ.λ.**: *for though I made you sorry with my epistle* (*sc.*, esp. 1 Cor. v.; *cf. Introd.*, p. 14), *I do not regret it; though I did regret it* (*for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season*), *yet now I rejoice*, etc. We follow the punctuation adopted by Tisch., W.H. and the American Revisers, the second clause softening the apparent harshness of the first, and **βλέπω γάρ . . . ὥραν** being a parenthetic explanation.

Ver. 9. **νῦν χαίρω κ.τ.λ.**: *now*, *sc.*, now that Titus is come, and I have learnt the effect of my letter, *I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye were made sorry unto repentance* (of which there was no sign when he wrote; see 1 Cor. v. 2), *for ye were made sorry according to the will of God*, *sc.*, in God's way as contrasted with man's way (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32 and see reff.), *so that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing*, *i.e.*, the sorrow caused by my rebuke was divinely ordered for your good, so that my severity did not hurt but rather benefited you. The *word* **μετάνοια** occurs curiously seldom in St. Paul (see reff.), perhaps because it indicates the very first step in the religious life, that "change of mind" as to God which precedes even the renunciation of sin (see esp. for this use reff., Acts and Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, Acts ii. 38, etc.), and this first step his correspondents had already taken, or his letters to them would not have been written.

Ver. 10. **ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη κ.τ.λ.**: *for such godly sorrow*, *i.e.*, sorrow for sin as an offence against God (Ps. l. 6) and not only for the temporal consequences of sin (*cf.* Bengel, "animi Deum

12. ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, οὐχ εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος,[1] οὐδὲ[2] εἵνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος[1]· ἀλλʼ εἵνεκεν τοῦ [u] φανερωθῆναι τὴν [1] σπουδὴν[3] ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[4] πρὸς ὑμᾶς [v] ἐνώπιον τοῦ [v] Θεοῦ. 13. Διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλήμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει ὑμῶν[5]· περισσοτέρως δὲ[6] μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν ἐπὶ τῇ χαρᾷ Τίτου, ὅτι [w] ἀναπέπαυται τὸ [x] πνεῦμα

u Reff. ii. 14.
v Reff. iv. 2.
w 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Philm. 7, 20.
x See on ii. 13.

[1] D*E have αδικηθεντος . . . αδικησαντος.

[2] ℵ^cB, 37, 73 have αλλʼ ουδε.

[3] G (not F), d*, g give σπουδην ημων.

[4] ℵD*F have υπερ υμων.

[5] FKL, the Bohairic and Harclean support παρακλ. υμων; better ημων with ℵBCDEGP, vg. and Peshitto.

[6] All the uncials place δε, not before μαλλον, but between επι and τη παρακλησει.

spectantis et sequentis"), *worketh repentance* which leads *to salvation*, a repentance *which bringeth no regret*. ἀμεταμέλητον may be taken with σωτηρία (see R.V. margin), but there would be no point in applying such an adj. to σωτηρία, whereas it is quite apposite as applied to μετάνοια (as by Chrys., R.V., etc.).—ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου κ.τ.λ.: *but the sorrow of the world*, *sc.*, such sorrow as the world feels—for failure, not for sin—*worketh out death*, *sc.*, as opposed to σωτηρία (*cf.* chap. ii. 16).

Ver. 11. ἰδοὺ γὰρ αὐτὸ κ.τ.λ.: *for behold, this same thing, viz., that you were made sorry after a godly sort, what diligence it wrought in you, yea* (*sc.*, "not only so, but also," ἀλλά introducing an accessory idea) *what a defence*, *sc.*, of yourselves to me through the mediation of Titus, *yea what indignation*, *yea what fear*, *sc.*, of St. Paul's rebukes, *yea what longing*, *sc.*, that he should come to them (see ver. 7), *yea what zeal*, *sc.*, on behalf of God and righteousness, *yea what avenging*, *sc.*, the heavy punishment solemnly inflicted on the offender in God's name (chap. ii. 6). Observe that ἐκδίκησις and ἐκδικέω are *always* (see reff. and Luke xviii. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 14, etc.) used of *God's* avenging of sin, not of man's retaliation.—ἐν παντὶ κ.τ.λ.: *in everything ye approved yourselves to be pure in the matter*, *i.e.*, not that they were quite free from gross sins of the flesh (see xii. 21), but that by their ready compliance with the Apostle's directions they had cleared themselves from the guilt of connivance at incest (see ii. 6). τῷ πράγματι (the dat. of regard) is a vague phrase used here and at 1 Thess. iv. 6 to denote abominable wickedness.

Ver. 12. ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα κ.τ.λ.: *consequently*, *although I wrote to you*, *i.e.*, wrote a severe letter, *it was not for his cause that did the wrong*, *sc.*, the incestuous son of 1 Cor. v. 1, *nor for his cause that suffered the wrong*, *sc.*, his father, *but that your diligence on our behalf might be made manifest to yourselves* ("chez vous," so πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 1 Thess. iii. 4) *in the sight of God*. He does not mean that this was the *only* reason for writing (*cf.* ii. 9), and that the more obvious reason was not in his mind; but he states strongly (expressing himself by an idiom common in the O.T., *e.g.*, Jer. vii. 22) a principal cause of his writing, *viz.*, that the Corinthian Church might be recalled to a true sense of what was due to its founder, as if it were the only cause. See on ii. 9, and, for a discussion of the whole question, see *Introd.*, p. 10 ff.

Ver. 13. διὰ τοῦτο παρακεκλ.: *wherefore we have been comforted*. With Tisch., W.H. and modern editors generally we place a full stop here. What follows introduces a new idea.

Vv. 13-16. The Joy of Titus in the Tidings he brought. Chrysostom notes the tact which leads St. Paul to communicate this so emphatically; Titus was going back to Corinth on the business of the collection (viii. 6, 16, 23), and it was very desirable that he should be well received there.—ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ παρακλήσει ἡμῶν περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.: *and in addition to this comfort of ours we rejoiced the more exceedingly* (*cf.* ver. 7, and for the double comparative *cf.* Mark vii. 36, Phil. i. 23) *at* (for the constr. χαίρειν ἐπὶ *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17, etc.) *the joy of Titus, because his spirit hath been refreshed by you all* (*cf.* the somewhat similar use of ἀπό in chap. ii. 3, Matt. xi. 19, Acts ii. 22). Both here and at ver. 15 πάντων is emphasised by its position before ὑμῶν; Titus was well received by *all* at Corinth, and it seems to be implied at xii. 18 that he left a favourable impression upon them all.

αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πάντων ὑμῶν· 14. ὅτι εἴ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ[1] ὑμῶν κεκαύχημαι, οὐ [y] κατῃσχύνθην· ἀλλ' ὡς πάντα[2] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλαλήσαμεν ὑμῖν,[3] οὕτω καὶ ἡ [z] καύχησις ἡμῶν[4] ἡ[5] ἐπὶ[6] Τίτου ἀλήθεια ἐγενήθη· 15. καὶ τὰ [a] σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐστιν, [b] ἀναμιμνῃσκομένου τὴν πάντων[7] ὑμῶν ὑπακοήν, ὡς μετὰ [c] φόβου καὶ [c] τρόμου ἐδέξασθε αὐτόν. 16. χαίρω ὅτι [d] ἐν [d] παντὶ [e] θαῤῥῶ ἐν ὑμῖν.

y 1 Cor. i. 27, xi. 4, 5, 22; chap. ix. 4.
z Reff. i. 12.
a Reff. vi. 12.
b 1 Cor. iv. 17; 2 Tim. i. 6.
c 1 Cor. ii. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 12; Isa. xix. 16.
d See on iv. 8.
e Reff. v. 6.

[1] G, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic give the order κεκ. υπ. ημων.

[2] CG, g, the Harclean and Bohairic have παντοτε for παντα.

[3] CDEP, d, e, f place υμιν before εν αληθ.

[4] BF have υμων for ημων.

[5] ℵ*B om. η before επι (so Tisch. and W.H.).

[6] DEGP have προς Τιτον.

[7] ℵ* om. παντων.

Ver. 14. ὅτι εἴ τι κ.τ.λ.: *for if in anything I have gloried to him on your behalf*, *i.e.*, have boasted of you (*cf.* ix. 2, xii. 5), *I was not put to shame*, *sc.*, by the vanity of my boasting being exposed; *but as we spake all things to you in truth* (this he is continually insisting on, *e.g.*, at i. 18, ii. 17, iv. 2, etc.), *so our glorying also*, *viz.*, *that made before Titus* (*cf.* Mark xiii. 9 for ἐπί with the gen.), *was found* (not "is found" as A.V., but "*was* found" as at 1 Cor. i. 30) *to be truth.*

Ver. 15. καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα κ.τ.λ.: *and his heart is more abundantly towards you, while he recalls to himself the obedience of you all, how with fear* (see reff. and *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 8, 1 Pet. iii. 15, for μετὰ φόβου) *and trembling you received him.* He had brought a stern message, which involved the excommunication of the unworthy member (1 Cor. v. 5); it was no wonder that they trembled at his coming.

Ver. 16. χαίρω ὅτι κ.τ.λ.: *I rejoice that in everything I am of good courage* (not as A.V. "I have confidence," which would be πέποιθα) *concerning you.*

II. The Collection for the Judæan Christians (viii. 1-ix. 15). We have now come to the second main topic of the Epistle, *viz.*, the collection to be made at Corinth, as in all the Christian communities which the Apostle had founded, on behalf of the poor Christians at Judæa (chaps. viii. and ix.). We first hear of this great undertaking at 1 Cor. xvi. 1, but it is plain from that passage as well as from 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2, that it had been organised some time before 1 *Cor.* was written. (See *Introd.*, p. 6.) The poverty of the Christians at Jerusalem, however caused, was evidently acute; and when St. Paul first parted from the Twelve on his mission to the Gentiles, one of the stipulations made with him was that he should "remember the poor" (Gal. ii. 10). This stipulation he faithfully observed, and it was to convey the money thus entrusted to him to its proper recipients that he paid his last visit to Jerusalem (Acts xxiv. 17). See further the excellent discussion in Stanley's note on 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

Chap. viii. vv. 1-7. THE LIBERALITY OF THE MACEDONIAN CHURCHES—AN EXAMPLE TO CORINTH.—Ver. 1. Γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.: *moreover* (for this is the force of the δὲ μεταβατικόν, marking the transition to a new subject; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 1, viii. 1, xv. 1, chap. x. 1, etc.), *brethren, we make known to you the grace of God*, *sc.*, the special grace of liberality in giving, *which has been given in*, *i.e.*, given to and exhibited in (see on i. 22), *the Churches of Macedonia*, *e.g.*, Philippi, Thessalonica and Berœa (Acts xvi. and xvii.), which places we may presume he revisited on this journey.

Ver. 2. ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ κ.τ.λ.: *how that in much proof of affliction*, *i.e.*, in spite of the severe afflictions by which they were tried, probably a reference to persecution and annoyance from their heathen neighbours (see Acts xvi. 20, Phil. i. 28, 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14, iii. 3-9), *the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty* (κατὰ βάθους = "reaching deep down"; *cf.* the phrase in Strabo, ix., 419, ἄντρον κοῖλον κατὰ βάθους) *abounded unto the riches of their liberality.* ἁπλοῦς means primarily "simple," "single-minded" (Matt. vi. 22), and ἁπλότης is thus used by St. Paul in chap. xi. 3, Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22; but single-mindedness or "heartiness" of giving (see 1 Chron. xxix. 17) involves "liber-

VIII. 1. ΓΝΩΡΙΖΟΜΕΝ δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας· 2. ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ [a] δοκιμῇ [b] θλίψεως ἡ [c] περισσεία τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ κατὰ βάθους [d] πτωχεία αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸν [1] πλοῦτον τῆς [e] ἁπλότητος αὐτῶν· 3. ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν, [f] μαρτυρῶ, καὶ ὑπὲρ [2] δύναμιν [g] αὐθαίρετοι, 4. μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν, τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν [h] κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς [i] ἁγίους δέξασθαι [3] ἡμᾶς· 5. καὶ οὐ καθὼς ἠλπίσαμεν,[4] ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν πρῶτον τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ἡμῖν [k] διὰ [k] θελήματος [k] Θεοῦ· 6. εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον, ἵνα, καθὼς [l] προενήρξατο,[5] οὕτω καὶ [m] ἐπιτελέσῃ εἰς ὑμᾶς καὶ

a Reff. ii. 9. b Reff. i. 4. c Rom. v. 17; chap. x. 15; Jas. i. 21 only. d Ver 9; Rev. ii. 9 only. e Rom. xii. 8; chaps. ix. 11, 13, xi. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22 only. f Rom. x. 2; Gal. iv. 15; Col. iv. 13. g Ver. 17 only. h Reff. vi. 14. i Reff. i. 1. k Reff. i. 1. l Ver. 10 only. m Reff. vii. 1.

[1] ℵᶜDEGKL support τον πλουτον; better το πλουτος with ℵ*BCP 17 (*cf.* the same variant Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16, Phil. iv. 19, Col. ii. 2; in later Greek there is a tendency towards the neuter form; see crit. note on ix. 2).

[2] KLP give υπερ δυν.; better παρα with ℵBCDEG.

[3] δεξασθαι ημας is not found in the uncials and primary vss.; it is a mere explanatory gloss.

[4] B 73 have ηλπικαμεν.

[5] B has ενηρξατο (*cf.* ver. 10).

ality" in giving (*cf.* ix. 7), and thus in many passages (see reff. and *cf.* Jas. i. 5) *liberality* is the best rendering. The whole of Greece, except the Roman colonies of Patrae and Corinth, was in a dire condition of poverty and distress at this period (see Arnold's *Roman Commonwealth*, ii., 382, quoted by Stanley); and the contribution of the Macedonian Christians was really comparable to the giving of the widow's mite (Mark xii. 44). It is noteworthy that no warnings against the temptations of wealth occur in 1 and 2 Thess. or Phil. See, however, Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 247.

Ver. 3. **ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν κ.τ.λ.**: *for according to their power, I bear witness, yea and beyond their power.* Field quotes a good parallel from Josephus, *Antt.*, iii., 6. 1, who has **κατὰ δύναμιν . . . παρὰ δύναμιν** as here.

Vv. 3, 4. **αὐθαίρετοι μετὰ πολλ. παρακ. κ.τ.λ.**: *of their own accord begging of us with much entreaty* (the constr. is clumsy but perhaps unbroken; we should expect **ἔδωκαν** after **αὐθαίρετοι**, but the verb is found in ver. 5) *the favour, sc.*, of giving (*cf.*, for this sense of **χάρις**, Acts xxiv. 27, xxv. 3, Ecclus. xxx. 6), *and the participation in the ministering to the saints, sc.*, the poor Christians in Judæa. The Macedonian Christians did not wait to be asked to give; they asked to be allowed the privilege of giving (*cf.* Acts xx. 35). **διακονία** is the regular word for such charitable service (*cf.* Acts vi. 1, xi. 29, Rom. xv. 25, 31, chap. ix. 1, 12, etc.), a primary duty of the **διάκονοι** being the administration of alms.

Ver. 5. **καὶ οὐ καθὼς κ.τ.λ.**: *and not* (merely) *as we hoped, i.e.*, beyond what we expected or hoped, *but first* (not only in order of time, but in order of importance; as we say "first of all") *they gave themselves to the Lord.* This is not merely the consecration of self (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1), which is the condition of all acceptable almsgiving, for this would not have been beyond the Apostle's expectations, but the devotion of personal service in the work of spreading the Gospel, such as was given by Sopater of Berœa, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica (Acts xx. 4), and Epaphroditus of Philippi (Phil. ii. 25). Other Macedonian Christians who are named as helpers of St. Paul are Jason (Acts xvii. 5 f.) and Gaius Acts xix. 29); possibly Demas also (Philm. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 10) was of Thessalonica, and it has been argued that St. Luke was of Philippi (see Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 202).—**καὶ ἡμῖν διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ**: *and to us* (some of them were St. Paul's companions in travel) *by the will of God.* Everywhere in St. Paul's writings the impulse to faithful service is traced up to God's grace.

Vv. 6, 7. **εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι κ.τ.λ.**: *so that we exhorted Titus* (the epistolary aor. infin.; this is the exhortation to Titus

την χάριν ταύτην. 7. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ [n]ἐν [n]παντὶ περισσεύετε,[1] πίστει[2] καὶ λόγῳ καὶ γνώσει καὶ [o]πάσῃ [p]σπουδῇ, καὶ τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν[3] ἐν ἡμῖν ἀγάπῃ, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε.[4] 8. οὐ [q]κατ' [q]ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς[5] ἑτέρων [p]σπουδῆς καὶ τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης [r]γνήσιον [s]δοκιμάζων[6]· 9. γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[7] ὅτι δι' ὑμᾶς[8] [t]ἐπτώχευσε [u]πλούσιος

n See on iv. 8.
o Rom. i. 29; 1 Cor. i. 5; chap. xii. 12; Eph. i. 3.
p Reff. vii. 11.
q Rom. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. vii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3.
r Phil. iv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4 only.
s 1 Cor. xi. 28; ver. 22; chap. xiii. 5; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess v. 21.
t Here only; Ps. xxxiii. 11; *cf.* chap. vi. 10, etc.
u Eph. ii. 4; 1 Tim. vi. 17.

[1] CP have περισσευητε.
[2] ℵ has εν πιστει.
[3] εξ υμων εν ημιν, ℵCDEGKLP, the Latin and Harclean vss., which gives the sense more agreeable to the context; B, the Peshitto and Bohairic give εξ ημων εν υμιν, which is preferred by W.H. and R.V. marg. (*cf.* the variants in vii. 12).
[4] D*E*G have περισσευσητε.
[5] DE have την ετ. σπουδην.
[6] D*G have δοκιμαζω.
[7] B om. Χριστου.
[8] CK have δι' ημας.

on his meeting with St. Paul in Macedonia after accomplishing his first Mission to Corinth; παρακαλ. is the word used throughout of the Apostle's directions to Titus; see viii. 17, ix. 5, xii. 17, and on chap. i. 4), *that as he made a beginning before*, *sc.*, in the matter of the collection, during the Mission from which he has now returned, *so he would also complete in you this grace also*, *i.e.*, the grace of liberal giving in addition to the graces of repentance and goodwill which rejoiced him so much to observe (vii. 13, 14). ἐπιτελεῖν is to bring to a successful issue a work already begun; see v. 11 below.—ἀλλ' ὥσπερ κ.τ.λ.: *yea rather* (ὥσπερ having an ascensive force as at i. 9, v. 7 being strictly parallel to and explanatory of v. 6) *that as ye abound* (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 58) *in everything* (so he had said of the Corinthians in 1 Cor. i. 5, ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε), *in faith* (see chap. i. 24 and 1 Cor. xii. 8, where πίστις is named as one of the gifts of the Spirit exhibited among them), *and utterance*, *i.e.*, the grace of ready exposition of the Gospel message, *and knowledge*, *i.e.*, of Divine things (λόγος and γνῶσις are conjoined, as here, at 1 Cor. i. 5, and γνῶσις is also mentioned with πίστις at 1 Cor. xii. 8; at 1 Cor. viii. 1 he points out with marked emphasis that γνῶσις is not comparable in importance to ἀγάπη as shown in condescension to a brother's intellectual weakness), *and all earnestness* (see reff. and *cf.* vii. 11, where he mentions the σπουδή that the Corinthians had exhibited when they received his message of reproof), *and in your love to us* (*cf.* i. 11 and viii. 24; the variant reading ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν would disturb the sense all through he is speaking of the graces of the Corinthians, not of his own), *so ye may abound in this grace also* (*cf.* ix. 8). The English versions and comm. take ἵνα with the subj. here as a periphrasis for the imperative, and understand some verb like βλέπετε, "*See* that ye abound, etc.," but this usage of ἵνα is unexampled. We follow Kennedy in taking v. 7 in close connexion with v. 6, although we do not agree with the inferences which he draws (2 *and* 3 *Cor.*, p. 122). V. 7 seems "to have been added by St. Paul," he rightly observes "to avoid any appearance of depreciating the work which Titus had already accomplished among the Corinthian Christians, by the description of it in v. 6 as a beginning". *Cf.* the shrewd remark of Grotius, "non ignoravit Paulus artem rhetorum, movere laudando".

Vv. 8-15. He counsels (though he will not command) that they follow the example of the Macedonian Churches, according to their ability. — Ver. 8. οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω κ.τ.λ.: *I speak not by way of commandment*, *i.e.*, I do not give you an authoritative and formal command (as I might do), *but as proving through the earnestness of others*, *sc.*, the example of the Macedonian Churches (ver. 3), *the genuineness also of your love* (ver. 7). For the constr. τὸ γνήσιον τῆς ἀγάπης see on iv. 17.

Ver. 9. γινώσκετε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.: *for ye know the grace*, *i.e.*, the act of grace, *of our Lord Jesus Christ*, *that being rich*, *sc.*, in His pre-existent state before the Incarnation, *yet for your sakes* (*cf.* Rom. xv. 3) *He became poor*, *sc.*, in that κένωσις

ὢν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ[1] ἐκείνου [v] πτωχείᾳ [w] πλουτήσητε. 10. καὶ [x] γνώμην ἐν τούτῳ [x] δίδωμι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν [y] συμφέρει, οἵτινες[2] οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι[3] ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν [z] προενήρξασθε[4] [a] ἀπὸ [a] πέρυσι· 11. νυνὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι [b] ἐπιτελέσατε, ὅπως καθάπερ ἡ [c] προθυμία τοῦ[5] θέλειν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐπιτελέσαι ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν. 12. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία [d] πρόκειται, καθὸ ἐὰν[6] ἔχῃ τις, [e] εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει.[7] 13. οὐ γὰρ ἵνα ἄλλοις [f] ἄνεσις, ὑμῖν δὲ[8] [g] θλῖψις· ἀλλ' ἐξ [h] ἰσότητος, ἐν [i] τῷ [i] νῦν [i] καιρῷ τὸ ὑμῶν [k] περίσσευμα εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων

v Reff. ver. 2.
w Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. iv. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 9, 18.
x 1 Cor. vii. 25; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 10; Philm. 14.
y 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23; chap. xii. 1.

z Ver. 6 only. a Chap. ix. 2 only. b Reff. vii. 1. c Ver. 19, chap. ix. 2; Acts xvii. 11 only. d Here only in Paul. e Reff. vi. 2. f Reff. ii. 13. g Reff. i. 4. h Col. iv. 1 only. i Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5 only; Gen. xxx. 20. k Here only in Paul.

[1] DEG have **αυτου**. [2] G, f, g and the Peshitto give **οτι** for **οιτινες**.

[3] The Peshitto (mistaking the sense) interchanges **ποιησαι** and **θελειν**.

[4] D*G have **ενηρξασθαι** (*cf.* ver. 6).

[5] BCD^cEKP read **εαν**; ℵD*GL have **αν**.

[6] C²L and the Bohairic support **τις**, but ℵBC*DEGKP and the Latins omit it.

[7] DEG, g add **τις** after **εχει**.

[8] ℵ^cDEGKLP, f, g, vg. and the Harclean support **υμιν δε**; ℵ*BC 17, d, e om. **δε**.

which the Incarnation involved (Phil. ii. 5, 6), (the aor. marks a def. point of time, "He *became* poor," not "He *was* poor"), *in order that ye by His poverty*, *i.e.*, His assumption of man's nature, *might be rich*, *i.e.*, in the manifold graces of the Incarnation (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5). This verse is parenthetical, introduced to give the highest example of love and self-sacrifice for others; there is nowhere in St. Paul a more definite statement of his belief in the pre-existence of Christ before His Incarnation (*cf.* John xvii. 5). It has been thought that **ἐπτώχευσε** carries an allusion to the poverty of the Lord's earthly life (Matt. viii. 20); but the *primary* reference cannot be to this, for the **πτωχεία** of Jesus Christ *by* which we are "made rich" is not the mere hardship and penury of His outward lot, but the state which He assumed in becoming man.

Ver. 10. **καὶ γνώμην κ.τ.λ.**: *and herein I give my opinion, for this* (*i.e.*, that he should offer them an opinion rather than give a command in this matter, *cf.* ix. 2) *is better*, *i.e.*, is morally profitable, *for you*, *inasmuch as you* (see Rom. i. 25, 32, etc., for **οἵτινες** = *quippe qui*) *were the first to make a beginning last year*, *sc.*, they began to make the collection before the Macedonian Churches did (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 1, chap. ix. 2), *not only to do but also to will*, *sc.*, they were beforehand not only in act, but in intention. **ἀπὸ πέρυσι** is for **ἐκ πέρυσι** or **πρὸ πέρυσι** of classical Greek; Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 49) notes its occurrence in a papyrus of the second cent. B.C., of which the words run: **ὅτι εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ κεραμεῖ ἀπὸ πέρυσι** ⳨ **ιβ κ.τ.λ.**, *i.e.*, "that twelve drachmae are in the pot *from last year*". This parallel is important, as showing that **ἀπὸ πέρυσι** does not necessarily mean "a year ago". It must be borne in mind that St. Paul is writing from Macedonia and probably in the month of November. Now the Macedonian year, like the Jewish, began with October, so that the phrase would be strictly justifiable, according to the chronological scheme adopted in the *Introd.* (p. 13).

Ver. 11. **νυνὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but now complete the doing also, that as there was the readiness to will, so there may be also the completion in accordance with your ability*: **ἐκ τοῦ ἔχειν** = **καθὸ ἂν ἔχῃ** of ver. 12 = *pro facultatibus* (*cf.* John iii. 34, **ἐκ μέτρου**), and not, as A.V., "out of that which ye have".

Ver. 12. **εἰ γὰρ ἡ προθυμία κ.τ.λ.**: *for if the readiness is there it is acceptable according as a man has, not according as he has not*; *cf.* ix. 7, Mark xii. 43, and Tobit iv. 8, "As thy substance is, give alms of it according to thine abundance; if thou have little, be not afraid to give alms according to that little".

Vv. 13, 14. **οὐ γὰρ ἵνα κ.τ.λ.**: *for* the collection is *not* made in order *that there may be relief to others*, *i.e.*, to the Judæan Christians, *and pressure to you, but by*

[l] ὑστέρημα, 14. ἵνα καὶ τὸ ἐκείνων περίσσευμα γένηται εἰς τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα· ὅπως γένηται ἰσότης, 15. καθὼς γέγραπται, [m] "Ὁ τὸ πολὺ, οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε· καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ [n] ἠλαττόνησε".

16. [o] Χάρις δὲ [o] τῷ [o] Θεῷ τῷ διδόντι[1] τὴν αὐτὴν [p] σπουδὴν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ Τίτου· 17. ὅτι τὴν μὲν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο, [q] σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων, [r] αὐθαίρετος ἐξῆλθε πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 18. [s] Συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ μετ'[2] αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀδελφὸν, οὗ ὁ[3] [t] ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ

l 1 Cor. xvi. 17; chaps. ix. 12, xi. 9; Phil. ii. 30. m Exod. xvi. 18. n Here only. o Reff. ii. 14. p Reff. vii. 11. q Ver. 22; *cf.* Phil. ii. 28; 2 Tim. i. 17. r Ver. 3 only. s Ver. 22 only. t Rom. ii. 29, xiii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 5; Phil. iv. 8.

[1] ℵ*BCKP, g read διδοντι; δοντι is read by ℵcDEGL, d, e, f, vg. and the Syriac; C and the Bohairic add ημιν (through misunderstanding the sense).

[2] Tisch. reads τον αδελφον μετ' αυτου with ℵ*P and the Bohairic; but the rec. order is supported by *all* the other principal MSS. and vss.

[3] F* om. ο.

equality, *your abundance at the present season being* a supply *for their want*, *that their abundance also may prove to be* a supply *for your want*, *sc.*, at some future time, *that there may be equality*, *i.e.*, reciprocity. There is no thought here of Jerusalem giving *spiritual* benefits in return for the *material* benefits given by Corinth (*cf.* chap. ix. 14 and Rom. xv. 27); what is meant is that if it ever came to the turn of Corinth to be poor, then it would be for Jerusalem to contribute for *her* support. Such an idea as that of the transference of the merits of the saints is, of course, quite foreign to the context.

Ver. 15. **καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ.**: *as it is written*, *sc.*, in the words of Scripture, "*He that* gathered (we must understand **σύλλεξας** from Exod. xvi. 17) *much had nothing over; and he that* gathered *little had no lack*," *sc.*, because each gathered enough manna for his own needs and no more. That each Christian Church may have enough for its *necessities*, not its *luxuries*, is what St. Paul contemplates as desirable and possible by mutual generosity in giving. The true text (ABF) of the LXX in Exod. xvi. 18 has **τὸ ἔλαττον** for **τὸ ὀλίγον**, which however is found as an early correction in A, and also in Philo.

Vv. 16-24. He commends to them Titus and two unnamed Companions, who, bearing this Letter with them, are sent to gather the Collection at Corinth.—Ver. 16. **χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *but thanks be to God*, *who gives* (note the pres. tense) *to* (lit., "in"; see on i. 22 for constr.) *the heart of Titus the same earnest care for you*, *sc.*, the same that I myself feel.

Ver. 17. **ὅτι τὴν μὲν παράκλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for not only did he accept* (the epistolary aorist) *our exhortation*, *sc.*, of ver. 6, *but* (and this is the proof of his **σπουδή**) *being himself very earnest* (we are not to press the comparative **σπουδαιότερος**; *cf.* Acts xvii. 22), *it was of his own accord that he went forth* (epist. aor.) *unto you*, *sc.*, from Macedonia, bearing this letter. **ὑπάρχων** is used (as at Rom. iv. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 7, chap. xii. 16, Gal. i. 14, Phil. ii. 6) instead of **ὤν**, as expressing not merely the fact that Titus was **σπουδαιότερος**, but that this was his habitual condition; "being, as he is," would convey the sense.

Ver. 18. **συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *and we have sent* (the epistolary aorist; *cf.* Acts xxiii. 30, chap. ix. 3, Phil. ii. 28, Philm. 12) *together with him the brother*, *sc.*, the brother whom you know (*cf.* chap. xii. 18), *whose praise in the Gospel*, *i.e.*, whose good repute as a labourer in the cause of the Gospel (*cf.* chap. x. 14, Phil. iv. 3, Rom. i. 9), *is throughout all the Churches*, *i.e.*, is spread abroad in all the Churches through which I have passed (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 17, xiv. 33; see xi. 28). The Patristic reference (Origen, Jerome, etc.) of these words to St. Luke is stereotyped in the Collect for St. Luke's Day, but there is hardly room for doubt that this is due to a mistaken interpretation of **εὐαγγέλιον** as signifying a *written* Gospel, rather than the "good news" of God delivered orally by the first Christian preachers. We have no positive data by which to determine which of St. Paul's contemporaries is here alluded to. It has been argued that as this unnamed "brother" is seemingly subordinate to Titus, he must not be identified with

εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν· 19. [u]οὐ [u]μόνον δὲ, [u]ἀλλὰ καὶ [v]χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν [w]συνέκδημος ἡμῶν [1] σὺν [2] τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ, τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ [3] τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν, καὶ [x]προθυμίαν ὑμῶν [4]· 20. [y]στελλόμενοι τοῦτο, μή τις ἡμᾶς [z]μωμήσηται ἐν τῇ [a]ἁδρότητι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ᾽ ἡμῶν· 21. [b]προνοούμενοι [5] καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων. 22. [c]Συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, ὃν [d]ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις [e]σπουδαῖον ὄντα, νυνὶ δὲ

u Reff. vii. 7.
v Acts xiv. 23 only.
w Acts xix. 29 only; *cf.* chap. v. 6.
x Reff. ver. 11.
y 2 Thess. iii. 6 only; *cf.* Acts xx. 20; Gal. ii. 12.
z Reff. vi. 3.
a Here only.
b Prov. iii. 4. c Ver. 18 only. d Reff. ver. 8. e Reff. ver. 17.

[1] DE add **εγενετο** after **ημων**.

[2] BCP, f, vg. and the Bohairic (followed by W.H.) read **εν** for **συν**, which is found in ℵDEGKL, d, e, g and the Syriac vss.

[3] ℵD^bcEK and the Syriac vss. support **αυτου**; BCD*GL, the Latins and Bohairic omit it.

[4] **υμων** after **προθ.** is found in F and a few cursives only; **ημων** is read by all the principal uncials and vss.

[5] KL support **προνοουμενοι καλα**; C 17, 73 and Bohairic give **προν. γαρ καλα**; better **προνοουμεν γαρ καλα** with the other uncials and vss.

persons so important as (*e.g.*) Apollos or Silas; and, again, that, as he was apparently not a Macedonian (ix. 4), he cannot be any of the prominent members of the Macedonian Church (see on ver. 5 above). Trophimus the Ephesian is not impossible (see Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29), but it is idle to speculate where the evidence is so scanty. The important point about this unnamed brother is that he was selected not by St. Paul, but by the Churches who took part in the work of collecting money as their representative as is now explained.

Ver. 19. **οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.**: *and not only so, but who was also appointed* (**χειροτονεῖν** is, strictly, to vote by a show of hands, and hence it came to mean "to elect") *by the Churches, i.e.*, all the local congregations interested, *as our fellow traveller in the matter of this grace* (reading **ἐν**; see crit. note), *sc.*, this contribution of money (see vv. 6, 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 3), *which is being ministered by us* to exhibit *the glory of the Lord* (*cf.* iv. 15), *and our readiness.* The MS. evidence requires us to read **ἡμῶν**, but it must be confessed that **ὑμῶν** is rather what we should expect, especially as **προθυμία** in ver. 11 and in ix. 2 is applied to the Corinthians and not to St. Paul; a plausible conjecture would be **κατὰ προθυμίαν ἡμῶν** for **καὶ προθ. ἡμ.**, but the words give an intelligible sense as they stand (see Gal. ii. 10).

Ver. 20. **στελλόμενοι τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *avoiding this* (**στελλέσθαι** might mean "to prepare" as at Wisd. xiv. 1, 2 Macc. v. 1, but Mal. ii. 5 and reff. make us decide for the Vulgate rendering *devitantes;* the metaphor is a naval one, of shifting sail so as to avoid an enemy's pursuit), *that any man should blame us in the matter of this bounty* (see xii. 18; **ἁδρός** = full, ripe, rich, as at 1 Kings i. 9, Job xxxiv. 19, Isa. xxxiv. 7, Jer. v. 5, and so **ἁδρότης** stands for a considerable and liberal — a "fat" — contribution) *which is being administered by us.* For the broken constr. **στελλόμενοι κ.τ.λ.** *cf.* v. 12, vii. 5.

Ver. 21. **προνοοῦμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for "we provide things honest" not only "in the sight of the Lord," but also "in the sight of men,"* an injunction in the Proverbs which the Apostle quotes again at Rom. xii. 17. Where other people's money is in question, one cannot be too careful; and the prudence of the method pursued in this collection, whereby the contributing Churches appointed colleagues to accompany St. Paul and to check his accounts, is worthy of close imitation in the ecclesiastical finance of a later age (*cf.* vi. 3).

Ver. 22. **συνεπέμψαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *and we have sent with them our brother, whom we have many times proved earnest in many things, but now much more earnest because of the great confidence which he has in you* (*cf.* Gal. v. 10, **πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς**), *i.e.*, which was inspired by the account that Titus brought

πολὺ σπουδαιότερον [f] πεποιθήσει πολλῇ τῇ εἰς ὑμᾶς. 23. [g] εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου, [h] κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς [1] ὑμᾶς συνεργός· [g] εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, δόξα Χριστοῦ.[2] 24. Τὴν οὖν [i] ἔνδειξιν τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν, καὶ ἡμῶν [k] καυχήσεως ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν,[3] εἰς αὐτοὺς

f Reff. i. 15. g 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xv. 11. h Lk. v. 10; Philm. 17; Isa. i. 23; *cf.* reff. i. 7. i Rom. iii. 25, 26; Phil. i. 28 only. k Reff. i. 12.

[1] DE, d, e, the Peshitto and Bohairic give **συνεργος εις υμας.**

[2] CF have **Κυριου** for **Χριστου.** [3] D*G, g give **υπερ ημων.**

of their good conduct. It is as impossible to identify this "brother" as him of ver. 18; like the first named he was an envoy of the contributing Churches (ver. 23), and further (what is not said of the first named) he was on terms of personal intimacy with St. Paul, as appears from this verse. The guess that he was Tychicus is a plausible one (see Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, 2 Tim. iv. 12, Tit. iii. 12), but it is only a guess and is incapable of verification. A few cursives (see on xiii. 13) give the name of *Barnabas* with those of Titus and Luke in the subscription at the end of the Epistle, and this *may* represent an early tradition.

Ver. 23. **εἴτε ὑπὲρ Τίτου κ.τ.λ.**: *whether* you ask *about Titus* (*cf.* on i. 8 for this use of **ὑπέρ**), *he is my colleague and my fellow worker to you ward* (for him St. Paul will be personally responsible), *or our brethren*, they are *the envoys of Churches*, *i.e.*, they were duly **χειροτονηθέντες** (ver. 19). The term **ἀπόστολος** is generally used by St. Paul as a technical term; but occasionally, as here, and at Phil. ii. 25 (of Epaphroditus) and (possibly) at Rom. xvi. 7, he uses it in its primitive etymological meaning of "envoy" or "emissary" (*cf.* 1 Kings xiv. 6). These men are further described as **δόξα Χριστοῦ,** *the glory of Christ*, perhaps because their work is so specially *ad majorem Dei gloriam* (see ver. 19 and ix. 13).

Ver. 24. **τὴν οὖν ἔνδειξιν κ.τ.λ.**: *shew ye therefore* (if we read **ἐνδεικνύμενοι** the exhortation is indirect, as at Rom. xii. 9-21) *unto them in the face of the Churches the demonstration of your love*, *sc.*, to us (*cf.* ver. 7), *and of our glorying on your behalf*, *sc.*, my boasting of your readiness to give (*cf.* vii. 4, 14, and ix. 2, 3).

Chapter IX.—Vv. 1-5. He is confident of their readiness to give; but Titus and his Companions have been sent on, that the Collection may be ready when he arrives at Corinth.—Ver. 1. **περὶ μὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for concerning the ministration to the saints*, *i.e.*, the collection (see on viii. 4), *it is superfluous* (*cf.* 2 Macc. xii. 44) *for me to write*, *sc.*, this letter (note the force of the art. before **γράφειν**), *to you*, who "were the first to make a beginning" (viii. 10). *Cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 9.

Ver. 2. **οἶδα γὰρ τὴν προθ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for I know your readiness*, *of which I glory* (for constr. *cf.* xi. 30, Prov. xxvii. 1) *on your behalf* (*cf.* vii. 14) *to the Macedonians*, *that Achaia* (not **ὑμεῖς**, he reports the actual words in which he made his boast; for "Achaia" see on i. 1) *has been prepared since last year* (see on viii. 10 above), *i.e.*, to make its contribution. It would seem that the Apostle feared that he had somewhat overstated the case, as he is evidently anxious about the Corinthian collection. The use of the present tense, **καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν**, shows that he is writing from Macedonia (see *Introd.*, p. 12).—**καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν ζῆλος κ.τ.λ.**: *and your zeal* (see on vii. 7) *has provoked the majority of them* (see on ii. 6), *sc.*, to contribute (*cf.* viii. 10).

Ver. 3. **ἔπεμψα δὲ τοὺς ἀδ. κ.τ.λ.** *but* (the **δέ** corresponding to **μέν** of ver. 1) *I have sent* (the epistolary aorist; *cf.* viii. 18) *the brethren* (*cf.* viii. 16-22), *that our glorying on your behalf may not be made void* (*cf.* esp. 1 Cor. ix. 15) *in this respect*, *i.e.*, in the matter of actually gathering the money, as distinct from their general readiness to be liberal (viii. 10), *in order that*, *even as I said*, *sc.*, to the Macedonians to whom he had repeatedly boasted of Corinthian generosity (ver. 2), *ye may be prepared*.

Ver. 4. **μή πως ἐὰν ἔλθωσι κ.τ.λ.**: *lest by any means*, *if there come with me any of Macedonia* (not "they of Macedonia," as A.V.; it is probably a fair inference from this verse that the unnamed "brethren" of viii. 18, 22 were not Macedonians), *and find you unprepared*, *i.e.*, with the collection still incomplete, *we—that we say not*, *ye* (which is what he really wishes to convey to them)—*should be put to shame in this confidence*, *i.e.*, should be shamed because of our

[l] ἐνδείξασθε,[1] καὶ [2] εἰς [m] πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. IX. 1. Περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους περισσόν μοι ἐστὶ τὸ [3] γράφειν ὑμῖν. 2. οἶδα γὰρ τὴν [a] προθυμίαν ὑμῶν, ἣν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν, ὅτι Ἀχαΐα παρεσκεύασται [b] ἀπὸ [b] πέρυσι· καὶ ὁ [4] ἐξ [5] ὑμῶν [c] ζῆλος [d] ἠρέθισε [e] τοὺς [e] πλείονας. 3. ἔπεμψα [6] δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἵνα μὴ τὸ [f] καύχημα ἡμῶν [7] τὸ [8] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [g] κενωθῇ, [h] ἐν τῷ [h] μέρει [h] τούτῳ· ἵνα, καθὼς ἔλεγον, παρεσκευασμένοι ἦτε· 4. μή [9] πως [10] ἐὰν [11] ἔλθωσι σὺν ἐμοὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ εὕρωσιν ὑμᾶς [i] ἀπαρασκευάστους, [k] καταισχυνθῶμεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν [12] ὑμεῖς,[13] ἐν τῇ [l] ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ τῆς [14] καυχήσεως. 5. [m] ἀναγκαῖον οὖν [m] ἡγησάμην παρακαλέσαι τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἵνα [n] προέλθωσιν εἰς [15] ὑμᾶς, καὶ [o] προκαταρτίσωσι τὴν προκατηγγελμένην[16] εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν[17] ταύτην [p] ἑτοίμην

l Rom. ii 15, ix. 11. Eph. ii. 7.
m Reff. i. 11.
a Reff. viii. 11.
b Chap. viii. 10 only.
c Reff. vii. 7.
d Col. iii. 21 only; Prov. xix. 7.
e Reff. ii. 6.
f Reff. i. 14.
g Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15; Phil. ii. 7 only.
h Reff. iii. 10.
i Here only.
k Reff. vii. 14.
l Chap. xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14.
m Phil. ii. 25; 2 Macc. ix. 21.
n Here only in Paul; *cf.* Acts xx. 5, 13.
o Here only.
p Chap. x. 6, 16; Tit. iii. 1.

[1] ℵCD^bcE**KLP, f, vg. the Syriac and Bohairic support **ενδειξασθε**; BD*E*G 17, d, e, g give **ενδεικνυμενοι** (preferred by Tisch.).

[2] **και** before **εις προσ.** is found in a few cursives only, and should be omitted.

[3] C 17 om. **το** before **γραφειν**; G has **του**.

[4] Better **το . . . ζηλος** with ℵB 17 (see on viii. 2).

[5] Better om. **εξ** before **υμων** with ℵBCP 17, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

[6] DE and the Bohairic give **επεμψαμεν**.

[7] B* has **καυχημα υμων**.

[8] G, g om. **το υπερ υμων**.

[9] D*, d, e, f, g, vg. om. **πως**.

[10] BD^b and the Peshitto om. **εαν**.

[11] D*^bE*L, d, e and the Peshitto have **και καταισχ.**

[12] C*DEG, d, e, g give **λεγω**.

[13] B* has **λεγ. ημεις**.

[14] **της καυχησεως** is found in ℵ^cD^cEKLP and the Syriac vss. (from xi. 17); better om. **της καυχησεως** ℵ*BCD*G 17, vg. and the Bohairic.

[15] ℵCKL support **εις υμας**; BDEG have **προς**.

[16] KL support **προκατηγγελμενην**; better **προεπηγγελμενην** (Rom. i. 2 only) with ℵBCDEGP.

[17] D*, d, e, m, vg. om. **υμων**.

exaggerated statements. **ὑπόστασις** = *substratum* or *substance* (Heb. i. 3, xi. 1) is sometimes used in the LXX as = "ground of hope" (Ruth i. 12, Ps. xxxviii. 6, Ezek. xix. 5), and thus it came to mean "confidence," as here (see reff.).

Ver. 5. **ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἡγησάμην κ.τ.λ.**: *therefore*, *sc.*, because of the reason in ver. 4, *I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren* (inasmuch as two of these "brethren" were not chosen by St. Paul, but were the delegates of the contributing Churches, the rendering "entreat" of the R.V. conveys well the meaning of **παρακαλέσαι**; but see on viii. 6) *that they should go beforehand unto you*, *sc.*, before the Apostle should himself arrive at Corinth, *and make up beforehand your bounty which was promised beforehand*, *sc.*, to the Macedonians. "Bis dat qui cito dat" is what he would impress upon the Corinthian Christians. **εὐλογία**, elsewhere used in the N.T. as = "blessing" (*e.g.*, Rom. xv. 29, 1 Cor. x. 16, Gal. iii. 14), is here = "gift," a meaning which as the rendering of בְּרָכָה it frequently has in the LXX (Gen. xxxiii. 11, etc.). "Originally the blending of the two ideas arose from the fact that every blessing or praise of God or man was in the East (as still to a great extent) accompanied by a gift' (Stanley). *Cf.* the similar ambiguity in the word **χάρις**.—**ταύτην ἑτοίμην εἶναι κ.τ.λ.**: *that*

q Rom. i. 29; Eph. iv. 19, v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5.
r 1 Cor. ix. 11; Gal. vi. 7.
s Here only; *cf.* i. 13.
t Here only.
u Heb. vii. 12.
v Prov. xxii. 8.
w Reff. iv. 8.
x 1 Tim. vi. 6 only; *cf.* Phil. iv. 11.

εἶναι, οὕτως ὡς εὐλογίαν, καὶ [1] μὴ ὥσπερ [2] q πλεονεξίαν. 6. τοῦτο δέ,[3] ὁ r σπείρων s φειδομένως φειδομένως καὶ r θερίσει· καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ᾽ [4] εὐλογίαις ἐπ᾽ [4] εὐλογίαις καὶ [5] θερίσει. 7. ἕκαστος καθὼς t προαιρεῖται [6] τῇ καρδίᾳ· μὴ ἐκ λύπης ἢ u ἐξ u ἀνάγκης· v ἱλαρὸν γὰρ v δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ v Θεός. 8. δυνατὸς [7] δὲ [8] ὁ Θεὸς πᾶσαν χάριν περισσεῦσαι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἵνα w ἐν w παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν x αὐτάρκειαν

[1] ℵ*G, d, e, f, g, m, vg. and Peshitto om. και after ευλογ.; ins. ℵcBCDEKLP, the Harclean and Bohairic.

[2] ως is the true reading; ωσπερ is found in a few cursives only.

[3] f, m, vg. and the Bohairic supply λεγω after δε.

[4] D*G, d, e, g, m and the Bohairic give εν ευλογίᾳ for the first επ. ευλ., and for the second D*, d, e have εξ ευλογιας, and G has επ᾽ ευλογιᾳ.

[5] D*E om. και.

[6] DEKL support προαιρειται; G 17 have προειρηται; better προηρηται with ℵBCP.

[7] C²DbcEKLP support δυνατος; better δυνατει with ℵBC*DG*.

[8] D* and the Peshitto give γαρ for δε.

(we must supply ὥστε as at Col. iv. 6) *the same might be ready as a bounty* (οὕτως ὡς marks the *exact* mode in which the thank-offering is desired; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 1, ix. 26), *and not as an extortion*, *sc.*, a matter of covetous grasping on my part (*cf.* xii. 17). The A.V. rendering of πλεονεξίαν = "covetousness," seems to mean "niggardliness, such as a covetous man would exhibit," and this would fall in well with the verses which follow; but it is not agreeable to the general meaning of the word or to St. Paul's usage elsewhere (see reff.).

Vv. 6-11. LIBERAL GIVING IS BLESSED OF GOD.—Ver. 6. **τοῦτο δέ, ὁ σπείρων κ.τ.λ.**: *but* (*sc.*, although I am not pressing you to give, *cf.* ver. 1) *this I say* (understanding φημι; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50), *He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly*, *and he that soweth bountifully* (lit., "on the principle of bounties"; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 10, ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι, for a similar dative of condition) *shall also reap bountifully*. A similar principle of spiritual husbandry is laid down in Prov. xi. 24, 25, where its application is plainly to the temporal prosperity of the "liberal soul"; *cf.* also Luke vi. 38. Here, too, this is, no doubt, the main thought (*cf.* viii. 14); but St. Paul elsewhere extends the principle to the future harvest which each soul shall reap according to its sowing (Gal. vi. 7; *cf.* chap. v. 10).

Ver. 7. **ἕκαστος καθὼς κ.τ.λ.**: *let each man give* (understanding διδότω) *according as he hath purposed* (note the perf.; he implies that they had already made up their minds to give. προαίρεσις is Aristotle's formal word in *Nic. Eth.*, iii. 3.19, for a free act of moral choice) *in his heart* (*cf.* Exod. xxv. 2, "of every man whose heart maketh him willing, ye shall take my offering"); *not grudgingly or of necessity*, *for* "*God loveth a cheerful giver*". In this quotation from Prov. xxii. 8, St. Paul substitutes (perhaps to avoid the cognate of εὐλογία) ἀγαπᾷ for εὐλογεῖ, the LXX reading as it has come down to us, but the sense is not altered. The duty of almsgiving played a large part in Hebrew ethics, and that it should be carried out ungrudgingly is often insisted on in the O.T. and Apocrypha, a point specially to be emphasised in the case of a people who have always had the repute of being over-fond of money—*e.g.*, "Thine heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him" (Deut. xv. 10); "Let not thine eye be envious" (Tobit iv. 7); "In every gift show a cheerful countenance" (Ecclus. xxxv. 9). These precepts St. Paul commends to the Corinthians (*cf.* Rom. xii. 8). (Note that the practice of having "all things common," which was initiated by the enthusiasm of the first converts (Acts iv. 32 ff.), did not last long; it was a noble attempt to express in outward deed the brotherhood of men as revealed in the Incarnation, but was, in fact, impracticable).

Ver. 8. **δυνατεῖ δὲ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.**: *and God is powerful* (see reff. xiii. 3) *to make*

ἔχοντες, περισσεύητε [y] εἰς [y] πᾶν [y] ἔργον [y] ἀγαθόν· 9. καθὼς γέγραπται, [z] "Ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν· ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [1]". 10. ὁ δὲ [a] ἐπιχορηγῶν [b] σπέρμα [2] τῷ σπείροντι καὶ ἄρτον εἰς βρῶσιν [c] χορηγήσαι,[3] καὶ [d] πληθύναι [3] τὸν [d] σπόρον ὑμῶν, καὶ αὐξήσαι [3] τὰ [e] γεννήματα [4] τῆς [e] δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν· 11. [f] ἐν [5] [f] παντὶ [g] πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν [h] ἁπλότητα, ἥτις [6] [i] κατεργάζεται δι' ἡμῶν [7] [k] εὐχαριστίαν τῷ [8] Θεῷ· 12. ὅτι ἡ διακονία τῆς [l] λειτουργίας ταύτης οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ [m] προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ [n] ὑστερήματα τῶν [o] ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν

y 2 Tim. ii. 21.
z Ps. cxi. 9.
a Gal. iii. 5; Col. ii. 19; *cf.* Phil. i. 19.
b Isa. lv. 10.
c 1 Pet. iv. 11 only; Ecclus. xxxix. 33.
d Here only in Paul.
e Hos. x. 12.
f Reff. iv. 8.
g Reff. vi. 10.
h Reff. viii. 2.
i Reff. iv. 17.
k Reff. iv. 15.
l Phil. ii. 17, 30.
m Chap. xi. 9 only.
n Reff. viii. 13.
o Reff. i. 1.

[1] GK, f, g add **του αιωνος** at end.

[2] ℵCD^bcEKLP support **σπερμα**; BD*G have **σπορον**.

[3] ℵ^cD^cGKL support the aorist infinitives (or optatives); better **χορηγησει . . . πληθυνει . . . αυξησει** with ℵ*BCD*P, the Latins and the Bohairic.

[4] The uncials have **γενηματα**.

[5] G, g read **ινα εν παντι**.

[6] D* has **ει τις** for **ητις**.

[7] C²P, g* and the Harclean margin give **δι' υμων**.

[8] D* om. **τῳ**; B has **ευχαρ. Θεου**.

all grace, *i.e.*, every gift, temporal as well as spiritual, *abound unto you* (see reff. iv. 15 for **περισσεύω** in a transitive signification), *in order that ye, having always all sufficiency*, *sc.*, of worldly goods and gifts (for **πᾶσαν** see reff. viii. 7), *may abound unto every good work*. Note the paronomasia, **ἐν παντὶ, πάντοτε, πᾶσαν . . . περισσεύητε . . . πᾶν.**

Vv. 9 and 10 are parenthetical, containing an illustrative quotation and its application.—Ver. 9. **καθὼς γέγραπται "Ἐσκόρπισεν κ.τ.λ.**: *as it is written*, *sc.*, in the words of Scripture (perhaps the quotation was suggested by the image of sowing and reaping which recalled the word **ἐσκόρπισεν**), "*He*, *sc.*, the liberal man, *hath scattered abroad* (*cf.* Prov. xi. 24), *he hath given to the poor*, *his righteousness*, *i.e.*, his beneficence (as at Matt. vi. 1; St. Paul, when using his own words, *never* uses **δικαιοσύνη** in this old Hebrew sense), *endureth for ever*."

Ver. 10. **ὁ δὲ ἐπιχορηγῶν "σπέρμα τῷ σπείροντι κ.τ.λ.**: *and he that supplieth* "*seed to the sower and bread for food*," *shall supply and multiply your seed*, *i.e.*, your means of giving, *for sowing* (the A.V. not only follows the inferior reading, but conceals the quotation from Isa. lv. 10), *and increase* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 6 for the trans. use of **αὐξάνω**) *the* "*fruits*" *of your* "*righteousness*," *i.e.*, of your beneficence, as in the preceding verse. The phrase **γενήματα δικαιοσύνης** in ref. Hosea may be illustrated by **τὸ γένημα τῆς ἀμπέλου**, "the fruit of the vine" in the Gospels (*e.g.*, Mark xiv. 25). This verse is the application, as it were, of the quotation in ver. 9, the connecting link being the word **δικαιοσύνη**.

Ver. 11. He now resumes the general subject of ver. 8, **ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι** here being in apposition with **ἐν παντὶ . . . ἔχοντες** there; there is thus no necessity to treat **πλουτιζ.** as a *nom. pendens*.—**ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**: *ye being enriched in everything unto all*, *i.e.*, all kinds of, *liberality*, *which worketh through us* (he goes on in the next verse to explain how this is) *thanksgiving unto God; cf.* i. 11, iv. 15.

Vv. 12-15. LIBERAL GIVING WILL CALL FORTH THE BLESSINGS OF THE RECIPIENTS.—Ver. 12. **ὅτι ἡ διακ. τῆς λειτ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for the ministration of this service* (**λειτουργία,** which originally stood for any public service, came to be restricted to the service of God; **λειτουργέω** is used in Rom. xv. 27 of this very contribution; *cf.* Num. viii. 22, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21) *is not only filling up* (note the constr. **ἐστι** with a participle) *the wants of the saints, but is abounding also through many thanksgivings unto God* (*cf.* iv. 15).

Ver. 13. **διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακ. κ.τ.λ.**: *inasmuch as they*, *i.e.*, the Judæan Christians, *through the proof*, *sc.*, of you, *afforded by this ministration* (*cf.* viii. 2 for a similar gen. after **δοκιμή**), *glorify God* (*cf.* Matt. v. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 12) *for the obedience of your confession in regard to*

τῷ[1] Θεῷ· 13. διὰ[2] τῆς [p] δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ [q] ὑποταγῇ τῆς [r] ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ [s] ἁπλότητι τῆς [t] κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας, 14. καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν,[3] [u] ἐπιποθούντων ὑμᾶς διὰ τὴν [v] ὑπερβάλλουσαν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφ' ὑμῖν. 15. [w] χάρις δὲ[4] [w] τῷ [w] Θεῷ ἐπὶ τῇ [x] ἀνεκδιηγήτῳ αὐτοῦ [y] δωρεᾷ.

p Reff. ii. 9.
q Gal. ii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 11, iii. 4.
r 1 Tim. vi. 12; Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23 only.
s Reff. viii. 2.
t Reff. vi. 14.
u Reff. v. 2. v Reff. iii. 10. w Reff. ii. 14. x Here only. y Rom. v. 15, 17; Eph. iii. 7, iv. 7.

[1] B has Χριστῳ for Θεῳ. [2] B has και δια. [3] BE have υπερ ημων.

[4] ℵcC²DbcEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. give δε after χαρις; om. ℵ*BC*D*G 17 and the Latins.

the Gospel of Christ (*cf.* ii. 12). The sentence is an anacoluthon; **δοξάζοντες** cannot be taken as in apposition with **πλουτιζόμενοι** of ver. 11, for the persons referred to are different. It would be grammatically admissible to take **δοξάζ. τὸν Θεὸν** with **εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χρ.**, but the order of words and the sense both support the connexion **ὁμολογίας εἰς κ.τ.λ.** Of the A.V. "by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the Gospel of Christ" Lightfoot truly remarks that "a concurrence of Latinisms obscures the sense and mars the English". The contribution of money for the relief of the Christian poor is a **ὁμολογία**, inasmuch as it is the manifestation to the world of belief in Christ's Gospel; **ὁμολογία** is a "confession" or "vow," and so (as in Deut. xii. 17, Amos iv. 5) = "a free will offering".—**καὶ ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας κ.τ.λ.**: *and for the liberality of your contribution unto them and unto all.* This would suggest that the rich Corinthian Church had been liberal to other Churches besides that of Jerusalem, but we have no knowledge of anything of the sort.

Ver. 14. **καὶ αὐτῶν δεήσει κ.τ.λ.** This is again an independent sentence, beginning with a gen. abs.: *while they also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you* (*sc.*, apparently, long to see you) *by reason of the exceeding grace of God upon you; i.e.*, you have the prayers of those whom you are helping, who feel the yearnings of affection for their benefactors in whom the working of God's grace has been so signally displayed.

Ver. 15. **χαρὶς τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.**: *thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift.* **δωρεά** is always in the N.T. (see reff., etc.) used of the gifts of God, not of men; and the "unspeakable" gift (*cf.* Rom. xi. 33, Eph. iii. 20) for which the Apostle bursts out here into a characteristic doxology is the gift of Christ Himself (John iii. 16) and of salvation in Him, thankful appreciation of which had borne such fruit in Christian lives.

III. The Vindication of his Apostolic Authority. It would appear that while Titus had brought favourable news as to the loyalty with which the Corinthians had received St. Paul's message of reproof in the matter of the incestuous person (vii. 9-11), he had also brought distressing intelligence as to the depreciation of the Apostle's authority by certain active Judaisers at Corinth. The case is so serious that it requires immediate attention, and the third (and last) section of the latter is occupied with St. Paul's reply in vindication of his claims. See *Introd.*, p. 22.

Chapter X. — Vv. 1-6. He Begs them not to force Him to exert his Authority with Severity when he comes. He first expresses the hope that their conduct will be such as to admit of his being "meek and gentle" when he arrives at Corinth, of his coming in a "spirit of meekness," and not "with a rod" (1 Cor. iv. 21).—Ver. 1. **αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος κ.τ.λ.**: *now* (**δέ** marks a transition to a new subject, as at viii. 1, 1 Cor. xv. 1) *I Paul myself* (**αὐτὸς ἐγὼ**, calling attention to a specially personal matter as at xii. 13, Rom. ix. 3, xv. 14; he writes **ἐγὼ Παῦλος** elsewhere at Gal. v. 2, Eph. iii. 1, Philm. 19 only, for the sake of emphasis) *entreat you* (*cf.* i. 4, and for the constr. **παρακαλῶ διὰ** *cf.* Rom. xii. 1, xv. 30, 1 Cor. i. 10; the **πραΰτης καὶ ἐπιείκεια τοῦ Χρ.** are the example which gives point to the entreaty or exhortation) *by the meekness and gentleness of the Christ.* That the Messianic King should be **πραΰς** had been declared by Zechariah (ix. 9, cited Matt. xxi. 5), while **πραΰτης** had been associated with His royal pro-

X. 1. ΑΥΤΟΣ δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς [a] πραότητος[1] καὶ [b] ἐπιεικείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς [c] κατὰ [c] πρόσωπον μὲν [d] ταπεινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀπὼν δὲ [e] θαῤῥῶ εἰς[2] ὑμᾶς· 2. [f] δέομαι δέ, τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι τῇ [g] πεποιθήσει[3] ᾗ λογίζομαι [h] τολμῆσαι ἐπί τινας τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς [i] κατὰ [i] σάρκα [i] περιπατοῦντας. 3. [k] ἐν [k] σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες, οὐ κατὰ σάρκα [l] στρατευόμεθα· 4. (τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς [m] στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικά, ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς [n] καθαίρεσιν [o] ὀχυρωμάτων·) 5. [p] λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν [q] ὕψωμα [r] ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ[4] [s] αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν [t] νόημα

a 1 Cor. iv. 21; Gal. v. 23; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12.
b Acts xxiv. 4 only; *cf.* Phil. iv. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 3; Jas. iii. 17.
c Acts iii. 13, xxv. 16.
d Reff. vii. 6.
e Reff. v. 6.
f Reff. v. 20.
g Reff. i. 15.
h 1 Cor. vi. 1; chap. xi. 21, etc.
i Rom. viii. 4; *cf.* reff. i. 17.
k Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22; Col. ii. 1, etc.
l 1 Cor. ix. 7; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 4.
m 1 Tim. i. 18 only.
n Ver. 8, chap. xiii. 10 only.
o Here only.
p Rom. ii. 15 only; Prov. vi. 18.
q Rom. viii. 39 only.
r Chap. xi. 20; Ezra iv. 19.
s Lk. xxi. 24; Rom. vii. 23; 2 Tim. iii. 6 only.
t Reff. ii. 11.

[1] The better spelling is **πραυτητος** with ℵ*BGP 17.

[2] P and the Latins give **εν υμιν** for **εις υμας**.

[3] C[2] and the Bohairic add **ταυτῃ** (*cf.* i. 15) after **τῃ πεπ.**

[4] G, d, e, g, m om. **και**.

gress by the Psalmist (Ps. xliv. 5); and Christ, when He came, declared that he was **πραΰς καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ**, a claim which His life on earth abundantly exemplified (*cf.* Matt. xii. 19, Luke xxiii. 34). So too in the wonderful portrait of the Righteous Man in Wisd. ii. 12 ff., **ἐπιείκεια**, "gentleness," "sweet reasonableness," is one of the qualities mentioned (ver. 19). In Greek Ethics (*e.g.*, Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.*, v., 10) the **ἐπιεικής** is the "equitable" man, who does not press for the last farthing of his rights (see reff.). St. Paul alludes to these qualities as well known to have belonged to the character of Jesus, even as they had been foretold of the Messiah.—**ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον κ.τ.λ.**: I Paul, *who indeed* (*sc.*, as you say by way of reproach, the concessive **μέν**) *before your face am lowly among you* (he had admitted this before, 1 Cor. ii. 3 and chap. vii. 6, and the lowliness of his demeanour had been made the subject of adverse comment, see further ver. 10), *but being absent am of good courage towards you*, *i.e.*, am outspoken in rebuke of you (a quite different phrase from **θαῤῥῶ ἐν ὑμῖν** of vii. 16).

Ver. 2. **δέομαι δὲ τὸ μὴ παρὼν κ.τ.λ.**: *nay* (*sc.*, "however that be," **δέ** recommencing the sentence) *I beseech you*, *that I may not* (the use of the article with **μή** and the inf. is somewhat unusual; but *cf.* ii. 1, Rom. xiv. 13; **τὸ** adds emphasis to the thing asked), *when present*, *shew courage with the confidence* (almost = "peremptoriness") *wherewith I count on myself* (mid., not passive) *to be bold against some* (for the vague **τινες** see on iii. 1) *which count of us as if we walked according to the flesh*. His opponents charged him with low motives (*cf.* ii. 17) which he will indignantly and sternly repudiate.

Ver. 3. **ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for though we walk in the flesh*, *sc.*, as all men must do (see reff.), *we do not war*, *i.e.*, carry on our campaign against evil and the enemies of God, *according to the flesh* (*cf.* John xvii. 15)—*for the weapons of our warfare* (see on vi. 7) *are not carnal* (see on i. 12), *but are mighty before God*, *i.e.*, in God's sight, in His estimation (or, perhaps, "*exceeding* mighty," which is the force of **τῷ Θεῷ** at Jonah iii. 3, Acts vii. 20; the A.V. "mighty through God," *i.e.*, "by His aid," cannot be right), *to the casting down of strongholds*, which is the ultimate object of every campaign, and which, being achieved, is the seal of victory; **καθαίρειν τὰ ὀχυρώματα** is the regular LXX phrase for the reduction of a fortress (see Prov. xxi. 22, Lam. ii. 2, 1 Macc. v. 65, viii. 10).

Ver. 4 is an explanatory parenthesis, and the constr. of ver. 5 is continuous with ver. 3, the metaphor of the destruction of the citadel being carried on.

Ver. 5. **λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες κ.τ.λ.**: *casting down*, as if they were centres of the enemy's force, *reasonings* (St. Paul's message, as he told the Corinthians at 1 Cor. ii. 4 was not **ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις**, but "in demonstration of the

u Reff. ix. 5. v Rom. xii. 19; cf. vii. 11. w Rom. v. 19; Heb. ii. 2 only. x Reff. ver. 1.

εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] 6. καὶ ἐν[2] [u]ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες [v]ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν [w]παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ[3] ὑμῶν[4] ἡ ὑπακοή.

7. τὰ [x]κατὰ [x]πρόσωπον βλέπετε; εἴ τις πέποιθεν[5] ἑαυτῷ Χριστοῦ[6] εἶναι, τοῦτο λογιζέσθω πάλιν ἀφ'[7] ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι καθὼς αὐτὸς Χριστοῦ,

[1] After Χρ. D*EG, d, e, g, m add **αγοντες**.

[2] D* has **ετοιμως** for **εν ετοιμῳ**. [3] C, r add **προτερον** after **πληρ**.

[4] D*cEG, d, e, g, r give the order **η υπακ. υμων**.

[5] B has **δοκει πεποιθεναι**. [6] D*E*G, d, e, f, g supply **δουλος** after **Χρ**.

[7] **αφ εαυτου** is found in CDEGKP (*cf.* iii. 5); better **εφ'** with ℵBL and the Latins.

Spirit and of power"; he ever regards the Gospel as a *revelation*, not a body of doctrine which could be reasoned out by man for himself from first principles—not, to be sure, an irrational system, but one which is beyond the capacity of reason to discover or to fathom to its depths), *and every high thing* (carrying on the metaphor by which the "towering" conceits of speculation are represented as fortifications erected against the soldiers of the Cross) *that is exalted*, or "elevated," "built up," *against the knowledge of God*, *sc.*, which is revealed in Christ, *and leading captive* (for **αἰχμαλωτίζειν** the more correct Attic form is **αἰχμαλωτεύειν**) *every thought into the obedience of Christ* (*cf.* ix. 13). All through this passage the Apostle has directly in view the opposition of gainsayers at Corinth, and so it is not safe to interpret his phrases as directed without qualification against the claims of the intellect and conscience in the matter of doctrine. Yet it must be remembered that he regarded the message which he preached as directly revealed to himself, and not derived from tradition or interpretation, and hence as possessed of a certainty to which the demonstrations of philosophy, however cogent, could not attain. All Truth must be loyal to "the obedience of Christ," who was Himself "the Truth" (*cf.* xiii. 8).

Ver. 6. **καὶ ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**: *and being in readiness* (*cf.* **ἑτοίμως ἔχω** chap. xii. 14) *to avenge all disobedience* (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 17), *sc.*, if there remain any still disobedient, *when your obedience*, *i.e.*, to me and to my Apostolic authority (*cf.* ii. 9, vii. 15), *shall be fulfilled*. The word **ὑπακοή** in ver. 5 brings him back to this, the primary object of his letter. He does not wish to arrive in Corinth until the Church as a whole is firm in its loyalty to him.

Vv. 7-18. Despite all appearances, his Apostolical Authority is weighty; his Mission to the Greeks is a Divine Trust.—Ver. 7. **τὰ κατὰ προσ. κ.τ.λ.**: *ye look at the things which are before your face; i.e.*, you pay too much attention to outward appearances (*cf.* Rom. ii. 11, Gal. ii. 6, Eph. vi. 9), you lay too much stress on personal intimacy with Christ in the flesh (v. 7), and on a man's bodily presence and powers of speech (ver. 10), even on his own self-commendation (ver. 12). The rec. text places a note of interrogation after **βλέπετε**, but it seems preferable to treat the sentence as a simple categorical statement (see esp. on ver. 12, and *cf.* John vii. 24).—**εἴ τις πέποιθεν κ.τ.λ.**: *if any man* (this is his usual vague way of referring to opponents; *cf.* xi. 4, 20) *trusteth in himself that he is Christ's*, prides himself on specially belonging to what he regards as the "party" of Christ, which had unhappily grown up at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12), *let him consider this again* (he has often heard it before, but has forgotten it) *with himself* (or, reading **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ**, "let him think this out for himself"—it does not need any prompting from without), *that even as he is Christ's, so also are we* (1 Cor. iii. 23).

Ver. 8. **ἐάν τε γὰρ καὶ περισσότερόν κ.τ.λ.**: *for even if I should glory somewhat abundantly* (or, perhaps, "somewhat *more* abundantly," *sc.*, than I have already done in vv. 3-6; but the comparative need not be pressed; *cf.* ii. 4), *concerning our authority* (*which the Lord gave for building you up, and not for casting you down*), *I shall not be put to shame*, *i.e.*, my confident words can be amply justified. He returns here to the image of ver. 4; his authority (and he repeats this again in the same words at xiii. 10) extends not solely or chiefly to the overthrow of the fortresses of mis-

οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς Χριστοῦ.[1] 8. ἐάν τε[2] γὰρ καὶ[3] περισσότερόν τι καυχήσωμαι[4] περὶ τῆς [y] ἐξουσίας ἡμῶν,[5] ἧς ἔδωκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῖν[6] εἰς [z] οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς [a] καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν, οὐκ [b] αἰσχυνθήσομαι· 9. ἵνα μὴ δόξω[7] ὡς ἂν [c] ἐκφοβεῖν[8] ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν. 10. ὅτι αἱ μὲν[9] ἐπιστολαί, φησί,[10] [d] βαρεῖαι καὶ [e] ἰσχυραί· ἡ δὲ [f] παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής, καὶ ὁ λόγος [g] ἐξουθενημένος· 11. τοῦτο λογιζέσθω ὁ [h] τοιοῦτος, ὅτι οἷοί ἐσμεν τῷ [i] λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ [i] ἔργῳ.

y Chap. xiii. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 4, etc. z Chaps. xii. 19, xiii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 26, etc. a Reff. ver. 4. b Phil. i. 20. c Here only. d Acts xxv. 7; 1 John v. 3. e 1 Cor. i. 25, 27, iv. 10, x. 22. f Reff. vii. 6. g Rom. xiv. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 4; Gal. iv. 14. h Reff. ii. 6. i Rom. xv. 18; Col. iii. 17.

[1] DcEKL and the Bohairic support Χριστου after ημεις, but all the other principal authorities omit it.

[2] BG 17 and (perhaps) d, e, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic omit τε after εαν.

[3] ℵcDcE**L, the Peshitto and Harclean margin support και after γαρ; om. και ℵ*BCD*E*GP, the Latins, Bohairic and Harclean text.

[4] BCDEK, followed by W.H., support καυχησωμαι; Tisch. reads καυχησομαι with ℵLP.

[5] C*P, the Peshitto and Bohairic omit ημων.

[6] ημιν is found in DcEGKL (P 73, f and the Harclean have ημιν ο κυρ.); om. ημιν ℵ*BCD* 17, d, e.

[7] D*EG, d, e, g give δοξωμεν.

[8] DE, d, e, g give εκφοβουντες.

[9] Better αι επιστ. μεν with ℵ*B, r.

[10] ℵDEGKLP, d, e, and the Bohairic have φησιν, which is also preferred by W.H.; B, f, g, r, vg. and the Syriac support φασιν.

guided imagination, but also to the positive and more congenial work of construction, of "building up" (*cf.* Jer. i. 10).

Ver. 9. **ἵνα μὴ δόξω κ.τ.λ.**: *that I may not seem as if I would scare you by my letters*. It is best to take these words with **εἰς οἰκοδομήν** of the preceding verse; his purpose in writing so severely is not to terrify them, but to build them up in holiness and obedience. **ὡς ἂν** = *tanquam*, with the infin. is only found here in the N.T. The plural **τῶν ἐπιστολῶν** suggests (what we know from 1 Cor. v. 9) that at least one letter of rebuke in addition to 1 *Cor.* had been written before this.

Ver. 10. **ὅτι αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ μέν, φασίν κ.τ.λ.**: *for "his letters" they say "are weighty and powerful but,"* etc. The reading is doubtful (see crit. note); if we follow the rec. text **φησίν** = "one says" or "he says" (*cf.* Wisd. xv. 12), the reference will be to an individual opponent (the **τοιοῦτος** of ver. 11) who would be readily recognised by the Corinthians; but we must then suppose **τις** to have dropped out. It is simpler therefore to read **φασίν** with the A.V. and R.V., and to take the words as reproducing the charge against the Apostle commonly made by those who were disaffected at Corinth. They are "remarkable as giving a contemporary judgment on his Epistles, and a personal description of himself" (Stanley).—**ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος κ.τ.λ.**: "*but his bodily presence is weak* (see chap. xii. 7, Gal. iv. 14, and Acts xiv. 12, where the Lystrans called Barnabas "Zeus," and evidently therefore counted him as of more dignified presence than his companion) *and his speech contemptible*"; *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17. Persuasive speaker as St. Paul must have been (the Lystrans called him Hermes as "the chief speaker"), he probably had not the arts of a trained rhetorician (1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4, chap. xi. 6), and this would appear a grave defect to these clever and shallow Greeks. According to the second century *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (§ 3) the Apostle was a low-sized man, bow-legged, of a healthy complexion, with eyebrows knit together (the Armenian version adds that his eyes were blue), and an aquiline nose. The description of him in the piece called *Philopatris* (§ 13), ascribed to Lucian, is very similar.

12. Οὐ γὰρ [k]τολμῶμεν[1] [l]ἐγκρῖναι[2] ἢ [m]συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς τισι τῶν [n]ἑαυτοὺς [n]συνιστανόντων· ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς[3] [o]μετροῦντες, καὶ συγκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς, οὐ [p]συνιοῦσιν.[4] 13. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐχὶ εἰς τὰ[5] [q]ἄμετρα καυχησόμεθα,[6] ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ [r]μέτρον τοῦ [s]κανόνος οὗ[7] [t]ἐμέρισεν[1] ἡμῖν[8] ὁ [t]Θεὸς[9] μέτρου, [u]ἐφικέσθαι[10] ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν. 14. οὐ[11] γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι[12] εἰς ὑμᾶς [u]ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς· ἄχρι γὰρ[13] καὶ ὑμῶν [v]ἐφθάσαμεν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ

k Reff. ver. 2.
l Here only.
m 1 Cor. ii. 13 only.
n Reff. iii. 1.
o Here only in Paul.
p Rom. xv. 21; Eph. v. 17.
q Ver. 15 only.
r Rom. xii. 3; Eph. iv. 7.
s Vv. 15, 16; Gal. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16 only.
t Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 17.
u Here only.
v Matt. xii. 28; Rom. ix. 31; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16.

[1] B has **τολμω**. [2] G has **κριναι**; DE add **εαυτους**.

[3] ℵ* om. **εαυτους** before **μετρ.**; DEK 73 have **εαυτους εαυτοις**.

[4] DcEKLP support **συνιουσιν**; better **συνιασιν** with ℵaB 17, 37; ℵ* has **συνισασιν**; om. **ου συν. ημεις δε** D*G, d, e, f, g (see note below).

[5] D*G and the Latins give **εις το αμετρον**.

[6] G, f, g give **καυχωμενοι**; om. **καυχ.** D*, d, e.

[7] M 67**, d, e, f, g, vg. give **οσου εμετρησεν**.

[8] GL, g, om. **ημιν**. [9] DE, d, e give **Κυριος**. [10] DE have **αφικεσθαι**.

[11] P has **ου γαρ μη ως**; B has simply **ως γαρ μη**, which W.H. place in their margin.

[12] K has **αφικνουμενοι**; G, **αφικομενοι**. [13] ℵ* om. **γαρ** after **αχρι**.

Ver. 11. **τοῦτο λογιζέσθω κ.τ.λ.**: *let such an one*, *sc.*, as makes comments of the kind just quoted, *reckon this, that* (*cf.* constr. ver. 7) *what we are in word by letters when we are absent, such are we also in deed when we are present.*

Ver. 12. **οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν κ.τ.λ.**: *for we do not venture* (an ironical refusal to put himself on a level with his adversaries, whose shallow pretensions he thus quietly exposes) *to number or compare ourselves* (note the paronomasia in the Greek) *with certain of them that commend themselves* (the charge made against *him*—see on iii. 1—he retorts with great effect on his opponents); *but they themselves measuring themselves by themselves and comparing themselves with themselves are without understanding* (*cf.* Prov. xxvi. 12). This sentence is so much involved, that it is not surprising to find the Western authorities (see crit. note) giving it a quite different turn by the omission of the words **οὐ συνιοῦσιν** (or **συνιᾶσιν**) **ἡμεῖς δὲ . . . καυχησόμεθα.** Following this shorter text, the meaning would be: "but we are measuring ourselves by ourselves and comparing ourselves with ourselves, not going into spheres beyond our measure," etc. This gives a connected sense, and is favoured by the fact that the balance of the sentence leads us to expect that **αὐτοὶ** after **ἀλλὰ** shall refer to the Apostle, and not to his opponents, as it must do with the longer reading. Nevertheless we believe that the omission is simply an attempt to evade the difficulty of the true text; it would be quite unlike St. Paul to speak of *himself* as his own standard of conduct, and would not be harmonious with the thought of ver. 13. Others take **συνιοῦσιν** as a dative participle and adopt the rendering: "but we (*i.e.*, St. Paul) measure ourselves by ourselves, and compare ourselves with ourselves, unwise as we are" (*sc.*, in their opinion). This, however, is not only open to the objection just mentioned, but would require **τοῖς** before **οὐ συνιοῦσιν.** On the whole, therefore, we prefer to follow the best MS. authority by reading **συνιᾶσιν**, and to treat the Western text as an abbreviation, which misses the point of the argument in the attempt to simplify the construction.

Ver. 13. **ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐχὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but we will not glory beyond our measure* (**εἰς τὰ** representing the direction and extent of his boasting), *but according to the measure of the rule which* (**οὗ** for **ὃν** by attraction) *God hath apportioned* (see reff.) *to us as a measure, to reach* (the infin. of purpose) *even unto you.* **κανών** is a line of direction (see reff., and *cf.* Clem. Rom., § 41, **μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν**

Χριστοῦ· 15. οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχώμενοι ἐν [w] ἀλλοτρίοις [x] κόποις, ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες, αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν,[1] ἐν ὑμῖν [y] μεγαλυνθῆναι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν[2] εἰς [z] περισσείαν, 16. εἰς τὰ [a] ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν εὐαγγελίσασθαι, οὐκ ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κανόνι εἰς τὰ [b] ἕτοιμα καυχήσασθαι. 17. "Ὁ δὲ [c] καυχώμενος ἐν [c] Κυρίῳ [c] καυχάσθω·" 18. οὐ γὰρ ὁ [d] ἑαυτὸν [d] συνιστῶν,[3] ἐκεῖνός ἐστι[4] [e] δόκιμος, ἀλλ' ὃν ὁ Κύριος συνίστησιν.

w Rom. xiv. 4, xv. 20; 1 Tim. v. 22.
x Reff. vi. 5.
y Phil. i. 20.
z Reff. viii. 2.
a Here only; cf. Amos v. 27.
b Reff. ix. 5.
c 1 Cor. i. 31 (Jer. ix. 24).
d Reff. iii. 1.
e Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 19; chap. xiii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[1] B has ημων for υμων.

[2] ℵ has υμων for ημων.

[3] DcKL support συνιστων; better συνισταντων with ℵBD*EGMP (*cf.* crit. notes on iii. 1, iv. 2).

[4] ℵcBGKLMP, g support εστι δοκ.; but ℵ*DE, d, e, f, r, vg. give δοκιμος εστι.

ὡρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα), and so here represents the "province" or sphere in which St. Paul conceives himself as appointed by God to proclaim the Gospel. He especially emphasises this here; to Corinth he has a "mission," as the Apostle of the Gentiles; his authority over the Corinthian Church is not usurped, but has been divinely given him.

Ver. 14. **οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you* (**ὡς μή** indicating that the case is only a hypothetical one; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 18); *for we came* (**φθάνω** being used as in modern Greek; see reff.) *as far as unto you in the Gospel of Christ.* Corinth was the westernmost point that he had reached. This verse, it will be observed, is parenthetical, and is introduced to make it clear that Corinth was part of his appointed sphere; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 15, ix. 1.

Ver. 15. **οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κ.τ.λ.**: *not glorying beyond our measure* (the argument is resumed from ver. 13), *that is, in other men's labours.* This he steadily avoided (*cf.* Rom. xv. 20); even Rome itself was to be visited *en route* to Spain (Rom. xv. 24). But his Corinthian opponents were not so scrupulous about intruding into another man's sphere (1 Cor. iii. 10, iv. 15).—**ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχ. κ.τ.λ.**: *but having hope that, as your faith groweth* (see Eph. ii. 21, iv. 15, Col. i. 10, ii. 19, for intrans. use of **αὐξάνειν**, and *cf.* chap. ix. 10), *we shall be magnified in you* (*cf.* Acts v. 13) *according to our rule, i.e.*, our 'line," our apportionment of Apostolic work, *unto further abundance, so as*, etc.

Ver. 16. **εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα κ.τ.λ.**: *so as to preach the Gospel in the regions beyond you, i.e.* (if we are to press the idea of direction in **ὑπερέκεινα**), the western parts of Greece, Rome and Spain, which were "beyond," if viewed from Jerusalem, the home of Christianity, whence St. Paul, like the other early preachers, received his "mission" (more probably, however, **ὑπερέκεινα** is used quite vaguely as **ἐπέκεινα** is in Amos v. 27, where the idea of direction cannot be read into it), *and not to glory in another's "line" about things made ready to our hand.* This is what the intruders had done at Corinth, whose Church St. Paul had founded (1 Cor. iii. 6).

Ver. 17. **ὁ δὲ καυχώμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *but he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord*, a quotation from the O.T. (see reff.) used before by St. Paul (*cf.* also Rom. xv. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 7). *For not he that commendeth himself is approved* (*cf.* Prov. xxvii. 2), *but whom the Lord commendeth* (*cf.* Rom. ii. 29, 1 Cor. iv. 5). And the Corinthian Church itself is his "letter of commendation" (iii. 2).

CHAPTER XI.—Vv. 1-4. HE BEGS THEM TO BEAR WITH HIM IF HE STATES HIS CLAIMS AT LENGTH; IT IS NECESSARY TO DO SO BECAUSE OF THEIR READINESS TO ACCEPT NOVEL TEACHING.—Ver. 1. **ὄφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου κ.τ.λ.**: *would that ye could bear with me in a little* (**μικρόν τι** only here and ver. 16; *cf.* Heb. ii. 7) *foolishness.* **ἀφροσύνη** = "nonsense" (see ref. and *cf.* Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 36, Eph. v. 17). He thus deprecates his insistence on his claim to apostolic authority, and at the same time introduces with great skill a passionate statement of it.—**ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχ. μου**: *nay indeed bear with me; i.e.*, he not only utters a wish, but entreats them directly. Others (*e.g.*, R.V. marg.) take **ἀνέχ.** as indic., *i.e.*, "but indeed ye do bear with me".

XI. 1. [a] Ὄφελον[1] ἀνείχεσθέ[2] μου μικρὸν τῇ[3] [b] ἀφροσύνῃ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ[4] μου. 2. [c] ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ [d] ζήλῳ· [e] ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ, παρθένον [f] ἁγνὴν [g] παραστῆσαι τῷ Χριστῷ· 3. [h] φοβοῦμαι δὲ [h] μή[5] [h] πως, ὡς ὁ [i] ὄφις Εὔαν[6] [i] ἐξηπάτησεν ἐν[7] τῇ [k] πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτω[8] [l] φθαρῇ τὰ [m] νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς

a 1 Cor. iv. 8; Gal. v. 12. b Vv. 17, 21; Mk. vii. 22. c 1 Cor. xii. 31; Gal. iv. 17. d Reff. vii. 7. e Here only. f Reff. vii. 11. g Reff. iv. 14. h Chap. xii. 20; Gal. iv. 11. i Gen. iii. 13. k Reff. iv. 2. l Reff. vii. 2. m Reff. ii. 11.

[1] D^c EGKL have **ωφελον** (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 8); **οφελον** ℵBMP.

[2] A few minuscules have **οφελον ηνειχεσθε**.

[3] KLP support **τῃ αφροσυνῃ**; ℵBDEM 17 have (preferably) **τι αφροσυνης**, and there are minor variants.

[4] ℵ has **αλλα και ανασχεσθε**. [5] For **μηπως** G has **μηποτε** and D* has **μη**.

[6] DEKL, the Harclean, d, e, f, r, vg. support the order **Ευ. εξηπ.**; but ℵBGMP 17, g and the Bohairic give **εξηπ. Ευ.**

[7] D* omits **εν**.

[8] D^bc EKLM, f, vg. and the Syriac support **ουτω φθαρῃ**; better om. **ουτω** (as a marginal gloss) with ℵBD*GP 17, d, e, g, r and the Bohairic.

Ver. 2. **ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *for I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy* (*cf.* Zech. i. 14, and for **Θεοῦ ζήλῳ** *cf.* Acts xxii. 3, Rom. x. 2; this "jealousy" of St. Paul is on behalf of God); *for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ, sc.*, at His Coming. The figure of Israel as a Bride presented to Jehovah as the Bridegroom was frequently used by the O.T. prophets (Isa. liv. 5, lxii. 5, Hosea ii. 19); and, according to the Rabbis, Moses was the bridesman or paranymph. Here St. Paul conceives of himself as the paranymph (*cf.* John iii. 29) who presents the Church as a pure Bride (*cf.* Rev. xxi. 2) to Christ, the heavenly Spouse, the "one husband" to whom she is bound to remain faithful. Some critics have found here an echo of Christ's words at Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1-12; but the similarity does not extend further than the employment of the same image demands. **ἁρμόζω** in the *act.* is regularly used of the father of the bride; in the *pass.* of the bride herself (Prov. xix. 14); and in the *mid.* generally of the bridegroom, but sometimes (as here) of others.

Ver. 3. **φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως κ.τ.λ.**: *but I fear lest by any means, as "the serpent beguiled" Eve in his craftiness* (in Gen. iii. 1 the serpent is called **φρονιμώτατος**, but St. Paul changes the word to indicate the baseness of the serpent's wisdom. Aristotle uses **πανουργία** in direct contrast to **φρόνησις**; *cf. Nic. Eth.*, vi., 12), *your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity* (*cf.* chap. vi. 6) *that is toward Christ.* It would appear that the belief of the synagogues was that the serpent literally "seduced" Eve (*cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 6-8, and Iren., *contra Haer.*, i., 307), and it is probably in reference to this that St. Paul substitutes the stronger word **ἐξαπατάω** (as he does at 1 Tim. ii. 14) for the simple verb **ἀπατ.** of Gen. iii. 13. Carrying on the metaphor of ver. 2, he expresses his anxiety lest the Corinthian Church, the Bride of Christ, should be seduced by the devil from her singleness of affection (*cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 37, 60, and see on viii. 2 for **ἁπλότης**) and her purity, and so should be guilty of spiritual fornication. He assumes that "the serpent" is to be identified with Satan, the tempter of mankind, as he does also at Rom. xvi. 20; the earliest trace of this identification, which has become so familiar, is Wisd. ii. 24, *cf.* Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2. He now gives the reason of his anxiety, lest they should fall away; *viz.*, they were showing themselves too willing to listen to strange teachings.

Ver. 4. **εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος κ.τ.λ.**: *for if he that cometh* (**ὁ ἐρχόμενος** *may* point to some one conspicuous opponent, but it would not be safe to press this, or to lay stress on the verb as indicating one who *comes* without authorised *mission*, as at John x. 8; it is probably a quite indefinite phrase, "if any one comes and preaches," etc.) *preacheth another Jesus whom we did not preach* (*not* "another Christ," "a new Messiah," for of this the false teachers at Corinth were *not*

[n] ἁπλότητος [1] τῆς εἰς τὸν [2] Χριστόν. 4. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον [o] Ἰησοῦν [3] [o] κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν, ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἢ εὐαγγέλιον [4] ἕτερον ὃ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε, καλῶς ἠνείχεσθε.[5] 5. Λογίζομαι γὰρ [6] μηδὲν [p] ὑστερηκέναι [7] τῶν [q] ὑπὲρ λίαν ἀποστόλων. 6. εἰ δὲ [8] καὶ [r] ἰδιώτης [9] τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ

n Reff. viii. 2.
o Acts ix. 20, xix. 13.
p Ver. 8; Rom. iii. 23; 1 Cor. i. 7; chap. xii. 11.
q Chap. xii. 11 only.
r Acts iv. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 16, 23.

[1] ℵ*BG 17, g and the Harclean (with asterisk) give **απο της απλοτητος και της αγνοτητος**, which is adopted by W.H. and the R.V.; ℵcDcKLMP, f, vg. and the Peshitto have only **απο της απλ.** of the rec. text.

[2] BDEKLP support **εις τον Χρ.**; ℵGM omit **τον**.

[3] G, f, g, vg. give **Χριστον** for **Ἰησουν**.

[4] G, g add **λαμβανεται** after **ευαγγ. ετ.**

[5] BD* 17 have **ανεχεσθε**; but ℵDcEGKLMP have **ανειχεσθε**; the rec. **ηνειχεσθε** is found in cursives only.

[6] B has **δε** for **γαρ**, probably in mistaken reference to **μεν** of ver. 4.

[7] D*E, d, e, r, etc., add **εν υμιν** after **υστερ.**

[8] D*, d, e, f, g give **ει και**.

[9] D*E, d, e, g give **ιδ. ειμι**.

guilty; but "another Jesus," *i.e.*, a different representation of the historical Person, Jesus of Nazareth, from that which St. Paul put forward when at Corinth; see reff.), *or if ye receive a different Spirit which ye did not receive*, *sc.*, a Spirit different from Him whom you received at your baptism (**λαμβάνειν** is the regular verb with **πνεῦμα**; *cf.* John xx. 22, Acts viii. 15, x. 47, xix. 2, Rom. viii. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 12, Gal. iii. 2; it expresses the co-operation of the will in a degree which **δέχεσθαι**, the verb used in the next clause of "accepting" the Gospel, does not; see Acts vii. 38, xvii. 11, 1 Thess. i. 6, etc.), *or a different Gospel which ye did not accept*, *sc.*, when the Gospel was first brought to you by me, *ye bear with him finely!* **καλῶς** is ironical, as at Mark vii. 9 = *praeclare*. This facile acceptance of novelty is the cause of his anxiety; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 11, Gal. i. 6-8. Such instability is always a danger in the case of newly-founded Churches.

Vv. 5-15. He is not inferior to his Adversaries although (*a*) he is not a trained Orator (ver. 6), and although (*b*) he did not claim maintenance from the Church (ver. 7). This was not through want of affection for them, but that there might be no room for cavil.—Ver. 5. **λογίζομαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for I reckon that I am not a whit behind these superfine Apostles;* you receive *them* gladly; why not *me?* He then proceeds to refute the two reasons which were assigned for the disparagement of his apostolic authority, *viz.*, (*a*) he had none of the arts of a trained rhetorician, (*b*) he had not claimed maintenance from the Church of Corinth, which he had a right to do, if of genuine "apostolic" rank. **οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι**, "these superfine Apostles" is thus, as at xii. 11, an ironical description of the **ψευδαπόστολοι** (ver. 13) against whom he is contending. The A.V. and R.V. render "the very chiefest Apostles," *i.e.*, the original Twelve, who received their commission directly from Christ, and especially Peter, James and John; but to introduce any mention of *them* here would be irrelevant, and would interrupt the argument (they *were* **ἰδιῶται ἐν λόγῳ**), not to speak of the fact that **ὑπερλίαν** seems always in Greek literature to be used in an ironical sense.

Ver. 6. **εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ.**: *but even if I be rude in speech* (see on x. 10; **ἰδιώτης** is a "layman," who is without professional training), *yet am I not in knowledge*, *sc.*, of divine things (see on viii. 7 for **λόγος** and **γνῶσις**); *but in everything we have made it*, *sc.*, **τὴν γνῶσιν**, *manifest* (reading **φανερώσαντες**; *cf.* Col. iv. 4) *among all men* (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 7, Heb. xiii. 4, or "in all circumstances," as at Phil. iv. 12) *to you-ward*. He claims that he both knows the truth, and has presented it to them openly and plainly (*cf.* chap. ii. 17, iv. 2).

Ver. 7. **ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα κ.τ.λ.**: *or did I commit a sin* (note the irony) *in abasing myself* (*cf.* Phil. iv. 12), *that ye might be exalted*, *sc.*, in spiritual privileges (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 11), *because I*

τῇ γνώσει· ἀλλʼ [s]ἐν [s]παντὶ [t]φανερωθέντες[1] ἐν[2] πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς. 7. ἢ[3] ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα, ἐμαυτὸν[4] ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε, ὅτι [u]δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ [v]Θεοῦ [v]εὐαγγελίον εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν; 8. ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας [w]ἐσύλησα, λαβὼν [x]ὀψώνιον πρὸς τὴν ὑμῶν διακονίαν· καὶ παρὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ [y]ὑστερηθεὶς, οὐ [z]κατενάρκησα οὐδενός[5]· 9. τὸ γὰρ [a]ὑστέρημά μου [a]προσανεπλήρωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας· καὶ [b]ἐν [b]παντὶ [c]ἀβαρῆ ὑμῖν[6] ἐμαυτὸν ἐτήρησα καὶ τηρήσω. 10. ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ὅτι ἡ [d]καύχησις αὕτη οὐ σφραγίσεται[7] εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τοῖς [e]κλίμασι τῆς Ἀχαΐας. 11. διατί; ὅτι[8] οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς; ὁ [f]Θεὸς [f]οἶδεν· 12. ὃ δὲ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω, ἵνα [g]ἐκκόψω τὴν [h]ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελόντων ἀφορμήν, ἵνα ἐν ᾧ καυχῶνται

s Reff. iv. 8. t Reff. ii. 14. u Rom. iii. 24; Gal. ii. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 8. v Rom. i. 1, xv. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 2, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 17. w Here only. x Luke iii. 14; Rom. vi. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 7 only; 1 Macc. iii. 28. y Reff. ver. 5. z Chap. xii. 14 only. a Reff. ix. 12; *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 17. b Reff. iv. 8. c Here only. d Reff. i. 12. e Rom. xv. 23; Gal. i. 21. f Chap. xii. 2, 3. g Rom. xi. 22. h Reff. v. 12.

[1] ℵcDcEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic support **φανερωθεντες**; D*, d, e, f give **φανερωθεις**; better **φανερωσαντες** with ℵ*BG 17, g.

[2] G, f, g, r, vg. and Peshitto omit **εν πασιν**.

[3] G, f, g, r, vg. give **η μη αμ.** [4] DEGLP have **εαυτον** for **εμαυτον**.

[5] DEGKL support **ουδενος**; better **ουθενος** with ℵBMP 17, 37.

[6] ℵcDEGL, g support **υμιν εμαυτον**; better **εμαυτον υμιν** with ℵ*BMP 17, d, e, f, vg.; K om. **υμιν**.

[7] **σφραγισεται** is a scribe's blunder (supported by a few cursives only) for **φραγησεται**.

[8] B om. **οτι** after **διατι**.

preached to you the Gospel of God for nought?

Ver. 8. **ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα κ.τ.λ.**: *I robbed other Churches, e.g.*, Philippi (Phil. iv. 15. He expresses himself hyperbolically to bring out his meaning; **συλᾶν** is a very strong word, see Acts xix. 37, Rom. ii. 22), *taking wages of them* (**ὀψώνιον** primarily means the rations supplied to a soldier, and thence his *pay*; see reff.), *that I might minister unto you.* **διακονία** is not used here in special reference to the collection for the Judæan Christians, as it was at viii. 4, ix. 1, 13, but in its most general sense; *cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 11, Heb. i. 14.—**καὶ παρὼν κ.τ.λ.**: *and when I was present with you, i.e.*, during his first visit to Corinth (see Acts xviii. 1 ff.), *and was in want* (a condition which he recalls again, Phil. iv. 12), *I was not a burden on any man.* **νάρκη** is the torpedo-fish, which paralyses its victims by contact, and then preys upon them; so **καταναρκᾶν** signifies "to oppress heavily". The compound verb is not found elsewhere in Greek literature (we have **ναρκᾶν** in Gen. xxxii. 25, Job xxxiii. 19); Jerome says (Ep. cxxi. *ad Algasiam*) that it is a Cilicianism, like **ἡμέρα** in 1 Cor. iv. 3.

Ver. 9. **τὸ γὰρ ὑστέρημά μου κ.τ.λ.**: *for the brethren, when they came from Macedonia* (very likely Silas and Timothy; see Acts xviii. 5, Phil. iv. 15), *supplied the measure of my want; and in everything I kept myself* (note the aorists as pointing to the definite period of his residence in Corinth) *from being burdensome unto you* (*cf.* xii. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 6), *and so will I keep myself.*

Ver. 10. **ἔστιν ἀλήθ. Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *as the Truth of Christ* (we have **ἡ ἀλήθ. τ. Θεοῦ**, Rom. i. 25, iii. 7, xv. 8; *cf.* John xiv. 6, Eph. iv. 21) *is in me* (for the form of the asseveration see on i. 18; Rom. ix. 1 is not a true parallel to the constr. here), *this glorying, sc.*, in my independence, *shall not be stopped, as far as I am concerned, in the regions of Achaia* (see on i. 1); *cf.* vii. 14. The true reading is **φραγήσεται**; **φράσσειν** is "to fence," but in N.T. (Rom. iii. 19, Heb. xi. 33; *cf.* also Dan. vi. 22) is used with **στόμα** in the sense of "to stop" the mouth.

Ver. 11. **διατί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγ. κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth, i.e.*, that I *do* love you.

Ver. 12. **ὃ δὲ ποιῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *but what I do, that I will do that*, by refusing to accept maintenance gratis at your hands,

εὑρεθῶσι καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς. 13. οἱ[1] γὰρ [i]τοιοῦτοι [k]ψευδαπόστολοι, ἐργάται [k]δόλιοι, [l]μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ· 14. καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν[2]· αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ [m]Σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς[3] ἄγγελον φωτός· 15. οὐ μέγα οὖν[4] εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης, ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται[5] κατὰ τὰ

i Reff. ii. 6.
k Here only.
l 1 Cor. iv. 6; Phil. iii. 21; 4 Macc. ix. 22.
m Reff. ii. 11.

[1] G has **ου γαρ** for **οι γαρ** and omits **εις** before **αποστ.**

[2] DbcEKLM support **θαυμαστον**; better **θαυμα** (Rev. xvii. 6 only) with ℵBD*GPR 17.

[3] D*, d, e, m give **ως αγγελος** for **εις αγγ.**

[4] D*, d, e, m and the Peshitto omit **ουν**.

[5] D*, d, e, m have **εστιν** for **εσται.**

I may cut off the occasion (**τὴν ἀφορμ.**, the definite opportunity for attack which my opponents desire) *from those who desire occasion that in the matter of their boast*, *sc.*, that as of Apostolic rank free maintenance was their rightful due, *they may be found even as we*, *i.e.*, they desire that I and they may be on equal terms so far as the taking of money is concerned. It is better to regard the second **ἵνα**, not as in apposition with the first, but as dependent on **θελ. ἀφορμ.** and as expressing the desire of St. Paul's *opponents*, not his own. The situation seems to have been as follows: St. Paul held that the "labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke x. 7, 1 Tim. v. 18), and in 1 Cor. ix. 11-13 he gives a clear exposition of the principle as applied to preachers of the Gospel. On these grounds he more than once (Phil. iv. 15, 16) accepted money from the generous Church of Philippi. But it was not his usual practice. He reminds the Thessalonians (1 Thess. ii. 9) that when with them he had worked for his living. So too he did at Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), any help he then accepted coming from Macedonia (chap. xi. 9); and he did the same at Ephesus (Acts xx. 34). Now his Corinthian opponents were very ready to take money for their teaching (1 Cor. ix. 12); indeed they prided themselves on doing so, as it was the privilege of "apostles". This determined St. Paul that it should never be truly said of him that he was a hireling teacher, and so he was especially careful at Corinth (1 Cor. ix. 15-19) to avoid even the appearance of grasping after money (*cf.* Gen. xiv. 23). This honourable independence, however, created a difficulty in two directions. On the one hand, it gave his opponents a handle for saying that he was not really of Apostolic rank, inasmuch as he dared not claim Apostolic privilege; and, on the other hand, it hurt the feelings of his Corinthian friends that he should refuse maintenance at their hands. His reply is contained in vv. 7-12 of this chapter. And the point of ver. 12 is that his action is necessary, for if he were to take money as his opponents did, it would speedily be made a matter of cavil, and would tend to bring him down to their level (see also xii. 14).

Ver. 13. **οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ.**: *for such men* (this explains the ground of his determination in ver. 12 not to give opportunity for cavil) *are false apostles* (*cf.* Rev. ii. 2. This speedy appearance of false teachers was one of the most remarkable features of the Apostolic age; *cf.* Gal. ii. 4, Phil. i. 15, iii. 18, Tit. i. 10, 2 Pet. ii. 1, 1 John iv. 1), *crafty workers* (*cf.* Phil. iii. 2), *fashioning themselves into Apostles of Christ*, *i.e.*, laying special claim to that great title (*cf.* chap. x. 7). **μετασχηματίζειν τι** is to change the outward appearance (**σχῆμα**) of a thing, the thing itself in essence (**μορφή**) remaining unchanged (see reff.).

Ver. 14. **καὶ οὐ θαῦμα κ.τ.λ.**: *and no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light.* Light is the symbol of God (1 John i. 5, 1 Tim. vi. 16) and His messengers (Matt. xxviii. 3, Acts xii. 7), as darkness is the symbol of Satan (Luke xxii. 53, Eph. vi. 12, Col. i. 13). The **μετασχηματισμός** of Satan has just before been in the Apostle's mind (ver. 3), and perhaps such passages as Gen. iii. 1, Job i. 6, 1 Kings xxii. 19-23 sufficiently account for the image. But it is more probable that some Rabbinical tradition lies behind the word used by St. Paul; *cf. Apoc. Moysis* (v. 17) **τότε ὁ σατανᾶς ἐγένετο ἐν εἴδει ἀγγέλου.** A reference has been here found by Ewald to Matt. iv. 1-11, but while it is not improbable that the Apostle had heard the story of the Lord's Temptation, there is no clear trace of it in his Epistles.

Ver. 15. **οὐ μέγα οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *it is no great thing therefore, if his ministers also,*

ἔργα αὐτῶν. 16. Πάλιν λέγω, Μή τίς με δόξῃ [n] ἄφρονα εἶναι· εἰ δὲ μή[1] γε, κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με, ἵνα μικρόν[2] τι κἀγὼ καυχήσωμαι.[3] 17. ὃ λαλῶ, οὐ[4] λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν [o] ἀφροσύνῃ, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ [p] ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως· 18. ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται [q] κατὰ τὴν[5] [q] σάρκα, κἀγὼ καυχήσομαι. 19. ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε τῶν ἀφρόνων, [r] φρόνιμοι ὄντες· 20. ἀνέχεσθε[6] γάρ, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς [s] καταδουλοῖ, εἴ τις [t] κατεσθίει, εἴ τις λαμβάνει, εἴ τις [u] ἐπαίρεται,

n Rom. ii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 36; ver. 19, chap. xii. 6, 11; Eph. v. 17.
o Reff. ver. 1.
p Reff. ix. 4.
q Reff. i. 17.
r Rom. xi. 25, xii. 16 (Prov. iii. 7); 1 Cor. iv. 10, x. 15.
s Gal. ii. 4 only.
t Mark xii. 40; Gal. v. 15.
u Reff. x. 5.

[1] D* has μη for μηγε.

[2] καγω μικρον τι is the order in all the best authorities; μικρον τι καγω only in a few cursives and the Harclean.

[3] DEKLPR give καυχησομαι; καυχησωμαι, ℵBGM.

[4] The order ου λαλω κατα Κυρ. is found in DELM, d, e, r, vg., the Bohairic and Harclean; better ου κατα Κυρ. λαλω with ℵBGKPR, f, g and the Peshitto. For κατα Κυριον f, r give κατα Θεον.

[5] ℵ*D*GR 17, 73 give κατα σαρκα; ins. την ℵcBDcEKLMP.

[6] The Armenian vs. adds after ανεχ. γαρ, ει τις εξαπατᾳ υμας.

sc., as well as himself, *fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness* (see on iii. 9); *whose end*, notwithstanding their disguise (*cf.* Rom. vi. 21, Phil. iii. 19), *shall be according to their works* (see on ver. 10).

Vv. 16-33. His Apostolic labours and trials.—Ver. 16. **πάλιν λέγω κ.τ.λ.**: *I say again* (the first time having been in ver. 1), *let no man think me foolish*, *i.e.*, senseless with the **ἀφροσύνη** of self-praise; *but even if ye do* (for **εἰ δὲ μή γε** *cf.* Matt. vi. 1, ix. 17, Luke xiii. 9, xiv. 32), *yet receive me as foolish* (there is a somewhat similar ellipse in Mark vi. 56, Acts v. 15), *that I also*, *sc.*, as well as they (*cf.* ver. 18), *may glory a little* (**μικρόν τι** = "a trifle," "a little bit").

Ver. 17. **ὃ λαλῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *what I speak, I speak not after the Lord*, *i.e.*, Christ (he refuses to claim Divine inspiration for his self-glorying; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 12, 25), *but as in foolishness, in this confidence of glorying* (see on ix. 4 for **ὑπόστασις**).

Ver. 18. **ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing that many*, *sc.*, of the Corinthian Judaisers against whom this whole polemic is directed (*cf.* ii. 17, where they are also alluded to as **οἱ πολλοί**), *glory after the flesh*, *i.e.*, in external circumstances which are really no fit subject for glorying (see, on **ἐν προσώπῳ**, chap. v. 12 and reff.), *I too will glory*, *sc.*, after the flesh; *i.e.*, he proceeds to explain how much better external grounds he has for boasting than his Judaising rivals.

Ver. 19. **ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε κ.τ.λ.**: *for ye bear with the foolish*, *i.e.*, the false teachers, *gladly*, *being wise yourselves*, the latter clause being, of course, ironical, although (see reff.) it was true that **φρόνησις** was a quality which he had seriously ascribed to the Corinthians in a former letter. His point is that, as they have borne with the self-commendation of the pseudo-apostles, they should extend the same indulgent toleration to him. He then goes on to remind them of the insolence and ill-treatment which they had endured at the hands of these self-constituted spiritual guides.

Ver. 20. **ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for ye bear with a man if he* (we cannot press **τις** so as to point to any special individual; *cf.* x. 7) *enslave you* (in contrast to any such tyranny, St. Paul describes himself as the **δοῦλος** of the Corinthians; see iv. 5, and *cf.* Acts xv. 10); *if he devour you*, *i.e.*, robs you of your substance by greedily demanding maintenance, as these "superfine Apostles" did (see on ver. 12, and *cf.* Rom. xvi. 18, Phil. iii. 19); *if he take you captive* (**λαμβάνειν** is thus used of catching fish, Luke v. 5; *cf.* chap. xii. 16. Field defends the A.V. "taketh of you," *i.e.*, takes money, by appealing to the Peshitto, and also by the usage of good Greek writers); *if he exalt himself* (*cf.* x. 12, xi. 18); *if he smite you on the face.* A blow in the face was, and is, a common form of insult in the East (*cf.* 1 Kings xxii. 24, Matt. v. 39, xxvi. 67,

εἴ τις ὑμᾶς[1] εἰς πρόσωπον [v] δέρει. 21. κατὰ [w] ἀτιμίαν λέγω, [x] ὡς [x] ὅτι ἡμεῖς[2] [y] ἠσθενήσαμεν[3]· ἐν ᾧ δ'[4] ἄν τις [z] τολμᾷ, (ἐν[5] [a] ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω,) τολμῶ κἀγώ. 22. [b] Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ· Ἰσραηλῖταί εἰσι; κἀγώ· σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; κἀγώ· 23. διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσι, ([c] παραφρονῶν λαλῶ,[6]) [c] ὑπὲρ [a] ἐγώ· ἐν [d] κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν[7] [d] πληγαῖς [e] ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν [d] φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν θανάτοις

v 1 Cor. ix. 26.
w Chap. vi. 8, etc.
x Reff. v. 19.
y Ver. 29, chaps. xii. 10, xiii. 3, 9, etc.
z Reff. x. 2.
a Reff. ver. 1.
b Acts vi. 1; Phil. iii. 5 only.
c Here only.
d Reff. vi. 5.

[1] υμας εις προσ. is the order of DbKLM and the Peshitto; better εις προσ. υμας with ℵBD*EGP 17, the Latins and Harclean.

[2] G, g place ημεις after ησθεν.

[3] ησθενησαμεν is supported by DEGKLMP; better ησθενηκαμεν with ℵB 17, 37, 73. After ησθεν. DE, d, e and the Clem. vg. add εν τουτῳ τῳ μερει.

[4] D*, d, e, vg. and the Syriac have αν for δ' αν.

[5] G, g have εν αφρ. λεγω after τολμω καγω.

[6] DEG, the Latin and Peshitto give λεγω for λαλω.

[7] BD*E 17, d, e, f, vg. (followed by W.H. and the R.V.) give the order εν φυλ. περισσ., εν πληγ. υπερβ., which we adopt; the rec. text is supported by ℵcDbKLM, the Syriac and Bohairic vss.; ℵG, g (followed by Tisch.) give εν πληγ. περισσ., εν φυλ. υπερβ.; P has εν φυλ. υπερβ., εν πληγ. περισσ.

Acts xxiii. 2, 1 Cor. iv. 11); and the despotic teachers whom the Corinthians tolerated had very likely inflicted this last indignity upon them. *Cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. i. 7, where it is forbidden to the ἐπίσκοποι to be "strikers". "Such are your teachers," he says to them, "*I* am but weak in comparison with these strenuous spiritual directors."

Ver. 21. **κατὰ ἀτιμίαν λέγω κ.τ.λ.**: *by way of disparagement*, *sc.*, humbly of myself, *I say that we*, *i.e.*, I myself, ἡμεῖς being ironically emphasised, *have been weak*, *i.e.*, I have not attempted to enforce my authority in any of these directions (*cf.* x. 10 and 1 Cor. ii. 3). He now changes his tone from irony to direct and masterful assertion, and in the splendid passage which follows he makes the "boast" which he has been leading up to with such prolonged explanations.—**ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν κ.τ.λ.**: *and yet whereinsoever any man is bold* (*I speak in foolishness*—this he is careful to add once more; see ver. 17), *I am bold* also. His whole life will justify him.

Ver. 22. **Ἑβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ**: *are they Hebrews? so am I.* At a later period the term Ἑβραῖος was not confined to Palestinian Jews (Eus., *H.E.*, ii., 4, 2, iii. 4, 2), but expressed mere nationality. However in the N.T. it is used in contrast with Ἑλληνιστής (Acts vi. 1; *cf.* Phil. iii. 5), and denotes a Jew who retained his national language and customs. Jerome states (*de Vir. ill.*) that St. Paul was born in Gischala of Galilee, but this cannot be true in the face of his own statement that he was born in Tarsus (Acts xxii. 3).—**Ἰσραηλεῖταί εἰσιν; κἀγώ**: *are they Israelites? so am I.* The term Israelite expresses the sacred character of the nation, like the term *Quirites* for Romans, and is always used in the N.T. as a term of praise (John i. 48, etc.).—**σπέρμα Ἀβρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *are they the seed of Abraham? so am I.* This is the highest dignity of all, to be an inheritor of the Messianic promises given to Abraham (*cf.* for the phrase Isa. xli. 8, John viii. 33, Rom. ix. 7, Gal. iii. 29). In the two parallel passages, Rom. xi. 1, Phil. iii. 5, he adds that he is of the tribe of Benjamin—a fact which probably accounts for his name "Saul" (1 Sam. ix. 1). It shows how strong the Judaising party were at Corinth that he thinks it important to put this proud statement of his descent in the forefront of his apology.

Ver. 23. **διάκονοι Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *are they Christ's ministers?* (as they specially claimed to be; *cf.* x. 7)—*I speak as one beside himself* (*sc.*, as if he would say "this is mad boasting indeed; for what office *can* be higher than this?"); *I am more*, *i.e.*, I am that in a higher degree than they (ὑπέρ being used adverbially), as is proved by my trials in the service of the Gospel. The summary which follows is of deep interest for the student of St.

πολλάκις. 24. ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων [e] πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα[1] [e] παρὰ [e] μίαν ἔλαβον, 25. τρὶς ἐρραβδίσθην,[2] ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρὶς [f] ἐναυάγησα, [g] νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ [h] βυθῷ πεποίηκα· 26. [i] ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις[3]· [k] κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις λῃστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ [l] γένους, κινδύνοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, κινδύνοις ἐν πόλει, κινδύνοις ἐν [m] ἐρημίᾳ, κινδύνοις ἐν

e Here only. f 1 Tim. i. 19 only. g Here only. h Here only; Pss. lxviii. 16, cvi. 24. i John iv. 6 only. k Rom. viii. 35 only. l 2 Macc. xii. 31. m Mark viii. 4; Heb. xi. 38.

[1] The preferable spelling is τεσσερακοντα with ℵB*DE.

[2] The preferable spelling is εραβδισθην with all the uncials except M.

[3] D*, d, e and the Peshitto give πολλαις for πολλακις.

Paul's life; he goes into more definite detail than elsewhere (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11-13, chap. iv. 7-10, vi. 4-10), and gives us a more vivid picture of his extraordinary labours than would be possible to form from the narrative in the *Acts* alone. It will be remembered that his missionary career lasted for ten or eleven years after this Epistle was written, and that therefore we cannot regard these verses as giving us a *complete* list of his trials.—**ἐν κόποις κ.τ.λ.**: *in labours more abundantly*, *sc.*, than they (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10), *in prisons more abundantly* (up to this point in his life we only know of one imprisonment, *viz.*, at Philippi, Acts xvi. 23, but there must have been others; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 7, where he speaks of Andronicus and Junias as having been his "fellow-prisoners" on some occasion to which no other allusion had been preserved. Afterwards we read of his being imprisoned at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 33), at Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35) and at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30), besides which the evidence of the Pastoral Epistles gives another Roman imprisonment. Clement of Rome (§ 5) speaks of St. Paul as *seven* times in bonds; *cf.* vi. 5 above), *in stripes above measure*, details of which are given in the following verses (*cf.* Acts xxi. 32), *in deaths oft*, *i.e.*, in frequent perils of death (*cf.* Acts ix. 23, xiv. 19, etc., and chaps. i. 10, vi. 9).

Ver. 24. **ὑπὸ Ἰουδ. κ.τ.λ.**: *of the Jews five times received I forty* stripes (there is an ellipse of **πληγάς** as at Luke xii. 47) *save one*. The Law forbad more than forty stripes (Deut. xxv. 3); and, to be on the safe side, it was the custom in the judicial scourgings of the synagogues (Matt. xxiii. 34, Acts xxii. 19) to stop short at thirty-nine. This punishment was so severe that death often ensued (cf. Josephus, *Antt.*, iv., 8, 21); we know nothing of the circumstances under which it was inflicted on St. Paul.

Ver. 25. **τρὶς ἐραβδίσθην κ.τ.λ.**: *thrice was I beaten with rods*, *i.e.*, "virgis caesus sum," a *Roman*, as distinct from the *Jewish*, method of scourging—distinct too from flagellation with *thongs* (Matt. xxvii. 26). It was forbidden in the case of a Roman citizen by the Lex Porcia, but nevertheless St. Paul had endured it at Philippi (Acts xvi. 23, 37), and barely escaped it at Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 25). We do not know the other two occasions alluded to.—**ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην κ.τ.λ.**: *once was I stoned*, *i.e.*, at Lystra (Acts xiv. 19, and *almost* at Iconium, ver. 5), *thrice I suffered shipwreck*, of the circumstances of which we have no record, for the shipwreck on his voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii.) was subsequent to this, *a night and a day have I been* (there seems to be no special reason here for the perf. in preference to the aorist) *in the deep*, probably after one of the shipwrecks (*cf.* Acts xxvii. 44). For **ποιεῖν** with words of time *cf.* Acts xv. 33, xx. 3, Jas. iv. 13.

Ver. 26. **ὁδοιπορίαις πολλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *in journeyings often* (of the extent of which the *Acts* gives us some idea; their dangers are now enumerated), *in perils of rivers*, *sc.*, from swollen torrents dangerous to ford (Stanley notes that Frederick Barbarossa was drowned in the Calycadnus, not far from Tarsus; see Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 23, for several illustrations of the dangers of the Pisidian highlands), *in perils of robbers*, on account of whom travelling in Asia Minor was, and still is, dangerous (the district of Perga and Pamphylia which St. Paul traversed on his first missionary journey was notorious for brigands; see Strabo, xii., 6, 7), *in perils from my kindred*, *i.e.*, persecutions at the hands of the Jews which he had suffered (see Acts ix. 23, 29, xiii. 50, xiv. 5, 19, xvii. 5, 13, xviii. 12, 1 Thess. ii. 15), and from which he was yet to suffer more (Acts

θαλάσσῃ, κινδύνοις ἐν [n] ψευδαδέλφοις· 27. ἐν[1] [o] κόπῳ καὶ [o] μόχθῳ, ἐν [p] ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις,[2] ἐν [q] λιμῷ καὶ [r] δίψει,[3] ἐν [p] νηστείαις πολλάκις,[2] ἐν [s] ψύχει καὶ [q] γυμνότητι· 28. χωρὶς τῶν [t] παρεκτὸς, ἡ ἐπισύστασίς[4] μου[5] ἡ καθ' ἡμέραν, ἡ [u] μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. 29. τίς [v] ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς [w] σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ

n Gal. ii. 4 only.
o 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8.
p Reff. vi. 5.
q Rom. viii. 35.
r Here only.
s Acts xxviii. 2.
t Matt. v. 32; Acts xxvi. 29 only.
u Mark iv. 19; Luke xxi. 34; 1 Pet. v. 7.
v Reff. ver. 21.
w Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13.

[1] ℵcKLMP, f, vg., etc., support **εν κοπῳ**; better om. **εν** with ℵ*BDEG, d, e, g.

[2] D*, d, e, f, vg. and the Peshitto have **πολλαις** (twice) for **πολλακις**.

[3] B has **διψη**.

[4] KLMP support **επισυστασις**; better **επιστασις** with ℵBDEG 17 (*cf.* Acts xxiv. 12) and vg. = *instantia*.

[5] ℵcDEKLMP, f, g, vg. support **μου**; better **μοι** with ℵ*BG 17.

xx. 3, xxi. 31, xxiii. 12, xxv. 3), *in perils from the Gentiles*, as, *e.g.*, at Iconium (Acts xiv. 5), at Philippi (Acts xvi. 20) and at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23), *in perils in the city* (Acts xxi. 31 and *passim*), *in the desert* (Arabia (?), Gal. i. 17), *in the sea*, *i.e.*, in town and country, by land and by water, *in perils among false brethren*, *i.e.*, probably the Judaisers who were his bitter opponents (*cf.* ver. 13 and Gal. ii. 4).

Ver. 27. **κόπῳ καὶ μόχ. κ.τ.λ.**: *in labour and travail, in watchings often* (see on vi. 5), *in hunger and thirst* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11, Phil. iv. 12), *in fastings often*, *i.e.*, plainly, in involuntary deprivation of all food (the idea of voluntary devotional fastings is quite foreign to the context here, and to bring it in spoils the rhetorical force of the passage; see on vi. 5), *in cold and nakedness* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11).

Ver. 28. **χωρὶς τῶν παρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *besides the things which I omit* (see reff., and *cf.* Heb. xi. 32; the A.V. "those things that are without" = vulg. *quae sunt extrinsecus*, is wrong), *there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches* (see on viii. 18). **ἐπισύστασις** of the rec. text means a combination for hostile purposes, and is used of Korah's rebellion in Num. xvi. 40, xxvi. 9, in which latter place we have the same textual variants as here (*cf.* also 1 Esdr. v. 73). This *may* be the true reading, both here and at Acts xxiv. 12, for the syllable **συ** might readily drop out in transcription. If it be adopted here it would refer to the cabals of the Apostle's adversaries = "the daily combination against me," and would thus indicate a trial distinct from "the care of all the churches," which is next mentioned. But, although this gives a good sense, we prefer to read **ἐπίστασις** as better supported both here and at Acts xxiv. 12 (the only places of its occurrence in N.T.). Polybius uses the word as = "attention," "close observation," but this will not suit Acts xxiv. 12. It is found in 2 Macc. vi. 3 as = "visitation" or "pressure," and the latter rendering seems best to satisfy the context here. We have therefore followed the Revisers in adopting the Vulgate rendering *instantia* = "that which presseth," and in taking **ἡ μέριμνα κ.τ.λ.** as in apposition with **ἡ ἐπίστασις**.

Ver. 29. **τίς ἀσθενεῖ κ.τ.λ.**: *who is weak*, *sc.*, in prejudice (as at Rom. xiv. 1, 1 Cor. viii. 11), *and I am not weak*, *i.e.*, in Christian sympathy (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 22 **ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀσθενής**); *who is made to stumble, and I burn not? i.e.*, with the fire of righteous indignation (*cf.* **πυρωθείς** = "inflamed" at 2 Macc. iv. 38). The word **ἀσθενῶ** now suggests to him a new thought, that it is in his weakness as supported by God's grace rather than in any strength of his own that his real boast may be made.

Ver. 30. **εἰ καυχᾶσθαι κ.τ.λ.**: *if I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern my weakness* (*cf.* chap. xii. 5, 9), such as are the perils and indignities which he has recounted in the preceding verses.

Ver. 31. **ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.**: *the God and Father of the Lord Jesus, who is blessed for evermore* (see on i. 3, and for **ὁ ὤν** as applied to God, "the self-existent one," *cf.* Exod. iii. 14, Wisd. xiii. 1, Rev. i. 8), *knoweth that I lie not* (*cf.* xii. 6). This solemn asseveration belongs (see reff.) to what *follows*, and not to the statements which precede

x 1 Cor. vii. 9; Eph. vi. 16.
y 1 Cor. ii. 3; chaps. xii. 5, 9, 10, xiii. 4.
z Reff. i. 3.
a Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; Ps. lxxxviii. 53.

[x] πυροῦμαι; 30. εἰ καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, τὰ τῆς [y] ἀσθενείας μου [1] καυχήσομαι. 31. Ὁ [2] [z] Θεὸς καὶ [z] πατὴρ τοῦ [z] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [3] [z] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [4] οἶδεν, ὁ ὢν [a] εὐλογητὸς [a] εἰς τοὺς [a] αἰῶνας, ὅτι [b] οὐ [b] ψεύδομαι. 32. ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὁ ἐθνάρχης Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλέως [c] ἐφρούρει τὴν Δαμασκηνῶν [5] πόλιν, πιάσαι με θέλων [6]· 33. καὶ διὰ [d] θυρίδος ἐν [e] σαργάνῃ [f] ἐχαλάσθην διὰ τοῦ τείχους, καὶ ἐξέφυγον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.

b Rom. ix. 1; Gal. i. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 7. c Gal. iii. 23; Phil. iv. 7. d Acts xx. 9 only. e Here only. f Acts ix. 25, xxvii. 17.

[1] B om. **μου**. [2] D*E, d, e have **ο Θεος του Ἰσραηλ**.

[3] ℵBGKL, g and the Harclean omit **ημων**; ins. DEMP, d, e, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic.

[4] DEKLMP, d, e, f, vg. the Peshitto and Bohairic support **Χριστου**; om. ℵBG 17, 37, g and the Harclean.

[5] D^{b}KLM support **Δαμ. πολιν**; the preferable order is **πολιν Δαμ.** with ℵBD*EGP 17, 37 and the Latins.

[6] BD*, d, e, f, vg. and the Peshitto omit **θελων**; ins. ℵD^{c}EKLMP and (before **πιασαι με**) G, g, the Bohairic and Harclean.

it. If the text is not corrupt, it would seem that the Apostle intended now to illustrate in detail the providence which overruled his life, the "strength which was perfected in weakness," and that, beginning with one of the earliest and least dignified perils of his career as a Christian missionary, he then is led off through some train of ideas which we cannot trace into the quite different subject of his "visions" and "revelations," which diverts him from his original intention. If, on the other hand, we might suppose vv. 32, 33 to be a marginal gloss (founded on Acts ix. 23-25, and perhaps introduced in reference to the **κίνδυνοι ἐκ γένους** of ver. 26) which was not part of the original text—though possibly an autograph addition made after the letter was finished—the argument would be quite consecutive. He feels the remarkable account in xii. 2-4 to be so incredible that he thinks it right to prefix the strong asseveration of ver. 31 that he is telling the truth. But there is no MS. authority for thus treating vv. 32, 33.

Ver. 32. **ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὁ ἐθν. κ.τ.λ.**: *in Damascus the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes, sc.*, by placing a watch at the gates, *to take me; and through a window* (*i.e.*, an aperture in the city wall, or the window of a house overhanging the wall) *was I let down in a basket* (**σαργάνη** is anything twisted, and so here probably a rope basket; **σφυρίς** is the word used in Acts ix. 25) *by the wall, and escaped his hands.* The incident took place on St. Paul's return to Damascus from Arabia (Gal. i. 17) and is narrated in Acts ix. 23-25. The date of it is important in the chronology of the Apostle's life. It could not have been before A.D. 34, for coins of Tiberius prove Damascus to have been under direct Roman administration in that year. Tiberius was unlikely to have handed Damascus over to Aretas (fourth of the name), the hereditary chief (*cf.* 2 Macc. v. 8) of the Nabathæan Arabs; for up to the close of the reign of Tiberius military operations were being carried on against Aretas by the legate of Syria. Hence Damascus was probably not ceded to Aretas until the reign of Caligula, and consequently this episode in St. Paul's life cannot have taken place before the middle of A.D. 37. Instigated by the Jews (Acts ix. 23), the "ethnarch," or provincial governor of Damascus under Aretas (*cf.* 1 Macc. xiv. 47), laid a plan for the arrest of the Apostle which was frustrated by St. Paul's escape in the manner described (*cf.* Josh. ii. 15, 1 Sam. xix. 12).

CHAPTER XII.—Vv. 1-6. THE APOSTLE'S VISION: IF HE CHOSE, HE COULD BOAST OF IT.—Ver. 1. With Tisch., W.H. and the R.V. we adopt the reading (see crit. notes): **καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ· οὐ συμφέρον μέν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *I must needs glory, though it is not expedient* (*sc.*, my opponents drive me to it); *but I will come to visions* such as were seen by Daniel (x. 1), which were predicted as to be granted in the New Dispensation (Joel ii. 28 f., quoted in Acts ii. 17), which were seen by St. Peter (Acts x. 10), and by St. John (Rev. i. 10, iv. 1), as well as by St. Paul him-

XII. 1. Καυχᾶσθαι[1] δὴ[2] οὐ συμφέρει[3] μοι· ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ[4] εἰς [a] ὀπτασίας[5] καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις Κυρίου.[6] 2. οἶδα ἄνθρωπον [b] ἐν [b] Χριστῷ πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, (εἴτε [c] ἐν [c] σώματι,[7] οὐκ οἶδα· εἴτε [d] ἐκτὸς [d] τοῦ[8] [d] σώματος, οὐκ οἶδα· ὁ [e] Θεὸς [e] οἶδεν·) [f] ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. 3. καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον, (εἴτε ἐν σώματι, εἴτε ἐκτὸς[9] τοῦ σώματος, οὐκ[10] οἶδα· ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν·) 4. ὅτι ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν [g] παράδεισον, καὶ ἤκουσεν [h] ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ

a Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23; Acts xxvi. 19 only.
b Reff. v. 17.
c Reff. v. 6.
d 1 Cor. vi. 18.
e Chap. xi. 11.
f Acts viii. 39; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xii. 5.
g Luke xxiii. 43; Rev. ii. 7 only.
h Here only.

[1] ℵc, f, vg. prefix **ει** before **καυχ.** (from xi. 30).

[2] KM support **δη**; ℵD* and the Bohairic give **δε**; BDcEGLP 17, 37, the Latin and Syriac vss. have **δει**.

[3] DcEKL and the Harclean support **συμφερει μοι**; D* and the Peshitto give **συμφερει** without **μοι**; better **συμφερον μεν** with ℵBGP 17, 67**, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.

[4] **γαρ** is read by DEKL and the Syriac vss.; better **δε** with ℵB (which adds **και**) GP 17, 73, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic.

[5] GP have **εις τα(ς) οπτ.**

[6] G, g give **Χριστου** for **Κυριου.**

[7] D*E* have **εν τῳ σωμ.**

[8] B om. **του** before **σωματος.**

[9] ℵDbcE**GKLMP support **εκτος** (from ver. 2); BD*E* have **χωρις,** which is perhaps preferable.

[10] B om. **ουκ οιδα,** and accordingly W.H. bracket the words.

self (Acts ix. 3, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1, Acts ix. 12, xxii. 17) *and revelations of the Lord*, *sc.*, revelations granted by Christ (Rev. i. 1). St. Paul repeatedly insists that he received his message **δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰη. Χρ.** (Gal. i. 12, Eph. iii. 3; *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 3); on one occasion he went up to Jerusalem **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν** (Gal. ii. 1); and he claims to have the power of speaking **ἐν ἀποκαλύψει** (1 Cor. xiv. 6), as had also some of his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. xiv. 26). He now mentions one signal instance of such a "vision and revelation" which was vouchsafed to him.

Ver. 2. **οἶδα ἄνθρ. ἐν Χρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I know* (not "I knew" as the A.V. has it) *a man in Christ*, *i.e.*, a Christian (see reff.), *fourteen years ago* (for the constr. **πρὸ ἐτ. δεκ.** *cf.* John xii. 1)—*whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not* (the words distinctly indicate St. Paul's belief that perception is possible for a disembodied spirit); *God knoweth—such an one caught up to the third heaven*. *Cf.* Ezek. viii. 3. "The Spirit lifted me between the earth and the heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerusalem." The date of this trance must have been about 41 or 42 A.D., years of which we have no details so far as St. Paul's life is concerned; probably he was then at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30, xi. 25; *cf.* the reference to St. Paul in the dialogue *Philopatris*, § 12: **ἐς τρίτον οὐρανὸν ἀεροβατήσας**). The mention of "the third heaven" raises interesting questions as to Jewish beliefs. There is no doubt that a plurality of "heavens" is recognised all through the O.T. (see, *e.g.*, Deut. x. 14, 1 Kings viii. 27, Neh. ix. 6, Ps. lxviii. 33 and cxlviii. 4); but it has been matter of dispute whether the Rabbinical schools recognised *seven* heavens or only *three*. However it is now fairly well established that, in common with other ancient peoples (*e.g.*, the Parsees, and probably the Babylonians), the Jews recognised *seven* heavens. This view not only appears in the pseudepigraphical literature, but in some of the Fathers, *e.g.*, Clement of Alexandria. Its most detailed exposition is found in the *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, a Jewish apocalypse written in Greek in the first century of our era (now only extant in a Sclavonic version). In chap. viii. of this work we find that Paradise is explicitly located in the "third heaven," which is the view recognised here by St. Paul (see Charles' *Sclavonic Enoch*, pp. xxxi. ff.).

Vv. 3, 4. **καὶ οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον κ.τ.λ.**: *and I know such a man* (he speaks with such caution and reticence of this

i Reff. xi. 30.
k Reff. xi. 16.
l Reff. i. 23.
m Reff. i. 8.
n 2 Thess. ii. 4 only.
o Here only.
p Reff. ii. 11.
q Mark iv. 65; 1 Cor. iv. 11.

οὐκ [i] ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι. 5. ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχήσομαι· ὑπὲρ [1] δὲ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχήσομαι, εἰ μὴ ἐν ταῖς [l] ἀσθενείαις μου.[2] 6. ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχήσασθαι, οὐκ ἔσομαι [k] ἄφρων· ἀλήθειαν γὰρ ἐρῶ· [l] φείδομαι δὲ, μή τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσηται ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει με, ἢ ἀκούει τι [3] ἐξ ἐμοῦ.

7. Καὶ τῇ [m] ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων ἵνα [4] μὴ [n] ὑπεραίρωμαι,[5] ἐδόθη μοι [o] σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκὶ, ἄγγελος [p] Σατᾶν [6] ἵνα με [q] κολαφίζῃ,

[1] D* has περι δε for υπερ δε.

[2] BD* 17, 67**, d, e, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. om. μου; ins. ℵD^cEGKLMP, f, g, vg. (*cf.* ver. 9).

[3] ℵ^cD*E*KLP, d, e, f and the Harclean support ακουει τι; better om. τι with ℵ*BD^cE**G 17, 37, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic vss.

[4] The best authorities ℵABG 17 read διο before ινα; it is omitted by DEKLP, the Latin and Syriac vss., "a characteristic Western attempt to deal with a difficulty by excision" (Hort).

[5] DELP give υπεραιρομαι.

[6] ℵ^cA**D^bcEKLP and the Harclean margin support Σαταν; better Σατανα with ℵ*A*BD*G 17*, 67**, the Bohairic and Latin vss. (Σαταν is indecl. in 1 Kings xi. 14, but the form in N.T. is always the declinable Σατανας).

momentous event in his spiritual life that he will not even describe it in the first person) . . . *how that he was caught up into Paradise* (see previous note), *and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter;* such words are reserved for the Divine voice which speaks to man, although this restriction does not apply to *all* Divine words.

Ver. 5. **ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου κ.τ.λ.**: *on behalf of such an one will I glory, but on mine own behalf, i.e.*, of myself in my normal state, *I will not glory save in my weaknesses*, as he has already done, xi. 23 ff.

Ver. 6. **ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσω καυχ. κ.τ.λ.**: we must supply a suppressed clause: "And yet, as you see, if I *did* choose to boast, I should keep within the truth" is the sense. *For if I should desire to glory, I shall not be foolish* (*cf.* xi. 1 and ver. 11), *for I shall speak the truth* (xi. 31); *but I forbear, lest any man should account of me above that which he seeth me to be or heareth from me.* He is anxious that he should be judged, *not* by his report of his own spiritual experiences, but by his laborious and painful life in the service of the Gospel. It is instructive to notice that he does not bring forward this vision as *evidence* of the truth of doctrine; he only mentions it incidentally and with reserve as a Divine manifestation of which he might legitimately boast, if he chose. On the other hand, he appeals to the fact that he had seen the Risen Christ (1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8) as of great evidential importance, which indicates that he believed *that* vision to be "objective" in a sense in which the visions of an ecstatic trance are not.

Vv. 7-10. HIS "THORN IN THE FLESH".—Ver. 7. **καὶ τῇ ὑπερβ. τῶν ἀποκ.** If we read **διό**, these words ought either to be taken with the concluding words of ver. 6 (as by W.H.), or—regarding ver. 6 as a parenthesis—with ver. 5 (as by Lachmann). Neither gives a satisfactory sense, and we therefore follow the R.V. in regarding the construction as broken. He says *and by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations*—and then suddenly changes the form of the sentence.—**διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρ. κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore, that I should not be exalted overmuch, there was given to me, sc.*, by God (as at 1 Cor. xi. 15, xii. 7, Gal. iii. 21), *a thorn in the flesh, an angel of Satan* (who is regarded as having power over the **σάρξ**, Luke xiii. 16, 1 Cor. v. 5, Job ii. 5), *that he might buffet me* (see reff.), the pres. tense indicating that this "buffeting" was not a single isolated trial but continual, *that I should not be exalted overmuch.* In classical Greek **σκόλοψ** means a "stake," and this is given as an alternative rendering in the R.V. margin. Thus the Apostle's trial would be likened to a continual "impalement". Stanley, who adopts this rendering, compares Gal. ii. 20 "I am crucified with Christ". But in the Greek of the

ἵνα[1] μὴ [n] ὑπεραίρωμαι. 8. ὑπὲρ[2] τούτου τρὶς[3] τὸν Κύριον παρε-
κάλεσα, ἵνα [r] ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· 9. καὶ εἴρηκέ μοι, [s] Ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ
χάρις μου· ἡ γὰρ δύναμίς μου[4] ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται.[5] ἥδιστα
οὖν μᾶλλον καυχήσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου,[6] ἵνα [t] ἐπισκηνώσῃ

r Luke iv. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 5.
s John xiv. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 8.
t Here only.

[1] The second ινα μη υπεραιρ. is omitted by ℵ*ADEG 17 and the Latin vss.; but is found in ℵcBKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss., and is printed by Tisch. and W.H.

[2] A has και υπερ. [3] D*E, d, e and the Bohairic give τον Κυρ. τρις.

[4] ℵcA²DbcEKLP, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. support μου after δυν.; better om. with ℵ*A*BD*G and the Latins, but the sense is not affected.

[5] τελειουται, ℵcDcEKLP; better τελειται with ℵ*ABD*G.

[6] B 67**, the Harclean and Bohairic vss. om. μου after ασθ.; ins. ℵADEGKLP, the Latin, Peshitto and Sahidic vss.

LXX (see Num. xxxiii. 55, Hosea ii. 8, Ecclus. xliii. 19) **σκόλοψ** undoubtedly means "thorn," not "stake" (Ezek. xxviii. 24 is, perhaps, doubtful). Illustrations of its use in this sense also occur in Artemidorus, Babrius and the medical writers (see Field *in loc.* and *Hermathena*, xix., p. 390); *e.g.*, of the pain of cutting a tooth it is said **ὅταν ἐμπεπαρμένος ᾖ σκόλοψ σαρκί** (*Comm. in aph. Hippocr.*, 25). We hold, then, that **σκόλοψ** here certainly means "thorn," and that St. Paul's trial is compared to the vexatious irritation of a thorn rather than to the agonising and fatal torture of impalement on a stake. We have no knowledge as to what this trial was. It is a mere fancy, and not a happy one (probably suggested by the Latin *stimulus carnis*), that it consisted in violence of sensual passions (*cf. contra* 1 Cor. vii. 7-9 and ver. 9 below). That the **σκόλοψ** is an individual opponent who was a "thorn in his side" (*cf.* x. 7, xi. 14) was held by Chrysostom; Ephraim Syrus identifies him with Alexander the coppersmith (2 Tim. iv. 14)! But this guess hardly explains **σαρκί**; the trial was not of the spirit, but *in the flesh*. It seems likely on the whole that it was a bodily infirmity, probably the **ἀσθένεια τῆς σαρκός** of Gal. iv. 13. Jerome (*Gal.*, iv., 13) and Tertullian (*de Pudic.*, 13) mention the tradition that it was *headache*; this was probably (if there be any truth in the tradition) only a symptom. Another view (supported by the Celtic name for the disease) is *epilepsy*, a disease to which "visionaries" are said to be prone, but which afflicted two such strong men as Napoleon and Peter the Great. Those who hold this view generally point to the circumstances of St. Paul's conversion as illustrating an attack of the disorder. But *this* at least is excluded by the Apostle's own words; the "thorn in the flesh" was "given" him *after* the "vision" of fourteen years before; *i.e.*, this infirmity came upon him *after* the year 41. Another plausible conjecture (see Farrar, *St. Paul*, Excurs. xi., but *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 39) is that the Apostle suffered from *ophthalmia* (*cf.* Acts ix. 9, Gal. iv. 15, vi. 11), a very common disease in the East. Prof. Ramsay (*loc. cit.*, p. 94 ff.) thinks it was chronic malarial fever. Whatever his infirmity was, it apparently affected the dignity of his outward appearance (Gal. iv. 14), and was evident to the eye. For a full discussion of the various theories on the subject see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 186 ff.

Ver. 8. **ὑπὲρ τούτου τρὶς κ.τ.λ.**: *concerning this thing* (or "this angel"; for **ὑπέρ** = "concerning" see on i. 8) *I besought the Lord, i.e.*, Christ (see ver. 9), *thrice that it* (or "he") *might depart from me.* "Thrice" seems to point to three special occasions, when his prayers for the removal of his trial were specially urgent. Like Another who prayed thrice that the cup of suffering might pass from Him (Matt. xxvi. 44), St. Paul did not receive the answer his spirit longed for. But he did receive an answer abundantly sufficient to strengthen and to console.

Ver. 9. **καὶ εἴρηκέ μοι κ.τ.λ.**: *and He hath said* (note the perf. as expressing the abiding validity of the Divine promise; so often in quotations from the O.T., *e.g.*, Acts xiii. 34, Heb. iv. 4, x. 9) *to me*, "*My grace is sufficient for thee* (*cf.* Isa. xliii. 2), *for My power is being made perfect* (**τελεῖσθαι** is found here only; the tense indicates a continuous fact in St. Paul's life) *in weakness*". So it is said of Christ that He was "made perfect through sufferings" (Heb. ii. 10);

ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 10. διὸ [u] εὐδοκῶ ἐν [v] ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν [w] ἀνάγκαις, ἐν [x] διωγμοῖς,[1] ἐν[2] [w] στενοχωρίαις, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ [y] ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι. 11. Γέγονα [z] ἄφρων καυχώμενος[3]· ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὤφειλον ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν [a] συνίστασθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ[4] [b] ὑστέρησα τῶν [b] ὑπὲρ λίαν [b] ἀποστόλων, εἰ καὶ οὐδέν εἰμι.

12. Τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου [c] κατειργάσθη[5] ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν [d] πάσῃ

u Reff. v. 8. v Reff. xi. 30. w Reff. vi. 4. x Acts xiii. 50; Rom. viii. 35; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 11. y Reff. xi. 21. z Reff. xi. 16. a Reff. iii. 1. b Reff. xi. 5. c Reff. iv. 17. d Reff. viii. 7.

[1] A om. εν διωγμοις.

[2] ℵcDEGKLP support εν στεν.; better και στεν. with ℵ*B.

[3] LP and the Syriac vss. support the explanatory gloss καυχωμενος after αφρ. om. ℵABDEGK, the Latin and Egyptian vss.

[4] B ins. τι after γαρ (W.H. place it in their margin); G has ου γαρ.

[5] ℵAB³KL support κατειργασθη; B*DEG have κατηργασθε.

and of the power which He communicates from Himself the same law holds good. *Cf.* Isa. xl. 29-31.—**ἥδιστα οὖν κ.τ.λ.**: *most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses* (*sc.*, rather than that they should be removed), *that the power of Christ* (see on vi. 7 and reff. there) *may rest upon me*, lit., "may spread a tabernacle over me". The image is that of the Shechinah or **σκηνή**, the glory which was the symbol of the Divine presence in the Holy of Holies, descending upon the faithful (*cf.* John i. 14, Rev. vii. 15, xxi. 3). The two renderings ("strength" and "power") of **δύναμις** in the A.V. of this verse are preserved (although interchanged) in the R.V. by a curious inadvertence on the part of the Revisers, who are generally scrupulous even to pedantry in maintaining uniformity in such matters.

Ver. 10. **διὸ εὐδοκῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *wherefore I am well content in* (for **εὐδοκεῖν ἐν** *cf.* 2 Sam. xxii. 20, Matt. iii. 17, 1 Cor. x. 5) *weaknesses, in insults* (**ὕβρις** is used for "injury" to a ship in Acts xxvii. 10, 21; it does not occur elsewhere in N.T.; but *cf.* **ὑβρίζειν**, Acts xiv. 5, 1 Thess. ii. 2), *in necessities, in persecutions and distresses, for Christ's sake* (*cf.* Matt. v. 11); *for whenever I am weak, then am I strong*. Wetstein compares Philo's **τὸ ἀσθενὲς ὑμῶν δύναμίς ἐστι** (*Vit. Mos.*, i., § 13). St. Paul's words are more than a verbal paradox: they express the fact, to which history abundantly testifies, that the world's throne is the Cross.

Vv. 11-13. THE FOREGOING TESTIMONY TO HIS CLAIMS OUGHT TO HAVE COME FROM THE CORINTHIANS WHO WITNESSED HIS APOSTOLIC LABOURS.—Ver. 11. **γέγονα ἄφρων· ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *I am become foolish, sc.*, boasting thus: *ye compelled me, i.e.*, it was your doing; *for I ought to have been commended by you* (*cf.* iii. 1, 1 Cor. ix. 1), *i.e.*, you should not have left it to me to speak my own praises: *for in nothing was I behind the superfine Apostles*, whom you trust so readily, *although I am nothing, sc.*, in God's eyes (*cf.* John viii. 54, 1 Cor. iii. 7). Of the Apostles properly so called, St. Paul calls himself **ὁ ἐλάχιστος** (1 Cor. xv. 9); but he will not admit for a moment the superiority of the Corinthian Judaisers.

Ver. 12. **τὰ μὲν σημεῖα κ.τ.λ.**: *truly* (there is no antithesis to **μέν**) *the signs of an Apostle* (**τοῦ** is generic, "such as might be expected from an Apostle"; *cf.* Mark. xvi. 20) *were wrought* (note the passive; he does not claim to be anything more than God's instrument; **οὐδέν ἐστι**) *among you in all patience, sc.*, on my part (**ὑπομονή** is an essential quality for a Christian missionary; see on i. 6), *in signs and wonders and powers*. This direct assertion, made as if it were indisputable, that miracles had been wrought at Corinth through his agency (see also Rom. xv. 19, 1 Cor. ii. 4) is noteworthy. The three words used should be distinguished. **τέρας** is something anomalous, outside the ordinary course of nature. This, however, is not the prominent idea in the N.T. miracles; **τέρας** is *never* used in the N.T. (save in the quotation Acts ii. 19) except in combination with **σημεῖον** = a "sign" of the Divine purpose. **σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα** is the regular phrase both in O.T. (Exod. vii. 3, etc.) and in the N.T. for

[e] ὑπομονῇ, ἐν [1] [f] σημείοις καὶ [f] τέρασι καὶ [f] δυνάμεσι. 13. τί γάρ ἐστιν ὃ ἡττήθητε [2] ὑπὲρ [3] τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας; εἰ μὴ ὅτι αὐτὸς [4] ἐγὼ οὐ [g] κατενάρκησα ὑμῶν· [h] χαρίσασθέ μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην. 14. ἰδοὺ τρίτον [5] [i] ἑτοίμως [i] ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐ [k] καταναρκήσω ὑμῶν [6]· οὐ γὰρ [l] ζητῶ τὰ ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς. οὐ γὰρ ὀφείλει τὰ τέκνα τοῖς γονεῦσι [m] θησαυρίζειν, ἀλλ' οἱ γονεῖς τοῖς τέκνοις· 15. ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα δαπανήσω [7] καὶ [n] ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν· εἰ καὶ [8] περισσοτέρως ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶν [9] [o] ἧττον ἀγαπῶμαι.

e Reff. i. 6.
f Acts ii. 22; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 4.
g Chap. xi. 8 only.
h Reff. ii. 7.
i Acts xxi. 13; Dan. iii. 15.
k Chap. xi. 8 only.
l 1 Cor. x. 24, 33, xiii. 5; Phil. ii. 21.
m 1 Cor. xvi. 2.
n Here only.
o 1 Cor. xi. 17 only.

[1] DcEKLP and the Bohairic support **εν σημειοις**; ℵaAD*, d, e, f and the Harclean give **σημειοις**; G, g and the Peshitto **και σημ.**; ℵc **τε σημ.**; better **σημειοις τε** with ℵ*B 17, 73.

[2] ℵcADbcKLP support **ηττηθητε**; better **ησσωθητε** with ℵ*BD*.

[3] DE give **παρα** for **υπερ**.

[4] G and the Latin vss. give **εγω αυτος**.

[5] ℵABG, the Latin, Syriac and Sahidic vss. have **τριτον τουτο** (DE and the Bohairic give **τουτο τριτον**); om. **τουτο** KLP (*cf.* xiii. 1).

[6] DbcEKL, the Latin, Syriac and Egyptian vss. support **καταναρκ. υμων**; D*G have **υμας** for **υμων**; om. **υμων** ℵAB 17, 73.

[7] D*E, d, e add **και εκδαπανησω** after **δαπανησω**.

[8] NcDbcEKLP, f, vg. and the Syriac vss. support **ει και**; om. **ει και** D*d, e, g; om. **και** ℵ*ABG 17 and the Egyptian vss.

[9] ℵcBDEGKLP and the Latin vss. support **αγαπων**; better **αγαπω** with ℵ*A 17 and the Egyptian vss.

"miracles"; but it is their *signal* rather than their *wonderful* character upon which stress is laid. To describe them as **δυνάμεις** (Matt. vii. 22, Acts xix. 11, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28) directs attention to the Omnipotent Being to whom they are due.

Ver. 13. **τί γάρ ἐστιν ὃ ἡσσ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for what is there wherein ye were treated as inferior* (*cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 19) *to the rest of the churches, except indeed that I myself did not burden you? Cf.* Acts xx. 33, 1 Cor. ix. 12 and ver. 16. The emphatic **αὐτὸς ἐγώ** may indicate that it was only he himself (and not his colleagues) who refused maintenance (see on xi. 12). This was the only **σημεῖον τοῦ ἀποστόλου** which he did not exhibit at Corinth, and he ironically adds, *Forgive me this wrong*.

Vv. 14-18. That he did not claim maintenance at Corinth was disinterested on his part.—Ver. 14. **ἰδοὺ τρίτον τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *behold this is the third time that I am ready to come to you.* While these words only express that he had been *ready* to go twice before, they are quite consistent with the hypothesis, required by xiii. 1, 2 and ii. 1 (see *Introd.*, p. 5), that he had actually *paid* two previous visits to Corinth, the first of which is described in Acts xviii. That we have no details of the second is no argument against its having taken place.—**καὶ οὐ καταναρκ. κ.τ.λ.**: *and I will not be a burden to you*, following in this my practice on the two former occasions; *for I seek not yours but you; for the children are not bound to lay up for the parents*, in which relation he stands to them (1 Cor. iv. 14 f., *cf.* Gal. iv. 19), *but the parents for the children* (*cf.* Prov. xix. 14). See on xi. 12 for St. Paul's principles of action in this matter.

Ver. 15. **ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα κ.τ.λ.**: *and I will most gladly spend and be wholly spent for your souls' sake* (*cf.* chap. i. 6, Rom. ix. 3, Phil. ii. 17, 1 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 10 for the like expressions of unselfish devotion). **ψυχή** is here used (as at Heb. xiii. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 11) of the spiritual part of man, the interests of which are eternal.—**εἰ περισσοτέρως ὑμᾶς ἀγαπῶ κ.τ.λ.**: *if I loved you more abundantly, i.e.*, than I love other Churches of my foundation (*cf.* xi. 11), *am I loved less* (*sc.*, than I am loved by other Churches)? Is it thus that you requite my affection?

Ver. 16. **ἔστω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but be it so!*

16. Ἔστω δέ, ἐγὼ οὐ [p] κατεβάρησα [1] ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὑπάρχων [q] πανοῦργος [r] δόλῳ ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. 17. μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' [2] αὐτοῦ [s] ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; 18. παρεκάλεσα Τίτον, καὶ [t] συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν [3]· μή τι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος; οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιεπατήσαμεν [4]; οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς [u] ἴχνεσι;

19. Πάλιν [5] δοκεῖτε ὅτι ὑμῖν [v] ἀπολογούμεθα; [w] κατενώπιον [6] τοῦ [7] [w] Θεοῦ [w] ἐν [w] Χριστῷ [w] λαλοῦμεν· τὰ δὲ πάντα, [x] ἀγαπητοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς

p Here only.
q Here only; *cf.* iv. 2.
r Rom. i. 29; 1 Thess. ii. 3.
s Reff. ii. 11.
t Here only.
u Rom. iv. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 21.
v Acts xxiv. 10; Rom. ii. 15.
w Chap. ii. 17.
x Reff. vii. 1.

[1] ℵG have κατεναρκησα υμων (from ver. 13) for κατεβαρησα υμας.

[2] G, f, g, vg. om. δι' αυτου.

[3] Some editions of the Peshitto suggest αδελφους for αδελφον, but it is doubtful if there is a Greek variant behind their texts.

[4] G, g add after περιεπατησαμεν (from xiii. 2), οτι εαν ελθω παλιν ου φεισομαι.

[5] ℵcDEKLP, g, the Syriac and Bohairic vss. support παλιν; better παλαι with ℵ*ABG 17, 67**, d, e, f, vg. with a period after απολογ.

[6] DEKLP support κατενωπιον; better κατεναντι with ℵABG (*cf.* ii. 17).

[7] ℵcDbcEKL support του Θεου; better om. του with ℵ*ABD*GP 17, 37 (*cf.* ii. 17).

I did not myself burden you (*cf.* xi. 9 and ver. 13). This the Corinthians grant as indisputable, but they allege a sinister reason, *viz.*, *being crafty* (for **ὑπάρχων** see on viii. 17) *I caught you* (see on xi. 20) *with guile* (*cf.* iv. 2, **μὴ περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ μηδὲ δολοῦντες κ.τ.λ.**). That is, his adversaries hinted that, although he did not accept maintenance directly, yet the collection made for the Judæan Christians was under his hand, and that he was not above suspicion in his disposal of it. To this he returns an indignant denial, and appeals directly to their own observation of the messengers whom he had sent, of whom Titus (at least) had met him in Macedonia with a report (vii. 6) and was sent back to Corinth with two companions to complete the business, carrying this letter (viii. 6, 18 ff.).

Ver. 17. **μή τινα ὧν κ.τ.λ.**: *of those whom* (**ὧν** by attraction for **ἐκείνων οὓς**) *I have sent, was there one by whom I took advantage of you?* The constr. is broken, and the resulting anacoluthon is one of the most striking in St. Paul's writings (*cf.* Rom. viii. 3, Gal. i. 20).

Ver. 18. **παρεκάλεσα Τίτον κ.τ.λ.**: *I exhorted Titus* (see on viii. 6), *and I sent the brother with him.* This was the mission from which Titus' return is recorded above (vii. 6). We do not know the name of his companion; but it is highly probable that Titus and this **ἀδελφός** are the **ἀδελφοί** who were the bearers of the former letter to Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 12).—**μή τι ἐπλεονέκτ. κ.τ.λ.**: *surely Titus took no advantage of you? walked we not* (*i.e.*, Titus my emissary and I myself) *by the same spirit and in the same steps?* It is plain that Titus' first mission had been admirably fulfilled, and that the Corinthians had recognised his single-mindedness and sincerity (see vii. 13). To their good opinion of him St. Paul might fairly point, for Titus, after all, had only carried out *his* instructions.

Vv. 19-21. His Glorying has not been by way of Apology, but to edify them unto Repentance.—Ver. 19. **πάλαι δοκεῖτε κ.τ.λ.**: *ye are thinking this long time* (*i.e.*, since they read xi. 1 ff.; for **πάλαι** *cf.* Matt. xi. 21, Heb. i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 9) *that we are excusing ourselves to you*, which is very far from his intention (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 3). On the contrary, *in the sight of God speak we in Christ* (as he had said before, ii. 17). *But all the things, sc.*, which we speak, *beloved, are for your edifying, sc.*, of which you sorely stand in need.

Ver. 20. **φοβοῦμαι γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for I fear lest by any means, when I come, I should find you not such as I would, and should myself be found of you such as ye would not, i.e.*, indignant to severity at their backsliding (*cf.* x. 2), *lest by any means there should be strife* (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 3), *jealousy, ragings* (this seems to be the force of the plur. **θυμοί**; *cf.* Wisd. vii. 20), *factions* (**ἐριθεῖα** is derived from **ἔριθος**, a hired labourer, and signifies a

ὑμῶν [y] οἰκοδομῆς. 20. [z] φοβοῦμαι γάρ, [z] μή [z] πως ἐλθὼν οὐχ οἵους θέλω εὕρω ὑμᾶς, κἀγὼ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν οἷον οὐ θέλετε· μή πως [a] ἔρεις,[1] [b] ζῆλοι,[2] [c] θυμοί, [d] ἐριθεῖαι, [e] καταλαλιαί, [f] ψιθυρισμοί, [g] φυσιώσεις, [h] ἀκαταστασίαι· 21. μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα[3] με ταπεινώσῃ[4] [i] ὁ [i] Θεός [i] μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πενθήσω πολλοὺς τῶν [k] προημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ [l m n] ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ [l m o] πορνείᾳ καὶ [l n] ἀσελγείᾳ ᾗ ἔπραξαν.

y Reff. x. 8. z Reff. xi. 3. a Rom. i. 29, xiii. 13; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 15. b Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v. 20. c Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20; Eph. iv. 31; Col. ii. 8. d Rom. ii. 8; Gal. v. 20; Phil. i. 17, ii. 3. e 1 Pet. ii. 1 only; Wisd. i. 11. f Here only. g Here only; *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 6, 18, v. 2, viii. 1. h Reff. vi. 5. i Rom. i. 8; Phil. i. 3, iv. 19; Philm. 4. k Chap. xiii. 2 only. l Gal. v. 19. m Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5. n Eph. iv. 19. o 1 Cor. v. 1, vi. 13, 18, vii. 2.

[1] BDEGKLP, the Latin, Egyptian and Harclean vss. give **ερεις**; Tisch. and W.H. read **ερις** with ℵA 17 and the Peshitto.

[2] ℵD[bc]EKLP, the Latin, Egyptian and Harclean vss. support **ζηλοι**; Tisch. and W.H. read **ζηλος** with ABD*G 17 and the Peshitto.

[3] ℵ[c]D[c]KL support **ελθοντα με**; better **ελθοντος μου** with ℵ*ABGP, placing **με** after **ταπειν.**

[4] ℵAK support **ταπεινωσῃ**; BDEGLP have **ταπεινωσει.**

mercenary cabal), *backbitings*, *whisperings* (*i.e.*, open and secret defamation of character), *swellings*, *i.e.*, insolences, *tumults* (see on vi. 5). *Cf.* Jas. iii. 16, **ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία.**

Ver. 21. **μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου κ.τ.λ.**: *lest when I come, my God should humble me again before you*, *sc.*, because of the scanty fruit of his preaching (as had been the case on his *second* visit), *and I should mourn for many* (observe, not "all") *that have sinned heretofore*, *i.e.*, before my second visit, *and did not repent*, *i.e.*, after my second visit (we thus retain the force of the aorist part; for **μετανοέω** see on vii. 9, and for **μετανοεῖν ἐπὶ** *cf.* Joel ii. 13, Amos vii. 3), *of the uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness which they committed.* There is nothing in the anxiety here expressed which is inconsistent with the language of vii. 9 ff. *There* he expresses his satisfaction that in the matter of the incestuous person the Corinthians had obeyed his directions; but their proneness to sins of the flesh he is fully alive to. See, *e.g.*, vi. 14, vii. 1.

CHAPTER XIII. — Vv. 1-10. IF HE COMES AGAIN, HE WILL NOT SPARE: CHRIST IS HIS STRENGTH: LET THE CORINTHIANS SEE TO IT THAT HE BE THEIRS ALSO. — Ver. 1. **τρίτον τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.**: *this is the third time I am coming to you.* "*At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.*" That is, he will hold a formal enquiry in the strict legal way (see reff.) when he arrives. No evasions will be possible.

Ver. 2. **προείρηκα καὶ προλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *I have said beforehand* (at chap. x. 6, 11, xii. 21), *and I do say beforehand, as when I was present the second time* (*cf.* ii. 1, xii. 14), *so now being absent, to them that have sinned heretofore*, *i.e.*, before my second visit (as at xii. 21), *and to all the rest*, *i.e.*, any more recent offenders, *that if I come again I will not spare.* It was "to spare" them that he had paid hitherto no further visit after his second (i. 23). He proceeds to give the reason why he will not "spare" if such a visit should be necessary; *viz.*, they have challenged his Apostolic authority.

Ver. 3. **ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν κ.τ.λ.**: *seeing that ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me* (*cf.* Matt. x. 20), *i.e.*, a proof that I am really an "Apostle" with a "mission" from Christ to speak in His Name. This last thought leads him into a short digression. "He who has thus commissioned me is not weak, but strong, and this paradoxical strength in weakness is mine also" (vv. 3[b], 4).—**ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.**: *who is not weak in relation to you*, *sc.*, as you think me to be (x. 10, xi. 21), *but is powerful in your midst.* And this is true for two reasons: (*a*) because of His Resurrection, as the Victor over Death; (*b*) because of the strength with which He empowers us in the discharge of our duty to you. Each of these reasons is now introduced by **καὶ γάρ.**

XIII. 1. [a]Τρίτον[1] [a]τοῦτο ἔρχομαι[2] πρὸς ὑμᾶς· "[b]ἐπὶ[3] [b]στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ[4] τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα". 2. [c]προείρηκα[5] καὶ [d]προλέγω ὡς[6] παρὼν τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἀπὼν νῦν γράφω[7] τοῖς [e]προημαρτηκόσι, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν, ὅτι, ἐὰν ἔλθω εἰς τὸ πάλιν, οὐ [f]φείσομαι· 3. ἐπεὶ[8] [g]δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ [h]ἀσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ [i]δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. 4. καὶ γὰρ εἰ[9] [k]ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ [l]ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῇ ἐκ [m]δυνάμεως [m]Θεοῦ[10]· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς [n]ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν[11] αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ

a Chap. xii. 14; Num. xxii. 28; Judges xvi. 15; John xxi. 14.
b Deut. xix. 15 (Matt. xviii. 16; 1 Tim. v. 19).
c Chap. vii. 3.
d Gal. v. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 4.
e Chap. xii. 21 only.
f Reff. i. 23.
g Reff. ii. 9.
h Reff. xi. 21.
i Rom. xiv. 4; chap. ix. 8 only.
k 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2, 8; Gal. iii. 1.
l Reff. xi. 30.
m Reff. vi. 7.
n Reff. xi. 21.

[1] ℵ^cA 17, vg. prefix **ιδου** to **τριτον** (from xii. 14).

[2] A and the Peshitto read (from xii. 14) **ετοιμως εχω ελθειν** for **ερχομαι**.

[3] ℵ*, g and the Syriac vss. prefix **ινα** to **επι στ.**

[4] ℵ, f, vg. read **η τρ.** (as at Matt. xviii. 16, 1 Tim. v. 19) for **και τρ.**

[5] D*E add **γαρ** after **προειρ.**

[6] D*, d, e and the Harclean om. **ως** before **παρων**.

[7] D^cEKLP and the Syriac have **γραφω** (from ver. 10); om. ℵABD*G 17 and the Latins.

[8] f, vg. have *an* for **επει**, and there is Patristic testimony to a variant **ει**.

[9] So ℵ^cAD^bcEL, f, vg. and the Syriac; better om. **ει** with ℵ*BD*GKP 17, d, e, g and the Bohairic.

[10] 17 om. **Θεου**; so also Hilary.

[11] BDEKLP, d, e, vg. and the Harclean give **ασθεν. εν αυτω**; better **συν** for **εν** with ℵAG, f, g, the Peshitto and Bohairic.

Ver. 4. (*a*) **καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ.τ.λ.**: *for He was crucified through weakness* (*cf.* Phil. ii. 8, 1 Pet. iii. 18; **ἐκ** indicating that it was His self-assumed **ἀσθένεια** which made the Passion possible), *but liveth through* (**ἐκ** again indicating the ultimate condition) *the Power of God* (see reff. and *cf.* Rom. viii. 11, Eph. i. 20, Phil. ii. 9).—(*b*) **καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: *for we also are weak with Him* (the reading **ἐν αὐτῷ** might be explained from such passages as i. 5, iv. 10, 11; but it is so startling that we hesitate to adopt it, when the MS. evidence is so evenly balanced; **σὺν αὐτῷ** means simply "we are weak, as He was weak, in the world's eyes"; see xii. 10), *but we shall live with Him*, not only in the Resurrection Life of believers (John xiv. 19, Rom. v. 10, vi. 8), but *through the Power of God toward you*, *i.e.*, through the powerful sanctions with which He will confirm our exercise of Apostolic discipline at Corinth (*cf.* 1 Cor. v. 5). The thought is that already expressed in xii. 10. He now resumes the argument of ver. 3[a], *sc.*, you are claiming to test *my* claims: you should look to yourselves; *your* faith is a witness to mine—that Christ dwells in you is a proof that He dwells in me, who preached Him to you. *Cf.* chap. i. 24, iii. 2.

Ver. 5. **ἑαυτοὺς πειράζετε κ.τ.λ.**: *try your own selves* (**πειράζειν** generally has a sinister sense in the N.T. = "to tempt," as at 1 Cor. vii. 5, x. 9, Gal. vi. 1, 1 Thess. iii. 5; but see reff.) *whether ye be in the Faith*, *sc.*, the objective Christian Creed (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 13); *prove your own selves* (**δοκιμάζειν** goes back to **δοκιμή** of ver. 3; *cf.* also **ἀδόκιμοι** at the end of this verse). *Or know ye not as to your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you?* (*cf.* Rom. viii. 10, Gal. iv. 19) *unless indeed*, *sc.*, which is certainly not the case (for **εἰ μή τι** *cf.* Luke ix. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 5) *ye are reprobate.* **ἀδόκιμος** is that which will not satisfy a test, and so = *reprobus*. Their own consciousness of the power of Christ's grace is the best proof that his preaching to them was Divinely authorised; he "begat them in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. iv. 15).

Ver. 6. **ἐλπίζω δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *but*, however it may be with you, *I hope that ye shall know that we are not reprobate*, that

ζησόμεθα [1] σὺν [2] αὐτῷ ἐκ [3] [m] δυνάμεως [m] Θεοῦ εἰς [4] ὑμᾶς. 5. ἑαυτοὺς [o] πειράζετε εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτοὺς [5] [p] δοκιμάζετε. ἢ [6] οὐκ [q] ἐπιγινώσκετε ἑαυτούς, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς [7] Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστιν [8]; εἰ μή τι [r] ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε. 6. ἐλπίζω δὲ ὅτι γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ἀδόκιμοι. 7. [s] εὔχομαι [9] δὲ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν μηδέν, οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς [t] δόκιμοι φανῶμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὑμεῖς [u] τὸ [u] καλὸν ποιῆτε, [10] ἡμεῖς δὲ ὡς ἀδόκιμοι ὦμεν. 8. οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας. 9. χαίρομεν [11] γὰρ [12] ὅταν ἡμεῖς [v] ἀσθενῶμεν, ὑμεῖς δὲ δυνατοὶ ἦτε· τοῦτο δὲ [13] καὶ εὐχόμεθα,

o Rev. ii. 2 iii. 10; Ps. xxv. 2.
p Reff. viii. 8.
q Reff. i. 13.
r Rom. i. 28; 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16.
s Rom. ix. 3; 3 John 2.
t Reff. x. 18.
u Rom. vii. 21; Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21; Amos v. 14.
v Reff. xi. 29.

[1] DcEKL support ζησομεθα; G has ζησωμεν; better ζησομεν with ℵABD* 17.

[2] D* 17, d, e, g give ζησ. εν αυτῳ (a reading which may be the true one).

[3] G, g om. εκ δυναμ. Θεου; K om. Θεου.

[4] BDcE om. εις υμας, wherefore W.H. bracket the words.

[5] A om. εαυτους δοκιμαζ.

[6] ℵ* om. η.

[7] BDEKL, d, e and the Syriac support the order Ἰησ. Χρ.; ℵAGP, f, g, vg. and the Bohairic give Χρ. Ἰησ.

[8] BD* 17 om. εστιν after εν υμιν; but it is found in all the remaining uncials and in the primary vss.

[9] DcEKL and the Peshitto support ευχομαι; better ευχομεθα with ℵABD*GP 17, 37, the Latin, Harclean and Bohairic vss.

[10] ℵKL have ποιειτε for ποιητε.

[11] DEP, f give χαιρωμεν.

[12] DcE**K om. γαρ; the Peshitto has δε.

[13] ℵcDcEKL and the Peshitto give δε και; better om. δε with ℵ*ABD*GP, the Latin and Bohairic vss.

we can confidently submit to any testing of our apostolic authority.

Ver. 7. **εὐχόμεθα δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: *now we pray to God* (for **εὐχ. πρὸς** *cf.* Num. xi. 2) *that ye do no evil; not that ye may appear approved*, *i.e.*, the motive of his prayer was not that his ministry should be accredited by its success, *but that ye may do that which is honourable* (see reff. and mark the contrast between **τὸ κακόν** and **τὸ καλόν**), *even though we be as reprobate.* That is, his prayer was for their sakes, and it was sincerely offered although, if it were fully answered, there would be no occasion for the exercise of his apostolic authority, and so the **δοκιμή** or "proof" which the malcontents were asking for (ver. 3) would not be manifested. And he gives two reasons for this disinterestedness of his intercessions for them: (i.) he could not exercise his authority, even if he would, except in conformity with the facts (ver. 8), and (ii.) their moral growth is a real joy to him (ver. 9).

Ver. 8. **οὐ γὰρ δυνάμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *for we can do nothing*, exhibit no Apostolic power, *against the truth*, *i.e.*, against the facts of the case, *but for the truth* (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 1 for the elliptical constr.). The principle here laid down is of far wider application than an accurate exegesis can assign to it in its context. It is a *general* principle, which Christian theology has not always sufficiently remembered, that to fight against truth, whether ethical or historical or scientific, is to fight against Him who is *the* Truth, and so is to court defeat. We *can* do nothing, even if we would, against the truth (*cf.* 1 Esdr. iv. 38).

Ver. 9. **χαίρομεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: *for we rejoice when we are weak and ye are strong*, *i.e.*, in Christian graces. The primary reference is to that weakness which the non-exercise of Apostolic authority would seem to suggest to them (ver. 4, xi. 21), and of which his opponents were very ready to accuse him (x. 10); but in *all* weakness of his he repeatedly declares his contentment, if it minister in any way to their edification (see iv. 12,

τὴν ὑμῶν [w] κατάρτισιν. 10. διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα ἀπὼν γράφω, ἵνα παρὼν[1] μὴ [x] ἀποτόμως χρήσωμαι[2] κατὰ τὴν [y] ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκέ[3] μοι ὁ Κύριος εἰς [y] οἰκοδομὴν, καὶ οὐκ εἰς [y] καθαίρεσιν.

11. [z] Λοιπὸν, [z] ἀδελφοί, χαίρετε, [a] καταρτίζεσθε, παρακαλεῖσθε, [b] τὸ[4] [b] αὐτὸ [b] φρονεῖτε, [c] εἰρηνεύετε· καὶ ὁ [d] Θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ[5] [d] εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν. 12. [e] Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν [e] ἁγίῳ[6] [e] φιλήματι.

w Here only; *cf.* Eph. iv. 12; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
x Tit. i. 13 only; Wisd. v. 22 only.
y Reff. x. 8.
z Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1.
a Rom. ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 10; Gal. vi. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 10.
b Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2.
c Mark ix. 50; Rom. xii. 18; 1 Thess. v. 13.
d Rom. xv. 33.
e Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 27; *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 14.

[1] DEG and the Latins give **μη παρων**.

[2] DEGP have **χρησομαι**.

[3] KL and the Syriac support the order **εδ. μοι ο Κυρ.** (from x. 8); better **ο Κυρ. εδ. μοι** with ℵABDEGP, the Latin and Bohairic vss.

[4] A om. **το αυτο φρονειτε**.

[5] G 17, 73, g give **της ειρηνης** for **της αγ. και ειρ.**; DEL give **της ειρ. και της αγαπης**.

[6] AGL, f, g, vg. give **εν φιληματι αγιω**.

xii. 10, and *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 10).—**τοῦτο δὲ καὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *this we also pray for* (and not merely rejoice in), *viz.*, *your perfecting* (*cf.* ver. 11).

Ver. 10. **διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.**: *for this cause I write these things*, *i.e.*, this letter, *while absent that I may not when present* (*cf.* ii. 3) *deal sharply* (we must understand **ὑμῖν** after **χρήσωμαι**, as at Esth. i. 19, ix. 27) *according to the authority which the Lord gave me for building up and not for casting down.* The last clause is repeated *verbatim* from x. 8.

Conclusion.—Vv. 11-13. Final Exhortations, Salutations and Benediction.—Ver. 11. **λοιπὸν, ἀδελφοὶ κ.τ.λ.**: *finally*, *brethren* (**λοιπόν** strictly = "from henceforth," but is used vaguely, as in reff. for "finally". "Well, then," is its nearest equivalent as used in Modern Greek) *rejoice* (as at Phil iii. 1, iv. 4, 1 Thess. v. 16 and everywhere in the Pauline Epp. where the word occurs; the rendering of the A.V. "farewell" cannot be justified. "Farewell" would be **ἔρρωσθε**), *be perfected* (see reff. and *cf.* Lightfoot on 1 Thess. iii. 10), *be comforted*, *be of the same mind*, *live in peace*, *and* then *the God of Love* (this phrase is only found here in N.T., but *cf.* 1 John iv. 8) *and Peace shall be with you.* In these exhortations we have a summary of the whole letter: (1) *Rejoice* in the grace you have received (i. 24, ii. 3) even as I do on your behalf (vii. 7, 9, 16, xiii. 9). (2) *Be perfected*, go on to perfection (vi. 1, 13, vii. 1, 11, ix. 8, xii. 19, xiii. 9), the word **καταρτίζεσθαι** being used as at Gal. vi. 1 of gradual amendment after a grave fault. (3) *Be comforted*, the keynote of the early part of the Epistle (see on i. 4 and *cf.* especially i. 4, 6, vii. 7). (4) *Be of the same mind*, *live in peace* (xii. 20). With the whole may be compared 1 Cor. i. 10, **παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς . . . ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ.**

Ver. 12. **ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλ. κ.τ.λ.**: *salute one another with a holy kiss.* This common form of Eastern salutation became at an early date part of the ritual of Christian worship, as indicating the brotherhood of the faithful in the family of God. So early as Justin (*Apol.*, i., 65) we read of the "kiss of peace" in the service of the Eucharist.—**ἀσπάζ. ὑμ. κ.τ.λ.**: *all the saints*, *sc.*, all from Macedonia where the Apostle was, *salute you* (*cf.* Phil. iv. 22).

Ver. 13. **ἡ χάρις τοῦ κ. κ.τ.λ.**: *the Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ* (his concluding salutation in Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Phil., Philm., 1 and 2 Thess.), *and the Love of God* (see on v. 14), *and the Fellowship of the Holy Spirit* (as at Phil. ii. 1, and *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 9, x. 16) *be with you all*, even with those who opposed him. The ordinary conclusion of a letter of the period was **ἔρρωσθε**, as **χαίρειν** was the introductory greeting (see on i. 1). But St. Paul has a signature of his own, which he calls the **σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ** (2 Thess. iii. 17); *viz.*, he always ends with a prayer that Christ's *grace* may rest on his correspondents, either in the form **ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρ. Ἰη. Χρ.** or in the abbreviated form **ἡ χάρις** (as in *Eph.*, *Col.* and the Pastorals). Here, and here only, he fills it out so

ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ [f]ἅγιοι πάντες. 13. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ f Reff. 1.
Χριστοῦ,[2] καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος
μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Ἀμήν.[3]

Πρὸς Κορινθίους δευτέρα ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων τῆς Μακεδονίας,
διὰ Τίτου καὶ Λουκᾶ.

[1] After **Κυριου**, some cursives, f, m, vg., the Peshitto and Bohairic add **ημων**.

[2] B om. **Χριστου**.

[3] ℵcDEP, d, e, vg., the Syriac and Bohairic add **αμην**; better om. with ℵ*ABG 17, f, g, etc.

as to embrace the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Possibly the phrase the "God of Love" in ver. 11 has suggested here mention of the "Love of God," *i.e.*, the love which God has for man; and a prayer for the "Fellowship of the Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, the **κοινωνία** which is the Spirit's gift, is a fitting conclusion to a letter addressed to a community agitated by faction and strife and jealousy (xii. 20). But whatever were the thoughts which suggested this triple benediction (*cf.* Num. vi. 23 f.), it remains, as Bengel says, "egregium de SS. Trinitate testimonium". It offers a devotional parallel to the Baptismal Formula (Matt. xxviii. 19); and the order of its clauses receives its explanation in later words of St. Paul: **δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν . . . ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα** (Eph. ii. 18). It is the Grace of Christ which leads us towards the Love of God, and the Love of God when realised through the Spirit's power promotes the love of man (1 John iv. 11), the holy fellowship fostered by the indwelling Spirit.

πρὸς Κορ. κ.τ.λ. This subscription is found (in substance) in KL, the Harclean and Bohairic vss. and in many cursives, but has no real authority. The mention of Titus and Luke is plainly derived from chap. viii. 18. A few cursives add the name of Barnabas; the Peshitto mentions Titus only. The form of subscription in the best MSS., ℵAB 17, is simply **πρὸς Κορινθίους β**.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

GALATIANS

INTRODUCTION.

Text. The text of this Epistle has been constructed with due regard to the traditional text (*Textus Receptus*) on which our Authorised Version was based. But the discovery of MSS. not then known, and the critical study of ancient authorities since that time, necessitate careful revision and extensive alteration of that text. For this purpose the editor has relied mainly on Tischendorf's collation of MSS. The *Apparatus Criticus* is based on his authority and follows his notation. It contains all the MS. evidence which appears really important for determination of the text. The following letters are used to designate uncial MSS.:—

ℵ	Sinaiticus.	F	Augiensis.
A	Alexandrinus.	G	Boernerianus.
B	Vaticanus.	H	Coislinianus.
C	Ephraemi.	K	Mosquensis.
D	Claromontanus.	L	Angelicus.
E	Sangermanensis.	P	Porfirianus.

Corrections of ancient date, inserted in the uncial MSS., are indicated by small letters or numerals (a, c, 1, 3) attached to the capital letters. Cursive MSS. are denoted by the numerals generally accepted for their designation.

The readings, punctuation, and division of paragraphs differ here and there from those adopted by Westcott and Hort. The reasons for these variations may be gathered from the notes.

Pauline Authorship. Widely different opinions are entertained by critics with regard to the date of the Epistle and the locality of the Galatian Churches. But its authorship has never been seriously questioned. This unanimity of tradition is probably due to the nature of its contents. For it is stamped throughout with characteristic features of the Pauline mind and spirit. Matter and style alike attest the personality of the Apostle to the Gentiles. It unites dialectic skill in criticising the language and history of the Old Testament,

and a comprehensive philosophy which assigns to law, to the spirit, and to the flesh their several functions in God's government of the world, with intense spirituality and absolute devotion to the Lord Jesus. The Apostle Paul alone of the Apostles and their contemporaries exhibited this rare combination of mental and spiritual qualities. None of his Epistles is more certainly genuine, none gives so vivid a picture of his mind and character during the most active stage of his apostolic career.

ANCIENT TESTIMONY. The adoption of its language by Fathers of the Church in the second century proves its antiquity and high reputation in their time. Polycarp borrows ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν from iv. 26, and θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται from vi. 7; Irenæus gives a Latin version of iii. 19, referring to the Epistle by name; Justin Martyr reproduces Γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ (ἤμην) ὡς ὑμεῖς from iv. 12, and ἔχθραι ἔρεις ζῆλος ἐριθεῖαι θῦμοι . . . καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις from v. 20. Its canonicity is established by its insertion in every Canon of Scripture. Marcion also placed it at the head of his catalogue of Pauline Epistles.

ANTECEDENTS OF THE GALATIAN CONVERTS. Throughout the Epistle the author assumes the position of Founder, he addresses the Galatians as his own converts and claims special authority over them in the name of Christ who had made him Apostle and committed to him the ministry of the Gospel among them. One passage in the Epistle brings into prominence the diverse elements which entered into their composition, reminding us that, like other Pauline Churches, they were mixed bodies comprehending a minority of Jewish Christians (iii. 28). But the circumcised minority are in general ignored (iv. 8), for the Epistle is specially addressed to the Greek converts, who had not yet accepted circumcision, but had of late been urged by agitators to submit to it for the sake of the covenanted blessings attached to it at its institution. These uncircumcised Greeks formed apparently the mass of the Galatian Churches: there is at the same time no doubt that they had been for some time regular attendants on the teaching of the synagogue, for the Epistle assumes throughout their familiarity with the patriarchal history, the Law, the Psalms and Prophets, as well as expositions of Scriptural topics by Jewish teachers. They had belonged, in fact, to the body of devout Gentiles who frequented Jewish synagogues, studied Jewish Scriptures, and found many points of sympathy with their theology and morality, but repudiated their ceremonial law, and so formed a distinct class apart from the Jewish congregation.

Locality of the Galatian Churches. The locality of these Churches demands attentive consideration, for on the determination of this depends not only the date of the Epistle, but the whole of its historical connection with the life of Paul. The theory that these Churches were situated amidst the Keltic population in the north-east of Asia Minor, though it wraps much of their early history in darkness, requires us to assume that they were founded during the missionary journey of Paul and Silas across Asia Minor and revisited by Paul three years later: otherwise it could not be reconciled with the narrative of the Acts. The reaction therefore towards Judaism, which evoked the Epistle, cannot be dated before the commencement of his Ephesian ministry. Now before that time Paul had openly broken with the synagogue at Corinth and established Churches in Achaia practically independent of Judaism. Is it reasonable to conclude that a Pharisaic reaction in some of the Pauline Churches was then for the first time started with success and excited in his mind the lively apprehension which is here expressed? In my judgment the history of Greek Christianity precludes it, for a very real and formidable agitation on this very subject had once already run its course, and been so decisively checked in Syria and Palestine after the success of Paul and Barnabas in Southern Galatia as to render its renewal quite hopeless. A demand was made at Antioch by a Pharisaic party for the circumcision of all Christians, the authority of Paul and Barnabas was openly challenged, and the peace of the Church was endangered by conflicting views. But the decisive condemnation of this agitation at Jerusalem led to its speedy collapse; there is no trace, outside this Epistle, of its subsequent revival in any Greek Church. On the contrary the career of Paul within the next two or three years irrevocably established the independence of Greek Christianity; hence I conclude that the two intrigues of the Pharisaic party, first at Antioch, next in the Galatian Churches, recorded in this Epistle were but a later stage of the movement recorded in the Acts—last expiring efforts of Judaism to arrest the growing freedom of Greek converts.

But putting aside for the present the question of date, is there ground for supposing that these Churches were planted in the cities of Northern Galatia, Ancyra Pessinus and Tavium, as the late Bishop Lightfoot persistently contended, rather than in those of Southern Galatia, the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, as Professor Ramsay maintains? Great weight is deservedly attached to the opinion of Bishop Lightfoot; but it must be remembered that

it was formed more than a generation ago, when comparatively little was known of the internal geography of Asia Minor, or of its condition under the Cæsars: whereas Professor Ramsay's advocacy of the opposite view is founded on intimate acquaintance with the geography and history of the country during the first century. Again, Paul's foundation of the four southern Churches and subsequent visits to them are well-attested facts, while he is not known to have visited the northern division at all. It had indeed little attraction for an educated Greek as a sphere of missionary enterprise, and held out little promise of success, for it was then inhabited mainly by an imperfectly civilised population of Keltic herdsmen and shepherds. If the authenticity of the Acts be admitted, the earliest occasion on which Paul was within reach of Northern Galatia, and can have founded Churches there, was on his way to Troas and Macedonia. It has accordingly been suggested that he may then have turned aside to preach amidst that people. But every stage of that journey was accomplished under the immediate guidance of the Spirit, and the silence of the narrative, written as it was by a fellow-Christian who accompanied the apostolic party from Troas onwards, is conclusive against that theory. That history leaves the reader virtually no choice but to identify the Galatian Churches with the four whose foundation it records. It is futile to object that the instability which the Epistle reproves in the Galatians was characteristic of a Keltic people, for it belonged as certainly to the populace of the southern cities, or that there *may* have been Jews and Greeks in the northern cities when history establishes the special preponderance of these elements in the southern. The further contention that the name Galatia was not extended to the southern division of the province save in official language ignores the fact that the province had been seventy-five years in existence and really furnished the only collective name for the heterogeneous races incorporated in it under the previous rule of Galatian kings. If it be urged again that Paul would not have designated his Churches by the name of the province, the answer is that throughout his Epistles he invariably groups his Churches according to provinces, whether Syria or Asia, Macedonia or Achaia. His reference in this Epistle to the Churches of Judæa and to his ministry in Cilicia can hardly be reckoned an exception, for these were quasi-provinces governed independently by imperial procurators. Nor was this practice a mere accident of language: it faithfully reflected his deliberate policy of Church extension, suggested perhaps by the example of the Jewish Dispersion, who had before

planted their synagogues in the principal centres of commerce and civilisation. It was certainly his practice to establish groups of Churches round the several capitals of provinces, and link those centres together by chains of Churches along the main roads, and so to create an ecclesiastical organisation closely corresponding to the existing divisions of the Empire. We find for instance that he made the provincial capitals Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus successive centres of Church life as they were of imperial administration, and surrounded each with its group of dependent Churches. But for Jewish malice he might have done the same for Thessalonica; and his eager aspiration to visit Rome reveals still wider projects for multiplying these federations of Churches until they became coextensive with the Empire.

Hence I conclude that in this Epistle also the name Galatia denotes the province, as it clearly does in 1 Peter i. 1, and that the Galatian Churches were those in its southern portion whose foundation is recorded in the Acts. This conclusion is confirmed by the leading part assigned to the Galatian Churches in the collection for the Saints (1 Cor. xvi. 1). It is further supported by the previous course of Galatian history.

GALATIAN HISTORY. The Greek name Galatia denoted originally, like the Roman Gallia, the country of the Gauls or Kelts (Γαλάται). About B.C. 278 a considerable detachment of warriors, roughly estimated at 20,000, broke off from three of the Keltic tribes that poured down on Greece, and made their way across into Asia Minor with wives and children. As war was their trade and only means of subsistence, they scoured the country far and wide, sometimes plundering on their own account, sometimes allying themselves with various kings and cities, or taking service under them as mercenary soldiers. Eventually they formed permanent encampments under native chieftains in the north-east of Phrygia, south of Bithynia and Pontus, speaking their own language and dwelling apart from the older Phrygian inhabitants. This district became consequently known as Galatia: its broad stretches of upland afforded pasture for their flocks and herds, and their families found safe homes in their cantonments. But the limits of their territory were still unsettled, depending continually on the fortune of war: for the tribesmen retained their predatory habits and were hardly ever at peace with all their neighbours. At last, however, in B.C. 189 they were forced by a crushing defeat which they encountered at the hands of the Romans to respect the peace of their neighbours, and began to cultivate home industries within their own

borders. Gradually they mingled more freely than at first with the Phrygian population, adopted their religion, though they retained their own language, and dwelt among them as a dominant race, so that Northern Galatia became the home of a settled people.

But a century later the Mithridatic wars swept to and fro across their country, obliterating the old landmarks and opening a new chapter in Galatian history. Many of their chieftains distinguished themselves on the Roman side, and were rewarded with large grants of territory outside the old borders: one in particular, Deiotarus, became by the favour of Pompey the most powerful monarch in Asia Minor. He and his successors were enabled by the active part which they took in the ensuing civil wars of Rome, or by judicious desertion of the losing cause, to enlarge and consolidate their kingdom until it embraced Southern Phrygia with parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia, and extended to the range of Taurus. This was the kingdom which the last native ruler Amyntas bequeathed to the Romans at his death in B.C. 25. A Roman province was formed out of it, and retained the name Galatia which had belonged to it under its Galatian king. There is nothing in this history of gradual expansion to justify the arbitrary restriction of the name to the northern division alone.

Still less reasonable does this appear in the light of its subsequent history. For seventy-five years before this Epistle was written Galatia had formed a single province of the Empire. Now the unity of an imperial province was not merely official, but affected all the relations of life. A system of centralised despotism prevailed under the Cæsars which concentrated all authority—military, civil, judicial alike—in the hands of the governor; commercial and financial matters were regulated by him; his court was the centre of social life. The name Galatia therefore in the N.T. can only mean the great central province of Asia Minor which bore that name.

But in the middle of the first century there was a wide difference in language, occupation, nationality, social organisation, between the northern and southern portions of the province. The northern was still mainly Keltic and pastoral with comparatively little commerce and few roads. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was full of flourishing cities, and enriched by the constant flow of commerce across it. This was the natural result of its geographical position and political history. In ancient times it formed the highway along which the Asiatic monarchs of the interior maintained their communication with the western coast. When Greek monarchs ruled in Syria and Asia Minor, the high-road between their two capitals

Antioch and Ephesus passed through it and it became a principal channel for the flow of Greek commerce and civilisation eastwards. They were careful accordingly to plant and foster colonies of Greeks and Jews along the line of route. Hence came the mingled population of Greeks and Jews amidst whom Paul found so congenial a soil for planting Christian Churches. Augustus Cæsar in due time inherited the policy of the Syrian monarchs together with their dominions in Asia, planting fresh colonies in that region in order to secure the important high-road to the east for his legions and for the interchange of commerce. The citizens of these various colonies and municipalities had but one collective name—the name of the imperial province to which they belonged. So also the Galatian Christians, though for the most part of Greek or Jewish origin (as the tenor of previous history suggests), could hardly be addressed by any other name than that of Galatians.

JOINT MISSION OF PAUL AND BARNABAS. Throughout the early history of Greek Christianity no more important event is recorded than the conversion of Southern Galatia. The area of Christendom had not till then been extended beyond Syria, Roman Cilicia, and the island of Cyprus. The successful ministry of Paul and Barnabas in Galatia added a new province to the kingdom of Christ, drove a wedge deep into the heart of an idolatrous region, and established a valuable outpost for further advance into Asiatic and European Greece. And the special character impressed by the circumstances of that ministry upon the new Churches gave additional importance to their foundation beyond the material extension which it effected in the area of Christendom. There for the first time Paul made a direct appeal to his Gentile hearers against Jewish opposition, and met with an enthusiastic response. These Churches started in consequence with an overwhelming majority of Gentile converts. In them for the first time the Jewish Christians, who had hitherto held an undisputed initiative in the Church, found themselves in a decisive minority. This altered relation of Greeks and Jews produced a crisis in the history of Greek Christianity, and in the apostolic career of Paul himself. For the Greeks had previously occupied a subordinate position in the Church, and the Apostle to the Gentiles had played a secondary part in the ministry of the Gospel. When, however, he boldly denounced the Jewish people and their rulers in the Galatian synagogue for the murder of Christ, proclaimed him the light of the Gentiles, and overruled the claims of the Law in favour of purely spiritual doctrines of divine forgiveness and grace, of human faith and repentance, the Greeks recognised in Jesus the

Saviour of the whole world rather than the promised Messiah of the Hebrews, and rallied round the Apostle as the foremost champion of Greek freedom in Christ. It was the commencement of a veritable revolution. Hitherto Christianity had been regarded for the most part as a national religion, it was now perceived to be a world-wide revelation, and an irreconcilable antagonist to the narrow formal creed of the Jewish synagogue. Gentiles had indeed been admitted to the Church many years before, when Peter baptised Cornelius and his friends; and the assembled Church had then solemnly ratified his act. The right of believing Gentiles to Christian baptism had thenceforth become a fundamental law of the Church, sealed to them in perpetuity by a divine charter which none could gainsay. But the acceptance of this principle had wrought little visible effect upon the structure or government of the Church. No sudden influx of Gentile converts flooded the existing Churches; they only grew insensibly by continual adhesion of individual Gentiles or groups of Gentiles to older congregations of Jewish Christians. The process of conversion was too silent and gradual to exercise material influence over the prevailing spirit of the community or to remodel its ministry and organisation. Christian teachers retained in those early years the stamp of their Jewish training, partly because the Hebrew Scriptures continued to be the only written Canon of faith and practice (though they had learned to interpret them in a new spirit), but still more because the Apostles and older disciples had grown up to manhood before they had known Jesus, had accepted the Law for their rule of life, and drawn their inspiration from the writings of Hebrew prophets; they prided themselves on their descent from Abraham and the patriarchs, rested on God's ancient covenants with Israel, and fixed their hopes on the future kingdom of the national Messiah, which had a deeper significance for them than for other Jews because their faith was concentrated on the person of a living Lord who had risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. Again, the outward environment of the Church was no less Jewish than the spirit of its teaching, for the synagogue was still the only centre of public ministry open to Christian teachers. Thither the brethren resorted regularly for reading of the Scriptures, for united prayer and praise, and for religious instruction; there they delivered addresses to mixed congregations of Jews and Christians, basing their doctrine on the Jewish Canon. They claimed, in fact, to be a reformed branch of the ancient national Church, and were long regarded by the Greek world as a purely Jewish sect.

Accordingly, the conversion of the Gentiles made at first but slow progress; few came within touch of the Christian ministry but those who had already become regular attendants on the worship of the synagogue, the devout Gentiles who clustered round Jewish congregations in Greek cities. These were not proselytes, for they shrank from circumcision with all the ceremonial bondage and social exclusiveness which it entailed; but they had become familiar with the language, the history and the spirit of the Old Testament, and had accepted much of its theology and morality. They were predisposed by these antecedents to listen gladly to a Gospel which placed the love of God and man above ritual observance and taught the brotherhood of all mankind: and so embraced the faith in considerable numbers. But these Greeks had no rights whatever in the Jewish congregation; though their attendance was tolerated, if not encouraged, they were only admitted on sufferance. They were therefore at first content, after having occupied so subordinate a position in the synagogue, to fill a secondary place in the Church, and to acquiesce willingly in the leadership of Jewish Christians.

These considerations account for the tardy growth of Gentile Christianity, which lingered for several years on the eastern coast of the Levant without an attempt to raise its voice in the Greek cities to the west.[1] Even in Antioch, afterwards the mother-city of Greek Christianity, the Greeks were slow to vindicate their independence of Judaism. The prompt response however of that Church to the call of the Spirit for special labourers in the Lord's vineyard attested at last the growing strength of their spiritual life and their hopeful confidence in the future of the Kingdom. The diffusion of the faith had up to that time been due more to providential circumstances than to spontaneous effort; refugees had been driven by persecution to seek safety in distant cities, and had carried their faith with them in their flight. But the mission of Barnabas and Saul was a purely missionary enterprise despatched for the express purpose of extending the Gospel to the islands and coasts of the Mediterranean. The two Apostles were necessarily invested with wide discretion in regard to the conduct of their mission;

[1] Thirteen years elapsed between the conversion of Saul and the Apostolic Council. The baptism of Cornelius took place before Christian refugees from Jerusalem had settled in Cæsarea or Philip had taken up his abode there; so that it coincided more or less closely with the beginning of this period, whereas the mission of Paul and Barnabas belongs to its latter years; for the special object of the Apostolic Council was to allay the heart-burnings aroused among Jewish Christians by its success, and to restore the peace of the Church.

neither their route nor their methods could be fully determined in advance, for they depended on future openings that might present themselves, and were therefore in large measure left to their own judgment. But the direction in which it was launched gives a clear intimation of the desires and hopes that animated its authors; it turned its back on Palestine and the East, and set its face toward Asiatic Greece and the famous centres of Greek civilisation; it was, in short, a message from a Greek Church to their Greek brethren in other lands.

The condition of Western Asia at that time held out an exceptional promise of success to Christian Apostles. Thanks to the universal peace and settled order which the Cæsars had established throughout the Empire, that region had attained a high pitch of industrial activity and commercial prosperity. In spite of the social corruption and luxurious vices which riches brought in their train, the consequent exuberance of life, social, intellectual and spiritual, afforded a favourable opening for religious reform. The region had been in former centuries a frequent battlefield between Greek and Asiatic races, and still formed a border-land between eastern and western thought. But the religion which the people had inherited from ancient times was more Oriental than Greek, and its degraded type of sensuous worship could hardly satisfy the conscience even of a heathen community to which the influences of western civilisation had penetrated. Greek philosophy and Roman morality combined to create a nobler ideal of human duty and divine government than could be reconciled with the popular religion, so that all the better feelings of educated men and women were stirred into revolt against the debased superstition of the masses.

The religious ferment produced by this collision was specially aggravated by the multiplication of Jewish colonies in the principal cities of Asia Minor, systematically planted and fostered long ago through the wise policy of Syrian kings for the encouragement of trade and promotion of intercourse between these two races of their subjects. These settlements were particularly thriving in Southern Galatia, along the direct line of communication between the two capitals Antioch and Ephesus. Nowhere else are recorded such conspicuous traces of their religious influence over the surrounding population. They formed, of course, distinct communities of their own, divided from the Greeks by unsociable habits as well as ritual obligations and religious scruples. Yet their Scriptural teaching proved so attractive to seekers after God that a considerable number of Greeks frequented their weekly services in the Pisidian

Antioch and in Iconium, and these, like the devout Gentiles everywhere, were disposed to give a cordial welcome to the preaching of Christ. Accordingly, it was in those cities that His Apostles gained their first conspicuous success; there Asia Minor first awoke to the call of the Gospel, and the first fruits were reaped of an abundant harvest. It was, perhaps, inevitable that this hearty reception of the new doctrine by Greeks should provoke intense jealousy on the part of the Jews, and arouse bitter opposition from them. The vehement appeal of Paul to his Gentile hearers at Antioch brought that opposition to a head, and stirred the passions of both parties to fever heat. The Jews heard the impotence of their law for salvation denounced in their own synagogue, the Gentiles heard the offer of a new way of salvation by repentance and faith in Christ alone.

From that hour both alike recognised in that Apostle the foremost champion of Gentile rights and the most formidable adversary of Judaism.

Let us now, therefore, turn to his personal history and review the chain of circumstances which landed him with his colleague in the interior of Asia Minor. The record of the joint mission during its first few months was uneventful; they traversed Cyprus from end to end, preaching in all the synagogues by the way without achieving any success that the historian counted worthy of record. Barnabas, himself a native of the island, naturally took the lead in virtue of his older standing in the Church and of his superior position at Antioch as the chosen representative of the Twelve, but failed apparently to elicit any enthusiastic response. It was not till they reached Paphos, the western port and the seat of the Roman government, that the spirit of Paul was stirred within him to carry his appeal to Gentile hearers. He procured by some means an audience of the proconsul, and after a signal manifestation of his spiritual power in smiting Elymas with blindness, succeeded in converting Sergius Paulus himself. This success was fruitful in results: it established Paul's virtual leadership; for Barnabas, though he retained the nominal dignity of head, was content to submit the further guidance of their policy to the more determined counsels of his energetic colleague.[1] A new spirit of enterprise speedily mani-

[1] The historian chooses this occasion for dropping the Hebrew name Saul and adopting the Greek name Paul, indicating that he then entered on his special ministry to the Greeks. In relating the voyage from Paphos he ignores Barnabas altogether, and in the subsequent narrative assigns him throughout a secondary part. The language of the Lycaonian populace furnishes an apt illustration of

fested itself in their proceedings. *Paul and his Company* (as they are designated in Acts xiii. 13), crossing to the mainland, struck at once across Pamphylia and the Pisidian highlands into the interior. The desertion of John Mark at this critical moment is significant. He was warmly attached to his cousin Barnabas, and had undertaken the office of minister to the Apostles; yet so reluctant was he to embark with them on their new enterprise that he did not hesitate to incur a well-grounded charge of disloyalty by withdrawing from the mission immediately on touching the coast of Pamphylia, and leaving them to pursue their way without him to the Pisidian Antioch. This faint-hearted desertion serves by way of contrast to bring out in stronger relief the resolution with which the Apostles pressed forward from the coast. But on their arrival in Galatia their journey was arrested and came to an apparently premature termination. For many months they settled down permanently—first in Antioch, then in Iconium—with an absolute determination not to depart until they were either expelled by authority or driven to flight by imminent peril of life. Even then they did but take refuge in neighbouring cities for a while until the storm had passed, and eventually revisited the scenes of their former ministry, and so retraced their steps to the coast from which they had started, after firmly planting the faith of Christ in the region of Southern Galatia. The narrative does not explain this sudden arrest of the onward movement which had carried them with such determined energy into the interior, it simply records the fact that they stopped short in Antioch, without any intimation that a change had occurred in the apostolic policy. The reader might well gather from it the impression that Galatia had been all along their destined sphere of labour. This, however, could hardly be: it can scarcely be conceived that they contemplated the cities of Galatia as their final objective when they started with such resolute purpose from Paphos; for those cities had neither ancient fame nor present importance to attract special attention. Nor, again, would Mark have found that brief expedition into the interior so alarming as to desert his post if he had known how short a distance they were about to travel. What then, were the subsequent circumstances that prompted Paul and Barnabas to abandon their more ambitious designs and take up their residence at Antioch? The history and character of Paul quite

their mutual relations to each other: they recognised the superior dignity of Barnabas by identifying him with Jupiter, but called Paul Mercury because he was the chief speaker.

forbid any suspicion that the change was owing to caprice or to irresolution on his part. Nor was it due to the immediate and unexpected success of their ministry in that city; on the contrary, his recorded address in their synagogue furnishes ample evidence of his previous failure to touch the consciences or win the hearts of his Jewish hearers. He, doubtless, had begun his ministry there, as elsewhere, by offering the Gospel to the Jews, and his bitter denunciation of their prejudice against Christ shows how stubborn had been their resistance to his Gospel before he turned to his Gentile hearers with this despairing appeal.

On the whole therefore I conclude from a survey of the historical narrative that Paul and Barnabas embarked at Paphos on an ambitious project of missionary enterprise, which for some unknown reason they failed to realise, though they pursued it steadily without a pause as far as Antioch. It further appears that their first efforts after their arrival in that city were foiled by the persistent opposition of the Jews, but that their perseverance was at last rewarded by signal success amongst the Greeks.

It is time now to turn to the Epistle and compare these conclusions with the incidental reference there made to the circumstances of the conversion. In Gal. iv. 13 the Apostle reminds his converts that he had not originally preached the Gospel to them by his own deliberate choice, but on account of an illness which deprived him of all option in the matter. They knew (he writes) that his preaching had been due to infirmity of the flesh, *i.e.*, to bodily illness. This language plainly intimates that he altered his plans in consequence of the illness, and undertook their conversion instead of carrying out his previous intention. Neither the time nor the place of the attack are specified, but the context supplies materials for determining both. It shows that the Galatians were quite aware of his previous design, that they had been eyewitnesses of the illness, had watched its progress and seen enough of its repulsive symptoms to provoke natural contempt and disgust, but had on the contrary exhibited heartfelt sympathy and intense desire to alleviate his sufferings. It is quite certain therefore that it ran its course *after* his arrival in their country. It may have been contracted on the way; if it was (as his language in iv. 15 and vi. 11 suggests) an attack of virulent ophthalmia which permanently impaired his sight, it is probable that he caught the infection in the lowlands of Pamphylia, where that malady was notoriously prevalent. But whatever its specific character, it was in Galatia that it prostrated him, and by incapacitating him for continuing his journey

left him no choice but to prolong his stay in the country, and so occasioned the conversion of the Galatians as its eventual result. Evidently the illness beset him so soon after his arrival that he had no time before the attack either to resume his journey or to entertain any plan for preaching where he was. It was, however, so tedious and protracted in its operation that it altered his whole scheme of travel. And whereas he was but a passing stranger when he broke down, and had not attempted to make a single convert, he found himself before its close surrounded by a devoted band of friends who were zealous to make any sacrifice for his relief. The pathetic language of the Epistle shows how intimate an affection had grown up between the Apostle and his Galatian hosts, and makes it clear that the nucleus of a future Church was formed by the ministrations of his sick chamber. No mention is made of this illness in the Acts, for it belonged to the personal history of the Apostle rather than to the history of the Church; but the record dovetails with subtle harmony into the narrative of the Acts, explaining at once why he stopped short at the first stage of his intended journey, and how it came to pass that so many of his hearers afterwards rallied round him with enthusiasm on his appearance in the synagogue of Antioch.

A consideration of the geographical condition of Asia Minor in the middle of the first century brings out still more clearly the thorough agreement of the two narratives. The Epistle implies, as we have seen, that the foundation of the Galatian Churches was due to an interrupted transit through their country. Now this conception is fatal to the idea of a northern site for those Churches. What possible object could the Apostle have for visiting Northern Galatia at all unless it was for the conversion of its people? It lay quite away from his recorded track, and it is inconceivable that he intended to traverse it on his way to some still more distant field of labour. Southern Galatia, on the contrary, was traversed from end to end by a great highway along which he is known to have travelled four times, visiting the cities through which it passed. According to the Acts the first of these cities visited by the Apostle was the Pisidian Antioch in the extreme south of the Galatian province. There his journey was for some reason arrested, and there he succeeded after a prolonged sojourn in founding the first Galatian Church. These facts identify Antioch as the scene of his involuntary detention, and its position gives at once a definite clue to the original purpose of the apostolic expedition from Paphos. It was a Roman colony planted by Augustus Cæsar on the main road which

ran from Syria to the western coast of Asia and so linked the eastern provinces of the Empire with Greece and Rome by way of Ephesus. It was besides in direct communication with the southern coast of Pamphylia, and so with Cyprus; for a system of military roads, studded with colonies, converged upon it from the south. For full half the year this was the only regular means of communication between Paphos and the province of Asia; for even in autumn the persistency and violence of the Etesian winds out of the Ægean Sea made it difficult and dangerous for the best found vessels to round the Cnidian promontory, as was proved by Paul's subsequent experience. There is also good reason to calculate that Paul and Barnabas, starting from Syria after the reopening of navigation in the spring, spent the summer in traversing Cyprus from end to end and did not arrive at Paphos before the autumn. Their only means of proceeding westward at that season was to cross to the mainland in such coasting craft as they could find at Paphos and strike across Pamphylia to the main road at Antioch, as they did. This raises a presumption that their original object in making so eagerly for the Pisidian Antioch was to reach Ephesus and the province of Asia. On arriving at that city they had the option of three routes only: (1) to proceed northward by local roads into the heart of Phrygia, which was obviously not their intention when they started from Paphos; (2) to move eastward to Iconium and other Galatian cities, but these are expressly excluded from his original purpose by the language of the Epistle in iv. 13; (3) to pursue their journey westward by the high-road to Ephesus. This was Paul's project on his next visit to the Galatian Churches, and was doubtless his design on this occasion, had it not been hindered by illness, as it was afterwards by the voice of the Spirit. It was, in fact, ordained that the conversion of the Galatians should form the first step to that of Asia Minor, and that Ephesus and the famous cities of the western seaboard should be reserved for the final consummation of his apostolic labours amid the Asiatic Greeks. The outcome of his public ministry with Barnabas in Southern Galatia is recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. His successful appeal to the conscience of his Greek hearers provoked intense jealousy on the part of the unconverted Jews, who proceeded to hunt the Apostles with determined malice from every city in succession. They were enabled with the support of influential partisans at Antioch, by secret plots at Iconium, and by mob-violence at Lystra, to put the Apostles everywhere to flight, but not before they had planted in each place the seed of a future Church, which had become so firmly established before the final departure of Paul and Barnabas

from the country that they were able to organise a permanent framework for the government of the several Churches. According to their own report of their mission, its most conspicuous feature had been the door of faith which God had opened to the Gentiles. The widespread alarm raised in the Churches of the Circumcision by the number and ritual independence of these Greek converts produced a crisis in the Church and threatened a dangerous schism between its Jewish and Greek sections. Christians from Judæa raised a standard of open revolt against Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, disputing their right to concede this freedom to the Gentiles. Thanks, however, to the intervention of the older Apostles these agitators were decisively condemned at Jerusalem, the apostolic authority of Paul and Barnabas was triumphantly vindicated, and the liberty of Gentile converts in the matter of circumcision was finally established, while the religious prejudices of Jewish Christians against communion with the unclean were mitigated by prudent concession to Jewish sentiment.

Second Ministry of Paul in Galatia. The apostolic conference at Jerusalem was followed by a gathering at the Syrian Antioch of Christians from Jerusalem. Besides Judas and Silas, who were deputed by the Church of Jerusalem to proceed to Antioch as their representatives, Peter himself repaired thither with Mark and others, whose influence so seriously undermined that of Paul in the mind of Barnabas that they agreed to separate. Paul accordingly enlisted Silas as his companion for a fresh mission to the cities of the Greeks. His first object was to revisit his Galatian converts and communicate to them the terms of union between Jewish and Gentile converts which had been ratified by the Churches at Jerusalem and Antioch. He hastened apparently to carry tidings of that decision in person, probably crossing the mountain-passes from Cilicia as early as they were open in the ensuing spring,[1] and to recommend its observance to his disciples. During this visit he also made choice of Timothy for his minister, and decided in consequence to circumcise him, lest the Jews should take offence in the cities he was about to visit. His visit was otherwise uneventful. He traversed the whole country, confirming the Churches everywhere, but only on his way to the new sphere which lay before him; and did not revisit Galatia till three years later on his way from Syria to Ephesus.

Motive and General Scheme of the Epistle. The opening

[1] It appears from Cicero's letters that at the time of his government of Cilicia these passes were absolutely closed during the winter months (*Cic. ad Att.*, v., 21), even for important despatches.

verses of the Epistle throw a clear light on the motive which prompted it. In i. 1 he vindicates his own apostolic commission, in i. 6-9 the truth of his Gospel, against an attack which was troubling the peace of the Galatian Churches in his absence. The movement was not spontaneous, but due to an intrigue set on foot by foreign emissaries. Alarming tidings had, however, reached the Apostle as to the progress of the agitation. Its nature becomes apparent from the whole tenor of the Epistle; it was an attempt of the Pharisaic party to revive Judaism within the Church. For this purpose it was necessary for its authors to impugn the truth of the Apostle's doctrine, and they sought accordingly to undermine his personal influence and depreciate his apostolic authority. Some had even ventured to impeach the sincerity and the consistency of his teaching by accusing him of an inordinate desire to please (i. 10). He had perhaps given specious occasion for this charge by his avowed principle of becoming all things to all men, but he dismisses it lightly with scorn, for the friends and converts to whom he was writing knew well that his real motive had always been to win men to Christ. He does not apparently feel it needful to defend his motives, but concentrates attention on two points, the truth of his Gospel, and the reality of his commission from God. He begins with an indignant denunciation of the new heresy, which he declares to be a spurious perversion of the one true Gospel. But he perceives the necessity for vindicating his own right to speak in the name of Christ before grappling with the main issue and developing the fundamental divergence of the Gospel in its essential basis and spirit from the Law. For the result of the conflict depended practically more on the personal than the doctrinal factor. He had been himself the foremost champion of Gentile freedom in Christ; the doctrine of free grace in Him had won its way mainly through the advocacy of Paul and owed its triumph in Galatia, at Antioch, and in Jerusalem, to his eloquent support. This was why his antagonists had endeavoured to depreciate his position in the Church, and to set up the Twelve as the real interpreters of Christ on earth, that they might thereby discredit his authority as a teacher. The circumstances of his life furnished opponents with plausible ground for questioning the soundness of his doctrine. He had neither listened to the voice, nor seen the face, of Christ on earth; he had not attended on His ministry like the Twelve, nor been sent forth like them by His express command. He was, in short, to use his own words, an Apostle born out of due time. This made it easy for them to contend that he had not received

the Gospel by direct revelation from Christ, but gathered it at second-hand from the Twelve. To meet this insidious policy, he was forced to place on record the true history of his conversion and subsequent ministry in Christ. He relates accordingly God's revelation to him of His Son from heaven, his secret communion with God apart from all human intercourse, his entire independence of the Twelve, the full recognition of his Apostleship to the Gentiles by the three pillars of the Church at Jerusalem, and his public rebuke to Peter at Antioch. Incidentally this autobiography is of the utmost historical value: while it is in perfect harmony with the outlines of the historical narrative, it adds to it a rich store of personal details, and reveals the inward motives and policy of the chief actors in successive scenes. It relates, however, only certain events which bore on the immediate object of the author, *viz.*, the vindication of his own position in the Church.

The remainder of the Epistle (with the exception of a few personal appeals and practical exhortations) is devoted to a scrutiny of the divergent principles of the Law and the Gospel. The intruders, belonging manifestly to the Pharisaic party, had been urging the Greek converts in Galatia to embrace circumcision, not as an absolute necessity for salvation, but as a counsel of perfection which would invest them with superior holiness to their uncircumcised brethren, would entitle them to a higher place in the Kingdom of God, and secure to them the covenanted blessings promised to the children of Abraham. By this arrogant pretension to superiority in the sight of God these Jewish Christians were in fact pouring dishonour on baptismal grace, reopening the quarrel between Jews and Gentiles and destroying the unity of Christ. The Apostle combats this delusive persuasion by setting forth the true function of the Law in the divine economy. It had proved in practice impotent to bless, for it stipulated for a perfect obedience to which flesh could not attain as a condition precedent to acceptance before God, so that Israelites had in fact fled to Christ for refuge from the curse of a broken law: it was *primâ facie* inconsistent with the unconditional promise of God to Abraham, and the Mosaic dispensation was really an exceptional provision against the lusts of the flesh, designed like the preparatory discipline of childhood to last only during years of immaturity before the advent of the true Seed of Abraham. He argues that the Law was a bondage imposed on the children of Abraham after the flesh, whereas Christians are the true seed of Abraham and heirs like Isaac of God's ancient promises. By union with Christ in His death they have died to the condemna-

tion of the Law, by union with His life they have become partakers of His Spirit. They are therefore freed in Christ from the dominion of the Law unless they wilfully submit themselves to its yoke afresh by embracing circumcision. For the spirit within them stedfastly resists every sinful lust of the flesh, and brings forth of itself good fruit abundantly.

Summary of Contents. The principal heads of the argument are as follows:—

i. 1-5. Address, blessing, ascription of glory to God.

i. 6-9. Rapid defection of the Galatians from their faith; denunciation ot spurious Gospels.

i. 10-ii. 14. Repudiation of corrupt motives; attestation of the author's apostolic commission and of his independence of the Twelve and of human teaching; his championship of Gentile rights; and the recognition of his ministry to the Gentiles by the acknowledged pillars of the Church.

ii. 15-21. Israelites had themselves confessed by seeking salvation in Christ through faith that no flesh can attain to the righteousness of the Law. Paul himself had died to Law with Christ that he might be quickened with Him to the new life of Christ within him.

iii. 1-14. Spiritual blindness of the Galatians. Was it faith or obedience to Law that had procured for them the gifts of the Spirit? By faith men become children of Abraham and inherit his blessing. The Law entails a curse and not a blessing, but Christ has redeemed us all from the curse of the Law by bearing it Himself.

iii. 15-iv. 7. The publication of the Law from Sinai could not annul or modify God's earlier covenant with Abraham. It was merely a preparatory discipline like that of childhood and a temporary provision against the lusts ot the flesh, ordained for children of the flesh till the world was ripe for the Advent of Christ the true seed. All that are His are one with Him, and so are the seed of promise: they have outgrown the restraints of spiritua childhood and regained their birthright of freedom in the House of God.

iv. 8-10. Protest against the revival of ignorant superstitions.

iv. 11-20. Appeal to the remembrance of former affection.

iv. 21-30. Illustration out of patriarchal history of the mutual relations between Jews and Christians.

iv. 31-v. 12. Assertion of Christian freedom; protest against renewed bondage by circumcision; threats of punishment against these devotees to the flesh.

v. 13-vi. 10. Warning against the abuse of freedom; antagonism of the spirit to the flesh; its perfect harmony with Christ's law of love and excellence of its fruits; practical exhortation.

vi. 11-18. Peroration, and farewell blessing.

Comparison of Galatians ii. 1-10 with Acts xv. 1-29. In Gal. ii. 1-10 is recorded a conference of Paul and Barnabas with the Church of Jerusalem and its members. It appears from the narrative that they went up to Jerusalem for the express purpose of vindicating their right in virtue of their office as ministers of

Christ to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision—a right which had been seriously disputed, but strenuously maintained by them. It further appears that James, Peter and John welcomed them as brethren in Christ, and fully recognised their special commission from God to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles. In Acts xv. 1-29 is likewise recorded an open revolt at Antioch against the authority assumed by Paul and Barnabas to exempt Gentile converts from circumcision. They were forced in consequence to undertake mission to Jerusalem for the vindication of Gentile freedom in Christ as well as their own apostolic authority, and to enter upon prolonged debates with the Apostles and elders there gathered. In the sequel the Church resolved, on the advice of Peter and James, to repudiate unreservedly the claim for universal circumcision in the Greek Churches, to condemn the agitators, and heartily to commend the services of Barnabas and Paul to the cause of the Gospel. The two records differ in details—it could not well be otherwise if they are really independent—but agree completely about the substantial facts. The same issue is raised in both, *viz.*, the right of Paul and Barnabas to dispense with the obligation of circumcision, the same Apostles take part in the conference. It is true that the presence of John is not noted in the Acts, but the speakers only are there named, and John probably did not speak, but stood silently beside Peter as in earlier days, while Peter spoke for both; the result of the proceedings is the same according to both records. Now, this result was of such vital importance that it decided for all time the relation of Christianity to Judaism, declaring it to be world-wide in its scope, and distinguishing it from the national creed of the Jewish people. As the sanction given by the Circumcision to Peter's baptism of Cornelius had before stamped their approval on the admission of the uncircumcised to baptism beyond recall, so the Apostolic Council decided finally the union of all the members of Christ in a single Church: the concession once made at Jerusalem in the name of the assembled brethren was final.

There were, in fact, but two occasions on which Paul and Barnabas went up together from Antioch to Jerusalem, and the object of both visits is specified. The earlier occurred in the lifetime of Herod Agrippa, and, therefore, not later than 44, before their successful mission to Cyprus and Asia Minor, whereas the Epistle records the recognition of their special ministry to the uncircumcision in the fourteenth year after the conversion of Saul. Again, it was undertaken merely to carry alms with a view to an impending famine, and they found the Church of Jerusalem on their arrival in

the utmost peril. Herod was hunting down its leaders for death, and they were seeking safety in concealment or flight. Neither they nor Saul could show their faces without imminent danger, much less assemble to discuss the claims of the uncircumcised. The envoys could only depart in haste after depositing their alms in the hands of the elders. On the contrary, the account given in the Acts of their later visit to Jerusalem corresponds entirely (as we have seen) with the apostolic narrative. The historian, of course, reviews the event from the standpoint of Church history, while the Apostle presents the incidents in their personal aspect, and the details vary accordingly in the two narratives. For instance, the Epistle does not state that Paul and Barnabas were deputed by the Church of Antioch to represent them at Jerusalem, though we might well gather this from the circumstances and the history of their reception; it does, on the other hand, record a revelation of the spirit, either to him or to the Church, which prompted the action of both, though for some reason unrecorded in the pages of the history. The statement of Paul, that he took with him a Greek disciple of his own, incidentally confirms the statement of the Acts that other Christians were deputed to accompany the Apostles. The account given in the Acts of a personal collision between the Apostles and certain agitators at Antioch, on the subject of circumcision, explains the reference made in the Epistle to a demand for the circumcision of Titus, which Paul had steadfastly resisted. Whatever semblance has been found of divergence in the two accounts is really due to misconception of the language. Many critics have argued, for instance, as if the struggle over Titus took place at Jerusalem, but a careful student of the Greek text may perceive that it really occurred at Antioch before the mission, and is in perfect harmony with Acts xv. 1, 2. Again, James, Peter and John have been represented as at first lukewarm and hesitating in their support of Paul and Barnabas; but the Greek text places their brotherly cordiality in strong contrast with the prejudices and coldness of other Christians who had once been of high repute in the Church.

The silence of the Epistle about the injunctions of the Council to abstain from ceremonial uncleanness is easily understood. They were indispensable for harmonious intercourse between Greeks and Jews in one communion; they were of real value until the Church was able to promulgate a new law of uncleanness based on true principles and distinguishing real from ceremonial pollution. Paul had therefore recommended their observance, and had, partly in

consequence of this deference to the Mosaic law, been charged with preaching circumcision (v. 11). But the two questions were really distinct, and he is careful in this Epistle to confine himself to the subject of circumcision.

Historical Connection of the Epistle with the Life of Paul. The Galatian Epistle belongs obviously to the same group as the Thessalonian, Corinthian and Roman, but critics are by no means agreed as to its position amidst them in point of time, some placing it before, some between, some after, the others. All were written during the seven years in which Paul was engaged in founding and organising successive Churches on both sides of the Ægean Sea, there was considerable uniformity in the circumstances of his life throughout this period of apostolic activity, and this uniformity is reflected in a certain family likeness which runs through all the Epistles of that date. All except the Roman sprang out of the needs of infant Churches beneath his care. These depended largely on his personal example and authority for guidance in faith and morals; accordingly the personal element looms large in all, in none more so than in this. He was throughout in continual contact with Jewish influences, utilising the synagogue everywhere while it was possible for the conversion of devout Gentiles as well as Jews, and everywhere encountering opposition and persecution from the Jews. There was, however, little occasion to combat Judaism in the Thessalonian Epistles, for that Church was at the time suffering grievously from Jewish persecution; in the Corinthian Church again the Greek element predominated, and the most pressing dangers arose from the contamination of heathen license and idolatry. Therefore the antagonism between Pharisaic Judaism and Christianity comes into prominence in the Galatian and Roman Epistles alone. Both employ almost identical language in contrasting the Law and the Gospel, the former based entirely on the holiness of God and man's duty of absolute obedience, the latter adding the revelation of God's love even for sinners, and His offers of forgiveness and grace to all that believe in Christ. But the coincidence is not due to any similarity in the circumstances of the two communities. In the Galatian Church the Apostle was combating a survival of Judaism amidst his own converts, in the Roman Church he was laying down principles for a community who had hitherto had no Apostolic guidance. Still less can the identity of language be fairly urged to prove an approximation in the date of the two Epistles. For these fundamental truths formed without doubt the staple of the Apostle's teaching throughout the years of continuous transition

from Jewish to Christian doctrine, and his language in regard to them could not fail to become in some measure stereotyped.

We tread on far safer ground when we rely on historical considerations for determining the occasion of the Epistle. During the seven years of continuous transition from Jewish to Christian doctrine a radical alteration was effected in the position of Greek Christianity and of Paul himself. At the beginning no Greek Churches existed outside Syria except those which he and Barnabas had founded: the two stood on the same level, and rival teachers had fair show of reason for ranking him below the Twelve; at its close a multitude of Churches in Europe and Asia recognised him as the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and he might have replied to his detractors with scorn by pointing to the visible tokens of divine blessing stamped on his apostolic labours in Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia. That he did not do so in his Galatian Epistle furnishes conclusive proof of its early date. When Paul, after his second visit to Galatia, departed for an indefinite time to an unknown destination in the west, there was still a reasonable chance of inducing many Galatian converts to submit to circumcision in his absence, but with every fresh Greek Church added to the communion the hope must have steadily faded. The growing strength, number, and independence of these Churches soon after made a revival of Judaism in one of them hopeless. But the attempt made at Antioch after the Council (as the Epistle records) to affix a stigma of uncleanness on the uncircumcised shows that the Pharisaic party, though defeated in their efforts to *enforce* circumcision on all members of Christ, had not then abandoned the hope of *persuading* their Greek brethren to adopt it, and had little scruple about putting unfair pressure upon them for this object by withdrawing from their communion. Their partial success at Antioch in obtaining the adhesion of Peter and Barnabas to their practice encouraged them to hope much from fresh efforts in the absence of Paul. The moment was otherwise favourable for a renewed attempt to advocate circumcision in the Galatian Churches. Jewish influence was strong in the country; the people were impulsive and excitable, easily swept to and fro by capricious currents of religious emotion; the vacillation of Peter and Barnabas had made it easy to claim their sanction and set up the authority of the Twelve against that of Paul. He had himself during his recent visit furnished his adversaries with a fresh handle for misrepresentation, for he had circumcised Timothy and had recommended his converts to abstain from the forms of ceremonial uncleanness most offensive to the Jews, so that he was even said to be now preaching

circumcision (v. 11). The imputation seems absurd in view of his later life, and would have been so after he had openly broken with the synagogue, but was plausible enough when he was bent above all things on promoting harmony between the two sections of the Church by some voluntary sacrifices of Greek freedom in Christ. I contend therefore that the recent warnings to which i. 9 refers (see notes on that verse) were delivered on the occasion of his second visit to Galatia after the Apostolic Council, that the agitation in the Galatian Churches was a sequel of the intrigue at Antioch, some of the Pharisaic emissaries having probably followed the receding steps of the Apostle that they might renew their insidious schemes behind his back, and that the Epistle followed speedily on this agitation. Its language certainly implies a close connection between the two movements; for the remonstrance spoken at Antioch passes insensibly into the written argument without any clear line of division. If a later date be assigned to the Epistle, the abrupt termination of the autobiography on the eve of the second visit becomes unintelligible. The earlier date explains also the motive which prompted him to record his personal collision with Peter. It is inconceivable that he raked up this story out of a distant past. But if the example and authority of Peter and Barnabas had been employed by his rivals in Galatia to undermine his position, it became necessary for him in his own defence to give a true version of the events that had occurred at Antioch.

Assuming therefore that the reactionary movement in Galatia followed closely on his departure, where and when was the Epistle written? It may be presumed that he lost no time after he was informed of it before writing to counteract it; but the tidings could not reach him without considerable delay, for his destination was unknown until he himself opened communications from Philippi. Probably therefore he could receive no news from Galatia till after his arrival at Thessalonica; there was not however very frequent intercourse then between that city and Galatia, and his stay there was cut very short by persecution. The absence of Silas and Timothy at the time of writing points distinctly to the early days of his ministry at Corinth, for they were with him in Macedonia, but did not rejoin him afterwards till some weeks after his arrival in Corinth. That they were absent is morally certain. Their names, which appear conspicuously in the Epistles to the Thessalonians written about the same time, are here absent in spite of Timothy's Galatian home, and in i. 9 the writer expressly refers to the united warnings delivered by him and his colleagues Silas and Timothy, to fortify

the appeal which he now makes in his own name (*as we have forewarned you of late, I say again*). This date explains also the absence of any greeting from a Christian Church by name, for at the time the Apostle had only begun to gather round him the nucleus of the future Church of Corinth in the house of Aquila and Priscilla. I conclude therefore that the Epistle was written from Corinth before the arrival of Silas and Timothy, in which case it is the earliest Epistle of Paul now extant, being written before the Epistles to the Thessalonians. The previous outrage at Philippi and the subsequent persecutions which he encountered in Macedonia make the references to persecution and to the marks of Jesus branded on his body peculiarly appropriate.

RESULT OF THE EPISTLE AND SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CHURCHES. The Pharisaic reaction came upon Paul as an unwelcome surprise after the enthusiastic reception they had originally given to the doctrine of free grace in Christ, and the recent confirmation of their faith by personal intercourse. He gives vent, accordingly, in forcible language to his indignation at the disloyal intrusion of false teachers into his own fold. Their readiness to listen with itching ears to strange doctrines, and to be fascinated by the charms of religious novelty, even though the doctrine was incompatible with the spirit and the cross of Christ, and in spite of attacks aimed at the position of their own well-proved Apostle, distressed him sorely for they argued unsoundness in their faith, and shook his confidence in the permanence of their loyalty to Christ. But ought we, therefore, to conclude that they were permanently estranged from their great Apostle? Are we to infer the depth and strength of the reaction from its suddenness? It seems to me that the balance of evidence in the Epistle inclines the other way and tends to suggest their substantial loyalty in spite of some temporary estrangement. For the agitation is declared to be but *a little leaven*, dangerous in principle and fraught with possibilities of evil, but only just beginning to work; no mention is made of Greek converts having actually adopted circumcision. Paul expresses his confidence that they will all be of one mind with him; he does not hesitate to threaten the intruders with the judgment of the Churches if they persist (v. 10); he longs indeed to come amongst them and assure himself by a fresh visit of their fidelity to Christ and His Apostles, but he lays down his pen with an assurance that henceforth no man will trouble him. And the evidence of history confirms this favourable impression; it would seem that the Epistle did really succeed in re-establishing the faith of the Galatians. For we hear no more of any anxiety about

their state; the Apostle was in no hurry to make his voice heard among them—he let three years pass before he revisited them, and then only on his way to Ephesus. Yet an incidental reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 attests his confidence in their unshaken loyalty. It appears from that passage that when he appealed to all his Greek Churches for a joint contribution for the poor brethren in Jerusalem, the Galatians were the very first to receive his instructions, even before the Corinthians. It is a slight but sufficient testimony to the unbroken strength of the tie that bound them to their own Apostle.

ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ.[1]

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος, (οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν

[1] ℵABDEFGK 17, etc.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-5. APOSTOLIC ADDRESS, BENEDICTION AND DOXOLOGY.—The Epistle opens with the author's name and the designation of his office, *Paul, an Apostle*. So far it follows the regular practice of Apostolic Epistles in advancing at the outset a claim to attentive hearing. But circumstances gave in this case a special significance to this opening; for in the Galatian Churches rival agitators had seriously challenged the author's right to this title of Apostle, so that the bare mention of his office involved a distinct protest against the slanders which had been circulated in regard to his office and his person. He proceeds, accordingly, to an emphatic vindication of his divine commission, *not from men, neither through man*. He raises here a twofold issue, evidently corresponding to two specific points in his qualifications for the office, which his adversaries had on their side selected for attack. The transition from the plural in the first clause, to the singular in the second, is significant, and helps to furnish a key to the two particular points in his career on which his enemies had fastened. His mission to the Gentiles had apparently been disparaged on the plea that it had emanated *from men*, *i.e.*, from the Church of Antioch only. Again, the validity of his commission was impugned on the ground that he had originally received the Spirit *through a man*, *i.e.*, through the agency of Ananias, who had been deputed to lay his hands upon him at Damascus. By these insinuations an invidious comparison was instituted between Paul and the original Apostles who had been sent forth by Christ Himself, and had received the Spirit by a miraculous outpouring from Heaven on the day of Pentecost. It was obviously impossible to confute these aspersions by alleging any specific act of the risen Lord. Accordingly Paul contents himself for the moment with an indignant repudiation of the calumnies, reserving his full vindication for the historical review of his conversion and Christian life (i. 10-ii. 14). The tokens by which the risen Lord had attested His presence and His commission to His servant Paul had been very real and certain to the eye of faith; but they had, from the nature of the case, been less tangible than the evidence of His living voice and presence during His earthly sojourn; they had been granted at successive stages of the Apostle's life, and had often taken the shape of visions, personal revelations, and spiritual communion. At his conversion he had been declared a chosen vessel for future ministry; three years later the Lord had replied to his prayer in the temple, bidding him depart from Jerusalem, *for* (He said) *I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles;* afterwards, at Antioch, the Spirit had given command, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them;*

ἐκ νεκρῶν,) 2. καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας· 3. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν[1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 4. τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν περὶ[2] τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

[1] ημων BDEFGKL; placed after πατρος ℵAP 17.
[2] περι ℵADEFGKLP; υπερ B 17, 67.

thereupon God had visibly sealed his appointment by the abundant blessing bestowed upon his labours, as the Galatians themselves could amply testify.—**διὰ . . . πατρὸς.** The previous combination of **ἀπό** and **διά** in the negative clauses invites a corresponding combination here in the antithesis, **ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς,** declaring, on the one hand, the instrumentality of the Son in the appointment of His Apostle, and, on the other, tracing back the authority with which he was invested to God the Father' as its original source. But Paul prefers here, instead of contemplating his apostleship to the Gentiles by itself as a single act of the Divine Head of the Church, to connect it with the larger design of building up the Church of Christ, for which the united action of the Father and the Son was indispensable. The Father set that design in motion by raising Him from the dead, and is here accordingly associated with the Son as directly co-operating in the government of the Church. In the subsequent review of his own personal life, Paul in like manner perceives the immediate hand of God in his pre-Christian life, setting him apart from his mother's womb, and training him under the law for his future work as an Apostle, before he was brought to Christ at all.

Ver. 2. **οἱ σὺν ἐμοί.** No name is mentioned: neither Timothy nor Silas, nor any other companion of Paul known to the Galatians can have been with him when he wrote, nor is the name mentioned of any Christian congregation; probably he was residing in some Greek city in which no Church had yet been formed. The phrase **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ** seems, from its use in Phil. iv. 21, to describe a small group of brethren immediately surrounding the Apostle; for the salutation from them is there followed by a separate salutation from the Roman Church in general. The position of the Apostle during his first few weeks at Corinth, before Silas and Timothy rejoined him, corresponds closely to the circumstances indicated by this phrase (see Introd., pp. 146-147).—**ἐκκλησίαις.** There were four Churches in Southern Galatia, but they formed a single group, being all bound together by the great imperial highway that ran through them, and gave facility for constant intercourse. All would, therefore, respond speedily to any religious impulse, like the wave of Pharisaic reaction which the Apostle is combating in this Epistle.

Ver. 3. The apostolic blessing is here as elsewhere summed up in the comprehensive words *grace and peace*. These include the lifegiving power of the spirit as well as the assurance of God's forgiving love in Christ and peace with an accusing conscience. This verse affirms once more the co-operation of the Father with the Son in devising and carrying out the scheme of man's redemption.

Ver. 4. **περὶ τ. ἁμαρτιῶν.** The sin offerings of the Law were designated **περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (*cf.* Heb. x. 6, 8), but **περί** and **ὑπέρ** were equally applicable with reference to Christ's offering of Himself for our sins; the former fixing attention on the effect of His sacrifice in doing away sin, the latter on the motive which prompted Him, *viz.*, love for sinners. The two prepositions are combined in 1 Pet. iii. 18. It is often difficult to decide which is the genuine reading owing to the variation of MSS.: but here they are greatly in favour of **περί,** which is also more appropriate to the context: for in this clause a comparison is intended between the sin-offerings of Christ and the typical sin-offerings of the Law; while the next expresses the motive of the Saviour by the addition **ὅπως ἐξέληται . . .—αἰῶνος.** In early Greek this word denoted the appointed lifetime of man, and so combined the thought of an overruling destiny with the course of human life. From the conception of individual life was developed that of corporate life, whether of families, nations or societies, and the idea of divine appointment was more distinctly fastened on the word in Scripture, so that every successive dispensation of God was designated as an **αἰών.** In this place **αἰῶνος** denotes the world which Jesus found existing at the time of His coming, out of which He chose His disciples.

ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος[1] πονηροῦ, 5. κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

6. Θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος

[1] **αιωνος τ. εν.** ℵAB 17, 39; **τ. εν. αι.** ℵ^corr.DEFGHKLP.

World is the nearest English equivalent to **αἰών** in this sense, if only it be understood to mean a particular phase of human society, as in the phrases *religious world*, *scientific world*, etc., and not the material universe.—**ἐνεστῶτος**: *existing*. This participle is twice elsewhere applied to things existing by way of contrast to things future (**μέλλοντα**), in Rom. viii. 38 and 1 Cor. iii. 22. A similar contrast is here suggested between **ὁ ἐνεστώς** and **ὁ μέλλων αἰών**, *i.e.*, between the world which Christ found existing on earth and the Messianic world whose coming Hebrew prophets had foretold.—**πονηροῦ.** This sweeping condemnation of the existing world corresponds to the language of the Baptist and to Christ's own denunciations of the evil generation to which He came. In spite of all that revelation and conscience had done to leaven it, He found the faithful few in number, and evil predominant in the mass.—**ἐξέληται.** Here, as in Acts xxvi. 17, this verb coupled with **ἐκ** can only denote *choice out of* the world, not *deliverance from* it, which would require the addition of **ἐκ χειρός**, as in Acts xii. 11, or some equivalent. The clause describes the process of selection begun by Christ on earth, and still continued by the risen Christ as He calls fresh disciples into His Church continually.

Ver. 5. **ᾧ ἡ δόξα,** *sc.* **ἐστιν.** Our versions supply **ἔστω** and turn the clause accordingly into an invocation of praise. But the insertion of the article points rather to an affirmation, *whose is the glory*. The verb is usually omitted in the doxology, but **ἐστιν** is added in 1 Pet. iv. 11. *The glory* consists in the manifestation of the Father's character throughout all the ages in the continual redemption of mankind according to His will. Hereby is revealed His union of perfect wisdom, holiness, and love.—**εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων. αἰών** denotes in Scripture a divinely appointed period (see note on ver. 4). The larger of these divine dispensations comprehend within them other shorter periods, and are therefore designated **αἰῶνες αἰώνων.** The phrase in the text ascribes the glory to God for the whole term of these dispensations, *i.e.*, for all the ages of human life, since these together make up the sum of man's existence. The full form is used by the Apostle in Phil. iv. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 18, but he uses elsewhere the shorter form **εἰς τ. αἰῶνας.**—**ἀμήν.** This *Amen* crowns the previous declaration of the glory of God by an invitation to the Churches to join in the ascription of praise.

Vv. 6-9. THE APOSTLE EXPRESSES SURPRISE AT THE SUDDEN DEFECTION OF HIS CONVERTS FROM THE ONLY TRUE GOSPEL, AND PRONOUNCES ANATHEMAS ON ALL PERVERTERS OF THE TRUTH.—Paul is evidently startled at the tidings of a sudden revolution in Galatian feeling. His intense indignation is evinced by the vehemence of his language and the solemnity of his anathema. There could be but one true Gospel; this new doctrine was no Gospel at all, but only a heretical perversion of the truth by foreign agitators. They were probably emissaries of a Pharisaic party in the Church, which advocated circumcision and legal observances for all converts alike.

Ver. 6. **μετατίθεσθε**: *ye are removing* (not *removed* as in A.V.). The agitators had not yet achieved any decisive success, though the Galatians were disposed to lend too ready an ear to their suggestions. It was not so much their actual progress, as the evidence afforded of the instability of the Galatian faith, that excited misgivings in the mind of Paul (*cf.* iv. 11, 20); he regarded the movement as merely *a little leaven*, and had not lost his confidence in the personal loyalty of his converts and the general soundness of their faith (v. 9, 10, vi. 17. See Introd., p. 147).—**τοῦ καλέσαντος,** *sc.* **Θεοῦ.** The Gospel call proceeded from God, like those to Abraham and the ancient servants and people of God; the Epistles of Paul invariably attribute it to Him (*cf.* i. 15), not to His human instruments.—**ἐν χάριτι.** This is evidently not = **εἰς τὴν χάριν** (*into the grace of Christ*, A.V.), but records the spirit of Divine love which prompted the call. God, of His grace in Christ, sent forth the Gospel to the Galatians by the hands of Paul

ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον· 7. ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς, καὶ θέλοντες μεταστρέψαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 8. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίσηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. 9. ὡς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι, πάλιν λέγω, Εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

and Barnabas.—**ἕτερον.** This passage brings out forcibly the different meaning of **ἕτερος** and **ἄλλος.** **ἕτερος** is primarily *the other* of two, **ἄλλος** *another* of several. Hence **ἕτερος** fixes attention on two objects exclusively (*cf.* note on **τὸν ἕτερον** in vi. 4); here it marks the essential difference between the true and the spurious Gospel, distinguishing the latter as quite *a different Gospel.*

Ver. 7. **ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο.** The translation of this clause in A.V. and R.V. (*which is not another*) has caused great embarrassment by its apparent identification of the spurious Gospel with the true. Lightfoot pleads ingeniously that **ἄλλο** may mean another besides the true Gospel, and so interprets the clause to mean that it is no Gospel at all; but this will hardly be accepted by most other scholars. The American revisers suggest the rendering *which is nothing else than.* But these difficulties arise from making **ὃ** the subject of the sentence: surely it is in fact a connecting adverb (*touching which, as to which, whereas*), as it is again in ii. 10, and probably in ii. 20. If the clause be rendered, *whereas there is no other Gospel* (*i.e.*, than the true), the sense becomes perfectly clear, and it forms an appropriate introduction to the succeeding anathemas by its emphatic testimony to the one true Gospel.—**εἰ μή** . . . This clause qualifies the former "there is no other Gospel," only a spurious semblance (on the use of **εἰ μή** see note on ver. 19).—**τινές.** There is a studied vagueness in this and other references to the agitators. They were evidently not Galatian Christians, but strangers from abroad, whom the Apostle treats with real or affected contempt.

Ver. 8. **ἡμεῖς.** Paul here associates with himself the colleagues Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, who had combined with him to preach the Gospel. He desires to impress on his disciples that the controversy is not between one teacher and another, but between truth and falsehood: no minister of Christ, not even an angel, can alter the truth in Christ.—**ἀνάθεμα.** The two derivatives, **ἀνάθημα** and **ἀνάθεμα**, are both employed in the LXX and N.T. in different senses. **ἀνάθημα** serves, as in other Greek authors, to denote a temple offering, statue, or ornament (*cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 16, Luke xxi. 5), while **ἀνάθεμα** is restricted to the Hebrew conception of an offering devoted under a solemn vow to death or destruction (Lev. xxvii. 28, Josh. vii. 1, Acts xxiii. 14). The Epistles of Paul attach to the word the idea of *spiritual* death. The significant addition **ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ** in Rom. ix. 3 associates with it the further idea of separation from Christ, and consequent loss of all Christian blessings and means of grace. It does not, like excommunication, pronounce a judicial sentence on particular convicted offenders, but solemnly affirms general laws of the spiritual kingdom, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xvi. 22, any *who love not the Lord*, here any who tamper with the truth of the Gospel, are pronounced outcasts from the faith, and dead to the Spirit of Christ.

Ver. 9. **προειρήκαμεν.** The contrast between this plural and the singular **λέγω** proves that Paul is here referring, not to previous warnings of his own by letter, but to joint warnings given by his companions Silas and Timothy as well as himself during his visit to the Churches. He never speaks of himself in the plural number. **ὡς . . . ἄρτι**: *as we have also forewarned you of late, I say again.* Our versions interpret **προειρήκαμεν** *we have said before* and **καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω** *so say I now again.* But Greek usage forbids this antithesis between **προ.** and **ἄρτι.** **Προλέγειν** means *to forewarn*, not *to say in time past* (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 2, Gal. v. 21, 1 Thess. iii. 4); while **ἄρτι** is used indifferently of recent or of present time. In Matt. ix. 18, 1 Thess. iii. 6 it means *of late*, in Matt. xxvi. 53, John xiii. 7, 37, xvi. 12, 31, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, xvi. 7 it means *now*, by way of contrast with the future. **Ἄρτι** cannot therefore be used to contrast the present time with the immediate past. The words **καὶ ἄρτι** belong really to the preceding clause, and contain a reminder how recent had been the warnings which the Apostle is repeating. Since the rendering of John ix. 25 *Whereas I was blind, now*

10. Ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ ἔτι[1] ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην. 11. Γνωρίζω δὲ[2] ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· 12. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ, οὔτε[3] ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 13. Ἠκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ

[1] ει ετι ℵABD^{1}FG 17, etc.; ει γαρ ετι D^{3}EKLP.
[2] δε ℵAD^{3}EKLP; γαρ ℵ*BD^{1}FG 17.
[3] ουτε before εδιδ. BD^{3}EKL; ουδε ℵAD^{1}FGP 31, etc.

I see appears to contradict this view of ἄρτι, it may be well to point out that ὢν does not mean *whereas I was*, but that the speaker's real meaning was, *I being* (*sc.*, by nature) *blind now see*.

The true rendering is of some historical importance, as evidence that warnings on the subject of circumcision had been given to the Galatians by Paul and his companions during a recent visit (see Introd., p. 146).

Vv. 10-24. Repudiation of corrupt motives. Evidence from Paul's personal history that his conversion was due to God, and that he was taught the Gospel by God independently of the Twelve and of Jerusalem.—Ver. 10. The order of words in the Greek text forbids the stress laid in our versions on the alternative *men or God;* the meaning of which is besides a little obscure in this connection. The true rendering of ἢ is *rather than* (= μᾶλλον ἢ), as in Matt. xviii. 8, Luke xv. 7, xvii. 2, 1 Cor. xiv. 19: *Am I now persuading men rather than God?* This language indicates clearly what kind of calumnies had been circulated. His detractors accused him of sacrificing the truth of God for the sake of persuading men. It was, we know, his boast that he *became all things to all men*, but whereas his real motive was that he might win all to Christ, they insinuated that he was more bent on winning favour with men than on securing the approval of God. During his recent visit he had made two concessions to Jewish feeling; he had circumcised Timothy, and had recommended for adoption regulations tending to promote harmonious intercourse between Jewish and Gentile converts. It was easy to misrepresent these concessions as an abandonment of his former principles: and they furnished his enemies accordingly with a handle for decrying him as a time-server without fixed principles, now bent on winning Jewish favour, as he had been before on gaining the Gentiles (see Introd., p. 145, and *cf.* v. 11).—Ἄρτι. The Greek text throws the emphasis on this word, and its subtle irony is brought out by the ἔτι which follows. "Am I doing this *now?* Do you charge me *now* (he says in effect to these partisans of Judaism) with regarding men more than God? There *was* a time, before I knew Christ, when I did study to please men: if that were still my desire, I should not have been a servant of Christ."

Ver. 11. γνωρίζω. Here, as in 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1, this verb has the force of *reminding* rather than of *making known*. In all three passages the author calls attention to forgotten truths, which had once been well known.

Ver. 12. ἐγὼ. The personal pronoun is inserted, because the author is here laying stress on the special education he had received for his ministry of the Gospel. He had not learnt it, like his converts, from human teaching, but by direct communion with God in spirit, as the Twelve had learnt it from Christ's own teaching. This independence of older Christians is a marked feature in the history of his life. The agency of Ananias was necessary for his admission into the Church, but after his baptism no older Christian appears on the scene at Damascus.

Ver. 13. Ἠκούσατε. The Galatians had no doubt heard from Paul himself of his former persecution of the Church. How frequently it formed the topic of his addresses to Jewish hearers may be gathered from his defence of himself at Jerusalem in Acts xxii., and before Agrippa in Acts xxvi.—Ἰουδαϊσμῷ. The rendering of this word in our versions, *Jewish religion*, is unfortunate: it implies a definite separation between the two religions which did not then exist, for Christians were still habitual worshippers in the synagogue; and it puts

Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν· 14. καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. 15. ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 16. ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ

this view into the mouth of Paul, who steadfastly persisted in identifying the faith of Christ with the national religion. The word **Ἰουδαΐζειν** denotes the adoption of Jewish habits, language, or policy (*cf.* ii. 14). So here **Ἰουδαϊσμός** denotes Jewish partisanship, and accurately describes the bitter party spirit which prompted Saul to take the lead in the martyrdom of Stephen and the persecution of the Church. Incidentally the partisanship was based on a false view of religion, for the narrow intolerance of the Scribes and Pharisees was a prevailing curse of Jewish society at the time; but **Ἰουδαϊσμός** expresses the party spirit, not the religion. Still more alien to the spirit of Paul is the language attributed to him in the next verse, *I profited in the Jews' religion* (A.V.): for it indicates satisfaction at the success of his Jewish career, whereas he never ceased to regard it with lifelong remorse. His real assertion here is that he advanced beyond his fellows in sectarian prejudice and persecuting zeal—a statement borne out by the history of the persecution.—**ποτε.** This adverb is obviously attached to the preceding substantive **ἀναστροφήν.**

The imperfects **ἐδίωκον** . . . describe the course of action continuously pursued by Saul down to his conversion.—**ἐπόρθουν.** This term is likewise applied in Acts ix. 21 to the havoc wrought by Saul in the Church.

Ver. 14. **συνηλικιώτας.** Saul had been educated at Jerusalem, and this word points to his contemporaries in the schools of the Pharisees.—**γένει.** This term sometimes denotes *family*, but here *race and nation*, as in Acts xviii. 2, 24. So also **συγγενής** in Rom. ix. 3, xvi. 7, 21.—**ζηλωτής.** This is not here the proper name of a sect, being coupled with a genitive, as in Acts xxi. 20. Saul had no sympathy with the anarchical sect of Zealots who preached the sacred duty of revolt from Rome, though he had the persecuting zeal of an orthodox Pharisee. —**πατρικῶν.** This differs in sense from **πατρῷος.** The latter denotes the national law and customs of Israel (Acts xxii. 3, xxviii. 17), the former the hereditary traditions of the family, as the addition of **μου** further signifies. In Acts xxiii. 6 Paul describes himself as a son of Pharisees.

Ver. 15. **ἀφορίσας.** Paul looks back on his parentage and early years as a providential preparation for his future ministry: this view is justified by his antecedents. By birth at once a Hebrew, a Greek and Roman citizen, educated in the Hebrew Scriptures and in Greek learning, he combined in his own person the most essential requisites for an Apostle to the Gentiles. He was further moulded by the spiritual discipline of an intense, though mistaken, zeal for the Law of his God, which issued in bitter remorse. By this career he was fitted to become a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before the Gentile world. He did not hesitate accordingly to regard himself, like Hebrew prophets of old (Is. xlix. 1, 5, Jer. i. 5), as dedicated from his birth to the service of God.

Ver. 16. **ἀποκαλύψαι . . . ἐν ἐμοί.** These words taken alone might denote either an inward revelation to Paul himself, or a revelation through him to the Gentiles. But the context is decisive in favour of the former: for this revelation is not only associated closely with his conversion and his personal history between that and the visit to Arabia, but it is expressly stated that it was granted with a view to future preaching (**ἵνα** . . .).

The context distinguishes this revelation from the call; it cannot therefore be identified with the previous vision of Christ on the way, but (as the words **ἐν ἐμοί** import) was an inward and spiritual revelation which followed that appeal to eye and ear. The history corroborates this view: for it relates that Saul, after his vision, spent three days in solitary communion with himself and God before he was admitted to Christian baptism. — **προσανεθέμην.** This compound verb denotes (as in ii. 6) *additional* communication. After direct revelation

αἵματι, 17. οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν, καὶ πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν. 18. Ἔπειτα μετὰ τρία ἔτη[1] ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι

[1] τρια ετη ℵAP 17, etc.; ετη τρια BDEFGKL.

from God Saul had no occasion to seek further advice from man. There is an apparent reminiscence in thought and language of Christ's words, *flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but My Father*.

Ver. 17. **ἀνῆλθον.** The religious position of Jerusalem as seat of the Temple and mother-city of the Church, its political importance, and its geographical position on the central heights of Palestine, combined to suggest the application of the terms *up* and *down* to journeys to and from Jerusalem.—**ἀποστόλους.** In the third Gospel and early chapters of the Acts this title is habitually applied to the Twelve. It was extended to Paul and Barnabas on the occasion of their mission. In 1 Cor. ix. 2 Paul and Barnabas are distinctly enumerated amidst the recognised Apostles. Rom. xvi. 7 suggests a further extension of the title, probably to all founders of churches. But with the *possible* exception of James, no addition is recorded to the number of the Twelve at Jerusalem after Matthias.—**Ἀραβίαν.** No mention is made elsewhere of this journey; its object is clearly indicated by the context; for it is placed in strong contrast with human intercourse, and was, therefore, undertaken for the sake of solitary communion with God. The Arabian deserts were within easy reach of Damascus. Lightfoot suggests, indeed, that Paul perhaps repaired to Mount Sinai; but if the Apostle had been granted communion with God on Mount Sinai, the name would have constituted too effective an argument in favour of his Divine commission to be suppressed here. The Sinaitic peninsula was, in fact, remote from Damascus; the journey was at all times dangerous for travellers without escort, and in the year 37 (the most probable date of Saul's conversion) was hardly possible on account of war between King Aretas and the Romans.

Ver. 18. **Ἔπειτα.** The thrice-repeated **Ἔπειτα** in this verse, in ver. 21, and in ii. 1, singles out three events in the Apostle's life bearing on his intercourse with the Church of Jerusalem: his first introduction to them, his departure to a distant sphere of labour, and his return to Jerusalem with Barnabas. The object of this sketch was not to write a history of those years, but to fix attention on certain salient incidents which threw light on the real nature of his intercourse with Jerusalem. — **μετὰ τρία ἔτη.** A different preposition is here employed from that used in ii. 1, which describes a mission within fourteen years. In this case no precise date is implied; for the object is not to date the visit, but to show that three full years at least had elapsed before Paul had any intercourse with the Twelve.—**ἱστορῆσαι**: *to enquire of Cephas, i.e.*, to obtain information from him. This is the usual meaning of the verb; in Herodotus, and elsewhere, it denotes visits paid to places of interest with a view to getting information about them on the spot. The circumstances in which Paul found himself at that time make this sense very appropriate. He had been suddenly driven from his ministry at Damascus, and was compelled to seek a new sphere. He could not turn to any adviser more valuable than Peter for determining his future course. For that Apostle was not only prominent in the general government of the Church, but had taken the lead in its expansion by his visits to Samaria, to the maritime plain, and to Cæsarea, and by his baptism of Gentiles. In spite, therefore, of the danger of revisiting Jerusalem, Paul repaired thither to consult Peter as to how he could best serve Christ.—**Κηφᾶν.** Several MSS. give the Greek form, **Πέτρον,** of this name; but the Hebrew form appears to be the original reading throughout the Epistle, except in ii. 7, 8. At Jerusalem he was probably known by the name Cephas, but in the Greek Church at large by the name Peter.—**ἐπέμεινα.** Both in the Acts and in the Pauline Epistles this verb denotes the continuance or prolongation of a stay.—**πρὸς αὐτόν.** This can hardly be = **παρ' αὐτῷ,** *I abode with him*. The clause expresses rather the motive for Paul's lingering at Jerusalem, *I tarried to see him fifteen days*.

This narrative is so independent of the account given of Paul's first meeting with the Twelve in Acts ix. 26-29, that some critics question the identity of the

Κηφᾶν,[1] καὶ ἐπέμεινα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε· 19. ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Κυρίου. 20. ἃ δὲ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι οὐ ψεύδομαι. 21. Ἔπειτα ἦλθον εἰς τὰ κλίματα τῆς Συρίας καὶ τῆς Κιλικίας·

[1] Κηφαν ℵAB 17, etc.; Πετρον ℵcDEFGKLP.

two visits. But it is clear that both passages alike refer to Paul's first return to Jerusalem, after a prolonged sojourn at Damascus; and the subtle harmony of the two narratives is as conspicuous as their independence in details. The history states the bare fact that Paul, finding his life in imminent danger from the Jews at Damascus, fled to Jerusalem; the Epistle explains why he encountered so obvious a danger; the Epistle states that he prolonged his stay to see Peter; the history explains that he was unable to gain access to the Apostles for a time. The history records the principal events of the visit from the historical point of view, *e.g.*, the apprehensions felt by the Christian body, the intervention of Barnabas, the attempts on Paul's life; the autobiography passes these by as foreign to its purpose, but is far richer in personal details, relating incidentally the date, the motive, and the duration of the visit, and particularising the brethren whom Paul saw on the occasion; whereas in the Acts mention is merely made of the disciples generally.

Ver. 19. **εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον.** **εἰ μή** may either state an exception to the preceding negative clause (=*except, save*), or merely qualify it (=*but only*), as it does in Luke iv. 26, *to none of them*, *sc.*, the widows in Israel, *but only to Sarepta in Sidon;* and in Gal. i. 7, *no other Gospel, only* (**εἰ μή**) *there are some that pervert the Gospel.* The latter appears to be its meaning here. If James had been entitled an Apostle, the author would probably have written that he saw no other Apostles but Peter and James. But here he states emphatically that he saw no second (**ἕτερον**) Apostle, only James. The Epistle, like the Acts (see xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18), fully recognises the leading position of James in the local Church (*cf.* ii. 9, 12); and the ecclesiastical tradition which entitles him Bishop of Jerusalem corresponds to this. All the evidence left of his life suggests that he clung throughout his Christian life to Jerusalem and did not undertake such missionary labours as would entitle him to the designation of Apostle.—**τὸν ἀδελφὸν . . .** James is here described as *the brother of the Lord* in order to distinguish him from James the son of Zebedee, who was living at the time of Paul's first visit; but elsewhere as James: after the death of the other James there could be no question who was meant.

Ver. 20. The solemnity of this appeal to God in attestation of His truth marks at once the importance which Paul attached to his independence of human teachers, and the persistency of the misrepresentation to which he had been exposed.—**ἰδού.** This imperative is always used interjectionally in Scriptures: the subsequent **ὅτι** depends on **ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ,** which has the force of an attestation.

Vv. 21-23. About ten years of the life of Paul, between his flight from Jerusalem to Tarsus and his return to Jerusalem for the Apostolic Council, are here passed over. They were spent, partly in and around Tarsus and Antioch, partly in the joint mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The Galatians were already acquainted with the leading facts of that period, and it was needless to refer to them here: enough that he spent those years, like those at Damascus, in an independent ministry at a distance from Jerusalem. He did indeed repair thither once with Barnabas to carry alms from Antioch to the Elders; but circumstances prevented any intercourse with the Twelve at that time: for before they reached the city the Herodian persecution had begun, and the leading Christians were in peril of death at the hands of Herod. Paul himself can only have paid a secret and hurried visit to the city, and thought it needless apparently to mention it in this place.—**κλίματα.** This word denotes the fringes of coastland sloping down from the mountains to the sea in north-western Syria and eastern, *i.e.* Roman, Cilicia. It is applied in 2 Cor. xi. 10 to the coastlands of Achaia.

The name Syria is placed before Cilicia, though the ministry at Tarsus preceded that at Antioch: for the latter was by far the more important and prolonged ministry. A further reason for placing

22. ἤμην δὲ ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ· 23. μόνον δὲ ἀκούοντες ἦσαν ὅτι ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἥν ποτε ἐπόρθει. 24. καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸν Θεόν. II. 1. **Ἔπειτα διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν πάλιν**

Syria first was the subordinate position of Cilicia: for Roman Cilicia was, like Judæa, only a district of the great province of Syria, separately administered by an imperial procurator at Tarsus.

In Acts xv. 41 Syria and Cilicia are coupled together as forming a single region (**τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν**), no article being inserted before **Κιλικίαν**; not so here, for the first ministry at Tarsus was distinct from that at Antioch.

Ver. 22. **ἤμην δὲ ἀγν.** The correct translation is not *I was unknown* (as our versions render it), but *I was becoming unknown*. At the beginning of this period he was a familiar figure in Jerusalem, but in the course of ten years' absence he gradually became a stranger to the Christians of Judæa.—**ἐκκλησίαις.** This passage speaks of the Churches of Judæa in the plural, as does also 1 Thess. ii. 14. In the Acts the Church throughout Judæa, Galilee and Samaria is described as a single Church according to the text of the best MSS. (ix. 31): the funds contributed for the relief of the poor Christians in Judæa are handed over to the Elders at Jerusalem (xi. 29, xii. 25); brethren from Judæa are censured as members of their own body by the assembled Church at Jerusalem (xv. 1, 24). It would seem from this that an effective unity of administration and control existed in Jerusalem side by side with local organisation of the several Churches of Judæa.

Ver. 23. *The faith* seems to be here identified with the living body of believers, for this verse describes Saul as making havoc of *the faith*, while ver. 13 applies that term to the *Church*.

Ver. 24. They glorified God in Saul, ascribing the change entirely to the grace of God working on his heart.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-10. NARRATIVE OF THE AUTHOR'S VISIT WITH BARNABAS TO THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM, HIS FRUITLESS NEGOTIATIONS WITH PARTY LEADERS, AND THE BROTHERLY WELCOME AND RECOGNITION HE RECEIVED FROM JAMES PETER AND JOHN.—The author has shown by a rapid glance over the first thirteen years of his Christian life how independent he had been of human teaching at his conversion and subsequently. He now proceeds to record the true history of the negotiations which he had undertaken at Jerusalem in conjunction with Barnabas in the fourteenth year of his ministry. (On the identity of this conference with the Apostolic Council, whose proceedings are recorded in Acts xv., see Introd., pp. 141-144). The Galatians were well aware of the position of Paul and Barnabas in the Church of Antioch: it was not therefore necessary to state in express terms that they were deputed to represent that Church. Enough that their first act was to lay before the Church of Jerusalem an account of the Gospel they were preaching to the Gentiles, and that their divine commission to the Gentiles was fully recognised by the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem. They knew already the general outline of events: for the resolution adopted at Jerusalem, and subsequently approved at Antioch, had been duly communicated to them by Paul himself. His object in this Epistle is to remove misconstruction as to his own position. His reference of this question to the Church of Jerusalem had been misrepresented as an act of submission and acknowledgment of his own inferiority, whereas he had really procured the condemnation of *the false brethren* who denied his authority, had silenced his opponents, and met with brotherly fellowship and full recognition at the hands of James Peter and John.

Ver. 1. **διὰ δεκατ. ἐτῶν.** Greek usage in calculating intervals of time between two events reckons two years for the two broken years at the beginning and end of the period. Some critics, notably Lightfoot, calculate this period from the meeting with Peter mentioned in i. 18: but this attaches far too much importance to that interview. It is only mentioned and its date loosely indicated in order to show that three full years passed before they had any intercourse. The dominant note of time throughout in the mind of the author is surely the conversion: and the object of specifying a period of time here, as in i. 18, is to show how many years of Christian life had passed before the event.—**Τίτον.** The names of the Christians who accompanied Paul and Barnabas are not given in Acts xv. 2. It appears that Titus, a Greek Christian,

ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρνάβα, συμπαραλαβὼν καὶ Τίτον· 2. ἀνέβην δὲ κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσι, μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον 3. (ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλλην ὤν,

one of Paul's own children in Christ, was among them, and that Paul was responsible for his selection. His choice of a Greek for his companion evinces the determined spirit with which he started on his mission.

Ver. 2. **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν.** This statement of Paul's motive is in no way inconsistent with the independent statement in the Acts that he was deputed by the Church. The revelation may have come to Paul himself, and in that case he prompted the decision of the Church, of which he and Barnabas were at that time the ruling spirits; or it may have been made through the Spirit to the Church, in which case Paul would count it right at once to obey his voice.—**ἀνεθέμην . . .** Two different methods of action are here specified, public addresses describing the nature and result of the Apostle's preaching among the Greeks, and private interviews with individual brethren or groups of brethren. The term **κατ' ἰδίαν** does not imply secrecy in these communications. The context shows that the point at issue was the circumcision of Gentile converts.—**τοῖς δοκοῦσιν.** As this phrase recurs four times in eight verses, it is necessary to determine its true meaning with some precision. **δοκεῖν** nowhere else conveys the idea of superiority implied in our versions, *of reputation* (*of repute* R.V.). The two passages adduced in its support do not stand the test of criticism: in Eur., *Heracl.*, 897 there is an obvious ellipsis of **εὐτυχεῖν**, in *Hec.*, 295 of **δόξαν ἔχειν.** In the latter indeed **δοκούντων** appears to be a cynical comment of the deposed queen on the unreality of outward glory.

In fact **δοκεῖν**, like *seem* in English, was either a neutral term which expressed according to the context any impression, good or bad, produced by the appearance of an object, or it laid stress on the unreality of the mere outward semblance. The Greeks dwelt often on the contrast between **δοκεῖν** and **εἶναι** embodied in the famous line of Æschylus **οὐ γὰρ δοκεῖν δίκαιος ἀλλ' εἶναι θέλει.** In ver. 6 this contrast reappears in the antithesis between **δοκοῦντες εἶναι** and **ποτε ἦσαν.** In ver. 9, on the contrary, **οἱ δοκοῦντες**, coupled as it is there with **στύλοι εἶναι**, denotes the high estimate formed of the Three. The elliptical phrase **ἀνεθέμην τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2 should in like manner be interpreted by the context. I take it to mean **ἀνεθέμην οἷς ἐδόκει δεῖν ἀναθέσθαι.** Paul, as he states, brought the matter in private interviews before those whom it seemed right to approach in that way, *sc.*, influential opponents, whose hostility he was anxious to deprecate.—**μή πως . . .** It was of vital moment to the welfare of the Greek Churches at that time to avoid a breach with Jerusalem. Besides embracing a minority of Jewish Christians, they were leavened through and through with Jewish influences, so that a quarrel might have led to a disastrous schism in all the existing Churches. More than this, they relied still mainly on the Old Testament for the basis of their theology and morals. The abundant promise of harvest among the Greeks rested still on the nucleus of devout Gentiles who had been prepared by the teaching of the synagogue for the lessons of Christ's Apostles. **τρέχω . . . ἔδραμον.** The present subjunctive is coupled here with the aorist indicative, as it is in 1 Thess. iii. 5, to express the fear of present failure, coupled with a dread that past labours had been rendered futile.

Ver. 3. *Howbeit even Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, had not been compelled to be circumcised.* The last verse related the steps taken by Paul to disarm opposition. He was, however, no less resolute in his resistance to any encroachment on Christian freedom. The presence of Titus with him attested his determination; for the circumcision of Titus had been demanded, and resisted evidently by Paul himself. It is a strange misconception of critics to argue as if this struggle over Titus took place at Jerusalem. The demand for the circumcision of all converts was made at Antioch and pressed against the authority of Paul and Barnabas (Acts xx. 2): the express object of the deputation was to protest against this demand, which they did with entire success. The Greek aorist **ἠναγκάσθη** answers here to the English pluperfect, as often elsewhere (*cf.* Winer, xl., 5).

ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι·), 4. διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν[1]· 5. οἷς οὐδὲ[2] πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ, ἵνα ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαμείνῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 6. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι (ὁποῖοί ποτε

[1] **καταδουλωσουσιν** ℵABCDEFG; **-σονται** L; **-σωνται** K.
[2] **οις ουδε** ℵABCDcorr.EFGKLP; om. D.

Ver. 4. The narrative returns here, after the parenthetical reference to Titus, to the subject of vv. 1, 2, and the verb **ἀνέβην**, already repeated in ver. 2, must here also be supplied to complete the sense: *But it was because of the false brethren privily brought in that I went up, men who came in. . . .* The addition of the article, rightly inserted by the Revised Version before *false brethren*, shows that they were a particular body of convicted offenders against Christ, of whose guilt the Galatians had been already informed. The force of **παρεισάκτους** is well illustrated by *Strabo*, xvii., p. 794, where it denotes the treacherous introduction of foreign enemies into a city by a faction within the walls. In the next clause **παρεισῆλθον** describes the stealthy entrance of these secret foes; **κατασκοπῆσαι** marks their hostile intent, and likens them to spies who are bent on discovering to an enemy the weak points in a military position: the freedom of the Greek Churches in Christ is further declared to be the object of their hostility. This description brings the Epistle into close touch with the Acts: for it is there stated that Paul and Barnabas were driven to go up to Jerusalem by the factious opposition of certain foreign emissaries from Judæa who attacked the freedom of the Greek converts from circumcision and disturbed the peace of the Church; also that these men were altogether repudiated and condemned at Jerusalem by the Apostles and brethren, and finally that the document embracing this sentence of condemnation had been placed by Paul himself in the hands of the Galatians. There can be no doubt, in view of this close correspondence, that the false brethren whom the Epistle denounces are identical with the Pharisaic emissaries who stirred up strife at Antioch.—**καταδουλώσουσιν.** All the best MSS. agree in reading this future indicative instead of the subjunctive after **ἵνα**; possibly the author meant to express thereby the assured hope of success, and not merely the intention of the conspirators.

Ver. 5. **εἴξαμεν.** Paul here couples Barnabas with himself in recording the determined resistance offered by both to the demand for the circumcision of all Christians preferred at Antioch. Barnabas was at that time a staunch supporter of Greek freedom. The verse obviously refers to their attitude at Antioch before going to Jerusalem.—**τῇ ὑποταγῇ**: *by our submission*. Here, as in 2 Cor. ix. 13, **ὑποταγή** denotes a voluntary act, not one imposed upon a subject. The same rendering appears more appropriate for expressing the due attitude of wife and children in 1 Tim. ii. 11, iii. 4. The middle voice **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** is five times rendered *submit* in the Authorised Version, and the force of the original is impaired by its exclusion from the text of the Revised Version.—**ἵνα . . .** The motive for firmness was the maintenance *of* the truth of the Gospel, *i.e.*, of the freedom to which the uncircumcised were entitled in Christ.—**πρὸς ὑμᾶς**: *for you*, *i.e.*, with a view to your welfare. The rendering of our versions, *with you*, would be properly expressed by **ἐν ὑμῖν.**

Ver. 6. The author here resumes the broken thread of the narrative, which he interrupted after ver. 2 in order to show that his conciliatory attitude at Jerusalem was not due to weakness or irresolution. He now proceeds to relate the sequel of the advances which he made at Jerusalem to the Pharisaic party. The repetition of the phrase **οἱ δοκοῦντες,** and the fresh transition from the plural **εἴξαμεν** to the singular **ἐμοί,** indicate the fresh shifting of the scene from Antioch back to Jerusalem. The first clause is left unfinished, for the mention of these men *who seemed to be anything* leads the author to interrupt his narrative again that he may challenge their right to be heard; he breaks, accordingly, into the disparaging comment, *what manner of men they had once been, maketh no matter*—a forcible expression of his disappointment at finding so little Christian sympathy or life where he had hoped to find so much. After this parenthesis he remoulds the

ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον Θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει)—ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο. 7. Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον, ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς 8. (ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη), 9. καὶ γνόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, Ἰάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς[1] καὶ Ἰωάννης, οἱ

[1] Ι. και Κηφας ℵBCKLP; Πετρος και Ι. DEFG.

form of his sentence; and **οἱ δοκοῦντες**, the subject of **ἦσαν**, becomes the subject of the verb **προσανέθεντο**. Instead, therefore, of concluding the sentence in its original form, and stating that *from those who so seemed* he got no response, he writes, *to me, I say, those who so seemed communicated nothing further*.—**τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι.** These are identified with **τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2. They are there described as men whom it was thought advisable to approach in private, here as men who were thought *to be anything*, *i.e.*, to have any weight in the Church. The English version *somewhat* suggests that they held high office and were in positions of dignity, perhaps Apostles; but the Greek order in that case must have been **τί εἶναι**, nor can that emphasis be justified in rendering the enclitic **τι** after **εἶναι**. They were probably party-leaders, but the Apostle writes of them with scant respect as men who were now little better than a name.—**ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν . . .**: *What manner of men they had once been maketh no matter to me*. The margin of the Revised Version rightly renders **ὁποῖοι** as an indirect interrogative dependent on **διαφέρει**, and gives to **ποτε** its true sense of *formerly*, *in time past* (as in i. 13, 23). Coupled as it is here with **ποτε**, **ἦσαν** has the force of a pluperfect, and contrasts the character of these men as reported from past time with what Paul actually found them to be: he could get no brotherly help or counsel from them. Therefore he pronounces the adverse judgment upon them (**πρόσωπον . . . λαμβάνει**); for, like his Master (Luke xx. 21), he regarded no man's person, if weighed in the balance and found wanting.—**ἐμοὶ . . . προσανέθεντο.** This clause forms an antithesis to **ἀνεθέμην τοῖς δοκοῦσιν** in ver. 2. Paul had laid before them an account of his successful ministry among the Greeks, but they had no further response to make in the shape of Christian sympathy, or of fresh argument in justification of their prejudices against him and his teaching.

Ver. 7. The emphatic opening of this verse, **Ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον**, gives prominence to the thorough contrast presented by James, Cephas and John to the cold reserve of these suspicious and prejudiced opponents. It is perfectly clear in the Greek text, though unfortunately not in the English versions, that *they* are the subject throughout vv. 7-9, and that the participles **ἰδόντες** and **γνόντες** refer to *them* as well as the verb **ἔδωκαν**. *But contrariwise James and Cephas and John . . . when they saw . . . and perceived the grace that was given unto me, gave to me and Barnabas right hands of fellowship*. They saw in the marvellous success of Paul and Barnabas a visible token of their divine commission and of the grace bestowed upon them. These were doubtless the real authors of the final resolution adopted by the Council; and its hearty appreciation of their *beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ* coincides with the language of the Epistle.—**Πέτρος.** In this and the next verse the Greek name is used to designate the Apostle of the circumcision, probably because he was already known to the whole Greek world as an Apostle under that name. In Jerusalem, however, and as a man, he habitually went by his Hebrew surname Cephas, and that name is accordingly given him elsewhere in the Epistle.

Ver. 8. **ἐνεργήσας.** When this verb is applied to the work of the Spirit in the hearts of men, the preposition **ἐν** is added to it. The absence of **ἐν** before **Πέτρῳ** and **ἐμοί** indicates that this verse is not describing the work of grace in the hearts of Peter and Paul, but the work of God *for* them, *i.e.*, for the furtherance of the Gospel which they preached.

Ver. 9. The name of James is placed before those of the Apostles Peter and John. This was probably because as permanent head of the local Church he presided at meetings (*cf.* Acts xxi. 18). The well-known strictness of his own

δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς[1] εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν· 10. μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. 11. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε Κηφᾶς[2] εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ

[1] **ημεις** ℵBFGKLP; **ημεις μεν** ℵ^aACDE.
[2] **Κηφας** ℵABCHP; **Πετρος** DEFGKL.

legal observance gave special weight to his support of Greek freedom on this occasion. A comparison of his address with the subsequent resolution of the Council suggests that he took a leading part in drafting some part of it at least.—**οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι.** The habitual application to the Church of figures borrowed from a temple of God suggested the description of Apostles as pillars. It occurs also in Clement of Rome and Ignatius. The repetition of the phrase **οἱ δοκοῦντες** is apparently designed to contrast the high estimate formed of the Three with the unfounded and indefinite estimate of others who had proved to be mere names.—**ἵνα . . .** The mutual understanding between the two groups of Apostles obviously did not imply an absolute restriction of each to one section of the Church. All converts alike were members of a single united Church: circumstances of themselves forbade any definite division: Paul opened his ministry everywhere in the synagogue, and numbered Jews as well as Greeks amidst his converts. So Peter again is next found at Antioch.

Ver. 10. **μόνον . . . ἵνα.** A verb must be supplied out of **δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν** expressive of the pledge that the other Apostles exacted from Barnabas and Paul. **τῶν πτωχῶν.** These words are displaced from their grammatical position after **μνημονεύωμεν** in order to lay stress upon the poor being the central object of the appeal. Judæa suffered often from famine in apostolic times, and Christians were probably the worst sufferers owing to religious ill-will and social persecution. This passage implies chronic poverty. So also does the history of the Pauline contribution, which was not an effort to meet a special emergency, for it took more than a year to collect, but a fund organised to meet a permanent demand for systematic help.—**ὃ.** The addition of **τοῦτο** after **αὐτό** shows that **ὃ** is not the object of **ποιῆσαι**, but is used with adverbial force for a connecting particle, as in i. 7, *as for which*.—**καὶ ἐσπούδασα**: not *I also*, for this would require **καὶ ἐγώ** in the Greek text. The force of **καί** is to intensify the following verb. *I was not only willing, but was indeed zealous to do so.*

Vv. 11-14. INTRIGUE AT ANTIOCH TO AFFIX THE STIGMA OF UNCLEANNESS ON UNCIRCUMCISED BRETHREN, COUNTENANCED BY PETER AND BARNABAS, BUT OPENLY REBUKED BY PAUL.—The gathering of many Christians at Antioch after the Apostolic Council during the sojourn of Paul and Barnabas in that city is recorded in the Acts, but no mention is made of Peter or of this episode. The omission is instructive, for it bears out the impression which the Epistle itself conveys that the collision was a transitory incident, and had no lasting effect on Church history. The fact, however, that Peter and Barnabas both consented to affix the stigma of uncleanness on their uncircumcised brethren rather than incur the obloquy of eating with them bears striking testimony to the strength of the prejudices which then prevailed among Jewish Christians. Neither of them had any real scruples about intercourse with these brethren: Peter had been taught of God long ago not to call any unclean whom God had cleansed, and had recently protested at Jerusalem against laying the yoke of the Law upon the neck of the disciples; Barnabas had ministered for years to Greek converts, had championed their cause at Jerusalem with Paul, and had like Peter consorted with them freely of late: yet neither of them had the moral courage to act up to their convictions under the eyes of the brethren from Jerusalem. Their vacillation attests the difficulty of retaining Jews and Greeks in one communion, and the wisdom and prudence which guided the decision of the Apostolic Council. But that decision had materially strengthened Paul's position. A basis of union had been formally ratified between the two Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch. The Church of Jerusalem by calling on Greek Christians to consent, as they had done, to certain prescribed forms of abstinence had virtually bound themselves to accept these

ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. 12. πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον,[1] ὑπέστελλε καὶ

[1] ηλθον ACD[2]EHKLP; ηλθεν ℵBD[1]FG.

as conditions of intercourse, and the withdrawal from the common meal violated therefore the spirit of a solemn treaty. Paul had therefore strong ground for remonstrance, independently of his authority in his own Church, and his protest was evidently effectual, though he refrains from recording Peter's humiliating retreat from a false position. For it is recorded here for the express purpose of exemplifying his successful vindication of his apostolic rights.

The early Fathers shrank from admitting the moral cowardice of which Peter was guilty on this occasion, and made various efforts to evade the plain sense. Clement of Alexandria questioned the identity of Cephas with the Apostle. Origen propounded a theory that the scene was a preconcerted plot between the two Apostles for the confutation of the Judaisers; and this theory prevailed extensively in spite of the discredit which it cast on the character of both until it was effectually exposed by Augustine in controversy with Jerome, who had himself adopted it.

Again, this momentary collision beween the two great Apostles was distorted by party spirit into an evidence of personal rivalry. Their preeminence in their two respective spheres has been already noted as early as the Apostolic Council, and this led, perhaps inevitably, to personal comparison. In the Corinthian Church opposite partisans adopted their names for rival watch-words. At a later time elaborate fictions of their lifelong antagonism were invented and circulated in the Clementine literature. But the collision here mentioned was obviously a transitory incident. The language of gratitude and esteem applied to Peter elsewhere in the Epistle precludes any idea of permanent estrangement. — **ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.** Our versions are surely wrong in giving a causal force to **ὅτι** in this clause, for it adduces no clear and reasonable justification of the opposition offered. It is much better to take **ὅτι** as declarative: Paul is here stating the ground which he took up against Peter: *I withstood him, saying that he had condemned himself.* He urged that Peter was condemned by his own inconsistency. By first eating with Gentiles and then pressing upon them observance of the very principles that he had violated he was playing fast and loose with the Law.

Ver. 12. **Ἰακώβου.** Any visitors from the Church of Jerusalem might perhaps be said to come from James, who was its permanent head; but these brethren appear to have been in special sympathy with James in regard to their strict observance of the Law, and the respect paid by Peter to their opinion suggests that they were representative men, probably deputed for some purpose by their Church. There is, however, no reason to conclude that James prompted or approved the intrigue against Gentile freedom at Antioch. Scrupulous as he was about observing the Law, he had taken a leading part at Jerusalem in shaping the recent contract with their Gentile brethren, and was the last man to sanction an evasion of its terms.

The imperfect tenses **ὑπέστελλεν, ἀφώριζεν** give a graphic picture of Peter's irresolute and tentative efforts to withdraw gradually from an intercourse that gave offence to the visitors.—**τ. ἐκ περιτομῆς.** The omission of **τῆς** before **περιτομῆς** is conclusive against the rendering of our versions, *them . . . of the circumcision.* For **περιτομή** without an article does not denote the body of men, but the rite. By **τ. ἐκ περιτομῆς** are meant the party who based their faith on circumcision, and made that the charter of God's covenant rather than baptism, and not the Jewish Christians in general. It is clear from the context that the Circumcision as a body did eat with their brethren until Peter set the example of withdrawal through fear of this determined minority of partisans. In Acts xi. 2 the phrase obviously singles out a particular party who pressed the claims of circumcision in an assembly consisting wholly of circumcised men. In Acts x. 45 **οἱ ἐκ π. πιστοί** distinguishes those who believed after circumcision from the uncircumcised who believed; and in Col. iv. 11 **οἱ ὄντες ἐκ π. οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοί** designates *those men who were my only fellow-workers after circumcision.* (For the force of the elliptical phrase **οἱ ἐκ** *cf.* iii. 7, 9, Rom. iv. 14.)

Ver. 13. **συνυπεκρίθησαν . . . ὑποκρί-**

ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. 13. καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. 14. Ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ[1] ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, Εἰ σὺ, Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων, ἐθνικῶς ζῇς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, πῶς[2] τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαΐζειν; 15. ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ

[1] Κηφᾳ ℵABC 17, etc.; Πετρῳ DEFGKLP.
[2] πως ℵABCDEFGP; τι KL.

σει. The verb ὑποκρίνεσθαι is often used of playing a part as an actor in a play without any invidious meaning; but ὑπόκρισις corresponds throughout the N.T. to its English equivalent *hypocrisy*, and fidelity to the Greek text almost demands that rendering here. The men who had hitherto eaten with the uncircumcised and now withdrew because they shrank from giving offence were, in fact, affecting religious scruples which they did not feel, and the Apostle does not hesitate to denounce such insincerity by its true name *hypocrisy*.—**καὶ Βαρνάβας**: *even Barnabas*. The defection of Barnabas was a heavier blow to the cause of Gentile freedom than the vacillation of Peter. With the single exception of Paul himself, Barnabas had been the most effective minister of Christ for the conversion of Greeks; he had been of late deputed to appear with Paul as their representative in Jerusalem, and his withdrawal from social communion with Greek Christians fell upon them with the force of a betrayal. Yet Paul, who had been for many years his most intimate companion, and knew his heart, writes more in sorrow than in anger of his lamentable weakness in being led away by evil example. For he saw that he was the victim of stronger wills than his own. Jerusalem had been his early home and the place of his earliest ministry. The Twelve had been his first teachers in Christ: his cousin John Mark, who was even then in Antioch, was so dear to him that Barnabas, when driven to choose between him and Paul, chose Mark for the companion of his future ministry. What wonder then that he was tempted on this occasion for a moment to yield to the influence of Peter and the brethren from Jerusalem!

Ver. 14. **πρὸς τ. ἀλήθειαν.** Our versions render **πρός**, *according to*, like **κατά**: and so impugn these men for want of uprightness in their conduct rather than for inconsistency of doctrine. But the censure of the Apostle is really directed to the falsehood of their teaching. They *were not dealing straightforwardly with the truth* in casting the slur of uncleanness on those whom God had cleansed in Christ.—**ἀναγκάζεις.** Peter was by his example really putting a severe pressure on Gentile converts to adopt a Jewish rule of life, though perhaps unintentionally.—**ὑπάρχων.** This participle notes the bearing of antecedents on present action. Peter being a Jew might have been expected to act otherwise.

Vv. 15-21. JEWS THEMSELVES WERE DRIVEN TO RESORT TO CHRIST AS SINNERS FOR PARDON BECAUSE THEY COULD NOT OBTAIN JUSTIFICATION BY PERFECT OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW—NOT THAT THEY MIGHT THEREBY BECOME MORE FREE TO SIN, BUT FOR THE SAKE OF NEW LIFE IN CHRIST, EVEN AS PAUL HIMSELF ENDURED CRUCIFIXION WITH CHRIST, THAT CHRIST MIGHT LIVE IN HIM. Ver. 15. As the next verse opens, according to the Greek MSS., with **εἰδότες δὲ**, it is necessary to understand here a finite verb, *We are Jews*, etc.

The personal narrative breaks on abruptly at this point. Peter drops out of sight, and the Epistle passes from a protest against his vacillation into an elaborate argument against the doctrinal errors of the Pharisaic party, which forms too integral a portion of the whole Epistle to be detached from it. Yet the new strain of thought springs so directly out of the previous remonstrance that it might well have been addressed there and then to the Jewish Christians at Antioch. The outspoken protest against an insidious attempt to force on Gentiles the Jewish rule of life leads naturally to an enquiry what this rule has done for men who are Jews by birth. Did it justify them before God? We know that it did not: they had to turn to Christ for the peace with God which the Law could not give. In short, vv. 15-21 are connected at once with the preceding matter

ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί, 16. εἰδότες δὲ[1] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[2] καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου· ὅτι[3] ἐξ ἔργων νόμου[4] οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ. 17. εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ εὑρέθημεν

[1] δε ℵBCD¹E¹FGL; om. AD³KP.
[2] Χριστου Ιησου AB 17; Ι. Χριστου ℵCDEFGKLP.
[3] οτι ℵABDFG 17, etc.; διοτι CD³EKLP.
[4] εξ εργων νομου before ου δικ. ℵABCDEFGP.

and the subsequent; and apparently reproduce in substance an argument which had already been addressed, *viva voce*, to the circumcision-party at Antioch, whom the Apostle identifies in spirit and policy with the subsequent agitators in Galatia. —**οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμ.** This clause expresses pointedly the insolent contempt of the Pharisaic party for Gentiles, who did not belong to the holy nation nor inherit the Law and the Covenants. Yet in spite of these arrogant pretensions to superior sanctity (it is added) they were driven by the verdict of their own conscience to embrace the faith of Christ because they knew that no flesh could possibly be so perfect in obedience to Law as to be thereby justified.

Ver. 16. **οὐ δικαιοῦται . . .** Two methods of seeking justification in the sight of God are here distinguished. The former took account of nothing but stedfast obedience to the law of God. Before his conversion Paul knew no other: he had been taught by his legal training to base his standard of right and wrong entirely on the revealed law, to find in it the sole guide of conscience, and to measure righteousness by conformity to its commandments alone.

But his view of God's judgment had been profoundly modified by his conversion. He had learnt on the one hand from the teaching of Christ how impossible it was for man to attain to perfect righteousness, seeing that God claims not only obedience to the letter of the law, but an allegiance of the heart too thorough to be attainable by human infirmity. But on the other hand he knew now that God is a loving Father in Christ, ever seeking out His erring children that He may win them back, ever ready to temper strict justice with infinite mercy, and waiting only for the first response of imperfect faith and imperfect repentance, so they be at all sincere, to blot out a guilty past, and pronounce a favourable judgment on the sinner. He perceived that there is room in the judgment of God for another element beside strict justice, *viz.*, the mercy of the judge, and that a prisoner, however clear may be his guilt on the evidence of his life, may nevertheless be assured of pardon and acceptance by throwing himself in humble trust on that mercy. In the Epistles of Paul accordingly justification acquired a new meaning, becoming equivalent to acceptance before God, and the term righteousness was applied to the merciful acquittal of the guilty but penitent offender.

The clause **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου** defines an acquittal on the merits of the case alone, based on a life of holy obedience, while **διὰ πίστεως Ἰ. Χρ.** points to faith in Christ as the appointed channel of God's mercy.—**ἐπιστεύσαμεν.** Here, as in Rom. xiii. 11, this verb denotes the act of embracing the faith. Jewish Christians had by their conversion declared the hopelessness of their position under the Law without Christ. Faith in him was (they saw) the only means of obtaining justification.—**διότι . . .** This clause corroborates the verdict of conscience and experience by the authority of Scripture, for it adopts the language of Ps. cxlii. (cxliii.) 2, **οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν,** with only some verbal alterations suggested by the context of the Epistle. As two kinds of justification have been mentioned, the clause **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου** is required here to make it clear that the justification to which the Psalm refers was legal, the words **ἐνώπιόν σου** are dropped as needless in this context, and **πᾶσα σάρξ** is substituted for **πᾶς ζῶν** in order to show that the Psalm referred to earthly life. The passage is quoted with corresponding verbal changes in Rom. iii. 20.

Ver. 17. **εἰ δὲ . . . ἁμαρτωλοί.** The last verse arrived at the conclusion that Jewish converts by their own act con-

καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἆρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; μὴ γένοιτο. 18. εἰ γὰρ ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω.[1] **19. Ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω.**

[1] **συνιστανω** ℵABCDFGP.

demned themselves to be guilty of a broken law. The argument now proceeds on this assumption "*If* it be true (as has been shown) that *we by seeking to be justified in Christ were found to be ourselves also sinners* as well as the Gentiles —if our sin was then discovered, and it be admitted that confession of sin lies at the root of all Christian life, what then is the attitude of Christ toward sin?"—**ἆρα Χ. ἁ. διάκονος;** This clause is clearly interrogative, and the true reading is **ἆρα,** not **ἄρα** (inferential). For here, as always elsewhere in Pauline language, **μὴ γένοιτο** repudiates a monstrous suggestion, put forward in the form of a question, the mere statement of which is repugnant to the moral sense.

It was objected to this doctrine of God's free grace in Christ to guilty sinners that it held out a license to sin by doing away the wholesome restraints of the Law, and so encouraged men to continue in sin by its assurance of pardon. The fallacy is here dismissed with scorn on the strength of the very nature of Christ, but is more fully exposed in the sixth chapter to the Romans.

Ver. 18. "If, indeed, I do reestablish the authority of the Law over Christian life, it becomes true that Christ did lead me to transgression." So argues the Apostle as he turns to his own life for an illustration of the incompatibility of allegiance to Christ with the continued supremacy of the Law.

Ver. 19. **Ἐγὼ.** The stress laid on the personal pronoun shows that Paul is here referring to the facts of his personal history. He singles out his own conversion for the sake of the crucial example which it afforded of the difficulty of reconciling the commands of Christ with the traditional law of Israel, for he was actually bearing the commission of the high priest, and carrying out the orders of the Sanhedrim when Christ met him in the way and laid His commands upon him. He had to choose between the two: and at Christ's word he flung up his office and renounced for ever the service of the Law. — **διὰ νόμου**: *though under law*. The translation of these words in our versions *through the law* seems to me fatal to the sense: for the death to Law which is here recorded was not due to the instrumentality of Law, but was the immediate effect of the vision and words of Christ; and the express object of this reference to the conversion of Saul is to show how union with Christ annihilates the authority of an outward law. **διὰ νόμου** is really akin to **διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς** in Rom. ii. 27, and to **δι' ἀκροβυστίας** in Rom. iv. 11. In all these cases **διά** denotes the environment, whether of the letter, of circumcision, of uncircumcision, or of law, which was subsisting at the time. Saul was on official duty, surrounded by the circumstances and machinery of Law when Christ stayed him, and he became at once dead to the claim of Law upon him. — **νόμῳ ἀπέθανον.** These words give a vivid description of the spiritual revulsion produced by his conversion in the heart of Saul. Whereas, hitherto, his whole mind had been set on fulfilling the whole Law, and he had counted its obligations all in all to him, he now entirely renounced the duty of obedience to its commands and repudiated its authority. And just as death works a final change, and leaves behind an indelible effect, so did his conversion affix a permanent stamp of lifelong change on all his after years: thenceforth he served another Master, owned absolute obedience to His will, listened for His inward voice or outward revelation, and drank of His Spirit.

The absence of the article before **νόμῳ** is noteworthy; whereas the Law of Moses, being the one revealed Law, is always designated *the Law* (**ὁ νόμος**), **νόμῳ** denotes law in the abstract, so that this clause comprehends emancipation from all control of external law. The freedom was, of course, purely spiritual: Paul continued fully to acknowledge the duty of outward submission to all duly ordained authority, but maintained the absolute independence of his spirit and conscience from its dictates.—**ἵνα Θεῷ ζήσω.** This clause adds the motive for this death to Law. It was a veritable death unto life: Saul had striven in vain to obtain life before God by zealous fulfilment of every commandment; he now acknowledged his utter failure, surren-

20. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκ ἔτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. 21. οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιοσύνη, ἄρα Χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν.

[1] **τ. υιου τ. Θεου** ℵACD[3]EKLP; **τ. Θεου και Χριστου** BD[1]FG.

dered all the pride and ambition of his life, and cast himself in humble trust at the feet of Jesus to receive from Him that precious life which he had sought in vain by his most zealous efforts under the Law.

Ver. 20. **Χριστῷ συνεστ.** The Greek order throws special emphasis on **Χριστῷ**: union with Christ became from that time the central feature of his life; it entailed in the beginning a fellowship with his crucifixion, a real crucifixion of heart and will. By this figure he describes the intense agony of spiritual conflict, the crushing load of shame and bitter remorse which he underwent during the three days of darkness and silent despair that followed his vision of the Christ.—**ζῶ δὲ**: *And I live.* I can perceive no ground for rendering **δέ** *nevertheless* (A.V.) or *yet* (R.V.). There is no contrast here between the life and the previous death: on the contrary, the life is presented as the direct outcome of the death. As the resurrection of Christ was the sequel of the crucifixion, so Paul was joined to Christ in death that he might be joined to Him in spiritual life.—**οὐκ ἔτι . . .** The new life is no longer, like the former, dependent on the struggling efforts of a mere man to draw near to God in his own righteousness. Christ Himself is its source, as the vine is the source of life to the branches.—**ὃ δὲ ζῶ**: *But in that I live.* Our versions make this = **ἣν ζωὴν ζῶ**; but it seems to me more accordant with the context and with Greek forms of expression to make **ὃ** = *in that*, as it is rendered by A.V. in Rom. vi. 10. Two instances of this adverbial use of **ὃ** for a connecting particle have been already noted in this Epistle (i. 7, ii. 10). Paul is here accounting for the fact that he now possesses spiritual life, though still in the flesh and subject to motions of sin in his members: it belongs to him in virtue of his faith in the Son of God.—**με . . . ἐμοῦ.** The previous clauses have expressed the intimate personal union between the spirit of Paul and his Divine Master. In harmony with that view an exclusive personal aspect is presented of the love of Christ and of His sacrifice on the Cross, as though Paul himself had been their sole object.

Ver. 21. Christ died in order that men might live before God by His grace in spite of a broken Law; if men could keep the Law of themselves and live, there would be no call for grace, and the death of Christ would be proved a useless sacrifice.—**διὰ νόμου.** Law was never, like faith, instrumental to justification (*cf.* ver. 16). Accordingly, Paul never speaks of justification through Law, but either **ἐκ νόμου** or **ἐν νόμῳ**. Here, as in ver. 19, **διὰ νόμου** really denotes a legal environment, and the verse argues that if righteousness was really within men's reach under a legal dispensation, then there was no occasion for the death of Christ at all.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-6. What senseless folly is it for you, who had the Crucifixion of Christ set plainly before your eyes, to resort now to Circumcision! Think only how it was that you received the Spirit: was it by obedience to Law or by listening in Faith? Can you complete a spiritual work by an ordinance of the flesh? Did you suffer all that persecution for nothing? Was it your obedience to Law or your listening in Faith that led to God's imparting to you the Spirit with power, even as the faith of Abraham was reckoned to him for righteousness?—Ver. 1. **ἐβάσκανεν.** This word denoted either the fascination of an evil eye or some malignant influence akin to it; the infatuation of some Galatians at this crisis is attributed to the baneful effect of some mysterious powers of evil.

The reading **ἐβάσκηνεν** has probably found its way into some MSS. from classical usage; most verbs in **-αίνειν** form the aorist in **ᾰ** in the N.T., *e.g.*, **λευκᾶναι ἐσήμανεν ποιμάνατε.**

The additions **τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι** after **ἐβάσκανεν**, and **ἐν ὑμῖν** after **προεγράφη** in the Received Text are evidently

III. 1. ῏Ω ἈΝΟΗΤΟΙ Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν,[1] οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη[2] ἐσταυρωμένος; 2. τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν· Ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε, ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 3. οὕτως ἀνόητοί ἐστε; ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι, νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελεῖσθε; 4. τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ; εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῇ. 5. ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐνεργῶν δυνάμεις ἐν ὑμῖν,

[1] τῃ αληθειᾳ μη πειθεσθαι after εβασκανεν CD³EKLP; om. ℵABD¹FG 17, 67.

[2] εν υμιν after προεγραφη DEFGKLP; om. ℵABC 17, etc.

spurious. The former is probably due to a reminiscence of v. 7, where the clause occurs.—προεγράφη. This word is twice employed by the Apostle, once in Rom. xv. 4 with reference to the Scriptures, once in Eph. iii. 3 with reference to a former letter of his own. Here, probably, it refers in like manner to some document which he had placed in the hands of the Galatians, or some letter he had written for their guidance during his absence, in which the vital truth of the crucifixion had been enforced. That he wrote many apostolic letters to his converts is clear from 2 Thess. iii. 17. The addition κατ' ὀφθάλμους is in harmony with this view. γράφειν never has the sense of painting in the N.T.—ἐσταυρωμένος. The Greek order of words indicates that this participle has the force of a predicate. The fact of the Crucifixion with all that the fact involved was the truth which had been so distinctly set before the eyes of the Galatians in black and white.

Ver. 2. The Apostle appeals with confidence to the personal experience of his converts. They were themselves conscious of having received on their conversion gifts of the Spirit. Whence then came the inward change? Was it the result of fulfilling law, or of listening in faith? The question needs no answer: for it was obviously the result of listening in faith. The second clause couples together two essential requisites for conversion: men must not only listen, but listen in a right spirit, desiring to know and do God's will. The genitive πίστεως adds this essential condition.—τὸ πνεῦμα. *The spirit* constitutes in this Epistle a definite element in the regenerate nature, due to spiritual creation as the flesh is to natural creation—an internal organ by which the Holy Spirit operates on the will and prompts the action of man (*cf.* v. 16-22). It becomes therefore a living human force within the heart, distinct from the personality of the Holy Spirit. But on the other hand it is absolutely dependent for its vital force on the original inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and can neither live nor grow without continual nourishment and sustenance from Him.

Ver. 3. πνεύματι . . . σαρκί. These two datives denote the two internal spheres susceptible of moral influence. Conversion had brought about a spiritual change as its immediate result: it was folly to look for a consummation of this change from an ordinance of the flesh like circumcision. This was to exalt flesh above spirit instead of rising from flesh to spirit.—ἐνάρχεσθαι and ἐπιτελεῖν are coupled together in 2 Cor. viii. 6 and Phil. i. 6 to express the beginning and consummation of works of mercy and sanctification. Greek authors use ἐνάρχεσθαι with reference to the initial ceremony of a sacrifice (Eur., *Iph.*, A. 147, 435, 955), ἐπιτελεῖν in Heb. ix. 6 refers to the performance of ritual. The middle voice ἐπιτελεῖσθε is used here because the spiritual process is to be wrought by them upon themselves.

Ver. 4. The persecutions endured by the Galatian converts had all been due to the jealous animosity of the Jews: if they were now to accept the Law after all, they would proclaim their former resistance to have been wanton caprice on their part, which had led them to provoke persecution to no purpose (εἰκῇ) without any sufficient object.

Ver. 5. ἐπιχορηγῶν. The verb χορηγεῖν acquired its meaning from the function of the χορηγός whose duty it was to supply the members of his chorus with all necessary equipment in the course of their training and performance. As men took pride in the liberal fulfilment of this duty, the word came to denote a liberal supply. The compound ἐπιχορηγεῖν denotes apparently an enhancement of this bounty (2 Cor. ix. 10).—δυνάμεις. This word is sometimes applied in the Gospels to visible miracles, but in the language of Paul, as elsewhere, it denotes

ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως; 6. καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 7. γινώσκετε ἄρα ὅτι οἱ ἐκ πίστεως, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ Ἀβραάμ. 8. προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ Θεὸς, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ, ὅτι Ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. 9. ὥστε οἱ ἐκ πίστεως εὐλογοῦνται σὺν τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ. 10. ὅσοι

forces or powers. Here accordingly it refers to the supernatural powers imparted by the Spirit to Christians.

Ver. 6. The faith of the Galatians is likened to that of Abraham, in that it found the same acceptance with God.

The quotation of Gen. xv. 6 *was reckoned* follows the LXX, whereas our version, following the Hebrew text, refers to God, *he counted it*. This passage is repeatedly commented on by Philo as well as in the N.T. Paul bases his argument upon it in Rom. iv. 3 by way of proof that God imputes righteousness on the ground of faith, not of works, and James guards it against misinterpretation by teachers who degraded faith into a barren assent of the intellect (James ii. 17-23). Obviously Jewish teachers had already concentrated attention on this passage on account of the explicit testimony which it bears to the faith of Abraham and to God's acceptance of that faith; and stress had been laid upon its authority in their schools of theology.

Vv. 7-14. By Faith men become sons of Abraham and inherit his blessing, whereas those who claim it on the score of obedience to Law are subject to the curse of a broken Law; from which Christ redeemed us, Gentiles as well as Jews, by bearing the curse Himself.—Ver. 7. **Γινώσκετε**: *Ye perceive.* The emphatic admonition, *Know ye*, adopted in our versions, would require an aorist imperative **γνῶτε**, as in Heb. viii. 11. This verse contains a deduction from the former, as is suggested by the inferential **ἄρα**. Since faith was the ground of Abraham's justification, it follows that those who inherit his faith are his true sons.—**οἱ ἐκ πίστεως**, *sc.* **υἱοὶ ὄντες**. The form of the Greek sentence suggests the insertion of these words to complete the ellipsis. With this addition the verse carries on the previous argument to its natural sequel. The faith of Abraham was there declared to be a fundamental condition of the divine acceptance. Those therefore who inherit his faith are his sons indeed and heirs of his blessing. The discourse of Christ recorded in the Gospel follows the same line of argument: *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham* (John viii. 39). Both alike urge that resemblance in life and character is the true test of sonship. Gentiles therefore who prove themselves sons of Abraham by exhibiting like faith are his sons indeed, and inherit the blessing promised to his seed. The antithesis in ver. 10, **ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσίν**, *sc.* **υἱοί**, presents a like ellipsis: the exclusive claim of Jews to be sons of Abraham in virtue of their observance of the Law is there disposed of on corresponding grounds.

Ver. 8. **δικαιοῖ**: *justifieth.* The present tense is used because justification by faith, though not revealed to the Gentiles till Christ came, was an eternal truth of God's dealings with man, to be revealed in due time. There were in Genesis anticipations of this truth, and Abraham himself, the father of the faithful, was a kind of firstfruits of the Gentiles (Rom. iv. 10-12). The quotation here given contains the substance of promises recorded in Gen. xii. 3, and xviii. 18 with slight verbal alteration. These were *an* earlier Gospel, but not (as our versions intimate) *the* Gospel.

Ver. 9. **οἱ ἐκ πίστεως**. See note on ver. 7.

Ver. 10. The Apostle here proceeds to deal with the rival claim to a special blessing on the score of obedience to Law. Jews maintained that their knowledge of the Law entitled them to the blessings attached to the sons of Abraham. He urges on the contrary that this entailed on them the curse of a broken Law: for no flesh could keep the whole Law (*cf.* ii. 16). The failure of men to satisfy the requirements of the Law is not limited to the Mosaic Law, but is incidental to the idea of righteous Law in the abstract. Hence the expression **νόμου** rather than **τοῦ νόμου**. The Roman Epistle accordingly pronounces sentence of guilt on the Gentile as well as the Jewish world for breach of the Laws of natural or revealed religion. Here, however, the object is to meet claims founded on the Mosaic Law, so the curses of that

γὰρ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσί· γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι[1] Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὃς οὐκ ἐμμένει ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτά. 11. ὅτι δὲ ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, δῆλον· ὅτι Ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται· 12. ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' Ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ[2] ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς. 13. Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου, γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα· (γέγραπται γάρ, Ἐπικατάρατος πᾶς ὁ κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου·) 14. ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται

[1] **οτι** ℵABCDEFGP 17, etc.; om. KL.

[2] **ανθρωπος** after **αυτα** D^{3}EKL; om. ℵABCD^{1}FGP 17, etc.

Law are adduced in support of the argument. The imprecation here given is not a verbal quotation, but reproduces in substance the series of curses pronounced from Mount Ebal (Deut. xxvii. 15-26), summing them up in a single sentence.

Vv. 11, 12. The failure of the Law to justify is further established by a comparison of Habakkuk ii. 4 with Lev. xviii. 5: the latter embodies the spirit of the Law: for it demands obedience as a necessary condition antecedent to the gift of life from God (*cf.* Rom. x. 5). The prophet on the contrary makes life dependent upon faith. By thus substituting faith for obedience he virtually supersedes the existing Law, and establishes a new criterion, which takes account of the state of heart instead of the outward life (*cf.* Rom. i. 17). The same passage is adduced in Heb. x. 38 in proof of the vital importance of faith. All three writers agree in basing true religion upon heartfelt trust in God: but whereas the Epistle to the Hebrews regards faith from the same standpoint as the Hebrew prophet, and identifies it with the steadfast loyalty to an unseen God which supports the believer under manifold trials, Paul here limits his view to the faith which prompts the convert to embrace Christ. Regarding it therefore from a purely Christian standpoint, he embodies in his conception the new revelation of the Father's character made in Christ. The faith which he has in mind is justifying faith, the faith in God's pitying love which assures a repentant sinner of forgiveness and merciful acceptance in spite of a guilty past.

Ver. 13. The Law pronounced a blessing and a curse; but since it made no allowance for human infirmity, the blessing proved barren in result; while the curse, which invoked the just wrath of an offended God for the punishment of the guilty, proved, on the contrary, fruitful in condemnation.

From this hopeless state of just condemnation Christ delivered us by revealing the infinite mercy of an Almighty Father, and so reviving hope and thankful love in the heart of the condemned sinner by faith in His love.—**ἐξηγόρασεν.** The figure of a ransom, which this word conveys, is doubly appropriate in this connection. Men needed a ransom, for the Law had left them prisoners under sentence of death, and Christ had Himself to pay the price. He had to become a man like His brethren save in sin, and to endure the penalty denounced on malefactors and hang on the accursed cross, as if He had been guilty like them.—**γενόμενος κατάρα.** Hebrew thought tended to identify the man on whom a curse was laid with the curse, as it identified the sin-offering with the sin, calling it **ἁμαρτία** (Lev. iv. 21-25). Hence the scapegoat was regarded as utterly unclean by reason of the sins laid upon it.—**Ἐπικατάρατος . . .** This passage is quoted from Deut. xxi. 23 with one significant alteration. In the original the criminal executed under sentence of the Law is pronounced **κεκαταραμένος ὑπὸ Θεοῦ,** so that the Law is affirmed to be the voice of God, carrying with it the fulness of divine sanction. But here the words **ὑπὸ Θεοῦ** are omitted, inasmuch as the new revelation of God's mercy in Christ has superseded for Christians the previous condemnation of the Law.

The original passage refers to criminals executed under the Jewish Law, and commands the speedy burial of their dead bodies before sunset in opposition to the vindictive practices prevailing in Palestine among the surrounding nations

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. 15. Ἀδελφοί, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω, ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται. 16. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ· οὐ λέγει, 'Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν,' ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, Καὶ

of nailing up unburied bodies in public places (*cf.* 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 2 Sam. xxi. 10). It made, of course, no reference to crucifixion, which was a Roman mode of execution, not a Jewish.

Ver. 14. **ἵνα . . . ἵνα . . .** Two gracious purposes of the Redeemer are here coupled together: (1) the extension of the blessing to Gentiles as well as Jews; (2) the outpouring of the Spirit upon those that embraced the faith of Christ.

Vv. 15-18. God's word was plighted to Abraham that He would bestow the inheritance on his seed (not on all his descendants, but on one particular seed), and could not therefore be set aside by subsequent stipulations in the Law.—Ver. 15. **κ. ἄνθρωπον λέγω.** This preface indicates that the argument which it introduces is founded on the principles of human law and custom.—**διαθήκην.** The meaning *testament* affixed to this word in classical Greek belongs to the Greek practice of testamentary disposition, other covenants being designated by **συνθήκη**, etc. But no such law or custom existed among the ancient Hebrews, so the LXX employed the word to express the Hebrew conception of a *covenant* between God and His people. As this was the outcome of God's sovereign grace and bounty, and not a matter of mutual arrangement, it could hardly be described by any of the Greek terms for *covenant;* it was, on the other hand, analogous to a disposition of property by testament, and was accordingly designated by the term **διαθήκη**. Thence it was extended also to covenants between man and man in the LXX. The same sense of covenant is attached to the word apparently throughout the N.T. Here, at all events, the distinct reference to the covenant with Abraham leaves no doubt of its meaning.—**ὅμως ἀνθρώπου.** This phrase (= **καίπερ ἀνθρώπου οὖσαν ὅμως**) intimates that even men are bound by a contract duly ratified: *a fortiori*, God is bound by His plighted word. Two distinct methods of superseding a contract are suggested by **ἀθετεῖ** and **ἐπιδιατάσσεται**: it might be expressly annulled, or it might be overlaid by new stipulations.

Ver. 16. The clause **καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ** is quoted from God's promises to Abraham in Gen. xiii. 15 and xvii. 8 with only the necessary change of the second person **σου** into **αὐτοῦ**. The original promise was limited to the possession of the promised land, but was coupled with a perpetual covenant between God and the seed of Abraham: *I will be their God, Thou shalt keep my covenant, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations.* Hence Hebrew prophecy imported into it the idea of a spiritual inheritance, and the Epistle adopts this interpretation without hesitation.—**οὐ λέγει,** *sc.* **ὁ Θεός.** As the clause in question was quoted from an utterance of God, it was not necessary to specify the subject of **λέγει**.—**καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν**: *And to his seeds, i.e.*, families. This contrast between the many families and the one chosen family is more than mere verbal criticism: it contains the germ of that doctrine of continuous divine election within the stock of Abraham which is developed in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For Abraham had many children after the flesh; and the exclusion of Ishmael, Dedan, Midian, Esau in patriarchal times in favour of Isaac and of Jacob established the principle which culminated in the rejection of the Jewish nation in favour of Christ. This conception of a continuous holy family linking Christ with Abraham runs through the next section of the Epistle; just as **πολλῶν** and **ἑνός** here mean **π. σπερμάτων** and **ἑ. σπέρματος**, so **ἑνός** in ver. 20 means **ἑνὸς σπέρματος** and **τὰ πάντα** in ver. 22 **τὰ πάντα σπέρματα.** In like manner Christ is contemplated, not by Himself alone as constituting in the unity of His person the chosen seed, but as a new centre out of whom the family of God branched forth afresh. He became in a far higher sense than Isaac or Jacob a new head of the chosen family: for all Abraham's children after the flesh that received Him not were shut out from the blessing, while all who believed in Him became by faith sons of Abraham and members of the true family of God. The whole Church of Christ are in short regarded as one with Christ—one in life

τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός. 17. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω, διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ[1] ὁ μετὰ ἔτη τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα γεγονὼς νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ, εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. 18. εἰ γὰρ ἐκ νόμου ἡ κληρονομία, οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἐπαγγελίας· τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ Θεός. 19. Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη,[2] ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπήγγελται,

[1] εις Χριστον after Θεου DEFGKL; om. ℵABCP 17, etc.
[2] προσετεθη ℵABD³EKL; ετεθη D¹FG 71, etc.

and spirit, for they are members of His body and partake of His spirit (*cf.* vv. 28, 29).

Vv. 17, 18. The inviolate sanctity of God's earlier covenant in presence of the subsequent promulgation of the Law is here affirmed in virtue of the principle established in ver. 15. Had the inheritance been made contingent on obedience to Law, the previous promise would have been thereby invalidated.

The Received Text inserts **εἰς Χριστόν** after **Θεοῦ**. The words appear from the MS. evidence to be a later addition to the text, suggested probably by the previous argument, which associated the promise to Abraham with the coming of Christ, in whom alone that promise finds its fulfilment. The very form of the sentence forbids the acceptance of the addition here: for **διαθήκην** in the absence of an article does not denote the particular covenant concluded with Abraham, but signifies any covenant in the abstract, if duly ratified by God, whatever its nature.—**δι' ἐπαγγ. κεχάρισται.** The full bearing of the language on the argument can hardly be expressed in English without a paraphrase. **χαρίζεσθαι** denotes not merely a gift, but a free gift bestowed by the grace of God without reserve, and **ἐπαγγελία** marks the promise as a spontaneous offer, and not an undertaking (**ὑπόσχεσις**) based on terms of mutual agreement.

Vv. 19-22. THE LAW WAS A TEMPORARY ENACTMENT ORDAINED TO DEAL WITH THE OFFENCES WHICH IT DENOUNCES UNTIL THE COMING OF THE PROMISED SEED. THE GOD FROM WHOM IT PROCEEDED WAS THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, BUT HE PROMULGATED IT THROUGH ANGELS AND AN APPOINTED MEDIATOR TO ALL THE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM AFTER THE FLESH, NOT TO THE ONE CHOSEN SEED. DID IT THEN CONTRAVENE HIS PROMISES? NAY VERILY. IF INDEED IT HAD BEEN CAPABLE OF QUICKENING LIFE, IT WOULD HAVE PROVIDED NEW MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION: BUT WHAT IT REALLY DID WAS TO CONVICT ALL ALIKE OF SIN, THAT THE PROMISE MIGHT BE GIVEN TO THOSE WHO BELIEVE ON FAITH IN CHRIST.—**Τί οὖν ὁ νόμος.** What function then had the Law, if it had absolutely no effect on God's previous covenant with Abraham? — **τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν.** Our versions render this *because of transgressions*, ignoring the Greek article. But there could obviously be no transgressions until the Law existed, however grievous the moral degradation. The real meaning is that it was added with a view to *the* offences which it specifies, thereby pronouncing them to be from that time forward transgressions of the Law. Its design is gathered in short from its contents. The prohibitions of the Ten Commandments reveal their own purpose: they were enacted in order to repress the worship of false gods, idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath breaking, disobedience to parents, murder, adultery, theft, false witness, covetousness. These sins prevailed before the Law, but by pronouncing them to be definite transgressions it called in the fear of God's wrath to reinforce the weakness of the moral sense and educate man's conscience. The same aspect of the Law is forcibly presented in 1 Tim. i. 9. *Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and unruly. . . .* Attention is in both concentrated on the moral Law to the exclusion of the sacrificial and ceremonial.—**ἄχρις οὗ.** The alternative reading **ἄχρις ἄν** does not affect the sense. It is assumed on the strength of previous argument that the dispensation of the Law came to an end with the coming of Christ. By the gift of an indwelling spirit He emancipated His faithful disciples from allegiance to an outward Law.—**ἐπήγγελται**: *He* (*i.e.*, God) *hath promised* (*cf.* Rom. iv. 21, Heb. xii. 26). **ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι** never has a passive sense in the N.T.—**διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων.** The N.T. refers three times to the interposition of angels in

διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου· 20. ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν. 21. Ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ[1]; μὴ γένοιτο. εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι,

[1] **του Θεου** ℵACDEKLP; **Θεου** FG; om. B.

the promulgation of the Law: God's intercourse with Moses through the angel of His presence was evidently a common topic in Jewish schools of theology. In Acts vii. 53 the fact is recorded by way of enhancing the authority of the Law; in Heb. ii. 2 it is contrasted with God's revelation in His Son: here it is contrasted with God's more familiar intercourse with Abraham. He drew nigh to God, and *was called the friend of God:* but at Sinai the people stood far off, and the Law was made known through the double intervention of angels and of a human mediator.—**ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου.** The term **μεσίτης** was applied with the utmost latitude to any intermediate between two parties, whether it was the one great Mediator between God and man or any of the subordinate servants of God through whom He makes known His will to men or exercises His authority. The phrase **ἐν χειρί** defines its meaning here, for it implies that Moses was put in charge of the promulgation of the Law (*cf.* Numb. iv. 28, 37 in LXX), and was God's appointed agent for the purpose. This interposition of a mediator between God and the people was a marked feature of distinction between the Sinaitic and the patriarchal dispensation.

Ver. 20. The rendering of the first clause in our versions, *Now a mediator is not a mediator of one*, reduces it to an unmeaning truism. The author is not treating of mediators in the abstract, but writes of Moses the mediator of the Law that he was not mediator of one chosen family; and so contrasts God's revelation through him with the previous covenant. That covenant had been made with Abraham in person, and embraced a single chosen family (*cf.* ver. 16) restricted from generation to generation by continuous selection of God's elect until it centred in Christ Himself. Not so the covenant of Sinai: it was addressed, not to one family (**ἑνὸς**, *sc.* **σπέρματος**), but to many families of Abraham's children after the flesh. This change of recipients involved a vital change in the revelation also: whereas the promise had quickened faith by an appeal to gratitude and love, the Law used threats of wrath and punishment to deter corrupt and carnal natures from indulging the vices of the flesh.

The stress laid on the unity of the chosen seed in ver. 16 and the ellipsis of **σπέρματα** with **τὰ πάντα** in ver. 22 justify us in understanding **σπέρματος** here with **ἑνός.**—**ὁ δὲ Θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.** The recurrence of the same phrase **εἷς ὁ Θεός** with a corresponding force in Rom. iii. 30 suggests its true force and connection with the context in this place. The Apostle is there urging the real harmony of God's dealings with Jews and Gentiles, however different the method employed for justifying the two severally; and argues that it is nevertheless one and the same God who will justify both. So here after differentiating the revelation made through Moses from that to Abraham, he is careful to add that the God of Sinai is one with the God of Abraham, however distinct might be the two revelations. The true force of the clause may be expressed as follows, *but the God* (*sc.* the God of Sinai) *is one with the God of promise*. The twofold revelation of the name of God to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and as the eternal God *I am that I am*, suggests the same thought of the divine unity in spite of the various aspects in which God reveals Himself to successive generations of men.

Ver. 21. In view of the continuity of divine providence the suggestion that the Law contravened or nullified the previous covenant of God with Abraham and the patriarchs is dismissed as monstrous. It was incompatible with the faithfulness of God to His pledged word, and is therefore repudiated with the customary formula **μὴ γένοιτο.** The apparent sanction given by the Law to a new method of justification (*viz.*, by works) could lead to no actual result, unless it had at the same time possessed the power which it lacked of quickening spiritual life.—**τοῦ Θεοῦ.** These words are omitted in some MSS., but the preponderance of authority is in favour of their retention. The sense is the same whether they be expressed or understood. The addition may perhaps be due to a marginal comment which found its way into the text.

Ver. 22. The real function of the Law was not to justify but to convict of sin, that men might the more readily turn in humble faith to Christ for relief from the

ὄντως ἐκ νόμου ἦν ἂν[1] ἡ δικαιοσύνη· 22. ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, ἵνα ἡ ἐπαγγελία ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθῇ τοῖς πιστεύουσι. 23. Πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι[2] εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι· 24. ὥστε ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν, ἵνα

[1] **εκ νομου ην αν** ℵABC 3, etc.; om. **ην αν** FG; **αν εκ νομου ην** D³EKLP.
[2] **συνκλειομενοι** ℵABD¹FGP 17, etc.; **συνκεκλεισμενοι** CD³EKL.

burden of an accusing conscience.—**ἡ γραφή.** The Old Testament was always designated by the plural **γραφαί** in apostolic times, for the several books were preserved in separate rolls and did not form a single whole. Here, therefore, **ἡ γραφή** points to some particular passage of the Law to which the author has already drawn attention as embodying its spirit. The passage of Deut. xxvii. 26 quoted in ver. 10 answers this description, for it imprecates a curse on all who fell short of perfect obedience.—**συνέκλεισεν . . . τὰ πάντα.** The figure here presented of prisoners under sentence, condemned to pay the penalty of sin, makes it clear that the object of **συνέκλεισεν** is *persons*, not things: and accordingly these prisoners are described in ver. 23 as **συγκλειόμενοι** (masc.). A neuter plural substantive must therefore be understood with **τὰ πάντα** which is applicable to persons. Hence I infer that by **τὰ πάντα** is meant **τὰ πάντα σπέρματα,** *i.e.*, all the families of Abraham after the flesh, in other words the whole Jewish nation.—**ἵνα . . .** The design of the Law was to pave the way for the eventual fulfilment of the promise to all that believe by faith in Christ.

Vv. 23, 24. The position of the true children of God before the coming of Christ is illustrated by the control exercised over children in their father's house by members of his household. These verses explain the position of the faithful under the Law. They are here associated with Christians by the use of the first person plural; for they too were in their generation believers in God, they belonged to the same blessed family and inherited the original promise. Yet since all Israel from the time of Moses to the Advent were subjected to the control of the Law, they too were subject to bondage. But this was really due to the watchful love of their Heavenly Father, who thus provided needful shelter and guidance, just as an earthly father places his young children during years of weakness and inexperience under the charge of household servants.—**τὴν πίστιν.** The article, though ignored in our versions, is essential to the sense. By the coming of *the* faith is meant the historic fact of the Christian religion, the spread of the Gospel on earth. The term has the same objective sense as in i. 23, iii. 25, Acts vi. 7, and Rom. iii. 30, where also a clear distinction is drawn between **πίστεως,** faith in the abstract, and **τῆς πίστεως,** *the* faith of Christ. Obviously faith did not come with Christ, it was the most conspicuous virtue of the Jewish Church, and Abraham was but the first of many splendid examples of it.—**συγκλειόμενοι.** MS. authority is strongly in favour of the present participle, which is also more appropriate than the perfect **συγκεκλεισμένοι** for describing the continuous process of legal condemnation which prevailed from generation to generation.—**παιδαγωγός.** No English equivalent for this term can convey its real force, for it has no exact counterpart in an English home. The position of a nurse towards young children approaches more nearly than that of schoolmaster or tutor to the office of the **παιδαγωγός,** for he was a confidential dependent, usually a slave, neither qualified to instruct, nor invested with authority to control his young master, but appointed to attend on him, to safeguard him, and to report to his father any disorderly or immoral habits on which it might be necessary for the father to place a check. The Law in like manner regulated outward habits, enforced order and decency, and maintained a certain standard of morality among Israelites until in due time they became ripe for spiritual freedom. It was not the function of the Law to address itself directly to the conscience like the Prophets, or to claim spiritual authority over the whole man, but to impose a check on the open tyranny of evil, to enforce on the community a higher standard of morals, and so to foster indirectly the growth of spiritual life.

Vv. 25-29. But now we are no longer children. Ye are all sons

ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν· 25. ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἔτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν. 26. πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 27. ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. 28. οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος, οὐδὲ Ἕλλην· οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος, οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος· οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστὲ

OF GOD: AT YOUR BAPTISM YE PUT ON CHRIST, AND WERE INVESTED WITH SPIRITUAL MANHOOD: ALL PREVIOUS DISTINCTIONS OF CREED OR RACE, OF POSITION OR NATURE, WERE DONE AWAY: YE ARE ALL ONE IN CHRIST.—The sudden change from the first to the second person plural betokens an extension in the point of view from Israel to the Gentile world. The Epistle has been dealing since iii. 17 with the position of Israelites under the Law before the Advent of the Christ. But that event brought Gentiles also within the scope of God's revealed promises and of His blessings in Christ. So the Apostle turns to his converts, largely enlisted out of Gentiles, with the assurance, "Ye are all sons of God, whatever your antecedents". Their adoption is assumed, as their possession of the gifts of the Spirit is assumed in iii. 2. The spirit of adoption, of which they were conscious within their hearts, assured them that they were sons of God (*cf.* Rom. viii. 15, 16).

Ver 27. **ἐνεδύσασθε.** The conception of spiritual manhood is here associated with baptism by a figure borrowed from Greek and Roman usage. At a certain age the Roman youth exchanged the *toga praetexta* for the *toga virilis* and passed into the rank of citizens. So the Christian had been invested at his baptism with the robe of spiritual manhood. Whereas he had before been under the control of rules and regulations, like a child in his father's house, he possessed now the independence of a grown up son. This figure of clothing is applied in various ways in Scripture: the effects of death and resurrection are described in 2 Cor. v. 4 by the figure of *unclothing* and *reclothing:* the figures of *putting on Christ* and *putting on armour* are used in Rom. xiii. 12, 14, Eph. vi. 11 to express the new life support and strength required for our Christian warfare. The exact force of the figure depends in every case upon the context. Here the author evidently has in mind the change of dress which marked the transition from boyhood to manhood. Greeks and Romans made much of this occasion and celebrated the investment of a youth with man's dress by family gatherings and religious rites. The youth, hitherto subject to domestic rule, was then admitted to the rights and responsibilities of a citizen, and took his place beside his father in the councils of the family.

Baptism is in fact likened to a spiritual coming of age: the convert, who had hitherto been bound to obey definite commandments and fulfil definite duties, was now set free to learn God's will from the inward voice of the Spirit, and discharge the heavier obligations incumbent on a citizen of the heavenly commonwealth under the guidance of an enlightened conscience. He had entered on his spiritual manhood, and was accordingly emancipated from his earlier bondage to an outward Law.

There is an obvious correspondence between this figure of *putting on Christ* at baptism, and the ceremony which prevailed throughout the Church in subsequent centuries of investing catechumens with white robes on the occasion of their baptism. Both give expression to a kindred thought: some of the Fathers associate them together, and perhaps the language of the Apostle contributed to the spread of the ceremonial. The symbolism however differed materially: the white robes corresponded rather to the wedding garment in the parable: they were an emblem of purity and signified the cleansing effect of baptism, whereas the context of the Epistle points to enfranchisement and emancipation from control.

Ver. 28. Having now established the temporary and subordinate function of the Law, the Apostle finally repudiates every claim, whether on that or any other ground, on behalf of any distinct class to superior sanctity in Christ. All Christians, whatever their antecedents, are one in Christ.—**οὐκ ἔνι.** Distinctions of creed or race are incompatible with true membership of Christ: the legal barriers and social cleft which severed freeman from slave, even natural divisions as deep-seated as those of sex, disappear in presence of the all-absorbing unity of the body of Christ. **ἔνι** is a strengthened form of **ἐν** used for **ἔνεστιν**, as **πάρα, πέρι,**

ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 29. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ,[1] κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι. IV. 1. Λέγω δέ, Ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου, κύριος πάντων ὤν· 2. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶ καὶ οἰκονόμους, ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός. 3. οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι ὑπὸ τὰ

[1] **εστε και** FGKLP; om. **και** ℵABCDE 17, etc.

μέτα are for **πάρεστιν, περιέστιν, μέτεστιν.**—**ὑμεῖς.** Special stress is laid on this pronoun by its insertion with **πάντες**: the Galatians were themselves a signal instance of the power of the Gospel to make men one in Christ: for their Churches were gathered out of the most diverse elements: Jew and Gentile, slave and freeman, male and female, had all contributed to their composition.

Ver. 29. **ὑμεῖς.** The emphatic insertion of **ὑμεῖς** before **Χριστοῦ** in preference to **Χριστοῦ ἐστέ** lays stress apparently on the wonderful transformation of men who had been aliens from the people of God into members of Christ.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-7. There were in the Gentile world also before Christ children of God in bondage to human rule, that knew not the unseen Father in Heaven who was ordering their lives. They were like orphan children, whom a departed father has with loving care consigned during childhood to the charge of guardians and stewards. In due time, however, God sent forth His Son to redeem them also from bondage, and has made us sons and heirs, sending forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts.—In dealing with the relation of the Mosaic Law to the antecedent covenant and with its subsequent fulfilment in Christ, the Apostle necessarily limited his view of the seed of Abraham, who were covenanted heirs of salvation between Moses and the Advent, to Israel. He likened these accordingly to children growing up in their father's house under domestic control. But as most of those to whom he wrote had been converts from heathenism, he now extends his view of the world before Christ so as to embrace Gentiles also within its scope. Amidst the heathen were other children of God, a faithful seed, potential heirs of salvation, who passed through a like stage of spiritual childhood under different conditions. They were like orphan children committed by the watchful care of an unseen and unknown father to the custody of others. For they were subject to human systems of religion, government and law, neither knowing their Heavenly Father nor comprehending His love for them. The conception of a dead father providing by his will for the due education of his orphan children serves admirably to illustrate the mutual relations between God and the Gentile world, and to set forth the combination of steadfast love on one side with utter ignorance on the other. The illustration is obviously borrowed from testamentary systems prevailing among Greeks and Romans (not among Hebrews) which enabled a father to appoint guardians for his orphan children during their minority. These testamentary powers differed considerably in different parts of the Roman world according to the municipal laws of various cities. Whereas Roman citizens became wards of the state at fourteen, so that the powers of testamentary guardians were strictly limited, the discretion of the father was allowed a wider range in Greek cities. At Athens, for instance, the guardians of Demosthenes retained control over his property till he became a full citizen after eighteen; and in Asiatic Greece the custody of property was sometimes prolonged to twenty-five, though the personal authority ceased at fourteen. The dependent position of an orphan is described in popular language without legal precision; **νήπιος** is not a legal term, but an appropriate description for a child of tender years, naturally subject to the control of guardians (**ἐπιτρόπους**) and subordinate agents whom they might employ for household management or care of property (**οἰκονόμους**). It can hardly be right to identify the latter with the Roman *curatores*, for the special function of these officers was custody of property and not personal.

Ver. 3. **νήπιοι**: *children*, *i.e.*, spiritually children. The clause points to the stage of undeveloped spiritual life through which converts from heathenism had passed, the spiritual childhood which had been the lot of earlier generations be-

στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεν δεδουλωμένοι· 4. ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, 5. ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν. 6. ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν,[1] κρᾶζον, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. 7. ὥστε οὐκ ἔτι εἶ δοῦλος, ἀλλ' υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ.[2] 8. Ἀλλὰ τότε μέν, οὐκ εἰδότες Θεόν, ἐδου-

[1] ημων ℵABCD¹FGP; υμων D³EKL.
[2] δια Θεου ℵABC¹ 17; δια Θεον FG; Θεου δια Χριστου ℵᶜC³DEKLP.

fore the time was ripe for the Advent.—**στοιχεῖα.** The association of this word with **νήπιοι** fixes on it the conception of a rudimentary training to which the world was subjected during its spiritual infancy by way of preparation for the Gospel of Christ and the dispensation of the Spirit. Before men could enter into the spirit of His teaching, they had to learn the elementary principles of religion and morality. Compulsory obedience to definite rules of justice and order was a necessary preparation for the freedom of the Spirit. This preliminary education was given to the Hebrews in the Ten Commandments and the Law, it was imparted to a wider world in Greek civilisation and philosophy, in Roman law and government, and in other forms of national and social life. These rudiments are disparaged in ver. 9 as *weak and beggarly* in comparison with the teaching of the Spirit, for Christian men ought to have outgrown their spiritual childhood. So, again, in Col. ii. 8, 20, they are condemned wherever their traditional hold on human society produces an antagonism to the higher teaching of Christ. But before the Advent they formed a valuable discipline for the education of the world.

Ver. 4. When God saw that the world was ripe for the Advent, He sent forth His Son. Until generations of mankind had learnt through years of social training to control some of the animal instincts of their lower nature, to rebel against its brutal passions, and cherish a desire to live in obedience to their higher nature, until they had developed some sense of sin and some craving after a holiness beyond their reach, they were not ready to welcome a Redeemer.—**γενόμενον . . . νόμον.** The incarnate Son of God took upon Him our nature and our duties. He was (1) born of woman, (2) made subject to Law. His subjection to Law is so expressly associated with the subjection of the world in general to Law that the term cannot be limited (as our versions limit it) to *the* Law of Moses. Christ was in fact subjected also to Roman Law, and died by its sentence.

Ver. 5. **ἵνα . . . ἵνα.** These two final clauses couple together two gracious purposes of God in the scheme of redemption, (1) the obliteration of a guilty past, (2) divine adoption with the blessings which sonship entails. The description *under Law* includes Gentiles as well as Jews: for though they had not *the Law*, they were not without Law to God (*cf.* Rom. ii. 14 . . .): they have indeed been expressly specified in iii. 14 as included in the redemption from the curse of the Law.—**ἀπολάβωμεν.** This verb denotes *receiving back*, as **ἀποδιδόναι** does *giving back* (*cf.* Luke xix. 8): accordingly it describes the adoption in Christ as a restoration of the original birthright, withheld throughout many generations for the sake of necessary discipline.

Ver. 6. Sonship involves relations of mutual confidence and love between the Father who bestows His choicest gifts, and the Son who responds with His whole heart.

Ver. 7. **διὰ Θεοῦ.** This language is unusual, and many variations are found in MSS. and versions, amidst them the Received Text **Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ,** but there can be little question on MS. evidence that the above is the genuine text. As for the true force of the words, the Epistle has now traced the scheme of redemption and design of bestowing a heavenly inheritance in Christ as far back as the patriarchs, and has shown that from the time of Abraham downwards God was disciplining Israel with a view to their becoming sons of God, and again that He was really ordering the lives of Gentiles likewise, though they knew Him not, with the same intent. With good reason therefore it is here said "through God—through His original

λεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ[1] οὖσι θεοῖς· 9. νῦν δέ, γνόντες Θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν θέλετε; 10. ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε, καὶ μῆνας, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἐνιαυτούς.

11. Φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μή πως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς. 12. Γίνεσθε

[1] φυσει μη ℵABCD[1]EP; μη φυσει D[3]FGKL.

design and providential care—thou hast now become son and heir".

Vv. 8-10. BUT THOUGH IN TIME PAST WHEN YOU KNEW NOT GOD YOU WERE SLAVES TO FALSE GODS, HOW CAN YOU, NOW THAT YOU HAVE LEARNT TO KNOW HIM, OR RATHER HAVE BEEN RECOGNISED BY HIM, TURN BACK TO THE LESSONS OF CHILDHOOD AND CRAVE A BONDAGE TO TIMES AND SEASONS?—The guilt of past idolatry is palliated on the score of ignorance, in the same spirit as in Acts xvii. 30, in order to press home the responsibility of those who have learnt to know God (**γνόντες Θεόν**) in Christ. There was some excuse for their former bondage to imaginary gods who had no real existence: but how can they now turn back in heart to the weak and beggarly lessons of their spiritual childhood after they have received the spirit of sonship? Instead of ruling their own lives by reason and conscience under the guidance of the Spirit like men in Christ, they are bent on subjecting themselves like children to elementary rules of formal service.

Ver. 9. **μᾶλλον δέ.** This correction is added, lest any should pride themselves on their knowledge of God, to warn them that it is not due to their own act, but to God who recognised them as His sons and revealed Himself to them. **ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχά.** Hitherto the Apostle has spoken with respect of the education given to the world before Christ (iv. 1-3), bearing in mind the progress of the Greek and Roman world in social habits, institutions and laws: they had in fact learnt much in the sphere of morals and natural religion that would bear comparison with the progress of Israel under the light of the revealed Law of God. But when he compares the mechanical routine of formal observances which formed the staple of religion for the heathen and for many so-called religious Jews with the spiritual teaching of the Gospel, he does not hesitate to denounce them as weak and beggarly.

Ver. 10. The observance of Sabbaths and new moons, of feasts and fasts, of sabbatical and jubilee years, was clearly enjoined by the ceremonial Law; and Paul admitted the obligations of that Law for himself and for all the Circumcision. He continued to frequent the Sabbath-worship of the synagogue, attended the feasts, bound himself under voluntary vows. What he condemns is the adoption of these practices by baptised Gentiles: for this imputed to them an inherent sacredness incompatible with the true freedom of the Spirit.

Vv. 11-20. DISAPPOINTMENT OF THE APOSTLE AT THE CHANGED FEELING OF HIS CONVERTS; REMINISCENCES OF THE PAST; PATHETIC APPEAL TO OLD AFFECTION; PROTEST AGAINST PRESENT ESTRANGEMENT.—Ver. 12. Our versions abruptly sever the connection of this verse with the previous context, and do great violence to the Greek text in both clauses. They transpose the words **ἀδελφοί δέομαι ὑμῶν** from their true place at the end of the verse to the beginning, and render **γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ**, *Be ye as I am.* But this makes it = **γίνεσθε ὁποῖος ἐγώ εἰμι** (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 29), though it is impossible to understand **εἰμι** in the Greek text after **γίνεσθε**. The context points distinctly to **ἐγενόμην** as the proper supplement after **ὡς ἐγώ**. The last verse has carried back the author's thoughts to his original ministry, and he proceeds to revive the remembrance of that period. "Act as I did (he exclaims); deal with me as I dealt with you." Instead of a mere vague admonition to imitate his character he is holding up his actual conduct for an example to them, and proceeds to specify the particular occasion to which he refers.—**ὅτι κἀγὼ** . . .: *For I too beseech you as you, brethren, besought me.* It is an obvious error to detach **κἀγώ** from the following verb **δέομαι** and supply **εἰμι**, as is done in our versions. The Greek requires a verb to be supplied after **ὑμεῖς** corresponding to **κἀγὼ δέομαι ὑμῶν**, and I understand accordingly **ἐδεήθητέ μου**.

The Galatians could not fail to recollect the occasion to which these words refer; for it was the true birthday of their

ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, δέομαι ὑμῶν. 13. οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε· οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην

Church, the memorable crisis when at the close of Paul's address the Jews departed from the synagogue, but the Gentiles besought him to repeat to them the words of life on the following Sabbath; after which many Jews and proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas persuading them to abide by the doctrine of the grace of God. (See Acts xiii. 42, 43. In the Greek text it is clear that the persuasion proceeded from them, and not from Paul and Barnabas.) The Galatians had then been suitors to Paul to maintain the freedom of the Gospel, he was now a suitor to them in his turn for its maintenance. —**οὐδέν με ἠδικήσατε**: *Ye had done me no wrong*. The force of this clause appears from what follows: Paul is dwelling on the mutual relations between him and the Galatians at the time of that memorable petition. They on their side had done him no wrong, they had not driven him away by persecution or illtreatment, yet up to that time (**τὸ πρότερον**) he had only been induced by illness to preach to them. The Galatians had, in short, given him no excuse for passing them by, as he intended to do, until he was attacked by an illness which left him no option.

Ver. 13. **δι' ἀσθένειαν.** This can only mean *owing to infirmity of the flesh*, *i.e.*, to illness. **διά** with accusative has the same causal force in the N.T. as in Attic Greek. A phrase like **διὰ νύκτα,** *by night*, is found in Homer, but **διά** subsequently lost its temporal force, and only regained it in the Latinised Greek of later centuries from confusion with the Latin *per*. The position of **δι' ἀσθένειαν** before the verb lays stress upon the fact that the ministry was due to illness alone, and not to spontaneous resolve.

It appears from this and the following verses that the illness occurred under the eyes of the Galatians, who watched its progress, were familiar with its repulsive symptoms, and displayed tender sympathy with the sufferer. They were aware also of the alteration it had made in his plans. The inference from these facts is clear, that he did not intend at the time of his arrival in Galatia to preach there at all, but was prostrated immediately after by sudden illness, and so forced to relinquish his previous project and abandon for the present any further journey. The only conceivable way, in short, in which an attack of illness in Galatia can have occasioned his preaching there was by involuntary detention. Here, accordingly, the motive for mentioning it is to show how little claim he had on the gratitude of the Galatians at that time, and how little he had deserved the tender sympathy which they exhibited. The historical connection of this illness with the ministry of Paul and Barnabas is investigated in the Introduction (pp. 135-7).

It has been suggested that this attack was perhaps identical with the **σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί** mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 7, and this may be true, but the real nature of the **σκόλοψ** is unknown. Some features of this attack on the contrary may be inferred from the description given of its effects: it incapacitated the patient for travel, produced disfigurement and offensive symptoms, but allowed free intercourse with those around him. His success in winning the hearts of those who visited him in his sick chamber suggests a chronic ailment prolonged for a considerable time, as does also the complete change in his plans. The only definite hint given of a specific malady is the language of ver. 15: from which I gather that the eyesight was imperilled by a virulent attack of ophthalmia. That disease was notoriously prevalent in the lowlands of Pamphylia through which he had been travelling, and if so contracted, would produce the symptoms described. The pathetic appeal to Galatian sympathy on the score of imperfect sight in vi. 11 confirms this view. If his sight had been impaired by an illness to which they had themselves ministered with tender solicitude, they would be quick to feel for his privation.—**τὸ πρότερον.** Lightfoot contends with justice that this phrase cannot on account of the prefixed article refer to an indefinite period in time past. The author clearly had in his mind two distinct periods, an earlier and a later, during the earlier of which he states that his preaching had been occasioned by illness. Lightfoot suggests that he referred perhaps to the two visits which he had paid to the Galatian Churches: and the suggestion is reasonable if his theory be accepted of sites in Northern Galatia, for no details are known of either visit. But it is quite incompatible with the history of his ministry in Southern Galatia recorded in Acts xiii., xiv. That lasted over two winters at the very least, comprised two visits at considerable intervals to each of

ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον, 14. καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν[1] ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. 15. ποῦ[2] οὖν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν; μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι, εἰ δυνατὸν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ[3] μοι. 16. ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν, 17. Ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οὐ καλῶς, ἀλλὰ ἐκκλεῖσαι ὑμᾶς θέλουσιν, ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε.

[1] υμων ℵABD[1]FG 17, etc.; μου τον D[3]EKLP.
[2] που ℵABCFGP 5, etc.; τις DEKL.
[3] εδωκατε ℵABCD[1] 17, 47; αν εδωκατε ℵ[c]D[3]EKLP.

the Churches, and displayed throughout as resolute an initiative, as determined energy, as vigorous activity, as can be found in the whole course of his apostolic career. That ministry gave certainly no sign of illness, but the contrary. We have seen, however, that it was preceded by a prolonged illness, during which he was probably confined to his sick chamber and could only minister to those who visited him there. His first ministry in Galatia passed in short through two distinct stages, first the private ministrations of a sick man, and then a public career of unexampled vigour and success. The last verse placed the readers on the division line between the two, for it reminded them of the memorable petition addressed to him and Barnabas at the close of his first public address in the synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch. It is, therefore, of the preceding period that he writes here, "You know that it was owing to illness that I had preached to you *up to that time* (**τὸ πρότερον**)". It is needless to dwell on the complete harmony of this interpretation with the context.

Ver. 14. **τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν.** The best MSS. all read **ὑμῶν**, not **μου** or **μου τον**. The accusative **τὸν πειρασμόν** is not governed by **ἐξουθενήσατε** or **ἐξεπτύσατε,** whose real object is the **με** which follows **ἐδέξασθε**: it is really a pendent accusative in apposition to the sentence: *As for the temptation to you in my flesh* (*i.e.*, the temptation to reject me with contempt and disgust on account of my diseased state), *you did not*. . . .

Ver. 15. **ποῦ οὖν** . . . The MSS. are decisive in favour of **ποῦ,** which makes excellent sense. "You congratulated yourselves," it is urged, "on my coming among you, you welcomed me as an angel, as Christ Himself: what has become of that feeling now? where is your satisfaction at your lot?"—**ἐδώκατε.** Some MSS. insert **αν** before this verb: the addition would be necessary in Attic Greek to express the conditional force of the clause, but is not needed in Hellenistic Greek—**τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.** The full force of **ὑμῶν** may be given in English by the rendering *your own eyes:* for it lays stress on the contrast between their eyes and those of Paul. The addition is significant, and strongly confirms the view that his eyes were the organ specially affected by his malady.

Ver. 16. **ὥστε** is often used in the sense of *therefore* to introduce an imperative or an affirmative conclusion in the Epistles of Paul, but not an interrogation. I can see no reason here for making the clause interrogative: the rendering *I am therefore become an enemy to you* is quite in harmony with the context, which assumes the existence of some actual estrangement. This estrangement is attributed to plain speaking which had given offence to the disciples. As he had seen no trace of coldness at the time of his recent visit, he must be referring to some language which he had used on that occasion. Circumstances forced him to take up strong ground at that time on the subject of circumcision and to denounce the opposition and intrigues which he had encountered from the Pharisaic party.

Vv. 17, 18. The substantive **ζῆλος** (probably derived from **ζέειν,** *burn*) denotes some kind of passionate desire. Whether it was of good or evil tendency depended on the nature of its object and the spirit in which it was pursued: for the same term was used to designate zeal for God or for some noble object, personal passion, or an exclusive spirit of selfish jealousy. The verb **ζηλοῦν** partakes of the same neutral quality. Its figurative meaning is here borrowed from the efforts of a lover to win favour. The Pharisaic party *affected* (*i.e.*, courted) the Galatians in a selfish spirit, being minded to shut them out of their rightful inheritance in

18. καλὸν δὲ τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, καὶ μὴ μόνον ἐν τῷ παρεῖναί με πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 19. τεκνία[1] μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν· 20. ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι, καὶ ἀλλάξαι τὴν φωνήν μου, ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν.

21. Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε;

[1] τεκνια ℵ^cACD^3EKLP; τεκνα ℵBD^1FG.

Christ, that they might reduce them to dependence on their own Law. Paul also courted them, not for his own glory, but that he might join them to Christ, and he was glad that they should be courted at all times, even by others in his absence, if it was done in a right spirit. *They affect you* (he writes, *i.e.*, court you) *not honourably, but are minded to shut you out that you may affect them. But it is good for you to be affected at all times and not only when I am present with you.*—ζηλοῦτε. As there are no other instances of ἵνα being followed by an indicative present in Pauline language, it is probable that this and φυσιοῦσθε in 1 Cor. iv. 6 are really forms of the subjunctive, though ζηλῶτε is the contracted form in general use.

Ver. 19. **τεκνία μου.** This is an accusative in apposition to ὑμᾶς, not a vocative introducing a fresh appeal. It is clear from the addition of the connecting particle δέ after ἤθελον that that word begins a new sentence. τεκνία is usually a term of maternal endearment; and though addressed by John in his first Epistle to his children in Christ, is not used elsewhere by Paul, who prefers to address them as children (τέκνα), rather than as babes. But in this passage he is adopting the figure of a child-bearing mother; he is in travail for the spiritual birth of Christ within them (as he says), and straining all his powers to renew once more the spiritual life which had died in them until he could succeed in shaping their inner man afresh into the image of Christ.

Ver. 20. **ἤθελον.** This imperfect expresses a modified wish, qualified by implied conditions, like ηὐχόμην in Rom. ix. 3 and ἐβουλόμην in Acts xxv. 22. He would fain be with them now (ἄρτι) instead of waiting for some future opportunity, were it not that he was unavoidably detained by other claims.—ἀλλάξαι. This is interpreted by some as a threat of increased severity, by others as a craving for the use of gentler words; but neither interpretation agrees with the regular Greek usage of the word. The natural meaning of the Greek expression is to exchange the voice for some other means of persuasion, in this case for the pen, and this sense is clearly indicated by the context. Paul longs to come and speak to them instead of writing, and is confident of his power to clear away doubts and errors by personal intercourse. —ἀποροῦμαι. This middle voice denotes the inward distress of a mind tossed to and fro by conflicting doubts and fears.

Vv. 21-30. Patriarchal history is employed to illustrate the persecution of Christians, who are the promised seed of Abraham, by Jews who are his seed after the flesh. Hagar and her son, Sarah and her son, furnish prophetic types of the mutual relations between the two. As his elder son, the slave-born Ishmael, was cast out for mocking the freeborn child, so the older Israel under bondage to the Law will bring on themselves the doom of national rejection by persecuting the true Israel of God whom Christ hath endowed with the freedom of the Spirit.—The force of this illustration depends on the distinction drawn in iii. 16-22 between the seed of promise and the seed of Abraham after the flesh. The argument of Rom. ix. 6 . . . is likewise based on the successive exclusion of the latter from inheritance of the blessing. John the Baptist and Jesus Himself expressly warned the Jews not to rely on their claim to be sons of Abraham.

Isaac the child of promise, only son of a free mother after years of barrenness, and heir to an indisputable birthright, aptly prefigured the Church of Christ, born in the fulness of time, made free by the gift of the Spirit, and established for ever in the house of their heavenly Father by an eternal covenant of adoption. Ishmael again, who had for some years filled the position of a son without the birthright which could entitle him to inherit the blessing, but was eventually driven out for his mockery of the promised child, supplied an exact prototype of

22. Γέγραπται γάρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται, 23. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας δι' ἐπαγγελίας.[1] 24. ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν δύο[2] διαθῆκαι· μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ 25. (τὸ γὰρ[3] Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ), συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ

[1] δι' επαγγελιας ℵAC 17, 73; δια της επ. BDEFGKLP.
[2] δυο (without αι) ℵcABCDEFGKLP.
[3] το γαρ ℵCFG; το δε 17; το Αγαρ B; το δε Αγαρ ADE; το γαρ Αγαρ KLP.

Israel after the flesh, long recognised as the people of God, but bound under the Law, and eventually destined to be shut out from the household of God for their guilt in persecuting Christ and His Church. —**τ. νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε.** This is a remonstrance addressed to men who are bent on upholding the authority of the Law, but are indifferent to the lessons which it teaches. **ἀκούειν** has this force of *listening*, not only when used absolutely, but when coupled as it is here with an accusative (*cf.* Luke x. 39, Eph. i. 13).

Ver. 22. **γέγραπται ὅτι.** The statement which follows is not a quotation, but a summary of recorded facts.

Hagar and Sarah are entitled *the* handmaid and *the* freewoman because they are accepted types of each class in Scripture. In the LXX **παιδίσκη** denotes *any* young woman (*e.g.*, Ruth) as it does in Attic Greek, but in the N.T. **παιδίσκη**, a *handmaid*, corresponds to **παῖς**, a male servant.

Ver. 23. The two who were coupled together in the last verse as sons of one father are here contrasted in respect of their different mothers. — **γεγέννηται.** The perfect is used in order to present the birth as a Scripture record now in existence (*cf.* Heb. xi. 17, 28 . . .): otherwise the aorist **ἐγεννήθη** would have been appropriate. — **δι' ἐπαγγελίας.** There is an alternative reading **διὰ τῆς ἐπ.** supported by equal MS. authority: but it is difficult to attach any meaning to the article, whereas **δι' ἐπαγγ.** forms an appropriate antithesis to **κατὰ σάρκα.** Like **διὰ νόμου** in ii. 19, 21 it describes the attendant circumstances under which the birth took place, **διά** not having an instrumental force.

Ver. 24. **ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.** No doubt is thrown on the historical truth of the patriarchal history by classing the story of Ishmael with allegories: though an additional value is thereby claimed for it as embodying spiritual truth, and typifying the permanent relation between the two seeds.—**αὗται γάρ εἰσιν.** The two women are identified with the two covenants, the Sinaitic and the Christian, which they typify: and the characteristic features of the two are declared to be slavery and freedom.—**γεννῶσα.** This term is applied to the conception of the mother in Luke i. 13, 57 also, though more often applied to the father.

Ver. 25. **τὸ γάρ.** The variety of readings in the MSS., **το Αγαρ, το γαρ Αγαρ, το δε Αγαρ, το γαρ,** indicates some primitive error of transcription. It is hardly possible to extract any reasonable sense from the three first: for **τὸ Ἄγαρ** cannot mean Hagar herself: it denotes the name Hagar, and Stanley's attempt to connect this name with Sinai proved futile. How then can the statement be understood that the name Hagar is Sinai, or that it answers to Jerusalem? How again can the superfluous description of Sinai as a mountain in Arabia be explained? Moreover, the reading **τὸ Ἄγαρ** without any connecting particle is intolerable in Greek language, and **δέ** or **γάρ** was probably added to correct the solecism. Hence I conclude that **Ἄγαρ** was probably an error in transcription for the original **γάρ,** suggested by its occurrence immediately before.

The statement in the text on the contrary, *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia*, is full of meaning when it is remembered that Hagar had no connection with Sinai itself, but that she found a home for herself and her children in Arabia.—**συστοιχεῖ.** The previous clause **τὸ γὰρ . . . Ἀραβίᾳ** is a parenthesis, **ἥτις** is therefore the subject of **συστοιχεῖ.** The Apostle finds in the actual state of Jerusalem and her children the same characteristic feature of slavery as in the covenant of Sinai.

Ver. 26. **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερ.** The Psalms and

νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει γὰρ[1] μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς. 26. ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ ἡμῶν. 27. γέγραπται γάρ, Εὐφράνθητι, στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα· ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον, ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα· ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. 28. ἡμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσαὰκ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐσμέν. 29. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τότε ὁ κατὰ

[1] **δουλευει γαρ** ℵABCDFGP; **δ. δε** D³EKL.

Prophets attest the enthusiastic devotion of Israelites to the city of Jerusalem. Since the temple of God and the palace of the house of David were within its walls, it was at once the holy city round which clustered the religious feelings of Israel, and the city of the great king, of whom the royal house of David were representatives (*cf.* Ps. xlviii.). The events of the captivity and restoration associated it still more intimately with the national fortunes and aspirations of Israel. Hence both Isaiah and Ezekiel invested it with ideal glory in their prophetic anticipations of the Messianic kingdom. Their visions of its future destiny looked forward to its becoming the centre of a world-wide worship: there the great King of all the earth would manifest His presence, and thither would flow all nations, offering their homage and bearing due tribute of gifts and sacrifices. But the Hebrew ideal scarcely rose above imaginations of an earthly city and a temple on the mountains of Israel. It was the function of Christian inspiration to spiritualise this conception, to eliminate its local association with the typical temple on earth, and to substitute a heavenly for an earthly city. The Apocalypse bears witness to the process of transition. Though it adheres closely to the vision of Ezekiel, and continues to employ material imagery for expressing the dazzling brightness and intense purity of the temple-city, yet the New Jerusalem is now seen coming down from heaven to a new earth; in place of earthly light it is illuminated by the light which emanates from the throne of God and of the Lamb; and material images are interpreted as symbols of moral beauty and spiritual holiness. The Epistle to the Hebrews views the heavenly Jerusalem from another side. Whereas the Apocalypse depicts its buildings, streets and rivers, the Epistle describes the throng of angels, the assembly of the first-born, the spirits of departed saints that are gathered there round the throne of God, and contrasts the awful majesty of the living God with the material terrors of Sinai. This Epistle presents the contrast between the earthly and the heavenly Jerusalem, and between the covenants of Sinai and of Christ in a different aspect. For the Apostle embodies in his conception a purely Greek ideal of a city, the mother and home of freemen. A self-governed body of free citizens, subject to no foreign control, but maintaining justice and order in perfect peace by their own sovereign will, furnishes him with an appropriate type of the heavenly commonwealth, whereof Christians are even now citizens, dwelling in peace together in the unity of Christian brotherhood, and independent of all restraints of law because they themselves do the will of God from the heart.

The Hebrew form **Ἰερουσαλήμ** is naturally preferred to the Greek in all these passages, because Jerusalem is personified as an ideal city. The stress here laid on the freedom of Christ's disciples recalls the conversation of Christ with the Jews in John viii. 32 . . . but the bondage is there more distinctly associated with actual sin.

Ver. 27. The prophecy of Isaiah liv. 1, here quoted from the LXX, describes the restoration of Zion, the enlargement of her borders and increase of her people, under the figure of a wife long neglected and barren, but now restored to the favour of her husband and fruitful in children. This picture was perhaps suggested to the prophet by the history of Sarah's prolonged barrenness before she became the fruitful mother of Israel, and is peculiarly appropriate for describing the long delayed but fertile growth of the Christian Church, of which she was the typical mother.

Ver. 29. **ἐδίωκεν.** This imperfect denotes a tendency and disposition rather than actual persecution on the part of Ishmael. The nearest approach to it recorded is in fact his mockery of Isaac on the occasion of his weaning (Gen. xxi. 9). The LXX gives a different version of his conduct on that occasion,

σάρκα γεννηθεὶς ἐδίωκε τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα, οὕτω καὶ νῦν· 30. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; Ἔκβαλε τὴν παιδίσκην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς· οὐ γὰρ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδίσκης μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.

31. Διό, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐσμὲν παιδίσκης τέκνα, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας V. 1. τῇ [1] ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς [2] Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε· στήκετε [3] οὖν καὶ

[1] τῃ ελευθεριᾳ ℵABCDP; τῃ ελ. ουν C³KL; τῃ ελ. ῃ D³EKL; ῃ ελ. FG.
[2] ημας Χρ. ℵABDEFGP 17, etc.; Χρ. ημας ℵᶜCKL.
[3] στηκετε ουν ℵABCFGP 17, etc.; om. ουν DEKL.

which is accepted in the margin of the Revised Version, and seems more in harmony with the circumstances, *viz.*, that he was playing with the child, bearing himself in short as an elder brother in the family, and that the jealousy of Sarah was aroused lest he should claim an elder brother's share of the inheritance. But the Apostle adopts the traditional view of his conduct which was accepted by the Jews, in consequence perhaps of the subsequent feud between the two races; and discovers in Ishmael the same jealous temper that was exhibited by Jewish persecutors towards the infant Church.

Ver. 30. Again, the expulsion of Ishmael gives warning that those who observe the letter of the Law only, and lack the true spirit of sonship, though they render formal obedience to the will of the Father, have no abiding inheritance in His house.

CHAPTERS IV. 31—V. 12. FREEDOM IS OUR BIRTHRIGHT IN CHRIST AND AN ESSENTIAL CONDITION OF OUR CALL. ACCORDINGLY THE APOSTLE PROTESTS AGAINST THE CLAIM THAT ALL CHRISTIANS SHOULD BE CIRCUMCISED, AS A DEPARTURE FROM THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST, A DANGEROUS INNOVATION WHICH THE CHURCHES WILL CERTAINLY CONDEMN, AND A SUPERSTITION OF THE FLESH ON A PAR WITH THE GROSSEST HEATHEN SUPERSTITIONS.—Ver. 31. The preceding allegory has illustrated the essential difference between the heritage of Jews and Christians. Whereas Jews inherit bondage to Law, freedom is the Christian birthright, derived from their heavenly mother. The Apostle now proceeds to enforce the truth that Christ bestowed this freedom upon us, and that it is an essential principle of our call.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. In the original text, which I have adopted in accordance with the best MS. authority, the first clause of this verse is clearly detached from the second **στήκετε οὖν**, and attached to the preceding **ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας** without any connecting particle. But this primary connection with the preceding verse was apparently obscured at an early period of Church history, owing probably to the frequent use of the important section v. 1 ff. as a Church lesson by itself apart from the preceding allegory. It is difficult otherwise to account for the great variety of connecting particles employed in MS. versions and quotations to transform the fragment **τῇ ἐλευθ. ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθ.** into a complete sentence, *e.g.*, the addition of **ᾗ, οὖν,** or **γάρ,** and the omission of **οὖν** after **στήκετε,** all evidently corrections made with one object. The division of chapters has unfortunately perpetuated this error. But the removal of the full stop after **ἐλευθέρας** at once restores the full force of the original passage: *Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of a handmaid, but Christ set us free with the freedom of the freewoman.* The threefold iteration, *free, freedom, freewoman,* marks with expressive emphasis the importance of this Christian birthright.—**ἡμᾶς Χριστός.** The best MSS. place the object **ἡμᾶς** before the subject **Χριστός,** inverting the usual order of words. This inversion throws an emphasis on **ἡμᾶς,** as the previous context demands; for the whole passage forcibly contrasts the freedom granted to us Christians with the bondage which the Jews inherit.—**μὴ πάλιν . . .** Converts had all alike, whether Jews or Greeks, been under bondage to some law, human or divine: all had been set free by Christ, but might now, by the voluntary adoption of circumcision, forfeit this freedom and rivet the yoke of Law about their own necks.

Ver. 2. **ἐγώ.** The Apostle finds it necessary to express pointedly his own personal judgment on the effect of circumcision in consequence of false reports which had been circulated that he had

μὴ πάλιν ζυγῷ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε. 2. Ἴδε ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει· 3. μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ, ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. 4. κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε· 5. ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 6. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἰσχύει, οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη. 7. Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν[1]

[1] ενεκοψεν ℵABCDEFGKLP; ανεκοψεν rec.

given some sanction to the new doctrine. (See ver. 11.)

Ver. 3. **μαρτύρομαι.** This verb, which in Attic Greek denotes the calling of witnesses, is applied in Pauline language to the Apostle's own testimony.—**περιτέμνησθε, περιτεμνομένῳ.** The use of the present tense intimates that the warning is not aimed at isolated acts, but at the introduction of a systematic practice involving a virtual transfer of allegiance from Christ to the Law.

Ver. 4. **κατηργήθητε.** This verb is applied with comprehensive force to any destruction of growth and life, physical or spiritual, beneficial or deleterious. Joined with **ἀπό** it denotes the loss of some essential element of life by the severance of previous intimate relations, *e.g.*, annulment by death of a wife's obligations to her husband (Rom. vii. 2), and emancipation from the control of the Law by spiritual death (Rom. vii. 6). Here, in like manner, it denotes the paralysis of spiritual life by severance of union with Christ. This paralysis produces a deadening effect on the whole spiritual nature, and results in the continuous craving for legal justification which is expressed by **δικαιοῦσθε.** — **ἐξεπέσατε.** As the quasi-passive verb **ἐκπίπτειν** corresponds to the active verb **ἐκβάλλειν**, this aorist corresponds to **ἔκβαλε** in iv. 30; so that the combination of **κατηργήθητε** with **ἐξεπέσατε** contains a special allusion to the doom of Ishmael, who suffered the loss of his inheritance at the same time that he was cast out from his father's house. Disloyal children of God, who prefer bondage to filial freedom, have by their own act forfeited the birthright of sons, and been cast out from His favour and blessing.

Ver. 5. **πνεύματι.** In the absence of an article this dative must have an adverbial force, and should be rendered *in spirit*. The Holy Spirit is uniformly designated **τὸ Πνεῦμα.** — **ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.** This verb expresses eager expectation rather than the attitude of patient waiting attributed to it in our versions. True faith in Christ inspires a confident hope of acceptance (**δικαιοσύνης**) before God.

Ver. 6. Circumcision conveyed no spiritual blessing in return for its binding pledge of obedience to the Law. In 1 Cor. vii. 17-22 it is placed in the same category as marriage and slavery, outward conditions of life which are neither good nor evil in themselves, but are the appointed portion of some, who should therefore loyally accept the burden or the blessing. Paul not only paid due respect to the Law himself, but even circumcised Timothy, when he desired to take him with him as his minister in Christ amidst Jews, that he might avoid needless offence. But he warned his disciples at the same time that in resorting to it for salvation they were really denying the faith, and forfeiting their birthright of Christian freedom.—**δι' ἀγάπης.** The rendering of our versions *by* or *through love* confuses faith with love, as though faith was the result of love or worked through its instrumentality. But the clause really describes a combination of two distinct graces: there may be intense faith without love (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 2); but faith ought to work *in love, i.e.*, in a spirit of love. Love is the atmosphere amid which faith should put forth its energy. This force of **διά** has been already noted in the case of **διὰ νόμου** (ii. 19).—**ἐνεργουμένη.** The middle voice is here employed to describe the inner working of the spirit of man, the active is used for recording God's work for man in ii. 8.

Ver. 7. **ἐνέκοψεν.** The figure of a race, introduced by **ἐτρέχετε,** is here carried on. Hitherto they had run a smooth course of obedience to truth; who had thrown obstacles in their way?

Ver. 8. It was God who called Abraham, Moses, Samuel and the prophets of

ἀληθείᾳ[1] μὴ πείθεσθαι; 8. ἡ πεισμονὴ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς. 9. Μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. 10. ἐγὼ πέποιθα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο φρονήσετε· ὁ δὲ ταράσσων ὑμᾶς βαστάσει τὸ κρῖμα, ὅστις ἂν ᾖ. 11. ἐγὼ δέ, ἀδελφοί, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω, τί ἔτι διώκομαι; ἄρα κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ; 12. ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς.

13. Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε, ἀδελφοί· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε

[1] αληθειᾳ ℵAB; τῃ αλ. CDEFGKL.

old and was now calling the Galatians through the Gospel of which Paul was minister, but this new persuasion was no true gospel, and did not come forth from Him.

Ver. 9. Leaven became a type of moral and spiritual corruption in virtue of the fermentation it engenders. A very small lump might readily form a centre of widespread corruption; so stringent precautions were adopted in Jewish households for the removal of every particle before the days of unleavened bread. Hence the origin of the proverb quoted here and in 1 Cor. v. 6. It is clear that the taint of heresy had not yet spread widely through the Galatian Churches: it was more its insidious nature than its actual extent that alarmed the Apostle.

Ver. 10. The emphatic **ἐγώ** with which this verse opens reminds the converts of the Apostle's personal claims in the Lord on their allegiance. He reckons with confidence on their support in pronouncing the judgment of their church on any who may disregard this warning. Every offender shall bear his own responsibility, whoever he may be.

Ver. 11. It seems strange in view of Paul's later career that he should have needed to repudiate, however briefly and scornfully, the charge of still preaching circumcision as he had before his conversion. After his open breach with the synagogue, indeed, at Corinth and at Ephesus it would have been hardly possible to advance such a plea. But he had recently, before writing this Epistle, taken two steps open to this misconstruction on which agitators could fasten. He had deposited with the Galatians for their guidance the resolution adopted by the Church at Jerusalem which recommended scrupulous regard for the Law in certain matters, and he had himself circumcised a Galatian convert whose father had been a Greek. Paul contents himself with pointing for answer to the persecutions which he was still enduring at the hands of Jews, probably those which befel him in Macedonia.—**ἆρα.** The interrogative **ἆρα** is far more appropriate to the context than the inferential **ἄρα.** The Apostle, being accused of currying favour with the Jews, points indignantly to the persecutions he was suffering from them and exclaims, "Hath the stumbling-block of the Cross been done away?"

Ver. 12. **ὄφελον.** This adverb occurs also in 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Rev. iii. 15. In all three places it expresses dissatisfaction with the actual position, "Would that it were otherwise". But it acquires this force from its combination with past tenses, like the aorist **ὤφελον** in Attic Greek. When coupled however with a future as it is here, it does not express a wish, but like the future of **ὀφείλειν** declares what ought to be the logical outcome of the present. The clause predicts in bitter irony to what final consummation this superstitious worship of circumcision must lead. Men who exalt an ordinance of the flesh above the spirit of Christ will be bound in the end to proceed to mutilation of the flesh like heathen votaries. — **ἀποκόψονται.** This word was habitually used to describe the practice of mutilation which was so prevalent in the Phrygian worship of Cybele. The Galatians were necessarily familiar with it, and it can hardly bear any other sense.—**ἀναστατοῦντες.** This word forcibly expresses the revolutionary character of the agitation which was upsetting the peace and order of the Galatian Churches. It is used in Acts xvii. 6, xxi. 38 to denounce seditious and riotous conduct.

Vv. 13-15. FREEDOM IS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF CHRISTIAN LIFE, TO BE USED NOT FOR SELF-INDULGENCE, BUT FOR WILLING SERVICE TO THE LAW OF

ἀλλήλοις. 14. Ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται,[1] ἐν τῷ, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.[2] 15. εἰ δὲ ἀλλήλους δάκνετε καὶ κατεσθίετε, βλέπετε μὴ ὑπὸ ἀλλήλων ἀναλωθῆτε.

16. Λέγω δέ, Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. 17. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός· ταῦτα γὰρ[3] ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται,[4] ἵνα μὴ

[1] πεπληρωται ℵABC 17, etc.; πληρουται DEFGKLP.
[2] σεαυτον ℵABCDEK 17; εαυτον FGLP.
[3] ταυτα γαρ ℵBD¹EFG 17; ταυτα δε ℵᶜACD³KLP.
[4] αλλ. αντικ. ABCDEFG; αντικ. αλλ. ℵKLP.

LOVE.—Ver. 13. ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ. Our versions render this *unto* (*for* R.V.) *freedom*, as though it were the design of the Gospel to lead to freedom. But the Greek text affirms rather that God's call was based upon freedom, and so makes it an essential element in spiritual life and the inalienable right of every true Christian.—μόνον μή. A warning is added that freedom, essential as it is to spiritual life, is open to abuse by carnal men, and that it is subject to the demands of the higher Law of mutual love. "Only do not treat it as an opening for carnal self-indulgence, but for loving service to each other." μόνον is used in the same elliptical way in ii. 10 and 2 Thess. ii. 7; and the ellipsis of the verb after μή is common in rhetorical passages.—ἀφορμήν. This term was applied in military language to a base of operations, and generally to any starting-point for action. In Rom. vii. 8, 11, 2 Cor. xi. 12 it denotes an opening for sin, as it does here.—δουλεύετε. This injunction contains an instructive paradox. Christians are freed from the trammels of outward Law, not that they may please themselves, but that they may become slaves to the Law of mutual love. The true ideal of the Christian is not freedom, but unfettered service to the love of God and man, which annihilates self, and subordinates all selfish desires to perfect love. A similar paradox is found in 1 Cor. vii. 22, *he that was called, being free, is the bondservant of Christ.*

Ver. 14. πεπλήρωται. MS. authority is decisive in favour of this perfect against the present πληροῦται. The perfect is likewise adopted in the parallel passage Rom. xiii. 8, ὁ ἀγαπῶν νόμον πεπλήρωκεν. For the very existence of love in the heart attests the completion of a previous inward act of the will.—ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ. The single precept which follows embodies in itself the whole duty to man.—τὸν πλησίον. The language of Lev. xix. 18 is here invested with the comprehensive force which Christ attached to the word *neighbour* by his teaching.

Ver. 15. If the spirit of mutual love does not prevent Christian brethren from preying on one another, they are in danger of utter destruction.

Vv. 16-24. MEN WHO REGULATE THEIR LIVES BY THE SPIRIT WILL NOT CARRY OUT DESIRES OF THE FLESH. FOR GOD HAS SET THESE TWO FORCES IN MUTUAL ANTAGONISM WITHIN OUR HEARTS FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF KEEPING DUE CHECK UPON THE WILL. SO IF YE BE GUIDED BY THE SPIRIT, YE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO LAW: FOR THE SPIRIT MASTERS UNLAWFUL LUSTS BEFORE THEY ISSUE IN ACTION: AND ITS FRUITS ARE SUCH AS NO LAW CAN CONDEMN.—Ver. 16. Πνεύματι περιπ.: *Walk by the spirit, i.e.*, Regulate your lives by the rule of the spirit. You will not then fulfil the desire of the flesh.

Ver. 17. σὰρξ . . . πνεῦμα. All the various motives which operate on the mind and will to prompt intention and action are comprehended under one of the two categories, spirit and flesh. The line of division between them corresponds to that drawn in 1 Cor. ii. 14 between the natural man (ψυχικός) and the spiritual. The spirit of man owes its original existence to the quickening inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and depends for its continued life on the constant supply of his life-giving power: its impulses are therefore purely spiritual. In the term flesh are included all other desires of the natural man, not only the appetites and passions which he inherits in common with the animal creation, but all the desires that he conceives for the satisfaction of heart or mind. — ἐπιθυμεῖ. This is a neutral term equally applicable to the good desires of the spirit and the evil lusts of the flesh. ἀντίκειται ἀλλ.

ἃ ἂν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε. 18. εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, οὐκ ἐστὲ ὑπὸ νόμον. 19. φανερὰ δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, ἅτινά ἐστι πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀσέλγεια, 20. εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία, ἔχθραι, ἔρις,[1] ζῆλος,[2] θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, αἱρέσεις, 21. φθόνοι,[3] φόνοι, μέθαι, κῶμοι, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις· ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν, καθὼς προεῖπον, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες βασιλείαν Θεοῦ οὐ

[1] ερις ℵABD[1]; ερεις CD[3]EFGKLP.
[2] ζηλος BDEFGP 17; ζηλοι ℵCD[3]KL.
[3] Insert φονοι ACDEFGKLP after φθονοι; om. ℵB 17, etc.

ἵνα. After the coexistence of two conflicting forces, spirit and flesh, in the heart of man has been definitely affirmed, it is here added that these are set (*sc.* by divine appointment) in mutual antagonism to each other for the express purpose of due control over the human will. Both alike derive their being from the same Creator, though one belongs to the natural, the other to the spiritual, creation: both alike continue by His will to fulfil their several parts in the scheme of Christian life. It is beside the purpose of the Epistle to analyse the functions of the flesh in the economy of nature, or to affirm the absolute dependence of the human will on the spontaneous action of its desires for vital force and energy: enough that by the will of God they too form an essential element in Christian life: the Epistle deals not with their beneficial action, but with their liability to perversion. For their indiscriminate craving for indulgence renders them constantly liable to become ministers of sin. The mind of the flesh, if left without a check, issues in enmity to God and death (*cf.* Rom. viii. 6, 7). Wholesome restraint is therefore a condition essential to their healthy action. In every community this is to a certain extent provided by the discipline of education, by social order and law. But in true Christians a far more effective control is maintained by the spirit, since it is capable of combating every wrong desire within the heart before it issues in sinful action, and so by constantly checking any wrong indulgence it gradually neutralises the power of selfish appetites, and establishes an habitual supremacy over the whole mind and will, until in the ideal Christian it brings them into perfect harmony with the mind of Christ.

Ver. 18. Law finds no just occasion against men who are led by the spirit, for they themselves check every wrong desire within them, and so fulfil the whole Law. The identity of Law with justice and right is, of course, assumed.

Ver. 19. Though this verse enumerates only evil works of the flesh, it is not thereby suggested that its action is wholly evil; for the flesh has been shown to have its appointed function from God, and to be essential to the human will. The opening **ἅτινα** puts the following catalogue of crimes and vices in its true light as samples, produced by way of specimen of the evil effects wrought by excessive indulgence of natural appetites without due control, and not an exhaustive list of the works of the flesh, as the rendering *which*, in our versions, rather suggests. The list begins and ends with sensual vices due to the lower animal nature; it couples *idolatry* with its habitual ally *sorcery:* in specifying the various quarrels between man and man it adds two **διχοστασίαι** and **αἱρέσεις** to the corresponding list in 2 Cor. xii. 20, perhaps owing to the prevalence of religious dissensions in the Galatian churches.—**ἀσέλγεια.** This term, which in classical Greek expresses insolent contempt for public opinion, denotes in the N.T. shameless outrages on public decency—a fit climax to fornication and uncleanness.

Ver. 20. **ζῆλος.** See note on iv. 17.—**ἐριθεῖαι.** The apparent derivation of this word from **ἔριθος** (*a hireling*) points to mercenary motives. The Apostle elsewhere associates it with jealousy, envy and vainglory, and contrasts it with sincerity, union and love. It denotes, probably, selfish intrigues.—**αἱρέσεις.** This term is used in the N.T. to designate any religious sect or party, *e.g.*, the Pharisees, Sadducees, Nazarenes (as the Jews designated Christians).

Ver. 21. **προεῖπον.** No particular admonition is here specified: warnings against these sins had, of course, formed the staple of many former discourses.

The Epistle has already claimed for

κληρονομήσουσιν. 22. ὁ δὲ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματός ἐστιν ἀγάπη, χαρά, εἰρήνη, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη, πίστις, 23. πρᾳύτης, ἐγκράτεια· κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος. 24. οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ[1] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. 25. Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν. 26. μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες. VI. 1. Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἔν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι

[1] Χρ. Ιησου ℵABCP 17, etc.; om. Ιησου DEFGKL.

Christians the inheritance of sons. That this inheritance included a kingdom needed no proof; for the conception of a Messianic kingdom ran through Hebrew prophecy and covered the whole range of Gospel teaching.

Ver. 22. Since the object of this verse is to exhibit the harmony between the fruit of the spirit and the restraints of law, those qualities only are specified which affect man's duty to his neighbour. *Love* with its unfailing attendants, inward *joy* and *peace*, supplies the motive power; *long-suffering* in the face of wrongs and ill-treatment, *kindness* in rendering service to others, and *goodness* in the free bestowal of bounty on those who need, cannot fail to gain goodwill; *good faith*, *meekness*, *self-control* enlist confidence and respect.—**πίστις.** It is clear from the subordinate place here assigned to **πίστις** that it does not here denote the cardinal grace of faith in God which is the very root of all religion, but rather good faith in dealings with men, and due regard to their just claims.

Ver. 23. **πραΰτης**: *Meekness* is the outcome of true humility, the bearing towards others which results from a lowly estimate of ourselves.—**ἐγκράτεια**: *Self-control* comprehends every form of temperance, and includes the mastery of all appetites, tempers and passions.

Ver. 24. **ἐσταύρωσαν.** The Apostle has already traced back his own spiritual life to the fellowship with the crucifixion of Christ, which he had undergone at his conversion (ii. 20). He assumes that his converts have likewise crucified the will of the flesh—not, however (as the previous context shows), that that will is already dead, but that the spirit has by one decisive victory asserted its complete supremacy in all true Christians, and so given an earnest of its entire triumph in the end.—**παθήμασιν.** This word departs here from its usual meaning, *sufferings*, and expresses inward emotions, as in Rom. vii. 5. Greek philosophers applied **πάθος** in like manner to denote active impulses of passion.

CHAPTER V. 25.—VI. 6. RULES OF CONDUCT DICTATED BY THE SPIRIT OF MUTUAL LOVE.—Ver. 25. Here, as in ii. 20, the thought of crucifixion with Christ suggests that of the new life which is its sequel. *If*, then, *we live in spirit* (*i.e.*, if we have spiritual life), let us take the spirit for the rule to guide our conduct.

Ver. 26. The English version *provoking* introduces an idea of wanton provocation which does not belong to the Latin *provocantes*, nor to the Greek **προκαλούμενοι**, for this denotes challenges to combat, and so describes the spirit of defiance which animated rival parties amid the heated atmosphere of religious controversy. The verse denounces the vainglorious temper of party leaders which found vent in mutual defiance and ill-will.

Ver. 1. **Ἀδελφοί.** The last verse protested against unbrotherly tempers; this appeal presents, by way of contrast, the claims of brotherly love even in the case of real wrongdoing.—**καὶ προλημφθῇ.** The English version *overtaken* suggests the idea of sudden temptation, and so tends to palliate the guilt of the offender, but the Greek denotes rather his surprise in the very act, and so lays stress on the reality of his guilt. The passage is urging the tender treatment of actual offenders, and the preceding **καί** enforces the claims even of guilty brethren on Christian charity: "Brethren, if a man be actually detected . . . deal tenderly with him in a spirit of meekness."—**καταρτίζετε.** This verb denotes sometimes the original framing of a mechanism (*e.g.*, of the human body and of the universe in Heb. x. 5, xi. 3), but more often its readjustment (*e.g.*, the setting of a broken limb, or the mending of nets in Matt. iv. 21). Here it indicates the correction of an offender with a view to

πραΰτητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς· 2. ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζετε, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 3. εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναί τι μηδὲν ὤν, φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτόν[1]· 4. τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἕξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον· 5. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει. 6. Κοινωνείτω δὲ ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον τῷ κατηχοῦντι ἐν πᾶσιν ἀγαθοῖς. 7. μὴ πλανᾶσθε, Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρί-

[1] φρεναπατᾳ ε. ℵABC 17, etc.; εαυτον φρ. DEFGKLP.

his restoration; and the need of meekness and forbearance for the due execution of this delicate task is enforced.

The transition from the plural **καταρτίζετε** to the singular **σκοπῶν** is instructive. The treatment of offenders belonged to the Church collectively, but each member needed to examine himself individually, in order that he might fulfil his part with due humility and sympathy.

Ver. 2. **βαστάζετε.** From its original sense of taking up, this verb acquires the most various meanings, *e.g.*, *carrying* in Matt. xx. 12, *ministration* in Matt. iii. 11, *robbery* in John xii. 6. Here it signifies lending a hand to help by lifting heavy loads. This does not involve transference of the burden, for it is said in 2 Cor. viii. 13, *I mean not that other men be eased and ye burdened:* and in ver. 5 it is added that each will have his own pack to bear; but Christian love must ever be careful to relieve each in turn when overtaxed by crushing loads.

Vv. 3-5. Any conceit of our own strength or goodness is a vain delusion, for we are nothing. Let no man compare his own with others' work: this will only feed his vanity; but let each scrutinise his own work. Then, if he find there ground for rejoicing, it will be in the ability that has been given by God's grace to such a one as he is: for each will have his own burden to bear of conscious guilt and shame.

Ver. 4. **τὸν ἕτερον.** This phrase denotes originally the other of two persons, but in this connexion *another than self*, the world being classified under two heads —*self* and *not self*, so that any other man with whom we are brought into contact belongs to the second division.

Ver. 5. **φορτίον.** This word was applied to the pack usually carried by a porter or a soldier on the march. In Matt. xi. 30 Christ employs this figure to describe the burden which he lays on each of his disciples (**τὸ φορτίον μου**), and here it denotes the regular daily burden laid on Christians. It is necessary to distinguish this from the heavy loads (**βάρη**) to which ver. 2 refers as needing the help of Christian brethren for the relief of overtaxed carriers.

Ver. 6. *Let him that is taught share with him that teacheth.* The word **κοινωνεῖν** contains the key to the true meaning of this verse. Our versions understand it here, and in Rom. xii. 13, Phil. iv. 15, in the sense of *communicating* to others; but I can find no warrant for this in Greek usage. In Rom. xv. 27 it signifies distinctly to *receive* a share, and elsewhere to become a partner (**κοινωνὸς γενέσθαι**) and share in common with others (1 Tim. v. 22, 1 Pet. iv. 13, 2 John 11, Heb. ii. 14). Here in like manner it enjoins upon the leaders of the Churches the duty of admitting all the members to participation in any spiritual blessings they enjoy. It continues, in fact, the protest against the arrogant pretensions and selfish exclusiveness of Judaising leaders.—**ἀγαθοῖς.** It is impossible to restrict this word to mere worldly goods, except where the language of the context suggests or warrants such a restriction, as is the case in Luke xii. 18, xvi. 25. The language here points to the blessings of Christian faith and doctrine. — **κατηχούμενος.** Oral teaching is specified because it was the only form of instruction then existing in the Churches.

Vv. 7-10. God's Judgment is unerring. Those who sow either to the flesh or to the spirit shall alike reap the harvest for which they have sown. But faint not in welldoing, for we shall in due time reap life eternal. — Ver. 7. **μυκτηρίζεται.** From its original sense of *sneer* this verb was applied in rhetorical language to the betrayal of covert ill-will and contempt by cynical gestures in spite of fair words. There can be no double-

ζεται· ὃ γὰρ ἐὰν σπείρῃ ἄνθρωπος, τοῦτο καὶ θερίσει· 8. ὅτι ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν· ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 9. τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν· καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι. 10. ἄρα οὖν ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.

11. Ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί. 12. ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί, οὗτοι ἀναγκάζουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, μόνον ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ[1] διώκωνται.

[1] μη after Χριστου ℵABCDEF 17, etc.; after ινα FGKL.

dealing with God, for He knows all the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Ver. 8. Every action produces an effect on the character of the actor corresponding as exactly to its motive as the fruit to the seed. If it springs from selfish desire, it stimulates the growth of evil lusts, and issues in a harvest of inward corruption. If, on the contrary, it be done in obedience to the spirit, it quickens spiritual growth, and issues eventually in a harvest of eternal life. The heart of man resembles a field in which he sows, by the mere exercise of his will, a future harvest of good or evil.

Ver. 9. The warnings **μὴ ἐγκακῶμεν** and **μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι** carry on figures borrowed from harvest work: the former depicts husbandmen tempted to slacken their exertions by weariness of prolonged labour, the latter reapers overcome by heat and toil.

Ver. 10. **καιρὸν.** The last verse affirmed that there is a due season for the spiritual harvest as well as the earthly; the same analogy suggests the existence of a spiritual seedtime also, which we are bound to utilise.—**τὸ ἀγαθὸν.** This word varies widely in meaning, like *good* in English; it is applied both to the intrinsic goodness of God Himself (Matt. xix. 17), and to the mere manifestation of a kindly temper towards others. So also its compounds **ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ἀγαθουργεῖν.** The clause **πρὸς πάντας** attaches to it here the latter force: so that the goodness spoken of is goodness to others.—**τ. οἰκείους.** Christians are here designated as *the household of the faith*, and in Eph. ii. 19 as *the household of God.*

Vv. 11-18. The Apostle writes the peroration with his own hand, denouncing the motives of the Pharisaic party, affirming his own absolute reliance on the Cross and the new life of the Spirit, and concluding with a personal appeal and final blessing.—Ver. 11. The Greek text admits but one meaning. The use of the instrumental dative precludes the rendering, *See how large a letter I write*, which would require **πηλίκα γράμματα**: so that the verse obviously calls attention to the large letters employed by the writer from this point onwards. The statement in 2 Thess. iii. 17, that he regularly dictated the body of his Epistles (*cf.* also Rom. xvi. 22), merely attaching his signature by way of attestation, explains this appeal. The size of the letters attested the difficulty which he found in writing with his imperfect sight, and the effort he was now making on their behalf proved his anxiety for the welfare of his Galatian disciples. They were evidently well aware of his infirmity, and needed no explanation of this pathetic allusion to his blindness. It may, therefore, be reasonably read in connexion with iv. 15. Probably the prolonged attack of ophthalmia which had threatened the destruction of his sight had seriously impaired it, and they who had watched his sufferings with such tender sympathy would now be quick to feel for the privation which the attack had entailed upon him. **ἔγραψα**: *I write.* The epistolary aorist is constantly used to denote personal acts of the writer at the time (2 Cor. ix. 3, Eph. vi. 22, Col. iv. 8, Philem. 19, 21).

Vv. 12, 13. Paul impugns the sincerity of the agitators: their affected zeal for the Law was a pretext with a view to disarming Jewish enmity: they urged the circumcision of Gentiles also to gratify their own vanity. They had probably, like the Jewish Christians at Antioch (*cf.* ii. 13), been guilty of inconsistency

13. οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι αὐτοὶ νόμον φυλάσσουσιν· ἀλλὰ θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται. 14. ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, κἀγὼ τῷ κόσμῳ. 15. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή τι ἔστιν,[1] οὔτε ἀκροβυστία, ἀλλὰ καινὴ κτίσις. 16. καὶ ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ στοιχήσουσιν, εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[1] εστιν ℵABCDEFG 17, etc.; ισχυει ℵcDcKLP.

in their practice: but Paul apparently relies also on his argument in ii. 16 that Jewish converts had by the mere act of embracing Christ confessed their own inability to keep the Law, and could not therefore be sincere in preaching to others obedience to its rules.—**τῷ σταυρῷ.** This dative cannot surely mean *for* (*i.e.*, *by reason of*) *the cross.* If this had been the meaning, it would have been expressed by **διὰ τὸν σταυρόν.** The correct translation seems to be, *persecuted with the cross*, *i.e.*, the cross of outward suffering which was in those days the lot of so many converted Jews, and notably of Paul himself. The Cross of Christ is here identified with persecution as it is in Phil iii. 18 with self-denial.

Ver. 13. **περιτεμνόμενοι.** The present participle is more appropriate than the perfect **περιτετμημένοι,** which is read by some MSS.: for the author has in mind the adoption of a system, as in v. 3.

Ver. 14. Paul contrasts his own spirit with that which his rivals are manifesting. They are animated by selfish desires to glory over the flesh of others, he will glory only in the triumph of the cross over his own flesh, whereby the power of the world over him, and his carnal love of the world, are both done away.

Ver. 15. Circumcision is again declared, as in v. 6, to be a mere accident of outward circumstance and of no spiritual import: *faith working in love* was there pronounced essential for Christian life, and here *a new creation*, the birth of the spirit in the heart of man.

Ver. 16. **κανόνι.** Men need a rule to guide their lives as the surveyor or the carpenter for the right adjustment of his work. This rule was supplied to the Jew by the Law in a code of morals, but the Spirit quickens in Christians a new life whereby the conscience is enlightened to discern good and evil for the regulation of their lives.—**καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ**: *yea upon the Israel of God.* **καί** is not properly copulative here, but intensive. Those who walk by the rule of the Spirit are declared to be indeed the true Israel of God, not the Jews who have the name of Israel, but are really only children of Abraham after the flesh.

Ver. 17. **τοῦ λοιποῦ . . .** In deprecating any renewal of the present agitation Paul treats with contempt the prospect of serious danger from it. It had disturbed his peace and the peace of the Church, and must be got rid of, but he describes it as a wearisome annoyance rather than a real peril.—**στίγματα.** These were indelible marks branded on the flesh. They might be self-inflicted: instances are recorded of soldiers branding themselves with the name of their general in token of their absolute devotion to his cause. But they were as a rule inflicted for a badge of lifelong service; the figure in the text is borrowed from the latter, which were either *penal* or *sacred*. The penal were stamped on malefactors, runaway slaves, sometimes on captives; but it is clear from the context that the author has in mind the **στίγματα ἱρά** mentioned by Herodotus in ii., 113, with which the Galatians also were familiar in Phrygian temples. A class of slaves (**ἱερόδουλοι**) attached for life to the service of a temple were branded with the name of the deity. Paul likens himself to these in respect of his lifelong dedication to the name of Jesus, and of the marks imprinted on his body, by which he was sealed for a servant of Jesus in perpetuity. These were doubtless the scars left by Jewish scourging, by the stones of Lystra and the Roman rods at Philippi, all tokens of faithful service to his Master in which he gloried.

Ver. 18. **μετὰ τ. πνεύματος.** This form of the final blessing occurs also in 2 Tim. iv. 22 and Philemon 25, but not elsewhere: it was probably suggested

17. Τοῦ λοιποῦ, κόπους μοι μηδεὶς παρεχέτω· ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ[1] ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω. 18. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί. ἀμήν·

Πρὸς Γαλάτας.[2]

[1] Ιησου ABC[1] 17; Κυριου Ιησου C[3]D[3]EKL; Κ. Ι. Χριστου ℵ.

[2] προς γαλατας ℵABC 6, 17, 135; add ετελεσθη FG; add επληρωθη DE; add εγραφη απο Ρωμης KP 47.

here by the stress laid on the life of the Spirit in the Epistle.

The subscription ἀπὸ Ῥώμης is neither genuine nor correct. Its absence in the oldest MSS. stamps it as an addition of later date. The Epistle was evidently written before the Roman captivity (see Introduction, pp. 144-7).

APPENDIX A.

PAULINE CHRONOLOGY.

THE Apostolic Council forms a central landmark in the Christian life of Paul between his conversion and his Roman imprisonment, dividing the interval into two unequal portions. The length of the earlier is computed in Gal. ii. 1 at fourteen years; but this may not imply a total of more than thirteen; for the broken years at the beginning and end are both included separately in that total. The three first of these were spent in Damascus, except a brief sojourn in Arabia, according to Gal. i. 18: the remainder in or around Tarsus and Antioch, with the exception of one brief visit to Jerusalem for the conveyance of alms, and a subsequent mission with Barnabas to Cyprus and Asia Minor. The visit to Jerusalem was too uneventful to call for notice in the Epistle. Its incidental connection with the history of Herod Agrippa determines its date: Herod reigned from 41 to 44; his persecution of the Church occurred not long before his death, and had already begun when the envoys arrived at Jerusalem. The joint mission occupied at least two years, probably much more; its success established the position of Barnabas and Paul throughout the Church as Apostles to the Gentiles, and led to the controversy in regard to circumcision which was settled by the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem; evidently no long time intervened between its termination and the Council. From that time forward the continuous narrative of events in the Acts furnishes material for dating approximately the successive stages of Paul's apostolic career. He and Barnabas returned at once from Jerusalem to Antioch, and many Christians gathered there from Jerusalem, including Peter and others whose names are mentioned. The length of their sojourn in Antioch and the neighbouring Churches cannot be determined with precision, as it is not known at what season the Council took place; if at the beginning of winter, they must have remained there the whole winter; if near the end, perhaps only a few weeks. In either case it is certain that neither Barnabas nor Paul started

before spring, for the navigation of the Levant and the passes of Mount Taurus between Cilicia and Galatia were alike closed in winter to ordinary travellers. The amount of time spent in the second visit to the Galatian Churches, in Macedonia, at Athens, and on the way to Corinth, is uncertain, but exceeded half a year at the lowest computation, and the Corinthian ministry cannot have fallen far short of two years, as it embraced several Sabbaths in the synagogue, eighteen months in the house of Justus, and a further indefinite sojourn (*yet many days*) in the city. It may be presumed, as he hastened from Cenchreæ to Jerusalem to complete his vow and keep the feast there, that he arrived before Pentecost, about the same season that he departed from Antioch on his travels; so that the interval was about three years in all. Another period of three years carries on the history to the end of the Ephesian ministry; it includes first a journey from Jerusalem to Ephesus, in the course of which he *spent some time* in Antioch and went over all the Galatian country in order, then three months' ministry in the synagogue, and two years in the school of Tyrannus, and ends about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). Another year brought the Apostle to Jerusalem, after visiting the Macedonian and Corinthian Churches. His imprisonment—first at Jerusalem, then at Cæsarea during the last two years of the government of Felix and the first part of the rule of Festus, and lastly on the way to Rome—accounts for nearly three years more, making a period of ten years in all between his departure from Antioch on his second mission-journey and his arrival in Rome.

A valuable clue for determining the date of that event is supplied by the history of Felix. His recall took place a short time before the departure of Paul from Cæsarea. He was followed by a hostile deputation from Cæsarea complaining of his misgovernment; but apparently there had not been time to organise and despatch it before navigation closed for the winter, otherwise the Roman Jews would have heard of Paul's appeal to Cæsar (*cf.* Acts xxviii. 21); so that Felix was still awaiting his trial at Rome. Now it is pretty certain that Felix retained the government of Judæa for the first five years after the accession of Nero, in spite of the disgrace of his brother Pallas at the imperial court—as long, in short, as Burrhus and Seneca dictated the policy of the empire, and was not recalled before 59. In spite of his cruelty and extortion he retained the confidence of Burrhus to the last, perhaps by the vigour of his government, perhaps from personal motives; and it was probably the support of Burrhus even more than the wealth of Pallas which

secured his acquittal at Rome; for Burrhus procured from the emperor, as the result of the enquiry, the disfranchisement of the Jewish citizens of Cæsarea who had impugned the conduct of Felix, and the systematic adoption of a rigorous policy for the repression of Jewish sedition. As the death of Burrhus took place in February, 62, the trial of Felix cannot have been later than 61. I conclude, therefore, that his recall took place either in 59 or 60, and that Paul reached Rome early in 60 or 61. If Prof. Ramsay is right in his contention (*Expositor*, vol. iii., 1896, p. 336), that the voyage of Paul to Palestine took place in 57, this is a decisive confirmation of the earlier date. Reckoning back ten years we arrive at the spring of 50 or 51 for the date of Paul's departure with Silas from Antioch. If the earlier date be assumed, I take it that the Apostolic Council was held some weeks earlier in 50; if the latter be preferred, I am disposed to date the Apostolic Council late in 50, and to conclude that the winter of 50-51 was spent in Antioch or its neighbourhood. Either reckoning leads to the choice of 37 for the year of the conversion, according to the computation made in Gal. ii. 1.

It is true that most critics favour the adoption of an earlier date than 37 for the conversion, but chiefly (as I think) because so little is known of the years immediately following the first Pentecost. It seems to me, on the contrary, probable that several years of silent growth intervened before the disciples were strong enough in their faith to establish themselves in Jerusalem and face the persecution of the rulers; and I find in the Acts many indications of a considerable interval. But it is enough here to compare the history of the first great persecution of the Church, which gave occasion for the conversion of Saul, with the particular circumstances of the year 37 recorded in Josephus which impress on me the conviction that the conversion occurred in that year. The narrative of Acts vi.-ix. exhibits a remarkable series of events:—

1. Stephen was indicted for blasphemy, and after a regular trial before the Jewish authorities was condemned by acclamation, carried without the walls, and stoned to death in strict accordance with the procedure of the Mosaic Law.

2. This was followed by domiciliary visits to the houses of Christians, who were arrested, imprisoned, and condemned to death by the Jewish authorities, Saul himself giving his vote against them (Acts xxvi. 10). A sudden reign of terror prevailed for a short time in Jerusalem; and then ceased as suddenly, leaving the Apostles once more free to come and go preaching the faith.

3. The Sanhedrim were able to give Saul authority to bring Christians from the province of Syria outside Judæa bound to Jerusalem for trial.

Historians have with some reason questioned the possibility of such proceedings as these in a Roman province: for the imperial government maintained with the utmost jealousy its exclusive prerogative of life and death over its subjects throughout the empire; the extreme violence of religious factions made the enforcement of this principle more essential in Judæa than elsewhere, and the repeated but futile efforts of the Sanhedrim to procure the death of Paul, first by assassination, then by judicial sentence of the Roman governor, exemplify at once their impotence for the infliction of capital punishment, and the vital importance of Roman protection to the Apostolic Church. It is true that one other noted Christian, James the brother of the Lord, was stoned to death, like Stephen: but that was an isolated act of mob violence during an interregnum, instigated by a fanatical high-priest, and promptly punished as an outrage on Roman authority.

The most striking parallel to the trial of Stephen is presented by that of his Divine Master. Both alike were found guilty of blasphemy, partly on the evidence of witnesses, partly on their own confession of faith. But when the Sanhedrim appealed to Pilate for confirmation of the sentence, he met the appeal with bitter scorn, challenging them in derision of their impotence to carry out themselves the sentence of death which they had presumed to pronounce upon the prisoner. This was indeed no solitary instance of the haughty and arrogant spirit which Pilate displayed throughout his administration. For many years he continued to earn the hatred of the Jews by his imperious temper and excessive severity. It is utterly incredible that intolerable outrages on Roman authority, like the public stoning of Stephen and judicial murders of other Christians at Jerusalem, can have occurred under the government of Pilate. Now that government lasted ten years, and only came to an end by his deposition in the year 37. His removal made way for new rulers and new measures in Judæa, for the Emperor Tiberius, having then become involved in war with Aretas owing to the quarrel between that king and Herod Antipas, had commissioned Vitellius proconsul of Syria to lead an expedition into Arabia and attack him in his capital Petra. As this force had to march across Judæa and make it the base of operations, Vitellius was invested with supreme authority in that country. The support of the Jewish nation became indispensable for his

success, and Vitellius, a supple and unscrupulous courtier, afterwards notorious as the basest sycophant at the imperial court, left no stone unturned to win their favour. He at once dismissed Pilate in disgrace,[1] remitted obnoxious taxes, rescinded unpopular regulations, and repaired in person to Jerusalem to curry favour by feasts and sacrifices while his army was on the march. We know from Josephus that his most ostentatious and successful display of sympathy with the Jews was the restoration of the sacred vestments to the custody of the priesthood, which his predecessors had hitherto retained in their own hands with jealous care as a hostage for Jewish loyalty, and that he bestowed the office of high priest on a son of Annas the powerful head of the priestly oligarchy. That oligarchy had by that time conceived the same jealous hatred against the disciples of Christ as against their master; and an unscrupulous governor like Vitellius could find no cheaper means of gratifying them than the surrender of an unpopular sect to their will. The martyrdom of Christians by Jewish zealots for the Law became in short as natural under the circumstances as it was contrary to the imperial principle of religious toleration, and had been inconceivable under Pilate. The presence again of Vitellius in Jerusalem suggests a reasonable explanation of the mission to Damascus, which could hardly have been undertaken without express sanction from the proconsul.

Finally, the circumstances of the year 37 completely explain the rapid termination of the reign of terror in the Church. For about Pentecost Vitellius received tidings of the emperor's death, and being personally disposed to side with Aretas against Herod Antipas, he at once abandoned the expedition, and gladly returned to Antioch. From the day of Tiberius' decease no motive remained for courting Jewish favour: the new reign brought with it in fact an entire reversal of Roman policy in these regions; the Church enjoyed once more comparative peace under the shelter of Roman indifference; and before long the threats of Caius Cæsar to erect his own statue in the temple of God turned the thoughts of the Jews from attacks on the Christian religion to the defence of their own. There is in short one period, and one only, in the Roman government of Judæa during which the martyrdom of Stephen and many other Christians in Jerusalem was either probable or feasible, and that is the first half of the year 37.

[1] The date of Pilate's deposition and of the subsequent events is fixed with some precision by the time of his arrival in Rome: though he hastened thither according to his instructions, he did not arrive before the death of Tiberius on 16th March, 37 (*Jos. Ant.*, xviii., iv., 2).

APPENDIX B.

COMPARISON OF THE ROMAN WITH THE GALATIAN EPISTLE.

THE position of Paul toward the Roman Church differed widely from that which he held in regard to the Galatian, and his attitude in the two Epistles differs accordingly. He had the strongest possible claim on the loyalty of the Galatians, for he had spent months in founding and establishing each of the Churches, had recently visited them afresh, and wrote for the express purpose of checking a threatened revolt against his Gospel and his authority. He was, on the contrary, still a stranger to Rome, had no personal experience of their actual condition or special temptations, and no more claim on their allegiance than on any other converted Gentiles. He was, indeed, deeply interested in the welfare of the Church, and had perhaps commissioned Aquila and Priscilla with others of his own disciples to proceed thither and prepare the way for his own intended visit; but the original foundation of the Roman Church was probably due to others. Under these circumstances the coincidence between certain chapters of the two Epistles is remarkable. If it were limited to the expression of certain eternal truths like the antagonism of flesh and spirit, and that love is the fulfilment of the Law, the correspondence might reasonably be expected. But it extends to the quotation and application of the same texts, and to the conclusions founded on them. Both adduce the same Scriptural arguments to uphold justification by faith alone against legal righteousness. Both associate the adoption and inheritance of the sons of God in Christ with His ancient promises to Abraham and his seed. Both alike restrict the function of Law to the condemnation and punishment of sin, and contrast its bondage with the freedom of the Gospel in corresponding language. Lightfoot argues from this coincidence that the two Epistles approximated in date, in spite of the wide divergence in their general tenor. But the coincidence is distinctly

limited in its scope: it is very striking wherever the author is dealing with the doctrinal questions at issue between Judaism and Christianity and is scarcely perceptible elsewhere. The limitation is instructive, for it suggests that the author had made these subjects and the passages of the Old Testament which bear upon them an habitual topic of controversy with Jewish teachers in the synagogue. This view is borne out by comparison of the language used by other authors. Even the Epistle of James, widely different as are his lessons on the subject of faith and works, bases them on the same text as these Epistles, "Abraham believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness". Why was this? Because the blessing of Abraham, his faith and his righteousness were prevailing topics in the religious teaching of his day. Philo likewise refers constantly to the same passages of Scripture and bases his arguments upon them. Now, what had been the antecedents of Paul before and after his conversion? Educated in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, he had been a zealot for the Law, and a sincere believer in the teaching of the Pharisees. After growing up to manhood in this faith, he had for fourteen years before he wrote the Galatian Epistle been engaged in perpetual controversy with his former teachers, encountering in every synagogue the same objections, and combating them with similar arguments. Inevitably his thoughts and language on such subjects as the blessing of Abraham, faith and works, the Law and the Gospel, had become in a measure stereotyped; and in addressing former disciples of the synagogue, whether in Galatia or in Rome, he fell almost unconsciously into identical language and trains of thought.

The close analogy, however, of the two Epistles in certain parts serves to bring out in stronger relief their wide divergence in spirit and substance. The Galatian Epistle was evoked by an insidious attack on the Christian freedom of Greek Churches, and its tone is thoroughly controversial. It insists on the futility of seeking justification by obedience to the Law, it urges that Jewish Christians have all confessed themselves guilty sinners, and owe to Christ their redemption from the curses of the Law; it establishes the provisional character of the Sinaitic dispensation, and reduces it to a mere preparatory discipline designed for an age of spiritual childhood and wholly unfit for Christians, seeing they have attained to spiritual manhood; it dwells on the bondage of Israel after the flesh, and identifies unbelieving Jews with Ishmael in their present temper and future destiny. In the Roman Epistle we breathe a different atmosphere. It is a comprehensive exposition of Christian

faith and duty addressed to the central Church of the Empire from the standpoint of an Apostle who claims the right to promulgate a new law in the name of Christ for the whole Roman world; it insists on the universal sinfulness of Jew and Gentile alike; like the Galatian it accepts Abraham as father of the faithful, but is careful to add that he is so not of the circumcision only but also of the uncircumcision; it is not content to pass over God's earlier dealings with mankind before Abraham and to identify Christ with the seed of Abraham, but goes back to the Fall, and describes him as the second Adam redeeming the whole race from the dominion of sin and death; it does not borrow its idea of law, like the Galatian Epistle, from the Mosaic, but develops the conception of an universal law of conscience even in the heathen world which maintains perpetual conflict with the law of sin and death in our members.

The reader can hardly fail to recognise in the changed attitude of the Apostle his altered position, and the transformation that he had been instrumental in effecting in Greece and Asia between the dates of the two Epistles. The earlier is animated throughout with the spirit of conflict, and vividly recalls the period when Paul was earnestly battling for the spiritual life of his Gospel against the surviving spirit of Judaism within the Church. But when he wrote from Corinth to the Roman Church, on the eve of his departure, having no more place in those parts, the issue of the conflict had been virtually settled by the wonderful expansion of the Greek Churches, Judaism had lost its hold, and the independence of the Christian Church no longer admitted of a doubt. Hence the Apostle does not hesitate to write of the national rejection of Israel as an accomplished fact, deeply as he deplored it, and earnestly as he craved for their restoration to a due share in their inheritance and a place in the body of Christ. The Roman Epistle belongs, in short, to a distinctly later stage in the history of the Church than the Galatian. Its decisive inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one category, its identification of Law with the conscience of mankind, its comprehensive scheme of Christian legislation, based on the eternal principles of righteousness, truth and love, its maturity of Christian thought, proved that the Apostle had passed beyond the earlier stage of controversy with Judaism into a region of spiritual conflict with evils of faith and practice, and grasping the conception of a universal religion had braced himself to meet its demand for a new Law and a new life of the Spirit in Christ.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

EPHESIANS

INTRODUCTION

1. Ephesus. The city with which this sublime Epistle is traditionally associated had a notable name in the ancient Greek world. A remarkable place belongs to it also in the history of the origins of the Christian Church. It emerges far back in pre-Christian times, and the glimpses which we get of it from point to point in the course of its fortunes show us things of great and varied interest. Its rise into an importance which became world-wide, its achievements during the palmy period of its prosperity and power, the changes through which it passed from the days of its pre-eminence in Asia Minor on to its destruction by the Goths and its miserable survival in the insignificant modern village of Ayasaluk make an impressive story. Its inhabitants were drawn from various sources, Hellenic and Oriental. It was one of the chief centres of the Ionian settlers. But we are told of strangers who occupied the place or its neighbourhood long before the Ionian immigration. These are referred to by Pausanias (vii., 26), who speaks of them as Carians; but some modern scholars suppose them to have been Hittites (*cf.* article "Ephesus" in *Encyc. Biblica*). The city was colonised mostly from Athens, and something of the Athenian genius may be recognised in its people. But it is clear that it had a large infusion of Asiatic elements.

In ancient times Ephesus was a place of commanding commercial importance. It owed this not less to its geographical position than to the energy and enterprise of its people. No Greek city in Asia Minor was more advantageously planted. It stood at the meeting point of roads which carried trade with them and converged on the great line of communication between the East and the metropolis of the world. It was the chief city of one of the four great river valleys that penetrated Asia Minor, being to the Caÿster what Miletus was to the Meander, Pergamus to the Caïcus, and Smyrna to the Hermus. The most important of the Asiatic trade routes and great lines of intercourse between Rome and the East was the one that passed up

by the Meander and the Lycus to Laodicea and Apamea. This being so, the commercial supremacy was held by Miletus for a length of time, the road which was commanded by it having the advantage of being shorter and less difficult than that to which Ephesus was the key. But under the operation of influences which we can only partially trace things changed in the later period of the Greek sovereignty, and under the Romans Ephesus had the place which had once belonged to Miletus. It gained largely by the decline of other great commercial cities. The overthrow of Smyrna by the Lydians about B.C. 525 and that of Miletus by the Persians in B.C. 494 contributed much to its ascendency. Thus it came about that during the Roman Empire it ranked with Antioch and Alexandria as one of the three great emporia of the trade of the Eastern Mediterranean, and formed the commercial capital for the wide and varied territory west of the Cilician gates. It rose to the dignity of metropolis of the Roman Province of Asia. It was a free city. It had an "assembly" and "council" of its own, and a governor, or pro-consul, ἀνθύπατος (*cf.* Acts xix. 38). In the general and natural decay of popular government, however, under the Imperial system, power fell into the hands of officials, and in Ephesus the γραμματεύς, the "town-clerk" (Acts xix. 35) or "recorder," was the great authority.

Ephesus was originally a sea-port. It stood on the left bank of the Caÿster, it is true, a few miles up from the sea, but for a length of time the channel of the river was carefully attended to and kept open. It was never an easy task, however, to maintain a clear way between the harbour and the sea. The quantity of silt deposited by the Caÿster was great. Blundering engineering, undertaken in the second half of the second century B.C. under Attalus II. Philadelphus, made matters worse. By Paul's time the passage had got into such a condition that, though the city still retained its pre-eminence, mariners avoided Ephesus if they could. A serious attempt to improve the channel was made by the Governor of Asia, as Tacitus informs us (*Ann.*, xvi., 23), about A.D. 65. But effort slackened again, and things were left to take their course. The result in course of time was that the once famous harbour became a troublesome marsh. Ephesus ceased to be a sea-port, its trade declined, and the life went out of the city.

The importance of Ephesus, however, in ancient times was not due to its commercial position alone. It had a considerable name as a school of art. The great painters Parrhasius of the fifth century B.C. and Apelles of the fourth belonged to the city. Above all,

it was a place of paramount religious interest. It was the centre of the worship of the goddess who was known among the Greeks as Artemis and among the Romans as Diana. The temple erected in her honour was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world, a splendid structure of shining marble, stated by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, xvi., 40, 213) to have been 425 feet long and 220 wide (but by Mr. J. T. Wood to have measured 343 feet by 164), with 127 columns some 60 feet high. It is reported to have taken about 220 years to finish. In it was treasured an image of the goddess which was believed to have fallen from heaven in remote times. Behind the shrine was the "treasury," which was the bank of Asia. The temple was destroyed by the Goths in A.D. 262.

Magnificent as the temple was, it was not the only architectural wonder possessed by Ephesus. There was the great theatre, on the west side of Mount Coressus, a vast structure, the largest Greek theatre in Asia Minor and in the ancient Greek world, reputed to accommodate 50,000 spectators. North of it was the *stadium*, where races were run and wild beast fights were conducted. It was the temple, however, that made the chief glory of the city. It was the temple that added more than anything else to its importance. The chief boast of Ephesus was the title of **νεωκόρος**, or "temple-warden" (literally "temple-sweeper"), rendered "worshipper" in Acts xix. 35 by the AV, and "temple-keeper" by the RV. It is true that the title was more usually given to Asiatic cities as wardens of temples of the Imperial worship, and Ephesus was **νεωκόρος** first of one temple, then of two, and later still even of three. But an inscription of the second century and coins of the third bear witness to the fact stated in Acts xix. 35 that Ephesus had the title of Warden of the Temple of Diana (*cf.* Prof. Ramsay's article on "Ephesus" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*). This vast temple was not the only sacred structure that found a place on the slopes of the hill which made the original religious centre. Here was built the great Christian Church which was dedicated by Justinian to St. John the Evangelist. Here, too, at a later date, was erected the mosque which is reported to have been one of the best specimens of Arabian-Persian art.

2. THE CHURCH IN EPHESUS. It is with the great names of Paul and John that the story of the primitive Christian community in Ephesus is specially associated, both in the New Testament itself and in tradition. John's connection with the Ephesian Church belongs to the latter part of the first century. We have every reason to believe that, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion

of the members of the mother Church, that Apostle made Ephesus his home. The historian Eusebius speaks of his residence there, and reports certain interesting occurrences which took place during his stay. Other names known to us in the sacred history have also certain associations with the Ephesian Church. One of these is that of Timothy, who appears to have been commissioned by Paul towards the end of his career to do some special work in Ephesus. In 1 Timothy (i. 3) the Apostle is represented as reminding this his "own son in the faith" that he had besought him to abide "still in Ephesus," while he himself went into Macedonia, that he might "charge some that they teach no other doctrine". It may also be inferred from what is said of John Mark in different passages of the New Testament (Col. iv. 10; 1 Peter v. 13; 2 Timothy iv. 11) that he too had not a little to do with the Churches of Asia; and that being so, it can well be understood that he was known to the Church of Ephesus and visited the city in his journeyings. It has been supposed by some that the Evangelist Luke also had some connection with Ephesus. But there is no historical foundation for this. Mr. J. T. Wood indeed takes the name borne by the modern village which represents the ancient Ephesus to be a corruption of αγιος λουκας, "St. Luke". But Ayasaluk or Ayassaluk appears to be a corruption of Ayo-theolog, Ayo-tholog, αγιος θεολογος, the name being taken from the Church of St. John built there by Justinian.

It is with Paul himself, therefore, that the beginnings of the Church of Ephesus are associated. Men from Asia were among the multitudes in Jerusalem who heard the Apostles speak with tongues on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 9), and it is possible that the first tidings of the new faith may have been carried by some of these to the capital of the Province. But of that there is no record. The testimony of the Book of Acts is that Paul, at the beginning of his second great missionary journey, after he had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost" to preach the word in Asia (xvi. 6); but that at the close of that journey, when he was on his way from Greece to Syria, he did visit Ephesus and "reasoned with the Jews in the synagogue". That he made some impression on this occasion appears from the fact that he was asked to stay. This he could not do, because he had to press on to Jerusalem to keep the feast there. But he left Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus and promised himself to return (Acts xviii. 19-21). To this brief visit of the Apostle of the Gentiles, followed up by the efforts of Aquila and Priscilla, the planting of a Christian Church in the capital of the Province of Asia appears to be due. When

Paul was away in Syria and Asia (Acts xviii. 22, 23) something further was effected in another way. Apollos came to Ephesus, knowing only of the baptism of John. He had the way of God expounded to him more fully by the two devoted friends whom Paul had left behind him in Ephesus. The result was that, understanding better as he now did the fulfilment of the promised Messianic salvation, he "mightily convinced the Jews, and *that* publicly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus was Christ" (Acts xviii. 24-28). After Apollos had passed on to Corinth Paul returned, as he had undertaken to do, to Ephesus (Acts xix. 1). On this occasion his stay was a protracted one, extending over more than two years and three months (Acts xix. 8, 10), or as he expressed it in round numbers in his address to the elders at Miletus "by the space of three years" (Acts xx. 31).

First he devoted himself to the instruction of certain disciples who had been baptised only unto John's baptism and knew nothing of the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 1-7). Then for three months he spoke of the things of the Kingdom of God to the Jews in the synagogue. In this he had only partial success, and soon he had to encounter bitter opposition. He gave up his appeal, therefore, to the Jews, and took the school of "Tyrannus," in which he "disputed daily" for the space of two years. He did this with such result that he turned many from the practice of the magical arts which were in great favour in Ephesus, and "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" (Acts xix. 10, 20). In other words, the report of the Gospel which Paul preached penetrated through the Province, being carried no doubt to the great cities by travellers who visited Ephesus, and by missionaries or messengers like Epaphras. And for the purpose of disseminating the knowledge of the new faith through the Asiatic Province, Ephesus was not less singularly fitted by its geographical position and commercial communications than was Antioch for Syria or Rome for the further West. The tumultuous opposition, however, which was roused by Demetrius against Paul as a destroyer of the silversmith's craft and a subverter of the worship of Diana, brought his work in Ephesus to a close and compelled him to hasten his departure into Greece (Acts xix. 21—xx. 1). During his last voyage to Syria he did not visit Ephesus itself; but, touching at Miletus, he sent for the elders of the Ephesian Church and took his pathetic farewell of them there (Acts xx. 17-38).

So far as the Book of Acts is concerned, that is the last glimpse we get of Paul in his connection with Ephesus. In the Pastoral

Epistles, however, we have some further references to Ephesus and to Paul's care for the Church there. In 1 Timothy (i. 3), as we have seen, we find that Timothy had been placed in the city with a view to the preservation of sound doctrine, and that Paul desired him to remain there when he himself went into Macedonia; and in 2 Timothy mention is made both of the way in which Onesiphorus ministered to Paul in Ephesus (i. 18), and of the fact that Tychicus was sent by Paul to Ephesus (iv. 12). The relations, therefore, between Paul and this Church were of the closest and most confidential kind. As to the composition of the Christian community, it appears to have included from the first both Jews and Greeks (Acts xix. 1-10, xx. 21). The Gentile element, however, seems to have been the larger and to have grown more and more, so that the Epistle deals with the Church as practically a Gentile-Christian body.

In 1 Peter (i. 1) those in Asia, including doubtless the members of the metropolitan Church, are named among the strangers scattered throughout various lands, towards whom the writer has a certain responsibility and to whom he addresses his Epistle. In the Apocalypse which bears the name of John, the Church of Ephesus appears among the seven Churches of Asia to which John's message is directed; and that the Ephesian Church was recognised as the chief of the seven may be inferred perhaps from the fact that it has the first place in the list and in the address (i. 11, ii. 1). It is also with John that tradition connects the Ephesian Church after Paul's decease. Of its later history, it is enough to say that it long retained its importance among the Churches, and that, among other things, it was the seat of one of the great Œcumenical Councils (A.D. 431), and also of the notorious Robber-Synod (A.D. 440).

3. The Epistle—its General Character, Contents and Plan. Among the Epistles bearing the name of St. Paul there is none greater than this, nor any with a character more entirely its own. There have been students, it is true, who with an almost incredible lack of insight have considered it an insipid production or a tedious and unskilful compilation. Among these must be named even so acute a scholar as De Wette. Such pronouncements, however, belong to the failures and eccentricities of criticism, and count for little. With few exceptions scholars of all different schools who have studied and interpreted this Epistle have been at one in regarding it as one of the sublimest and most profound of all the New Testament writings. In the judgment of many who are well entitled to deliver an opinion, it is the grandest of all the Pauline letters. There is a peculiar and sustained loftiness in its teaching which has deeply

impressed the greatest minds and has earned for it the title of the "Epistle of the Ascension". It tarries largely among "the heavenlies," and lifts us into the eternities *a parte ante* and *a parte post*. It is characterised by a dignity and a serenity which are entirely in harmony with the elevation of its thoughts. It takes little to do either with the questions of ceremonialism or with the personal vindications which fill so large a space in others of the greater Epistles of St. Paul. The polemical element is conspicuous by its absence. There is scarcely even an echo of the great controversies which ring so loudly in the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. If they were still active in any measure or at all in the writer's view when he addressed himself to these Asiatic Churches, they are not on the surface at least of this majestic Epistle. The nearest approach to any explicit allusion to such things is in what is said in a single verse (chap. ii. 11) regarding the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision.

There is a remarkable cohesion, too, in the composition, part fitting in with part naturally and without effort. In its structure the Epistle is an unmistakable unity. The whole argument moves round a few great ideas. The plan is simple. The Epistle opens and closes in the usual Pauline way, and it divides naturally into two great sections, one doctrinal and the other practical or hortatory. There is first the usual inscription or greeting (i. 1, 2), followed by a thanksgiving which takes the form of a solemn ascription of praise to God for the spiritual blessings enjoyed by the writer and his readers. The mention of these blessings develops into a doctrinal statement which deals with the lofty themes of election, predestination, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; the mystery of the Divine will; the grace of the Holy Spirit as seal and earnest; the power of God in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ; the sovereignty of Christ over the world and His Headship over the Church; the Divine quickening of the spiritually dead; the abrogation of the Law that formed the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile; the love of Christ and His indwelling in the believer. Each of these great themes leads easily to the next. In the course of their exposition the Apostle enlarges especially on the ultimate purpose of God to sum up all things in Christ (i. 9-11); the relation in which Christ stands to the universe and to the Church (i. 20-23); the absolutely gracious character of the salvation, the new life, and the gifts bestowed upon believers by God (ii. 1-10); the revelation and fulfilment of the purpose of God, hidden for ages, to make the Gentile partaker with the Jew (ii. 11-22); and the marvel of the grace that has established equality and unity where once there were privilege and separation

(iii. 1-19). This first of the two primary divisions of the Epistle concludes with a doxology, which again celebrates that gracious power of God which works all for us and within us.

As the doctrinal section occupies the first three chapters, the hortatory section extends over the last three. These chapters are taken up with practical matters—the necessity of a walk in harmony with the Divine call; the commendation of humility, meekness, forbearance, concord, peace and all good brotherly relations; the duty of growing in likeness to Christ and in obedience to Him; the forsaking of all heathen vices; the practice of truthfulness and honesty, abstinence from all corrupt communications, from all bitterness and wrath and evil-speaking and malice; sedulous watchfulness against any falling back into easy compliance with the two characteristic pagan forms of moral evil, sensuality and greed, or into any slackness in the sense of their deep sinfulness; the reverent regard of the Christian relations between husband and wife, parents and children, masters and slaves, and the careful observance of the duties arising out of the Christian idea of these relations; the need for the full spiritual equipment provided by God for the withstanding of all evil. These various ethical requirements and recommendations are presented as all having their roots in the great facts and doctrines of grace which are expounded in the former division of the Epistle, and as all growing up out of that soil. In their enforcement special prominence is given to the maintenance of concord and peace in the Church (iv. 4); the great object which all Christian gifts are meant to serve (iv. 12-16); the forswearing of all sins of uncleanness as things wholly alien to the Christian life (v. 3-14); the sacredness of the primary domestic and relative duties, those above all pertaining to the relations of husband and wife (v. 22—vi. 1-9); the seriousness of the Christian's warfare and the sufficiency of the Christian's armour (vi. 10-18). The Epistle is brought to its close by some personal references bearing on the writer's requirements and commission (vi. 19, 20); a brief notice of the mission of Tychicus (vi. 21, 22); and a final salutation or benediction, which is given in terms of grace and peace (vi. 23, 24).

In the course of thought thus followed out in the Epistle there are certain great ideas that have peculiar prominence given them. Of these the largest is that of the Divine *grace*—the term χάρις occurring under one aspect or another some thirteen times. Another is that of "the heavenlies," which has an entirely peculiar place and application in this Epistle. Much, too, is made of the conceptions of the Divine *fulness* (πλήρωμα); the *mystery* (μυστήριον); the *economy*

(οἰκονομία); the spiritual *understanding* (γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις, σοφία, σύνεσις, φρόνησις) proper to the Christian and in which he is to increase. There are also the ideas of *union* and *unity*, union with Christ, union and fellowship one with another, the unity of the Church, the oneness of Jew and Gentile, the unity in the diversity of gifts, the unity of the faith. These great conceptions run through the Epistle, and express themselves in such compound forms as συνεζωποίησε, συνήγειρε, συνεκάθισεν, συμπολῖται, συγκληρονόμοι, συναρμολογουμένη, συνοικοδομεῖσθε, σύσσωμος.

The Epistle is remarkable also for the use which it makes of a series of terms of far-reaching significance, which belong to the very essence of its thought and nowhere get the place and the iteration which they have here, except in some measure in the Epistle to the Romans. Among these are the *counsel* (βουλή) of God, His *will* (θέλημα), His *purpose* (πρόθεσις), His good-pleasure (εὐδοκία), His *fore-ordaining* or *pre-determining* (προορίζειν), His *afore preparing* (προετοιμάζειν), etc.

The vocabulary of the Epistle also is singular and full of interest. The letter contains a number of words and phrases which are peculiar to itself and the sister Epistle to the Colossians, so far as the New Testament writings are concerned—such as ἀνθρωποπάρεσκος, ἁφή, ἀποκαταλλάσσειν, ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι, αὔξειν, and its noun αὔξησις, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, ῥιζοῦν, συζωοποιεῖν, συμβιβάζειν, ἐκ ψυχῆς. It has others which are confined to itself and certain others of the Pauline Epistles: ἀγαθωσύνη, ἀληθεύειν, ἀνεξιχνίαστος, ἐπιχορηγία, εὔνοια, εὐωδία, θάλπειν, κάμπτειν, περικεφαλαία, πλεονέκτης, ποίημα, πρεσβεύειν, προετοιμάζειν, προσαγωγή, προτίθεσθαι, υἱοθεσία, ὑπερβάλλειν, ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ.

On the other hand, there are a good many words which occur in this Epistle alone of all claiming to be by Paul, although they are found occasionally elsewhere in the New Testament, such as ἄγνοια, ἀγρυπνεῖν, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, ἀμφότεροι, ἄνεμος, ἀνιέναι, ἅπας, ἀπειλή, εὔσπλαγχνος, μακράν, ὀργίζεσθαι, ὁσιότης, ὀσφύς, πανοπλία, πάροικος, περιζωννύναι, πλάτος, ποιμήν, in the sense of *pastor*, πολιτεία, σαπρός, σπῖλος, συγκαθίζειν, σωτήριον, ὕδωρ, ὑποδεῖσθαι, ὕψος, φραγμός, φρόνησις, χαριτοῦν, χειροποίητος. Some of these obviously are of small moment. Others have some significance. On these lists see Abbot's *Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, and more especially Holtzmann's *Einleitung* and *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosser-Briefe*. In addition to these we have a considerable list of pure ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, including ἄθεος, αἰσχρότης, αἰχμαλωτεύειν, ἀνανεόω, ἄνοιξις, ἀπαλγεῖν, ἄσοφος, βέλος, ἐκτρέφω, ἐλαχιστότερος, ἑνότης, ἐξισχύειν, ἐπιδύειν, ἐπιφαύσκειν, ἑτοιμασία, εὔνοια, εὐτραπελία, ὁ ἠγαπημένος, as applied to

Christ, **θυρεός, καταρτισμός, κατώτερος, κληροῦν, κλυδωνίζεσθαι, κοσμοκράτωρ, κρυφῇ, κυβεία, μακροχρόνιος, μέγεθος, μεθοδεία, μεσότοιχον, μωρολογία, πάλη, παροργισμός, πολυποίκιλος, προελπίζειν, προσκαρτέρησις, ῥυτίς, συμμέτοχος, συμπολίτης, συναρμολογεῖν, συνοικοδομεῖν, σύσσωμος.** In the case of two of these, **αἰχμαλωτεύειν** and **εὔνοια**, the TR gives each in one other passage (2 Tim. iii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 3), but on insufficient documentary evidence. The introduction of some of these terms no doubt is due to circumstance. But an analysis of the vocabulary as a whole brings out the fact that in language as well as in thought this Epistle has a character of its own.

4. The Affinities of the Epistle. There are some resemblances which deserve notice between the terms of this Epistle and those of the address recorded in Acts (xx. 17-38) as delivered by Paul to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, *e.g.*, **μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης**, iv. 2., *cf.* Acts xx. 19; **ἐκληρώθημεν, κληρονομία**, i. 11, 14, *cf.* Acts xx. 32; the Divine **βουλή**, i. 11, *cf.* Acts xx. 27; the Divine **δύναμις** and **κράτος**, i. 19, *cf.* Acts xx. 32; the being *builded*, **συνοικοδομεῖσθε**, ii. 21, *cf.* Acts xx. 32. But apart from these we find a number of resemblances between this Epistle and other NT writings which are of interest, and which may point to certain relationships between them. There are a few points of contact, *e.g.*, between this Epistle and the three Pastoral Epistles (*e.g.*, in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10, ii. 1), which have been considered to go some way to establish identity of authorship, or at least of ultimate source. But these do not amount to much. There are other correspondences which are thought to indicate a certain affinity between this Epistle and the Fourth Gospel. Among these are reckoned the prominence given in both to the great conceptions of **ἀγάπη** and **γνῶσις**; the designation of Christ as **ὁ ἠγαπημένος** (Eph. i. 4) as compared with the terms of John iii. 35, x. 17, xv. 9, xvii. 23, 24, 26; the **ἐξελέξατο πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** of Eph. i. 4, and the **ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** of John xvii. 24; the common use of the figures of *light* and *darkness* (Eph. v. 11, 13; John iii. 20, 21), and the particular phrases **ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε** (Eph. v. 8), **περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε** (John xii. 35); the designation of the work of regeneration as a *quickening of the dead* (Eph. ii. 5, 6; John v. 21, 25, 28). In both writings again we have the work of redemption presented under the aspect of a *sanctification* or *setting apart* (**ἁγιάζειν**, Eph. v. 26; John xvii. 17, 19); and in both this is given as taking effect by way of a *cleansing* or *purifying by the word*—**καθαρίσας . . . ἐν ῥήματι** (Eph. v. 26), **καθαρὸς διὰ τὸν λόγον** (John xv. 3). We have also the idea of *grace according to measure* (**ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, Eph. iv. 17), and *grace without measure* in the one

case of Christ (John iii. 31). The striking resemblance between the ἀνέβη . . . κατέβη, ὁ καταβάς . . . ὁ ἀναβάς in Eph. iv. 9, 10, and the declaration οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς in John iii. 13 is also noticed. But less can be made of this, as the terms in Ephesians are drawn from an OT quotation. Nor can much be made either of the contention that what is said of Christ as the point of union or restoration for a divided world in Eph. i. 10 is essentially the same as the representation of Him as the Λόγος in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel; or of the parallel in such passages in John as x. 16, xi. 52, xvii. 20, 21 to the terms in which this Epistle enlarges on the inclusion of the Gentiles (ii. 13-22, iii. 6). The more relevant of these coincidences, however, may perhaps be taken to indicate an acquaintance on the part of the writer of the Fourth Gospel with this Epistle. They show at least that the authors of these two writings had much in common both in terms and in ideas.

There are certain points of contact also between *Ephesians* and the *Apocalypse*, of which much has been made by Holtzmann. Minor resemblances are discovered between such passages as Eph. i. 8 and Apoc. xiii. 18; Eph. ii. 13 and Apoc. v. 9; Eph. iii. 9 and Apoc. iv. 11, x. 6; Eph. iii. 18 and Apoc. xi. 1, xxi. 15-17; Eph. v. 32 and Apoc. i. 20. But these are too uncertain and remote to trust to. Of more importance are the coincidences between the view of Christ's relation to the Church in Eph. v. 25, etc., and the figure of the Church as the Bride of the Lamb in Apoc. xix. 7; the mention of the *Apostles and prophets* in Eph. ii. 20 and Apoc. xxi. 14; the μυστήριον *revealed* (ἀπεκαλύφθη) "to His holy Apostles and prophets (Eph. iii. 5) and the μυστήριον Θεοῦ in Apoc. x. 7; the μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις of Eph. v. 11 and the ἵνα μὴ συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς of Apoc. xviii. 4. It cannot be said, however, that these amount to much. Few would pronounce them sufficient to prove any literary or doctrinal dependence of the one writing on the other. Holtzmann, however, infers from them that the writer of *Ephesians* made some use of the *Apocalypse*.

Another writing with which *Ephesians* is thought to be in affinity is the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. Considerable resemblance is found between the two in their view of the Person of Christ, *e.g.*, in Eph. i. 10, 20-22, iv. 8-10, 15 and Heb. i. 8-13, ii. 9, x. 12, 13, etc. The *seating* of Christ *on the right hand of God* appears in both Epistles (Eph. i. 20; Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12). So is it also with the use of the term παρρησία with reference to access to God (Eph. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16); with the conception of Christ's work as *a sanctifying* (ἁγιάζειν, Eph. v. 25, 26; Heb. xiii. 12, x. 10); and with the place

given to *the blood* of Christ (Eph. i. 7; Heb. ix. 12). In the use of terms, too, there are resemblances of some significance. In both we have the phrases αἷμα καὶ σάρξ (for the more usual σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα), ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, αἰὼν μέλλων, προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν. And certain expressive words are found in both, such as ἀγρυπνεῖν, κραυγή, ὑπεράνω, βουλή. These things have been supposed to point to the priority of *Ephesians*, while some, on the other hand (*e.g.*, von Soden), have regarded them as indicating that *Hebrews* is the earlier writing. But it would be in the highest degree precarious to draw any inference from such data with respect to the chronological relation of the one Epistle to the other.

Of more interest is the connection between our Epistle and 1 *Peter*. The points of affinity between these two writings have been exaggerated, it is true, and conclusions have been drawn from them with a confidence which they do not warrant. They undoubtedly deserve attention, however, both for their number and for their significance. At the same time the lists prepared by Holtzmann and others require to be carefully sifted and considerably reduced. Among the more relevant coincidences are the following: the place given to *hope*; the connection of the Christian hope with the resurrection of Christ and with the κληρονομία (Eph. i. 18-20; 1 Pet. i. 3-5); the prominence of the idea of the Divine power (δύναμις Θεοῦ, Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 5); the mention of the *access* or *introduction* (τὴν προσαγωγὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Eph. ii. 18) to God which we have through Christ in the one, and the definition of the object of Christ's sufferings in the other (ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ Θεῷ, 1 Pet. iii. 18); the *mystery* hid πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in Eph. iii. 9, and the *fore-ordination* of Christ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου in 1 Pet. i. 20. Perhaps of yet greater significance are the parallels in idea and in expression with regard to the *ascension* of Christ (Eph. iv. 8-10; 1 Pet. iii. 22); the *session* of Christ at God's right hand in heaven (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. i. 20; ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, 1 Pet. iii. 22); the *subjection of all angelic powers* to Christ (Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 22).

There are other coincidences to which great importance has been attached, but which are of more doubtful relevancy. The most striking of these are the analogous statements about the *prophets*, the hiding of the meaning of their prophecies from themselves, and the extent of the revelation made to them (1 Pet. i. 10-12; Eph. iii. 5, 10). But it is not the same class of prophets that is in view in both. In 1 Peter it is the OT prophets; in Ephesians it appears to be the NT prophets. The resemblance between Eph. ii. 18-22 and 1 Pet. ii. 4-6 must be discounted to a considerable extent, because

both writers are quoting the familiar passage in Ps. cxviii. 22, or have its terms in mind. Nor does the coincidence between the opening doxologies (1 Pet. i. 3; Eph. i. 3—in both εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) carry us very far. On the other hand there are some marked resemblances in syntax and construction, especially in the paragraphs immediately following these doxologies.

On these *data* very contradictory conclusions have been suspended. Some have inferred that the author of *Ephesians* was a debtor to 1 *Peter* (Hilgenfeld, Weiss). Others have taken the author of 1 *Peter* to be a borrower from *Ephesians*. The theory has also been broached that both Epistles proceed from one hand, possibly that of the writer of Acts and the Third Gospel. Others have explained the case by supposing that Peter may have heard Paul in Rome, or that there may have been converse between the two Apostles in Rome which is reflected in these parallels. So different are the aspects in which these things present themselves to different minds. One thing at least it is very difficult to imagine. That is, that a writer of the genius and power which the Epistle to the Ephesians discloses could have been a borrower even from the author of 1 Peter.

The question of greatest interest, however, is that touching the relation between the Epistle to the *Ephesians* and the Epistle to the *Colossians*. Here the resemblances and the differences are equally striking and unmistakable. The general likeness in the *structure* of the two writings arrests attention at once—in the division of the matter between the doctrinal and the practical, in the form of the paragraphs, and in much of the diction. It is calculated, indeed, that in some seventy-eight out of 155 verses we have much the same phraseology. Lists have been compiled by De Wette and others including the following passages: Eph. i. 4; Col. i. 22: Eph. i. 6, 7; Col. i. 13, 14: Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20: Eph. i. 15-17; Col. i. 3, 4: Eph. i. 18; Col. i. 27: Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16: Eph. i. 22 f.; Col. i. 18 f.: Eph. ii. 1, 12; Col. i. 21: Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13: Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14: Eph. ii. 16; Col. ii. 20: Eph. iii. 1; Col. i. 24: Eph. iii. 2; Col. i. 25: Eph. iii. 3; Col. i. 26: Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, 25: Eph. iii. 8 f.; Col. i. 27: Eph. iv. 1; Col. i. 10: Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. iv. 3 f.; Col. iii. 14 f.: Eph. iv. 15 f.; Col. ii. 19: Eph. iv. 19; Col. iii. 1, 5: Eph. iv. 22 f.; Col. iii. 8 ff.: Eph. iv. 25 f.; Col. iii. 8 f.: Eph. iv. 29; Col. iii. 8., iv. 6: Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 12 f.: Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 4; Col. iii. 8: Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5: Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6: Eph. v. 15; Col. iv. 5: Eph. v. 19 f.; Col. iii. 16 f.: Eph. v. 21; Col. iii. 18: Eph. v. 25; Col. iii. 19: Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20: Eph. vi. 4; Col. iii. 21: Eph. vi. 5 ff.; Col.

iii. 22 ff.: Eph. vi. 9; Col. vi. 1: Eph. vi. 18 ff.; Col. iv. 2 ff.: Eph. vi. 21 f.; Col. iv. 7 f.

These parallels are by no means all of the same value. Yet with all necessary deductions they are remarkable both in number and in quality. Taken along with the large resemblance in matter, which extends in some parts over considerable sections, they exhibit a relationship close enough to warrant us to speak of the two as sister Epistles.

It does not follow from this, however, that the one is dependent on the other. There are, indeed, important differences between the two kindred writings which make it difficult to regard the one as made up out of the other. The style is different, that of *Ephesians* being round, full, and rhythmical, where that of *Colossians* is more pointed, logical and concise. The question of the *Church* has no such place in the latter as in the former. The Epistle to the Ephesians has much more of an OT colouring than that to the Colossians. In the latter we have only one OT quotation or allusion. In the former we have eight or nine, *viz.:* Gen. ii. 24 (Eph. v. 31); Exod. xx. 12 (Eph. vi. 2); Ps. iv. 4 (Eph. iv. 26); Ps. viii. 6 (Eph. i. 22); Ps. lxviii. 18 (Eph. iv. 8); Ps. cxviii. 22 (Eph. ii. 20); Song of Songs iv. 7 (Eph. v. 27, perhaps); Isa. lvii. 9 (Eph. ii. 17); Isa. lx. 1 (Eph. v. 14). There are phrases which are distinctive of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but which do not reappear in that to the Colossians, *e.g.*, τὰ ἐπουράνια. And besides all this there are whole paragraphs in *Ephesians* which have nothing like them in *Colossians*—those dealing with the union of Jew and Gentile in the one Church of God as the subject of the Divine predestination (Eph. i. 3-14); the unity of the faith and of the Church (iv. 5-16); the contrast between the light and the darkness with their corresponding results (v. 8-14); the mystery of the marriage-union as a reflection of the union between Christ and the Church (v. 22-33); the description of the panoply of God (vi. 10-17). And in like manner there are whole sections in *Colossians*, such as the polemical passage in chap. ii. and the salutations in chap. v., which have no place in *Ephesians*.

The question raised by the co-existence of these likenesses and differences has been very variously answered. Some have inferred that *Colossians* must have been the original writing, and that *Ephesians* resembles it at so many points because it has been borrowed largely from it. Others have regarded *Ephesians* as the earlier and more original composition. The scholar who has gone most laboriously into the details of this question, *viz.*, H. J. Holtzmann, came to the conclusion that the priority could not be given wholly to

either Epistle, but that there were sections of *Ephesians* (*e.g.*, i. 4, *cf.* Col. i. 22; i. 6, 7, *cf.* Col. i. 13, 14; iii. 3, 5, 9, *cf.* Col. i. 26, ii. 2) which pointed to the priority of that Epistle, while there were a considerable number that pointed in the opposite direction. He took refuge, therefore, in the complicated theory that *Colossians* as we have it is not the Epistle as it originally was; that there was a briefer Pauline Epistle to the Colossian Church on which the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians based his work; that the Colossian Epistle was afterwards enlarged by this author; and that the hand that did all this was not Paul's own, but perhaps that of the writer who added the closing doxology to the Epistle to the Romans.

This is a far-fetched explanation, and one beset by many difficulties. The terms supposed to have been taken from the Epistle to the Colossians come in quite simply and naturally in the sister Epistle, but by no means in the same context or connection. The most distinctive sections of the Colossian Epistle, those dealing with the strange, speculative views of Christ's person and relations, have no place in the Ephesian Epistle, and it is surely a surprising circumstance that a borrower such as the compiler of *Ephesians* is supposed to be should have so carefully avoided these things and should have appropriated only the least characteristic parts of the writing which he chose for the basis of his own communication. It is still more surprising that a writer capable of producing the Ephesian Epistle should have thought of using another composition in this dependent manner. In point of fact there is nothing in the Epistle to the Ephesians, whether of likeness or of unlikeness, that may not be accounted for in a far simpler and more natural way. A writer addressing himself in two different communications, prepared much about the same time, to Churches in the same part of the world, not widely separated from each other, with much in common, but with something of difference also in their circumstances, their dangers and their needs, naturally falls into a style and a tenor of address which will be to a considerable extent the same in both writings and yet have differences rising naturally out of the different positions.

5. Authorship of the Epistle. The historical evidence in favour of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle is very strong. We have the best reason for saying that by the end of the second century it was generally regarded as the work of Paul. There is evidence also that it was in circulation by the close of the first century or the beginning of the second. The place which it had then, and the use which was made of it, also indicate that it was recognised as more than an ordinary writing—that it was accepted indeed for what

it professed to be. In short, in oldest antiquity there is nothing to show that the claim which it bore upon its face was questioned, or that it was assigned to any other writer than Paul.

It is possible that within the NT writings themselves we have an important indication of the authorship. In Col. iv. 16 mention is made of an Epistle "from Laodicea". If *Colossians* is accepted as what it professes to be, and that Epistle "from Laodicea" can be identified, as many hold it can, with our Epistle to the Ephesians, we have a very direct witness to the Pauline authorship. But apart from that there are things of great interest in relation to the question of authorship in very early Christian literature. Even in Clement of Rome there are forms of expression which look like echoes of ideas and terms characteristic of this Epistle. Thus the phrase ἠνεῴχθησαν ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας in chap. 36 recalls Eph. i. 18. The statement in Eph. i. 4 of our election of God in Christ (καθὼς ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ, etc.) may perhaps be reflected in what is said of Christ Himself and us in chap. 64—ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ εἰς λαὸν περιούσιον. The paragraph on unity, too, in Eph. iv. 4-6 may be reflected in chap. 46—ἢ οὐχὶ ἕνα Θεὸν ἔχομεν καὶ ἕνα Χριστόν; καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος τὸ ἐκχυθὲν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ μία κλῆσις ἐν Χριστῷ. The most that can be said, however, of these analogies is that they are suggestive. Still less can be made of the witness of the *Didaché* or of certain passages in the Epistle of Barnabas (vi. 15, xix. 7). In the first of these two writings we have these two statements which have a general, but only a general, resemblance to Eph. vi. 5, 9, *viz.*, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ (*Did.*, iv., 11), and οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις δούλῳ σου ἢ παιδίσκῃ τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν ἐλπίζουσιν, ἐν πικρίᾳ σου. But this is all.

It is different with the testimony of Ignatius. It is claimed indeed by some excellent scholars that in one interesting passage Ignatius speaks definitely and unmistakably of Paul as the writer of an Epistle to the Ephesians. That is the statement in *Ep. ad Eph.*, c. 12, Παύλου συμμύσται (ἐστε) τοῦ ἡγιασμένου . . . ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The difficulty attaching to the interpretation of the second clause is seen perhaps in certain ancient variations of reading—in the substitution of μνημονεύω in the Armenian Version, and in the amplification ὃς πάντοτε ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν αὐτοῦ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν which it receives in the longer form of Ignatius. In order to make it carry the inference drawn from it the rendering "in all the Epistle" or "in every part of the Epistle to you" must be given it. But, not to speak of the inept

meaning that would thus be the result, it is very doubtful whether that rendering can be accepted as grammatically justifiable. None of the few instances which are adduced in support of the contention that πᾶς without the article can mean "the whole" can be said to be free of doubt. Some, *e.g.*, πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα (Matt. ii. 3), πᾶς Ἰσραήλ (Rom. xi. 26), are not pertinent, inasmuch as the nouns are proper names. Others are almost equally doubtful for other reasons, *e.g.*, ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς (Acts xvii. 26), where the phrase πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς has much the force of a proper name, there being only one such thing. The same in effect is the case with πᾶν σῶμα in a passage of Aristotle which has been very confidently appealed to, *viz.*, δεῖ τὸν πολιτικὸν εἰδέναι πῶς τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς· ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμοὺς θεραπεύοντα, καὶ πᾶν σῶμα (*Eth. Nic.*, i., 13, 7). For σῶμα is used there not in the sense of any particular body, but in that of *body* as distinguished from *soul*. If the sentence must be translated in accordance with the stated force of πᾶς in conjunction with an anarthrous noun, *viz.*, as = "in every letter," it cannot safely be concluded that Ignatius had in his mind a particular Epistle of St. Paul's known to be addressed to the Ephesians. It would be strange, indeed, as Professor Abbott remarks (*ut sup.*, p. xi), that if Ignatius wished to remind the Ephesians of Paul's regard for them he should "only refer to the mention of them in other Epistles, and not at all to that which had been specially addressed to them". But allowing this contested passage to stand aside, we find Ignatius elsewhere using words or phrases which appear to indicate an acquaintance with characteristic expressions in our Epistle, such as πλήρωμα, προορίζεσθαι, ἐκλέγειν, θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός, λίθοι ναοῦ πατρός, ἡτοιμασμένοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ πατρός (chap. ix.; *cf.* Eph. ii. 20-22), μιμηταὶ ὄντες τοῦ Θεοῦ (chap. i.; *cf.* Eph. v. 1).

The witness of Polycarp, Hermas and Hippolytus is also of some significance. In Polycarp we have two passages which have all the appearance of quotations from our Epistle or reminiscences of its terms, *viz.*: χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων (*Ep. ad Philipp.*, chap. i.; *cf.* Eph. ii. 5, 8, 9); and (in the Latin form, the Greek not being extant) "ut his scripturis dictum est, *irascimini et nolite peccare* et *sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*" (chap. xii.; *cf.* Eph. iv. 26). In Hermas, not to mention other sentences which are less definite, we have these—μηδὲ λύπην ἐπάγειν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ σεμνῷ καὶ ἀληθεῖ (*Mand.*; *cf.* Eph. iii. 30); and ἔσονται εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα καὶ ἓν σῶμα (*Sim.*, ix., 13; *cf.* Eph. iv. 4, 5). From Hippolytus we gather that Eph. iii. 4-18 was quoted as γραφή by the Valentinians (*Philos.*, vi., 34).

The judgments of scholars have differed and no doubt will continue to differ as to the relevancy and the value of these testimonies.

But with Irenæus at least and the Muratorian Canon we reach sure and indisputable ground. Irenæus refers to Paul by name as the author of our Epistle and quotes it as his. He cites Eph. v. 13 as words of Paul (*Adv. Hær.*, i., 8, 5); and he expresses himself thus—καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ (*Adv. Hær.*, v., 2, 3; *cf.* Eph. v. 30). The Muratorian Canon mentions the Ephesians as one of the Churches to which Paul wrote Epistles. The testimony of Clement of Alexandria is like that of Irenæus. Thus, after citing 2 Cor. xi. 2 as an injunction of the Apostle's (ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐπιστέλλων πρὸς Κορινθίους φησίν), he introduces Eph. iv. 13-15 in these terms—σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων . . . λέγων· μεχρὶ καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως, κ.τ.λ. (*Paed.*, i., 18). In the same way he quotes 1 Cor. xi. 3 and Gal. v. 16 ff. as words of Paul (φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος), and proceeds thus—διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει· ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, etc., as in Eph. v. 21-25 (*Strom.*, iv., 65). The testimony of Marcion is to the same effect, although he gave the Epistle the title "ad Laodicenos" (Tert., *Adv. Marc.*, v., 17); while Tertullian, his opponent, mentions Ephesus among the Churches that had original, apostolic Epistles, and corrects Marcion only on the matter of the destination—Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos (*Adv. Marc.*, v., 17). And from the latter part of the second century the stream of testimony to the fact that the Epistle was recognised as Paul's flows steadily on.

Notwithstanding the strength of the external testimony, however, there have been not a few in modern times, from Schleiermacher and Usteri on to the present day, who have doubted or denied the Pauline authorship. Among these De Wette, Baur and Holtzmann occupy a conspicuous place. It is to be observed, however, that some who have most strenuously questioned the genuineness of the Epistle still admit it to be of very early date—as early as A.D. 75 or 80. De Wette, *e.g.*, allows it to be a product of the Apostolic age, the work indeed of some highly gifted scholar of the Apostle's, and Ewald's position is something similar. Others take up an indeterminate position. The conclusion of Jülicher, *e.g.*, is that the Pauline authorship can neither be certainly accepted nor absolutely denied.

The arguments leading up to the doubt or denial of the genuineness of the Epistle are based upon internal considerations—style, language, peculiar usages, the nature of the ideas, etc. Thus De Wette regards the composition as unlike Paul's way of writing—in its

want of connection and its many parentheses, in much of its phraseology, and in the poverty of its contents. To him it is a composition copious in words but poor in ideas, lacking originality, so dependent indeed on the Epistle to the Colossians as to look like a "verbose amplification" of it, the work not of Paul himself but of an imitator. But the similarities between *Ephesians* and *Colossians*, as we have seen, admit of a simple explanation, and it is a surprising judgment, one that few certainly will accept, which De Wette pronounces on our Epistle when he speaks of it as having no distinctive character, as a dependent production, and non-Pauline in style. We should rather say with Meyer that it is so like Paul in tone, tenor and much else as to make it hard indeed to imagine that it can be the work of a mere imitator; all the more so if it is, as De Wette thinks it, without any special object.

Baur, Schwegler, and other adherents of the Tübingen School dilate chiefly on its doctrinal character as inconsistent with the Pauline authorship. They find it full of Gnostic and Montanist thought and terminology. They lay stress on the use of such terms as πλήρωμα, on the peculiarities of the Christology, etc., and judge it to be the product of the second century, when Gnostic speculations had taken shape and had become familiar. But this view of the Epistle is no longer asserted with the former confidence or in the pronounced form in which it was elaborated by Baur himself. It is acknowledged more generally now that the *phenomena* in the Epistle on which the old Tübingen School fastened may be accounted for by the operation of ideas which were in affinity with those known as Gnostic, but which came short of the developed Gnosticism of the middle of the second century; and further that the passages most insisted on by Baur, when fairly interpreted, are quite consistent with the form of doctrine found in the primary Pauline Epistles.

The objections most generally urged against the Pauline authorship take the following forms. In the first place the *vocabulary* of the Epistle, it is said, presents great difficulty. The ἅπαξ λεγόμενα are thought to be so numerous and of such a kind as to raise a very serious question. But when the list is examined the case is considerably modified. The whole number of words which are found in this Epistle and nowhere else in the NT is forty-two. The number of words found in this Epistle and occasionally elsewhere in the canonical books, but in none of the other writings generally recognised as Pauline by the critics in question, is thirty-nine, according to the reckoning of Holtzmann. But the Epistle to the Colossians and the three Pastoral Epistles are left out of account in this computa-

tion, and at the most the number of these ἅπαξ λεγόμενα is not proportionately greater than in some of the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. In *Galatians*, *e.g.*, there are thirty-three words used only there and nowhere else in the NT; in *Philippians* there are forty-one; in 2 *Corinthians* there are ninety-five; while in *Romans* there are no less than one hundred and in 1 *Corinthians* one hundred and eighty. Further, some of these terms, *e.g.*, those belonging to the description of the panoply of God in chap. vi., are obviously the products of the figure or the occasion. Some, again, are but single occurrences, and in the case of several there are related forms found in others of the Epistles. For example, καταρτίζω, κατάρτισις, ὁσίως, προσκαρτερεῖν appear elsewhere, though καταρτισμός, ὁσιότης, προσκαρτέρησις happen to be used only in *Ephesians*.

In the second place it is objected that there are certain Pauline words which get a new sense in this Epistle. Instances of this are alleged to be found in such terms as μυστήριον, οἰκονομία, περιποίησις. But with respect to the first of these the only passage in which it can be said to have anything like a novel application is v. 32. In the other four occurrences it is used in reality very much as it is used elsewhere by Paul. The term οἰκονομία, again, as it is handled in this Epistle, has the same general sense of *stewardship* as it has in 1 Cor. ix. 17, though with a different application. And if περιποίησις, which has the abstract sense in 1 Thess. v. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 14, has to be understood as concrete here in chap. i. 14, that is a variation which appears in the use of other terms in the Pauline writings and elsewhere.

In the third place it is objected that in this Epistle certain ideas are expressed by terms which differ from those employed by Paul elsewhere for the same purpose. To this class are sometimes reckoned such words and phrases as ἀγαπᾶν τὸν Κύριον, ἀγαπᾶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, δίδοναί τινα τί, ἀγαθὸς πρός τι, δέσμιος, ἴστε γινώσκοντες, εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου, σωτήριον, αἱ διάνοιαι, τὰ θελήματα, πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός. Little need be said of peculiarities of this kind. Some of them have their explanation in the nature of the subject or in simple variety in style and expression. Others have affinities elsewhere in the Pauline writings. How varied, *e.g.*, is Paul's way of speaking of *understanding*, *spirit*, etc. Is a writer like St. Paul to be shut up to the same stereotyped forms of expression in one writing after another? Is he to be debarred from using the word ἀγαπᾶν with reference to Christ or to the Church in this Epistle, merely because in other Epistles he uses it with regard to God? And is it impossible for him to

address his hearers as τέκνα ἀγαπητά when the imitation of God is in view, because elsewhere he may use that designation with regard to their relations to himself?

Some of the instances most commonly cited, however, deserve more attention. There is, *e.g.*, the use of φωτίζειν in iii. 9, in application to the Apostle's commission to enlighten or instruct. This, it is urged, is an application of the word not found elsewhere in the Pauline writings. But that might be the case and yet its use here might have its justification. The reading is not certain. The question is whether πάντας should be inserted or not. If it is omitted, then the aspect of the question is changed. If it is inserted, there are analogies to this use of φωτίζειν in the LXX (Jud. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xii. 2, xvii. 27, 28), and Paul may have followed these. There is again the designation of God as ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (i. 17). This indeed is a rare designation, and for that very reason one most unlikely to have been used by a forger or a mere imitator. But it is a designation perfectly consistent with the highest view of Christ's Person, and one which has its justification in Christ's own words, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel (John xx. 17). The phrase τὰ ἐπουράνια, which is used five times in this Epistle and, as it seems, with the local sense, is confined, it is true, to this one writing among all those attributed to Paul. But the adjective, ἐπουράνιος, in the sense of *heavenly*, is used also in 1 Cor. xv. 40, 48, 49; Phil. ii. 10. It is difficult to see why Paul should not be thought at liberty to use or even to coin such a phrase, or why he might not select the term τὰ πνευματικά instead of τὰ πνεύματα in the large and special sense which it has in this Epistle. Why, too, should it be thought that a word like κοσμοκράτωρ, or a phrase like ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, so appropriate to the ideas in hand, must be alien to Paul? So is it also with the word διάβολος which meets us in this Epistle, while in others, it is said, Paul speaks only of Σατανᾶς. But διάβολος is also used in 1 and 2 Tim. The two words indeed are practically the same in sense. They are employed interchangeably by other NT writers, *e.g.*, the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Acts. Why should a writer of the power and the versatility of Paul be tied down to the use of one of these words in all his writings, later as well as earlier? There remains the phrase of which perhaps most has been made, τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις καὶ προφήταις. This, it is said, smacks of the later period when men's thoughts of the Apostles and the prophets of the NT Church had changed. Its use here has been felt to be such a difficulty by some that they have tried to dispose of it as a gloss or as a case of dislocation in the text. But

there is nothing so very strange in this application of the term ἅγιος if we give the word the broad sense which is its proper sense, and which it has indeed in the very same context in the phrase ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων (iii. 8).

In the fourth place serious objection is taken to the Pauline authorship on the ground of what is held to be the un-Pauline type of thought which appears again and again in the Epistle. It is said, *e.g.*, that the question of the *inclusion of Jew and Gentile in one Church* is presented in a different light from that in which it is seen in other Pauline Epistles. Only here, it is said, is it put before us as the great object or, at least, a primary object of Christ's work and of the Divine predestination (ii. 13-18, 19-22, iii. 5, etc., iv. 7-16); and what is more, it is introduced simply as a matter of revelation and not as a thing over which there had been sharp controversy. It is certainly a remarkable place that is given in this Epistle to the thought of the unity of the Church and the perfect equality of Jew and Gentile within it. But there is no contradiction between this way of looking at the inclusion of the Gentiles and that which prevails in the other Epistles. The statement is in harmony with the general disposition of the Epistle, which is to carry all things back to the eternal will and purpose of God. The controversy, moreover, was ended, and Paul had no occasion to revive the memory of it in the message needed by those whom he addresses here.

The view, again, which is given of the *Law* in this Epistle is thought to be singular. The Law is not exhibited, it is said, as having any real moral value or religious use, but as having simply a typical significance and as the cause of enmity and separation between Jew and Gentile. And *Circumcision* itself, it is added, is presented as a merely formal thing, and contemptuous words are spoken of it (ἡ λεγομένη περιτομή, ii. 11) which would come strangely from Paul, himself a circumcised Jew and one who elsewhere attaches religious value to circumcision and says good things of it. But where he had for his special subject the oneness of Jew and Gentile as effected by Christ and as seen in the Church, it was matter of course that he should speak particularly of the dividing effect of the Law as it was witnessed in the pre-Christian times. And he does not speak elsewhere of the Law only in one way. He has very different things to say of it according to circumstances; and he presents it in aspects which seem even contradictory, speaking of it, as he does, now as holy (Rom. vii. 9) and again as incompetent (Rom. viii. 3); now as a παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. iii. 25) and again as carrying a curse (κατάρα) and condemnation with it (Gal.

iii. 10). And the same is true of the ways in which *circumcision* is regarded in the Pauline Epistles: *cf.* Rom. ii. 26-29, iii. 1; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15; Phil. iii. 5; Col. ii. 11, 13, etc.

A very different position, too, is thought to be given to the *Death* of Christ in this Epistle from what it has in the acknowledged Pauline writings. In Epistles like those to the Romans, the Galatians and the Corinthians its *expiatory* and *propitiatory* value is the theme on which Paul dwells with most emphasis. But here this is passed over in silence, and comparatively little is made of the Death of Christ even in other aspects. It is rather His exaltation with all that it involves that is dwelt on. But the difference, so far as it exists, is due to the occasion and to the state of those addressed. It is true that it is as the means by which the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile is effected that the *Cross* is specially mentioned (ii. 16), and it is with reference to the *imitation* of God that Christ's giving of Himself is described as an *offering* and a *sacrifice to God*. But there is nothing in this to make it impossible to suppose that the same author, writing with an eye on other conditions, might speak of the Cross and the Death of Christ in connection with the reconciliation of the world or of the individual. Moreover, we have here the *blood of Christ*, *redemption through His blood*, and the *forgiveness of sins* as related to His blood—all which are distinctly Pauline, if they are also Johannine, terms and ideas (i. 7, ii. 13).

Further, this Epistle is alleged to depart widely from the recognised Pauline Epistles in its *Christology*, its doctrine of Christ's *Headship*, and its view of the *Parousia*. With regard to the first of these particulars this Epistle is more in affinity with that to the Colossians than with any other, in so far as it exhibits Christ in His largest relations to creation, and presents Him as designed in the eternal purpose of God to be the bond of union or reunion for a world existing at present in a condition of dislocation and division. But there are at least the rudiments and foretokens of this doctrine of Christ's cosmical relations elsewhere. There is, *e.g.*, the statement of the "one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things," in 1 Cor. viii. 6; and there is the larger analogy in the great paragraph on the Evangel of Creation in Rom. viii. 19-20. It may be, again, that in other Pauline passages the *body* is said to be as *Christ* (1 Cor. xii. 12) or be *in Christ* (Rom. xii. 4, 5), and the *head* is reckoned simply among the members (1 Cor. xii. 21); whereas here, as in *Colossians*, believers are the *members*, Christ is the *Head*, and the Church is the *body*. But the different applications of these figures have their sufficient explana-

tion in the different subjects. In the present case the subject is the relation between Christ and the Church; in the others it is the relation between the members of the Church themselves. And as regards the *Parousia*, the assertion is that, instead of looking, as Paul does elsewhere, to that great event as the near and certain conclusion of the world's end and the consummation of the Kingdom of God, the writer of this Epistle views the future as made up of a series of ages following one upon the other. But this overlooks the consideration that the αἰῶνες ἐπερχόμενοι may be those that are to make up the Eternity which opens after the Second Coming. The fact remains, however, that the *Parousia* does not occupy the place which it has in such Epistles as those to the Thessalonians, and that there is nothing to show that it fills the writer's vision here as it does there. But this Epistle is separated by years from those earliest writings attributed to Paul. Much had taken place in the interval; the Return of Christ had not been witnessed, but the Kingdom of God had been seen establishing itself far and wide by the preaching of the Gospel. Even in the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians it is recognised that the *Parousia* cannot enter until certain things have happened; and in the further experience of God's ways as regards the times and the seasons, the Second Coming, though the expectation of it was not lost, came to be regarded as a less immediately impending event.

Finally, it is affirmed that this Epistle differs essentially from the acknowledged Pauline writings in its view of the *Church*, and that in more than one respect. It is singular, it is said, in speaking of the Church as *one*, and it gives a view of the Church which could not have emerged till a considerably later date than that to which *Ephesians* must be assigned if it is by Paul. To this it is enough to reply *first* that there is nothing in the Epistle to point to a highly developed condition of the Church. The *organisation* of the Church is not one of the subjects dealt with. The *gifts* bestowed upon the Church are brought into view, and are shown to be of various kinds. But they are not such as infer a comparatively late period. There is no mention of rule by bishops and deacons, nor does the *external* unity of the Church form a feature of this Epistle. The view which is given of the Church as *one* is indeed the highest found in the Pauline writings. But it is not wholly new. It has its foundations at least in earlier Pauline writings, as, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xii. 28 (ἔθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, etc.); xv. 9 (διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ); Gal. i. 13 (ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ); Phil. iii. 6 (διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν); *cf.* in the Book of Acts (the composition of a Pauline

writer), τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ [Κυρίου] ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, xx. 28. In the sister Epistle, too, the term ἐκκλησία is used both of the local Church and of the universal (i. 18, 24, iv. 15, 16). But, apart from that, the unity is a *spiritual* unity, a oneness which consists in the union of individuals, the ἅγιοι, in faith—not the unity of a corporation or an organisation. There is nothing in this important section of the teaching of the Epistle to make it necessary to suppose that it was written at a time when the multitude of separate local Churches were driven by the needs of defence to form themselves into one large, strong organisation.

In none of these particulars in which this Epistle is asserted to stand apart is there any essential difference between it and the acknowledged Pauline Epistles. There are differences, but they are differences which admit in each case of a natural explanation, and which in no case amount to anything that is incompatible with the recognised Pauline doctrine. On the other hand, as scholars like Jülicher frankly admit, we find in this Epistle many distinctive Pauline ideas, turns of expression, and qualities of style—the use of characteristic terms not found elsewhere in the NT, of particles like διό, ἄρα οὖν, etc.; of ideas like that of the Divine *riches*, etc., as well as the broad lines of Pauline doctrine. Allowing all reasonable weight to the internal considerations, of which so much is made, they come far short of balancing the strong and consistent argument provided by the historical testimony to the Pauline authorship.

6. The Destination of the Epistle. The traditional view is that the Epistle was addressed to the Ephesian Church—to that Church definitely and by itself. This view has still the support of some important authorities. In modern times, however, it has come to be largely held that the Epistle is an Encyclical letter, meant not for the Ephesian Church specifically, but for a number of Churches, or rather for the Christian people found in the Roman Province of Asia, or more particularly in the Phrygian territory. The question is—Which of these two views of the destination of the Epistle best satisfies the data at our disposal, internal and external?

At first the case for the traditional view seems to be far stronger than the other, especially on the side of the historical testimony. Here much depends on how the reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the inscription is regarded. The textual question is not by any means the only element in the case. But it is an important element, and the facts which come into view are of great interest. They are also plain and indisputable. First there is the fact that all manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, with the exception of three, have the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the

opening verse. There is the second fact that all manuscripts, so far as known to us, without any exception have had this express note of destination in the inscription at one time or other. There is the third fact that the description of the intended readers as the saints *in Ephesus* is found in all the ancient Versions. And in addition to this we have the fact that everywhere the *title* of the Epistle bears that it is addressed to the Ephesians. These things make their impression. They are taken by so high an authority as Meyer to mean that the entire ancient Church (Marcion being discounted), from the Muratorian Canon (somewhere about A.D. 180), Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, held the Epistle to be addressed to the Ephesians.

The argument from historical testimony in favour of the retention of "in Ephesus" in the inscription is also supported by such considerations as these—that in the Epistles generally acknowledged to be by Paul the readers in view are definitely designated, even when the Apostle is not writing to the Christians of a single Church or city (Gal. i. 2; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1); that if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted, the letter becomes a circular letter "without any limitation whatever of locality or nationality," as Meyer puts it, and that this does not fit in either with the declared mission of Tychicus (vi. 21), or with what is said in such passages as i. 15, ii. 11, iii. 1, iv. 17, etc. It is further urged that in every other case in which Paul makes use of the phrase τοῖς οὖσιν in an inscription, he attaches to it the name of the city or territory to which the readers belong (as in Rom., Cor., Phil.), and that without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ the τοῖς οὖσιν does not admit of a sense that is adequate or even natural. It may be added that some think there is an allusion to the world-famed temple of Diana at Ephesus in chap. ii. It is also strongly argued that it is incredible that no letter should have been addressed by Paul to a Church like this with which he had so many intimate connections, and which was of such importance in the fulfilment of his mission. The case as thus stated seems well-nigh concluded.

But there is another side to it. The arguments last mentioned are obviously of the most precarious kind. There are other Churches with which Paul had very close connections, but which have no letter specifically addressed to them among all the Pauline writings that have come down to us. If there is an allusion to any particular temple in chap. ii. it might be that of Jerusalem rather than that of Ephesus. The phrase τοῖς οὖσιν may be construed satisfactorily, as we shall see (*cf.* Notes on i. 1), even if ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is omitted. The letter may be a circular letter of another kind than that supposed by Meyer to be indicated by the contents. And there may be a

sufficient reason for Paul's departure in this case from his usual habit of designating by their locality the readers he addresses.

But it is of more importance to see how different an aspect the textual question assumes when it is more closely examined. For the weighty fact presents itself that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ are not found in our two oldest and best manuscripts, ℵB. They have also been struck out of cursive 67 by a second hand which may have some affinity with B. This is a fact of essential importance in view of what these two great uncials have been proved to be in respect of value as well as age. It is reinforced by transcriptional probability, it being far less likely that a local designation so much in Paul's way, if it belonged to the original text, should have been dropped out or deleted by a succession of scribes than that, not forming part of the original inscription, it should have been inserted by later hands. Nor can the witness of the ancient Versions outweigh this textual evidence. For, important as that witness is, it is the witness of documents, the extant manuscripts of which are not equal in antiquity to the Greek uncials.

But the textual case does not end here. It is supported by Patristic testimony of great significance. From Tertullian we learn that Marcion and his followers spoke of the Epistle as addressed to the *Laodicenes*. The relevant passages are these two: (1) Praetereo hic et de alia epistola, quam nos ad Ephesios praescriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos (*Adv. Marc.*, v., 11); and (2) Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos, sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator; nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit, dum ad quosdam (*ib.* 17). In face of this statement it is difficult indeed to suppose that Marcion could have had the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in his text.

Then it appears from what is reported of Origen's commentary that he, too, had not the words in his text. The passage runs thus: Ὠριγένης δέ φησι, ἐπὶ μόνων Ἐφεσίων εὕρομεν κείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι," καὶ ζητοῦμεν εἰ μὴ παρέλκει προσκείμενον τὸ "τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι" τί δύναται σημαίνειν· ὅρα οὖν εἰ μὴ ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Ἐξόδῳ ὄνομά φησιν ἑαυτοῦ ὁ χρηματίζων Μωσεῖ τὸ ὤν, οὕτως οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ ὄντος, γίνονται ὄντες, καλούμενοι οἱονεὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι εἰς τὸ εἶναι, "ἐξελέξατο γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα" φησὶν ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλος, "ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ," etc. (Cramer, *Catena*). Here Origen states distinctly that the phrase was without ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, and that this was peculiar to the case of *Ephesians*; and he proposes a particular way of getting a suitable meaning out of the phrase, giving it a metaphysical sense.

Further, as regards Tertullian, from the passages already quoted, it may be inferred with much probability that he, as well as Marcion, did not have ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in his text. For it is of the *title* that he speaks, and what he charges Marcion with falsifying is not the text itself but the title. If he had had the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the *text* he would surely have appealed to that in refuting Marcion. But instead of that he appeals to the *veritas ecclesiae*.

Then we have a statement of great importance made by Basil. It is as follows: τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων, ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπών· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν (*Adv. Eunom.*, ii., 19). Here Basil is obviously referring to the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ; not, as some painfully endeavour to make out, to the τοῖς or to the οὖσι. In doing so he gives us to understand that the local designation was absent, and his statement is the more important because he speaks not only of the ancient copies themselves, but also of the tradition of the men who were before him, and describes the clause as being in both cases simply τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

There are other witnesses that are considered to speak to the same effect. But they are less certain and at the best only of subordinate importance. There is a statement by Jerome to the following effect: Quidam curiosius quam necesse est putant ex eo quod Moysi dictum sit "Haec dices filiis Israel: qui est misit me," etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos. . . . Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos *qui sint*, sed ad eos qui Ephesi sancti et fideles sint, scriptum arbitrantur (On Eph. i. 1; vol. vii., p. 545). In this Jerome seems to refer to Origen and his interpretation of τοῖς οὖσι, and to the peculiar reading. But it is at least *possible*, as Meyer takes it, that the words *eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles* may represent τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ πιστοῖς; or it may be, as others, *e.g.*, Alford, think, that Jerome is dealing only with two possible interpretations of τοῖς οὖσιν, without saying anything to imply that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were absent from the inscription.

There is, however, something to notice in the case of certain Latin commentators. In some of these the inscription is dealt with in a way that suggests either that they had not the word *Ephesi* in the copies they followed, or that it occupied a different place. Thus Ambrosiater passes over the word *Ephesi* in his comment—non solum fidelibus scribit, sed et sanctis: ut tunc vere fideles sint, si fuerint sancti in Christo Jesu. Victorinus Afer's statement points to a different arrangement of the words—sed haec

cum dicit "Sanctis qui sunt fidelibus Ephesi" quid adjungitur? "In Christo Jesu" (Mai, *Script. Vet. nova Collect.*, iii., p. 87). At a much later period Sedulius Scotus also comments on the passage thus: Sanctis. Non omnibus Ephesiis, sed his qui credunt in Christo. Et fidelibus. Omnes sancti fideles sunt, non omnes fideles sancti, etc. Qui sunt in Christo Jesu. Plures fideles sunt sed non in Christo, etc. (*cf.* Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 384, 385, and Abbott, *ut supra*, pp. ii, iii). The strength of the case on the side of Textual Criticism, however, lies with ℵB and the testimonies of Marcion, Origen and Basil. It amounts to this, that there is no evidence that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ formed part of the Greek text of the first three centuries. It is not till we come to the latter half of the fourth century that we have any certain indication of the local designation being included in the inscription, and that indication is found in Basil's implied distinction between the *ancient* copies (τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων) and others.

But the question does not terminate there. The *character* of the Epistle itself and the relations between Paul and the Ephesian Church form weighty elements in the case. Everything goes to show how intimate these relations were, how peculiar was the place that this Church had in the Apostle's heart, how much it was his care. Not only was he the founder of the Church of Ephesus, but he spent some three years preaching and teaching in the city. During that long residence his interest in his Ephesian converts was so keen and anxious and his labours in their behalf so great that he describes himself as "ceasing not to warn every one day and night with tears" (Acts xx. 31). Various things that are mentioned or alluded to in his Epistles indicate how constantly he had them in his mind. And the farewell which he took of their elders at Miletus is among the most pathetic passages of the NT. On his side there were words of tender solicitude and loving warning; on theirs thankfulness, affection, an emotion so profound that they "fell on his neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more". It is difficult to suppose that Paul could have written a letter intended specifically for this Church without giving some indication of what it was to him personally, without some reference to what he had done for it and the grateful response which his labours had found in it, without letting his feeling towards its members express itself in some form.

Yet this Epistle is in all these respects a singularly neutral composition, without the personal note that makes itself felt in such Epistles as those to Corinth and Philippi, with nothing to say about

any individual but the bearer of the letter, with nothing to connect it with the particular locality, with little or nothing to recall Paul's stay in Ephesus or any of the many things that made his work among the Ephesians so memorable and the terms on which he and they stood to each other so close and affectionate. In the present case there is only the very general salutation which is given in the last two verses; and that is something less particular than the salutation with which the Epistle to the Philippians closes; while there are none of those personal touches throughout the Epistle to relieve the impersonal conclusion such as we find in these other letters. And in addition to the argument which founds on this neutral, impersonal quality of the Epistle, there are expressions here and there which perhaps suggest relations of a different kind from those which we know to have existed between Paul and the Ephesians. Not to speak of such passages as i. 15, there is the statement in iii. 4, which seems to some to mean that those addressed had yet to learn what Paul's "knowledge of the mystery in Christ" was; which could not be said of the Ephesians. There are also the two passages in which Paul uses the formula: "if indeed" (iii. 2, iv. 21, 22); of which it may be said that, although εἴγε does not necessarily express actual doubt, it is a particle more in place where the speaker's own experience or work is not in view, than where he addresses those who owe to him what they are and with whom his relations are direct and intimate.

The result, therefore, to which many have been led since Archbishop Ussher first threw out the suggestion is that this Epistle is a circular letter meant for a number of Churches in a particular part of the Asiatic province, of which Ephesus was one. This view is accepted in one way or other by such authorities as Bengel, Neander, Harless, Olshausen, Reuss, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Hort, Weiss, Woldemar Schmidt, Abbott, etc. This general conclusion, however, is put in more than one form. Some regard the sentence as complete in itself and as requiring nothing to be inserted after the τοῖς οὖσιν. Bengel, *e.g.*, looking to the κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν of Acts xiii. 1, and the αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ἐξουσίαι of Rom. xiii. 1, rendered it "*sanctis et fidelibus qui sunt* in omnibus iis locis, quo Tychicus cum hac Epistola venit". But the introduction of ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ in the former and the force of the οὖσιν in the latter make these imperfect parallels. Others give the words the sense of "the saints who are really such" or "the saints existing and faithful in Christ Jesus". But neither of these readings can be justified. The only interpretation of the clause that is quite consistent with grammar,

in making it a sentence complete within itself, is "the saints who are also faithful". Adopting this, some (*e.g.*, Abbott, following Reiche, Ewald, etc.) take the Epistle to be addressed not to any particular Church or Churches as such, but generally to all the Christian people in the Phrygian parts. This hypothesis, it is held, explains the absence of local particulars; avoids the necessity of supposing that a blank space had been left after the τοῖς οὖσιν; and enables us to understand the phrase "the epistle from Laodicea" in Col. iv. 16. Others, however, think the case is better met by supposing that a space was left in which the name of the particular church might be inserted to which the letter was addressed in the course of its circular journeyings; or, as Hort prefers to put it, that the blank in the original copy sent with Tychicus was filled in with the name of the Church of each place in which it was read.

The last is perhaps the most natural explanation. And on the whole question it may be said that it is much easier to understand how the local designation should have come to be inserted than to imagine how, if originally in the text, it should have come to be omitted, and that, too, at so early a date. The fact that the Ephesian Church was the Church of the chief city of the Asiatic Province and the most important Church in all these parts would account for the insertion of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, especially if, as is most probable, it was from Ephesus that copies were sent elsewhere. The fact that the Epistle was meant for a wider audience than that found in Ephesus itself would account for the circulation of such a letter as that referred to as "the epistle from Laodicea". On the other hand, the supposition that the Epistle was meant originally only for Ephesus, and that the ἐν Ἐφέσῳ came to be dropped either by accident or by design, is one hard to entertain. It is difficult to imagine how mere accident could account for the omission, and to say that the local designation was struck out of certain very ancient copies because it did not appear to be in harmony with the contents of the letter is to attribute to these very early times the operation of a criticism of which we have very little evidence.

7. Time and Place of Composition. The date has been put variously, *e.g.*, at A.D. 55-58 (McGiffert); 60 or 61 (Meyer); 62 (Zahn); 61-63 (Lightfoot); 75 to 80 (Ewald); about A.D. 80 (Scholten); about A.D. 100 (Holtzmann, Mangold); 130-140 (Baur, Davidson). The question of the *date* depends largely on the question of the *place*. The Epistle itself makes it clear that Paul was a *prisoner* when he wrote it (iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20). It contains things, too, which point to some affinity between it and other Epistles in which the

writer is a prisoner. The reference to Tychicus as the bearer connects it with the Epistles to Philemon and the Colossians (*cf.* vi. 21, Phil. 13, Col. iv. 7), and suggests that these three letters belong very much to the same period, and that they were written when Paul was occupied very much with the same questions. Two imprisonments, however, come into view—the one in Cæsarea (Acts xxiii. 35, xxiv. 27), the other in Rome (Acts xxviii.). Each of these has its supporters.

The view that this Epistle belongs to the period of the Cæsarean Captivity is advocated with great ability by Reuss and Meyer among others. Reuss contends that the theory that the various Epistles of the Captivity were all written from Rome rests mostly on "unauthenticated tradition"; that the mood of the Apostle in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon suits his circumstances in Cæsarea better than those in Rome; that there are chronological difficulties of a serious nature in the way of referring these three Epistles together with *Philippians* and 2 *Timothy* to Rome; that this makes it necessary to divide the five between Cæsarea and Rome; and that the various allusions to individuals, such as Tychicus, Timothy and Demetrius, in these Epistles are best harmonised, and certain particular statements, such as the πρὸς ὥραν in Phil. 15, best understood, on the theory that those to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon were written in Cæsarea.

Meyer admits that some of the arguments thus used by Reuss cannot be pressed, especially those founding on such indications as the πρὸς ὥραν, and on the idea that the friends of Paul mentioned in *Colossians* (iv. 9-14) and *Philemon* (10, 23) could not have been with him at Rome. But he attaches great importance to these considerations—*viz.*, (1) that it is more probable that Onesimus should have sought safety in Colossæ than that he should have risked the long journey by sea to Rome, and the possibilities of capture in Rome; (2) that if *Ephesians* and *Colossians* had been sent from Rome, Tychicus and Onesimus would have arrived at Ephesus first and afterwards at Colossæ; in which case it would be reasonable to suppose that Paul would have mentioned Onesimus to the Ephesians, as he does in the Epistle to the Colossians; (3) that the ἵνα εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς in Eph. vi. 21 implies that when Tychicus reached Ephesus he "would already have fulfilled the aim here expressed in the case of others," and these others are the Colossians (Col. iv. 8, 9); and (4) that in Phil. 22 Paul asks a lodging to be prepared for his speedy use—a statement implying that his place of imprisonment was not so distant from Colossæ as Rome was.

These arguments, however, when narrowly examined, are not so convincing as they appear at first sight to be. A runaway slave would in reality be more likely to escape discovery in the thick masses of the population of the world's metropolis than in Cæsarea. Our ignorance of the circumstances of the flight of Onesimus and the supposition that the Epistle is an Encyclical make the argument from the lack of any such mention of Onesimus as we find in Colossians uncertain. The ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς does not necessarily imply what Meyer infers from it, and the same may be said of the reference to the lodging in Philemon.

On the other hand there are weighty objections to referring this Epistle to the Cæsarean imprisonment. Thus, the circumstances of the captivity seem to suit Rome better than Cæsarea. For when we compare Acts xxiv. 23 with Acts xxviii. 16, etc., we gather that the Apostle had less liberty in Cæsarea than in Rome, and this accords ill with such passages as Eph. vi. 19, 20. The number of friends mentioned in these Epistles of the Captivity as *companions* of Paul—Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus Justus, Lucas, Demas, Epaphras, Tychicus, Onesimus—is considerable, so considerable as to make it probable, as Alford, *e.g.*, contends, that he was in Rome; for it was there rather than in Cæsarea that so many might have been with him. Then there is the argument drawn from the relations between the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians. If these letters belong to much the same period in Paul's career (and there is much to favour that), then the mention of "Cæsar's household" in Phil. iv. 22 points much more to Rome than to Cæsarea as the place of the Apostle's residence when he wrote these kindred communications; and the same holds good of the statement of his progress in Phil. i. 21, etc. In neither case can Cæsarea be fairly said to suit the circumstances, or to be of the importance implied. The expectation also which the Apostle appears to entertain when he wrote *Philippians* was that of speedy release and a visit to Macedonia (i. 26, ii. 24, Phil. 22); but what he looked to when he was in Cæsarea was rather that he might go to Rome.

These arguments will become all the stronger if it is made out that *Philippians* was written before *Ephesians*. There is the greater reason then for taking the latter to have been written at Rome. This is a question which need not be discussed at length here. It is enough to say that the arguments against the priority of *Philippians* in the line of these four letters of the Captivity are neither very certain nor very weighty, while there are various internal considerations which favour the priority. Of these the

most important perhaps is found in the points of contact on the one hand between *Philippians* and the earlier Pauline Epistles, especially *Romans*, and on the other hand between *Philippians* and the other three Epistles of the Captivity. These have been worked out with care by Lightfoot among others, at once with regard to particular expressions and to parallels in thought. They have led him and others to the conclusion that the Epistle to the Philippians is the middle link between the great letter to the Romans and those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon. The majority of scholars, therefore, take our Epistle to have been written at Rome. If so, its date may be about A.D. 62 or 63.

The question has also been considerably discussed whether our Epistle is prior to that to the Colossians or posterior to it. That it is prior is argued from its more general aim; from the more abstract character of its contents; and from the consideration that, as it is an Epistle which would be much more difficult to draw up than that to the Colossians, the resemblances between the two are best accounted for by supposing that some of the ideas thought out in the former were transferred to the latter. On the other hand, it is held that, as Colossæ was nearer Cæsarea and would be reached by Tychicus before he got to Ephesus, it is more natural to think that the Epistle to that Church would be written before the other, as it would be delivered before it. But this presupposes that the place of composition was Cæsarea. And the same is the case with the contention that the καὶ ὑμεῖς of Eph. vi. 21 refers to the Colossians (*cf.* Col. iv. 7), and presupposes that Paul had already communicated with Colossæ. These are all very precarious arguments, and the question must be regarded as undecided.

8. THE DOCTRINE OF THE EPISTLE. The teaching of the Epistle is at once so lofty and so profound as to more than justify all that has been said of the grandeur of the composition by discerning minds in ancient and in modern times. Chrysostom speaks of the Epistle as "overflowing with lofty thoughts and doctrines"—one in which Paul expounds things "which he scarcely anywhere else utters". (ὑψηλῶν σφόδρα γέμει τῶν νοημάτων καὶ ὑπερόγκων· ἃ γὰρ μηδαμοῦ σχέδον ἐφθέγξατο, ταῦτα ἐνταῦθα δηλοῖ.) Theophylact, Grotius, Witsius and others speak of it in similar terms. Adolphe Monod, in his *Explication*, describes it as "embracing in its brevity the whole field of the Christian religion," as expounding "now its doctrines, now its morals with such conciseness and such fulness combined that it would be difficult to name any great doctrine or any essential duty which has not its place marked in it". And Coleridge wrote of it as "one of

the divinest compositions of man," embracing "every doctrine of Christianity—first those doctrines peculiar to Christianity, and then those precepts common to it with natural religion" (*Table Talk*).

What gives it its peculiar majesty is the way in which it carries everything back to God Himself, His will, His eternal purpose and counsel. It is a distinctively *theological* Epistle, in the sense in which the Epistle to the Romans is distinctively *anthropological* or *psychological*, and that to the Colossians *Christological*. The great subjects of predestination and the Divine plan, eternal in the mind of God, centring in Christ and fulfilled in Him, have a larger and more definite place in this Epistle than in any other, excepting Rom. viii.-xi. It has at the same time, however, a rich Christology. Christ is set forth as the Son of God (i. 3, iv. 13); the Beloved of the Father (i. 6); pre-existent (i. 4); raised from the dead and exalted to supreme sovereignty over all things—King of the universe and Head of the Church (i. 20-23, ii. 6, iv. 9, 12, v. 23); the Giver of all spiritual gifts (iv. 7, 8); the Treasury of all knowledge and riches (iii. 8-10); having the place given in the OT to Jehovah (iv. 8).

Its *Soteriology* also is of wide compass. It speaks of Christ as the medium of God's forgiveness of sinners (iv. 32); of redemption as coming to us by Him (i. 7); of the offering and the sacrifice made to God in Christ's giving of Himself (v. 2); of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile as accomplished by Him; of the gracious results of His work as being effected by His *blood* and His *cross* (i. 7, ii. 16). The doctrine of the *Church* also reaches its highest point in this Epistle. Not only is the Church the Bride of Christ (v. 25-27) and His Body and the fulness of His gifts, but it is the Church ideal—one great, catholic, spiritual body including all the chosen, redeemed and sanctified. And among other doctrines which have a place in it is that of the Holy Spirit as active in the prophets (iii. 5), and as the believer's seal and earnest (i. 13, 14, iv. 30); that of regeneration as the operation of God (ii. 25); and that of the existence and power of evil spirits (ii. 2, vi. 12). The deep foundations of the confessional doctrine of original sin are also found by many in ii. 3, and the great Reformation doctrine of the priority of grace has its roots in ii. 5-8.

9. THE LITERATURE OF THE EPISTLE. The literature is copious. Not to mention the well-known books on New Testament Introduction, the various works on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, and the articles in the great Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopædias, there are many treatises of importance in addition to the formal commentaries. Among these may be mentioned C. F. Baur's *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*; H. J. Holtzmann's *Kritik der*

Epheser- und Kolosser-briefe; J. Köstlin's *Der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der verwandten N. T. Lehrbegriffe;* A. Lünemann's *De Epistola ad Ephesios Authentia;* J. F. Raebiger's *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium Commentatio;* C. von Weizsäcker's *Apost. Zeitalter;* L. Usteri's *Entwicklung des Paul. Lehrbegriff's;* O. Pfleiderer's *Der Paulinismus* (*Paulinism*, tr. by E. Peters) and his *Urchristentum;* A. Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul* (*The Apostle Paul*, tr. by A. M. Hellier); J. T. Wood's *Modern Discoveries on the Site of Ancient Ephesus;* A. C. M'Giffert's *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age;* G. G. Findlay's *Ephesians* (*The Expositor's Bible*); R. S. Candlish's *Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, expounded in a series of Discourses;* J. Pulsford's *Christ and His Seed, central to all things, being a series of Expository Discourses on Ephesians;* R. W. Dale's *The Epistle to the Ephesians, its Doctrine and Ethics;* J. B. Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays;* F. J. A. Hort's *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians;* W. M. Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, Church in the Roman Empire,* and *St. Paul the Traveller.*

Among commentaries the following may be noticed: those by Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Theophylact, Jerome and Œcumenius in ancient times; those by Luther, Bugenhagen, Bucer and Calvin in the Reformation period—of which Calvin's is by far the best; P. Bayne's *Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians* (1643); J. Ferguson's *A Brief Exposition of the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians* (1659); Thomas Goodwin's *Exposition* (1681); L. Ridley's *Commentary* (1546); R. Rollock's *In Ep. Pauli ad Ephesios Commentarius* (1580); also H. Zanchius, *Comment. in Ep. ad Ephesios* (1594); R. Boyd of Trochrig, *In Epistolam Pauli Apost. ad Ephesios Praelectiones* (1652); John Locke, *Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians* (1707); J. D. Michaelis, *Paraphrase u. Anmerkungen über die Briefe Pauli an die Galat., Eph., Phil., Col.* (1750, 1769); S. F. N. Morus, *Acroases in Epp. Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios* (1795); P. J. Spener, *Erklärung der Episteln an die Epheser und Colosser* (1706); G. T. Zachariæ, *Paraphrastische Erklärung der Briefe Pauli an die Gal., Eph., Philip., u. Thess.* (1771, 1787).

Of works of more recent date those by the following may be mentioned: Dr. Alfred Barry, in Ellicott's *New Testament Commentary for English Readers;* L. F. O. Baumgarten Crusius, *Comm. über die Briefe Pauli an die Eph. u. Kol.* (1847); J. A. Beet, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon;* J.

T. Beck, *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Epheser;* F. Bleek, *Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Kol., d. Philemon, u. d. Epheser;* K. Braune, in Lange's *Bibelwerk;* J. G. Candlish, *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians;* J. L. Davies, *The Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon;* John Eadie, *Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians;* C. J. Ellicott, *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on Ephesians, with a Revised Translation;* G. H. A. Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Ap. Paulus übers. u. erklärt*, and *Sieben Sendschreiben des N. B.;* J. F. Flatt, *Vorlesungen über die Briefe an die Gal. u. die Epheser;* G. C. A. Harless, *Comm. über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* C. Hodge, *Commentary on Epistle to the Ephesians;* J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* F. A. Holtzhausen, *Der Brief an die Epheser übers. u. erklärt;* M. Kähler, *Der sogen. Eph. des P. in genauer Wiedergabe seines Gedankenganges;* A. Klöpper, *Der Brief an die Epheser;* J. Macpherson, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians;* F. K. Meier, *Commentar über d. Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* H. A. W. Meyer, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief Pauli an die Epheser;* the same, edited by Woldemar Schmidt (1878, 1886), and by Erich Haupt (1897); H. C. G. Moule, "The Epistle to the Ephesians" (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*); H. Oltramare, *Comm. sur les Epîtres de S. Paul aux Coloss., aux Ephés. et à Philémon;* L. J. Rückert, *Der Brief Pauli an die Epheser erläutert und vertheidigt;* G. Schnedermann, in Strack u. Zöckler's *Kurzgef. Kommentar* (1885); H. von Soden, in *Handcommentar zum N. T.;* R. E. Stier, *Die Gemeinde in Christo Jesu: Auslegung des Briefes an die Epheser;* B. Weiss, *Die Paulinischen Briefe im berichtigten Text, mit kurzer Erläuterung;* G. Wohlenberg, *Die Briefe an die Epheser, an die Colosser, an Philemon u. an die Philipper ausgelegt* (Strack u. Zöckler's *Kurzgef. Comm.*, 1895).

Abbreviations.—The abbreviations adopted in this Commentary are either those usually employed or such as explain themselves.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a]ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] [b]διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, τοῖς [c]ἁγίοις τοῖς[2] οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ[3] καὶ [d]πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ

a 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Titus i. 1; also Rom. i. 1; Gal. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. b 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; also Rom. xv. 32; 2 Cor. viii. 5. c Col. i. 2; Phil. i. 1; also Dan. vii. 18; Acts ix. 13, 32, 41; Rom. i. 7; Heb. iii. 1. d Col. i. 1; also Wisd. iii. 9; Acts x. 45; 1 Tim. v. 16; Rev. xvii. 14.

[1] **Ιησου Χριστου**, TR with ℵAFKL, etc., Vulg., Syr.-P, Arm., etc., Gr. and Lat. Fathers. **Χριστου Ιησου**, BDP 17, etc.; Vulg. am., Syr.-H, Boh., Copt., Goth., etc.; Origen, etc.; LTTrWHRV.

[2] **πασιν** is inserted by ℵ[3]A, Vulg., Copt., Cyril Jer., etc. D omits **τοις** before **ουσιν**.

[3] **εν Εφεσῳ** omitted by Bℵ 67[2], Orig., Marc., Basil. It is omitted by WH, and is transferred to margin by TTr and RV.

Title.—Ancient documents give the title of this Epistle in various forms. In our oldest manuscripts, BℵAK, etc., it is simply **προς Εφεσιους**, and this is followed by LTTrWH. Later, it becomes **προς Εφεσιους επιστολη**, as in *k*; **επιστολη προς Εφεσιους**, as in *l*; **Παυλου επιστολη προς Εφεσιους**, as in P; **του αγιου αποστολου Παυλου επιστολη προς Εφεσιους**, as in L; **προς Εφεσιους επιστολη του αγιου αποστολου Παυλου**, as in *h*. Nor are these the only forms. In DF we have **αρχεται προς Εφεσιους**; Cod. am. gives *incipit epistula ad Ephesios*, and *f* has **τοις εφεσιοις μυσταις ταυτα διδασκαλος εσθλος**. The form followed by the AV is that of the Elzevir text, **Παυλου του αποστολου η προς εφεσιους επιστολη**.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1, 2. *Address and Salutation*.—In the form of his Epistles, especially in the opening address and in the conclusion, Paul follows the methods of letter writing which were customary in the ancient world, in particular in Greece and Rome, in his own time. We now possess a considerable collection of ancient letters, especially communications of a business kind and letters of familiar intercourse. Not a few of these belong to the periods immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ. They help us to a better understanding of some things in Paul's Epistles. They also let us see how he infused the new spirit of Christianity into the old accustomed heathen forms of epistolary correspondence.

This Epistle opens in Paul's usual way, with a greeting in which both the writer and the readers are specifically designated. At the same time the address has certain features of its own, which have their explanation in the circumstances.—**Παῦλος**. In the Epistles which he addresses to Churches, Paul usually associates some one else, or more than one, with himself in the superscription—Sosthenes in 1 Corinthians; Timothy in 2 Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians; Silvanus and Timothy in 1 and 2 Thessalonians; "all the brethren" in Galatians. The only exception is the Epistle to the Romans. In Philemon, too, a letter of a personal and private character, though meant also for the Church in the house of the recipient (ver. 2), he names Timothy with himself. But in the present Epistle no one is conjoined with him in the greeting. It is difficult to suppose that he was absolutely alone at the time when he wrote this letter. The explanation lies probably in the fact that the Epistle was written as a communication of a general character, intended to go round a considerable circle of Churches.—**ἀπόστολος**. Usually this term has the definite, official sense of a

delegate, a messenger with a commission. Occasionally it has a wider and less specific meaning, as in Acts xiv. 4, 14, 1 Cor. ix. 5, 6; Gal. ii. 9, and probably Rom. xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 5, 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 6. In the Gospels, while it occurs oftener in Luke, it is found only once in each of the other three. In the LXX it occurs once, as the representative of שָׁלוּחַ (1 Kings xiv. 6). In later Judaism it denotes one who is sent out on foreign service, *e.g.*, to collect the Temple-tribute. See Light., *Galatians*, pp. 92-101. **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.** This order is to be preferred, with the RV and TTrWH, to the **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** of the TR and the AV. The genitive may be the ordinary possessive genitive, "an apostle belonging to Christ Jesus"; or it may be the genitive of derivation or source, "an apostle sent by Christ Jesus," the term **ἀπόστολος** retaining something of its original sense of one *sent* by another. The former is the more probable view, looking to the analogy of such phrases as **οὗ εἰμι** (Acts xxvii. 23). The name **Χριστός**, which in the Gospels preserves its technical sense of "the Christ" in all but a few instances (*e.g.*, Matt. i. 1, 18; Mk. i. 1; John xvii. 3), has become a personal name in the Pauline Epistles. The combination "Jesus Christ," or "Christ Jesus," which is rare in the Gospels, occurs frequently in the Book of Acts and most frequently in the Epistles.

There is a variety in the way in which Paul designates himself in his Epistles that is of interest and has its meaning. In some he gives only his name, and makes no reference to his being either an *apostle* or a *servant* of Jesus Christ. So in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. In one (Philemon) he describes himself as a "prisoner of Jesus Christ". In one (Philippians) he is "servant" only; in two (Romans and Titus) he is both "servant" and "apostle". In seven (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy, and here in Ephesians) it is only the apostleship that is instanced, but in each case with a further statement of how it came to him.—**διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ.** So also in 1 and 2 Corinthians, Colossians and 2 Timothy. In Galatians we have **οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Θεοῦ πατρός, κ.τ.λ.**; and in 1 Timothy: **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** (RV); *cf.* **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ,** with reference to the commission to preach (Titus i. 3). The phrase used here in Ephesians defines the apostleship as an office which came to Paul neither by his own will nor by the act of any man, but by direct Divine call and appointment. His Epistles certainly reflect his consciousness of this fact. His work, his discourses, his letters all alike reveal the conviction that he was in actuality what he had been declared to be in the message to Ananias—"a vessel of election" (Acts ix. 15). This is the main idea in the defining sentence and its equivalents. They vindicate Paul's authority, indeed, when that is challenged, but they express primarily the fact that it was by grace he was what he was (1 Cor. xv. 10).—**τοῖς ἁγίοις.** Those addressed are designated first by a term which expresses the great Old Testament idea of their *separation*. It does not immediately or distinctively denote their personal piety or sanctity in our sense of the word, though that is dealt with as going with the other. It expresses the larger fact that they are set apart to God and taken into a special relation to Him. In three of the Epistles of the Captivity (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians) it takes the place which the Church has in the superscriptions of the earlier Epistles (Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians). The reason for the variation is not easy to see. It has been supposed to be due to the desire to give "a more personal colouring to the Epistle as if addressed to the members of the Church as individuals rather than as a body" (Abbott). The distinction, indeed, is not carried through the two groups of Epistles; for in Philemon it is again "the Church," not "the saints".—**τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.** The local definition **ἐν Ἐφέσῳ** (on which see more in the Introduction) is inserted by the vast majority of manuscripts, both uncial and cursive, and Fathers, and, as far as we know, by all the Versions. It is supported also to some extent by the fact that in the oldest manuscripts the title of the Epistle is **προς Εφεσιους**; by the apparently unanimous tradition of the Early Church that this Epistle was addressed to the Ephesians; by the absence of all evidence indicating that the Epistle was claimed in ancient times for any other Church definitely named; and by certain parallels in Ignatius. On the other hand, it is omitted by the two oldest and most important uncials, B and ℵ (in which it has been inserted by later hands); it is expurged from the cursive 67 by a corrector who seems to have had an older document before him; it did not

Ἰησοῦ. 2. ᵉχάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. e Gal. i. 3 al.

[1] Χρ. before Ιησ. B.

belong to the text of the manuscripts followed by Origen early in the third century, nor to that of those mentioned by Basil about a century and a half later. The omission is supported also to some extent by a statement made by Tertullian regarding Marcion; and more decidedly by the *general* character of the Epistle (its lack of personal references, salutations to individuals, etc.), as well as by the difficulty of understanding why the phrase should have been dropped if it did belong to the original text. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and others, therefore, bracket it in their texts; Tregelles brackets it in his margin and the Revisers give it as an alternative reading in their margin.

If **ἐν Ἐφέσῳ** is retained, all is plain. If the hypothesis is accepted (on which see Introduction) that a blank space was left after the **τοῖς οὖσιν** to be filled in with the names, each in its turn, of the particular Churches in the Province of Asia to which the letter came in its rounds among the congregations, all still remains plain. But if the clause is omitted and if the hypothesis mentioned is not accepted, a difficulty arises in dealing with the combination **τοῖς οὖσιν καὶ πιστοῖς**. There are far-fetched expedients which need only to be named in order to be dismissed—such as Origen's notion that the **τοῖς οὖσιν** has a transcendental sense, meaning that the saints ARE, as God is called I AM, and expressing the idea, as it may be, that they are those who have been called out of non-existence into real existence or an existence worthy of the name; and the somewhat similar idea that the **τοῖς οὖσιν** denotes the reality of their sainthood: "the saints who are really such"; or the reality of their sainthood and faith: "the saints and believers who are truly such". The choice lies between two explanations, *viz.*, (1) "to the saints who are also believers in Christ Jesus," and (2) "to the saints who are also faithful in Christ Jesus". The former gives to **πιστοῖς** the special New Testament sense which it has in such Pauline passages as 2 Cor. vi. 15; Gal. iii. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Titus i. 6. It takes the term to be added in order to complete the description of the readers as *Christians*—not merely *set apart*, as might be the case with Jews (the **τοῖς ἁγίοις** by itself not going necessarily beyond the OT idea and the Israelite relation), but specifically *believers in Christ*. The latter gives the adjective the sense of *trustworthy*, *steadfast*, which is its classical sense, but which it also has in a later passage of this Epistle (vi. 21), in other Pauline Epistles (Col. iv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 2), and occasionally elsewhere in the NT (*e.g.*, 1 Pet. v. 12; Heb. ii. 17). The term thus defines the readers, who are understood to be Christians, as *faithful*, *constant* in their Christian profession. This is favoured by the designation of the brethren in Col. i. 2, which is the closest parallel and in which the **πιστοῖς** seems to have the sense of *faithful*. It is objected that, if this were the meaning, the **πιστοῖς** should have been followed by the simple dative **Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, as in Heb. iii. 2. In like manner it is objected to the former explanation that in connecting the **πιστοῖς** immediately with the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, "believing in Christ Jesus," it has usage against it, **πιστὸς ἐν** not being found in that sense in the NT although we find **πίστις ἐν** occasionally in Pauline passages (Eph. i. 15; Gal. iii. 26) and **πιστεύειν ἐν** at least once elsewhere (Mk. i. 15). But in point of fact the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** is best taken here in the definite Pauline sense which it has as an independent phrase expressing a distinct and profound idea—that of fellowship or union with Christ, or standing in Him. It is doubtful whether it is meant to qualify both the **ἁγίοις** and the **πιστοῖς** (so Abbott, etc.). More probably it qualifies the nearer adjective, and expresses the fact that it is in virtue of their union with Christ that the readers are **πιστοί**. Their constancy has its meaning and its life in their fellowship with Him. Of the two explanations the second is to be preferred on the whole (with Lightfoot, etc.), although the first has the support of Meyer, Ellicott, etc.

Ver. 2. **χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη**: *Grace to you and peace.* Supply **εἴη**, on the analogy of other optatives, *e.g.*, in 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2; Jude 2. This is the Christian rendering of the greeting with which letters began. It combines the Greek form with the Hebrew, but translates the **χαίρειν** of the former into the

3. [f]Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ[1] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν[2] Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ [g]εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς[3] [h]ἐν πάσῃ [i]εὐλογίᾳ [k]πνευματικῇ ἐν

f Luke i. 68 al.; Gen. ix. 26; Rom. ix. 5 reff. g = Acts iii. 26; Gal. iii. 9; Heb. vi. 14 al. h constr., here only. See James iii. 9. i = Rom. xv. 29; Heb. vi. 7 ‡; Gen. xxxiii. 11. k = Rom. i. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 11; Col. i. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 5 †.

[1] και πατηρ omit B, Hil.[186]; ο θεος και omit Victorin., Hil.[239, 437].
[2] τ. κυρ. και σωτηρος ημων ℵ*. [3] Omit ημας ℵ*.

evangelical **χάρις**. What Paul desires for his readers is the enjoyment of the free, loving favour of God and the peace which results from it. This is the usual form which the opening salutation takes in the Epistles of the NT. So it is in Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Peter; as also in Revelation i. 4. It is not, however, the only form. In James, but only in him, we have the old formula **χαίρειν** (i. 1). In 1 and 2 Timothy and 2 John (but not in Titus according to the best reading) it is **χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη**; and in Jude we find **ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ*. The *grace* and *peace* desired for the readers by the writer are blessings which come only from God the Father and from Christ. The "Lord Jesus Christ" is named along with "God our Father" as the giver of the grace and peace—a collocation impossible except on the supposition that the writer held Christ to be of the same rank with God or in a unique relation to Him. There is a distinction indicated here between God and Jesus Christ. But it is not in what they are able to give; for the gifts of grace and peace come from both. Nor is any distinction suggested here in respect of ***nature***. But there is a distinction in respect of ***relation*** to believers. To the receivers of grace and peace God is in the relation of *Father;* to the same subjects Christ is in the relation of *Lord*. God is *Father*, having made them His children by adoption. Christ is *Lord*, being constituted Head of the Church and having won the right to their loving obedience and honour; *cf.* MacP., *in loco*.

Vv. 3-8. Doxology, or Ascription of Praise to God for the Blessings of His Love and Grace. This extends over six verses, in one magnificent sentence intricately yet skilfully constructed, throbbing in each clause with the adoring sense of the majesty of that Divine Counsel and the riches of that Divine Grace which had made it possible to write in such terms to Gentiles in a distant province of the heathen Roman Empire. It is Paul's way to begin with a doxology or a burst of thanksgiving. The latter, expressed by **εὐχαριστῶ, εὐχαριστοῦμεν**, etc., is the more usual, and is found in one form or another in Romans, 1 Corinthians, Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy (i. 12), 2 Timothy. The former is seen in 2 Corinthians and (in a different form) in Galatians as well as here. The only Epistle that lacks both is that to Titus.

Ver. 3. **εὐλογητός**: *Blessed*. The LXX equivalent for the Hebrew בָּרוּךְ, Vulg. *Benedictus*. In the NT the idea of being *blessed* is expressed both by **εὐλογητός** (Luke i. 68; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3), and by **εὐλογημένος** (Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39; Mark xi. 9; Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38; John xii. 13, etc.). On the analogy of similar verbs **εὐλογητός** means "to be praised," "worthy of praise," and it is sometimes said to differ from **εὐλογημένος** in that the latter denotes one on whom blessing *is* pronounced. But that distinction is a fine one and uncertain. Philo puts the difference thus: **εὐλογητός, οὐ μόνον εὐλογημένος . . . τὸ μὲν γὰρ τῷ πεφυκέναι, τὸ δὲ τῷ νομίζεσθαι λέγεται μόνον . . . τῷ πεφυκέναι εὐλογίας ἄξιον . . . ὅπερ εὐλογητὸν ἐν τοῖς χρησμοῖς ᾄδεται** (*De Migr. Abr.*, § 19, i., 453, Mang.; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *sub voc.*). The distinction is shortly expressed thus by Light., "while **εὐλογημένος** points to an isolated act or acts, **εὐλογητός** describes the intrinsic character" (*Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 310). In the NT **εὐλογητός** is used only of God; in one case, indeed, absolutely, "The Blessed" (Mark xiv. 61). In the LXX it is used both of *God* (Gen. ix. 26, xiv. 20; 1 Sam. xxv. 32; Ps. lxxii. 17, 18, 19, etc.), and (less frequently) of ***man*** (Gen. xii. 2, xxiv. 31, xxvi. 29; Deut. vii. 14; Jud. xvii. 2; 1 Sam. xv. 13, xxv. 33; Ruth ii. 20). In the LXX **εὐλογημένος** is occasionally used of God. In the NT it is used only of man (Matt. xxv. 34; Luke i. 28, 42), of the Messiah (Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39;

Mark xi. 9; Luke xiii. 35, xix. 38; John xii. 13), or of the Messianic Kingdom (Mark xi. 10). In doxologies we are usually left to supply the verb, which may be ἔστιν (Abbott); ἔστω on the analogy of ἔστω . . . ηὐλογημένος in 2 Chron. ix. 8; or εἴη on the analogy of Job i. 21, Psalm cxiii. 2, in which passages, however, the form is εὐλογημένος. Here, as generally where εὐλογητός is the word used and not εὐλογημένος, the sentence is best taken as an affirmation, ἐστίν being supplied; *cf.* Psalm cxix. 12 in contrast with Psalm cxii. 2; Job i. 21; 2 Chron. ix. 8. In most cases the εὐλογητός stands first in its sentence. There are exceptions, where the verb or participle has a position within the sentence or at its close. These are explained by some (W. Schmidt, etc.) as due to the fact that the emphasis is meant to be on the *Subject* of the doxology, not on the idea of the praise itself; by others (Haupt, etc.) more simply as regards most occurrences, if not all, as due to the fact that the copula (εἶναι, γιγνέσθαι) is expressed. The cases most in point are 1 Kings x. 9; 2 Chron. ix. 8; Job i. 21; Psalm lxviii. 19, cxiii. 2. In all these instances except the last the form is εὐλογημένος and the γένοιτο or εἴη is expressed. In Psalm lxviii. 19 alone we have **Κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός**, and that followed immediately by **εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν**.—**ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* The same designation of God occurs also in Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, ii. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3. In Col. i. 3, the καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the TR is too slenderly supported to be retained. Many good commentators (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Schmied., etc.) take the Θεός and the πατήρ apart here, placing the genitive in relation only to the latter and making the sense "Blessed be God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," or "Blessed be God who is also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ". Others (including Theod., Jer., Theophyl., Stier, Blk., V. Hofm., V. Soden, Oltr., Klöp., Beck., Alf., Light., W. Schmidt, Abbott) understand God to be praised here as the God of our Lord Jesus Christ as well as His Father. Grammar leaves the question open; for the inclusion of Θεός and πατήρ under one initial article does not establish the second view, nor does the use of καί instead of τε καί disprove it (*cf.* iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25). The first rendering is advocated on account of the extreme rarity of the designation "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Ell.); on the ground that Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ being a "stated Christian designation of God," only the πατήρ requires any further definition by a genitive (Mey.); or for the reason that the passages in which the phrase θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν occurs show it to have been Paul's habit to use θεός absolutely, the appositional πατὴρ κ.τ.λ. serving to define more particularly the *Christian* idea of God (Haupt). The second rendering is to be preferred, however, as the more natural, and is supported by the analogous Pauline construction ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (Gal. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13). Nor is there anything strange or un-Pauline in God being called "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ". As true Man Christ had God for His God as we have Him for our God. He Himself spoke of God as "My God" in the cry of desolation from the Cross and again in His word to Mary after His Resurrection (John xx. 17). In this same Epistle, too, we have the express designation ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (i. 17).

This form of doxology (as well as the prayer in the greeting for *grace and peace*) occurs again in 2 Cor. i. 3 (as also in 1 Pet. i. 3), but with a different reference—there with regard to Paul's own experiences, here with regard to the Christian enlargement of others.—**ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς**: *who blessed us.* To suppose that the ἡμᾶς refers to Paul himself is inconsistent with the whole tenor of the paragraph and with the κἀγώ in ver. 15. If Paul speaks of God as εὐλογητός it is because of the great and generous things He had actually done for himself and for these Ephesians. These things he proceeds to set forth in respect both of their *nature* and their *measure*. He says first that "God blessed us" (not "hath blessed us"). The question is how far he is looking back here. Is it to the time when God first made him and those addressed His own by grace? Or is it to the eternal counsel of that grace? There is much to be said in favour of the second of these two references. It appears to be more naturally suggested by the text than the other. We may, perhaps, plead on its behalf the analogy of the aorists in Rom. viii. 29, 30. It gives unity to the whole statement, and makes the interpretation of the following clauses, each introduced by ἐν, easier. Yet on the whole the first is to be preferred, especially in view of the further definition introduced by the καθώς of

ver. 4. The idea, therefore, is that in calling us to Christian faith God blessed us, and that the great deed of blessing which thus took effect in time had its foundation in an eternal election. All that Christians are is thus referred back to God's free, decisive act of **εὐλογεῖν**; "blessing" in His case meaning not words of good but deeds of grace. So, too, the **εὐλογητός** which comes from our lips answers to, and is the return for, the **εὐλογήσας** of God. In word and thought we bless God because in deed and positive effect He blessed us; *cf.* Is. lxv. 16.—**ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ**: *with every spiritual blessing*. This defines the nature of the "blessing" with which God so signally blessed us. The **ἐν** might be understood in the *local* sense, as denoting the sphere within which the **εὐλογεῖν** proceeded. But in view of the following **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**, it is simplest to take it as the *instrumental* **ἐν**, "by means of"; *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 18; James iii. 9; and the analogous **ἐν μέτρῳ μετρεῖν, ἐν ἅλατι ἁλίζειν** (Matt. vii. 2, v. 13; Mk. iv. 24, ix. 49), etc. See Winer-Moult., *Grammar*, p. 485; Buttmann-Thayer, *Grammar*, p. 329. The **πνευματικῇ** is taken by some to mean *inward* as opposed to *outward* blessing, or blessing relating to the spirit of man, not to the body (Erasmus, etc.)—a sense too restricted to fit the usage of the term in the NT. Others understand it to mean "of the Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, blessing proceeding from the Holy Spirit. So Mey., Alf. (who makes it "blessing of the Spirit"), etc.; so, too, Ell., who would refer the term *directly* to the Holy Spirit, on the basis of Joel iii. 1 ff.; Acts ii. 16. But this would be more naturally expressed by **ἀπὸ** or **ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος**, and it is the *kind* of blessing rather than its *source* that is in view here. It is best, therefore, to take **πνευματικῇ** to define the blessings in question as *spiritual* in the sense that they are the blessings of grace, blessings of a Divine order, belonging to the sphere of immediate relations between God and man (*cf.* Rom. i. 11, xiv. 1, xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 11). It is true that these come from God through the Spirit. But the point in view is what they are, not how they reach us. There is little to suggest either that a contrast is drawn between the blessings of the Gospel and the more temporal blessings of the OT economy, as Chrys., Grotius, etc., suppose. There is still less to suggest that the statement is to be limited to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, healing, tongues, etc., dealt with in 1 Cor. xii., etc. This latter supposition is refuted by the inclusive **πάσῃ**. The expression is a large one, covering all the good that comes to us by grace—whether the assurance of immortality, the promise of the resurrection, the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven, the privilege of adoption, etc., as Theodoret puts it; or all that belongs to the fruit of the Spirit, the graces of love, joy, etc. (Gal. v. 22, 23), as Abbott explains it; or the peculiar blessings of peace of conscience, assurance of God's love, joy in God, the hope of glory, etc., as it is understood by others. The blessing with which God blessed us is the highest order of blessing, not of material kind or changeful nature, but of heavenly quality and enduring satisfaction, and such blessing He bestowed upon us in its every form and manifestation. — **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenly places*. Further definition of the *blessing* in respect of its *sphere*—"in the heavenlies". In the NT the adjective **ἐπουράνιος** occurs both in the literal sense and in the metaphorical, and in a variety of applications—*existing in heaven* (**ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐπ.**, Matt. xviii. 35, v. l. **οὐράνιος**); of heavenly *order or descent* (the Second Adam, **ὁ ἐπουράνιος**, 1 Cor. xv. 48); *originating* in heaven, *belonging* to heaven, *heavenly* in contrast with *earthly* (**κλῆσις ἐπ.**, Heb. iii. 1; **δωρέα ἐπ.**, Heb. vi. 4; **πατρίς ἐπ.**, Heb. xi. 16; **Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπ.**, Heb. xii. 22; **βασιλεία ἐπ.**, 2 Tim. iv. 18). It is not easy to determine the precise shade of meaning in each case. The plural **τὰ ἐπουράνια** is used of the eternal decrees or purposes of grace as contrasted with the operations of grace accomplished and experienced on earth (John iii. 12); of the celestial bodies, sun, moon and stars (1 Cor. xv. 40); of things or beings in heaven as contrasted with those on earth or under earth (Phil. ii. 10); of the heavenly types and realities of religious services of which earthly ordinances and ministries are the shadow (Heb. viii. 5). The particular phrase **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**, however, has this peculiarity, that it occurs five times in this Epistle and nowhere else in the NT. It is a singular fact that even in the writings bearing Paul's name it is confined to this one letter, and is not found even in the companion Epistle to the Colossians which belongs to the same time, has so much in common, and in point of fact presents more than one opportunity, as Meyer observes, for the introduction of such a phrase (i. 5, 16, 20).

In three out of the five occurrences the term has the *local* sense (i. 20, ii. 6, iii. 10), and in a fourth (vi. 12) that sense is also possible, though not certain. The expression in all probability has the same application in the present instance. To take it, with Chrys., Thdt., Beng., and more recently Beck, as a further description of the blessing in respect of its *nature* as *spiritual* or *heavenly* has not only usage against it, but also the consideration that the second of the two descriptive clauses would then add little or nothing to what is expressed by the first. Deciding for the local sense, however, we have still to ask how the phrase is to be connected and what is its particular point. Some connect it (*e.g.*, Beza) immediately with **ὁ Θεός**, making the sense "God who is in heaven blessed us". But this puts the qualifying clause at an awkward distance from its subject. The clause may be connected with the **εὐλογήσας** as describing the deed of blessing in respect of its sphere; which would be most suitable to the case if the **εὐλογήσας** were understood of the Divine *decree* of grace. Some, adopting the same connection, make it refer ideally or proleptically to the blessings laid up for our future enjoyment in the heavenly life (*e.g.*, Th. Aquin.); but the context has in view blessings which are ours in reality now. Others take it to refer to the *Church* as the Kingdom of God on earth, the present depository of the Divine blessings (Stier); but the Church is not identified in this way with the Kingdom of God in the Pauline writings. It is best, therefore, to connect **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** immediately with the previous **ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ**, and to understand it as describing the region in which this "spiritual blessing" is found. Not a few interpreters, indeed, pointing to the analogy of ii. 6, Phil. iii. 20 (where, however, it is our *citizenship* that is said to be in heaven, not we ourselves), etc., introduce a mystical sense here, and take "the heavenlies" to be, not "literal locality but . . . the heavenly region in which our citizenship is" (Abbott), the heaven that is created within us here and now by grace. "The heaven of which the Apostle here speaks," says Lightfoot, "is not *some remote locality*, some *future abode;* it is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian." So substantially also Alf., Ell. (the latter connecting it, however, with **εὐλογήσας**), Cand., etc. But what the writer has specially in view here is the eternal counsel of God and the effect given to it on earth, and there is nothing to suggest that at this point he is thinking of believers as being themselves in a certain sense in heaven even now. It is best, therefore, to retain the simple local meaning (as the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions render it, "in heaven," "in the heavens"), and take it to describe the blessings which are stated to be in their nature spiritual further as being found in heaven. To that they belong, and from thence it is that they come to us to be our present possession on earth. (So Subst., Mey., Haupt, etc.) The choice of the unusual form here may be due to the largeness of the idea. It is not merely that the blessings with which God blessed us are blessings having their origin in heaven (which might have been expressed by **ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ** or some similar phrase), but that they are blessings which have their *seat* where God Himself is and where Christ reigns.—**ἐν Χριστῷ**: *in Christ*. Not merely "*through* Christ". The phrase expresses the supreme idea that pervades the Epistle. Here it qualifies the whole statement of the *blessing*, in its bestowal, its nature, and its seat. The Divine **εὐλογεῖν** has its ground and reason in Christ, so that apart from Him it could have no relation to us. It is ours by reason of our being in Him as our Representative and Head; "by virtue of our incorporation in, our union with, Christ" (Light.). "In Him lay the cause that God blessed us with every spiritual blessing, since His act of redemption is the *causa meritoria* of this Divine bestowal of blessing" (Mey.).

Ver. 4. **καθώς**: *even as*. Not "because," but "according as," "in conformity with the fact that". *Cf.* **καθότι**, which is used in the NT only by Luke and means both "according as" and "because"; and the Attic **καθά, καθό**, for which, indeed, **καθώς** is occasionally used in classical Greek, at least from Aristotle's time. Here **καθώς** designates the ground of the "blessing" and so is also the note of its grandeur. The "blessing" proceeded on a Divine election, and took effect in accordance with that. It has its foundation, therefore, in eternity, and is neither an incidental thing nor an afterthought of God. So in 1 Pet. i. 2, the **ἐκλογή** has its ground and norm in the **πρόγνωσις**, the foreknowledge of God the Father, and that "foreknowledge" is not a theoretical but an efficient knowledge.—**ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς**: *He chose us* (not "hath chosen us"), or *elected us*. The verb, which occurs in the NT

τοῖς [l] ἐπουρανίοις [n] ἐν [1] χριστῷ,[2] 4. καθὼς [m] ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς [n] ἐν αὐτῷ[3] [o] πρὸ[4] [o] καταβολῆς κόσμου, [p] εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ [q] ἀμώμους

l = ver. 20; ch. ii. 6, iii. 10, vi. 12 only; Matt. xviii. 35; Dan. iv. 23. m = Mark xiii. 20; John vi. 70 reff. (1 Cor. i. 27; James ii. 5 only in Epp.); Deut. vii. 7. n = Col. i. 16; see Acts xv. 7. o John xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20 only. ἀπό, Matt. xiii. 35 al. p constr., Col. i. 10, 22. q ch. v. 27; Col. i. 22 only in Paul; Heb. ix. 24; 2 Kings xxii. 24.

[1] Omit **εν** some cursives, *e.g.*, 7.

[2] After **Χριστω** insert **Ιησου** D[2, 3]EK 4, 46, 47, 76, 109, 115, Syr.-P., Eth., Theophyl., Victorin., Sedul.

[3] For **εν αυτω, εαυτω** FG, Did., Athan.

[4] **προς** FG.

only in the Middle (except, perhaps, in Luke ix. 35), is the LXX equivalent for בָּחַר, and expresses the idea of *selecting for oneself out of a number*. It is sometimes alleged that we are not entitled to give it so definite a meaning in doctrinal paragraphs like the present, because there are passages in which it appears to express nothing more than the general idea of a *choice*, without reference either to any special relation to the person choosing or to the leaving of others unchosen. (So, *e.g.*, Abbott.) But the passages adduced in support of this are few in number and by no means bear out the contention. In Luke ix. 35, *e.g.*, where **ἐκλελεγμένος** is said of the Son, the idea of a choice from among others is certainly not an alien idea (*cf.* Thayer-Grim., *Lex.*, *sub voc.*); and in Acts iv. 5, xv. 22, 25, the point is a choice for oneself in the form of an appointment to a particular service or office. That the verb denotes the choice of one or more out of others is implied in its compound form, and is made abundantly clear by actual usage, *e.g.*, in the case of the selection of the Twelve (John vi. 70, xiii. 18, xv. 16), the appointment of a successor to Judas (Acts i. 24, etc.). In not a few passages it is made more certain still by the addition of explanatory terms, *e.g.*, **ἀπό τινων** (Luke vi. 13), **ἐκ κόσμου** (John xv. 19), **ἐκ τινων** (Acts i. 24), **ἐν ἡμῖν** (Acts xv. 7). That it means to choose out *for oneself* appears from such passages as Luke x. 42, xiv. 7. The verb **ἐκλέγεσθαι** is specially used of God's election of some out of mankind generally to be His own in a peculiar sense, the objects of His grace, destined for special privilege, special relations, special service; *cf.* Acts xiii. 17 (of Israel); Mark xiii. 20; John xv. 19; Rom. ix. 11, xi. 5, 7, 28; 1 Cor. i. 27 ff.; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 9 ff. The foundation of the statement is the great OT idea of Israel as a nation chosen by the Lord to be "a peculiar people unto Himself, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth" (Deut. xiv. 2; *cf.* Ps. xxxiii. 11, 12, cxxxv. 4; Isa. xli. 8, 9, xlii. 1). What is meant, therefore, is that the blessing which God bestowed on these Ephesians was not a thing of the time merely, but the issue of an election prior to their call or conversion, a blessing that came to them in accordance with a definite choice of them out of the mass of others by God for Himself.—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: *in Him;* that is, in Christ, not "through Him" simply. But in what sense? It is true that Christ is the first "Elect" of God, and that our election is contained in His. But His election is not the matter in hand here, and the point, therefore, is not that in electing Christ God also elected us (Calv., Beng., etc.). Nor, again, is it that we are *included* in Him (Hofm.), for neither is this the point in view here. The immediate subject is not what *we* are or are made, but what *God* does—His election and how it proceeds. And the idea is that that election has its ground in Christ, in the sense that apart from Christ and without respect to His special relation to us, and His foreseen work, there would be no election of us. An extraordinary sense is attached to the **ἐν αὐτῷ** by Beys., who takes the point to be that the "divinely conceived prototypes of perfected believers are from eternity posited by God in the One Prototype of humanity acceptable unto Him" (*Christ. d. N. T.*, p. 141). This is a philosophical notion wholly alien to Paul, on which see Meyer, *in loc.* The **ἐν αὐτῷ** might mean that God's election of us was *in Christ* in so far as Christ was contemplated as having the relation of "head and representative of spiritual, as Adam was the representative of natural, humanity" (Ols., Ell.). But it is best taken as expressing again the broad idea that "in Christ lay for God the *causa meritoria* of our election" (Mey.).—**πρὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ κόσμου**: *before the foundation of the world.* This is the only occurrence of this particular expression in the Pauline

writings, but it occurs also once in John (xvii. 24) and once in Peter (1 Pet. i. 20). It is akin to the form **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς** (Matt. xiii. 35, omitting **κόσμου** with LTTrWHR *marg.*), **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** (Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3; Rev. xiii. 8); as also to these phrases: **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** (1 Thess. ii. 13), **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7), **πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων** (2 Tim. i. 9). It expresses most definitely the fact that the *election* in question is not the setting apart of certain persons at a definite period, an act in time, a *historical* selection, as some (*e.g.*, Beys.) strive to prove, but an eternal choice, a determination of the Divine Mind before all time. The idea of the Divine election in the NT is not a philosophical idea expressing the ultimate explanation of the system of things or giving the *rationale* of the story of the human race as such, but a religious idea, a note of grace, expressing the fact that salvation is originally and wholly of God. In Pauline teaching the subjects of this Divine election are neither the Church as such (Ritschl), nor mankind as such (Beck), but Christian men and women, designated as **ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς.** It is, as is here clearly intimated, an eternal determination of the Divine Will, and it has its ground in the freedom of God, not in anything foreseen in its subjects. Of a prevision of faith as the basis or motive of the election there is no indication here. On the contrary, the character or distinguishing inward quality of the subjects of the election is presented in the next clause as the *object* of the election, the end it had in view. (See especially Haupt, *in loc.*)—**εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους**: *that we should be holy and without blemish.* The election, therefore, had a definite purpose before it—the *making* of its subjects **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους.** The simple infinitive is freely used to express the idea of *purpose* or *design* not only in the NT but in classical Greek (Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 12; Thuc., i., 50, iv., 8; Herod., vii., 208, etc.; *cf.* Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 399). On the **ἁγίους** see under ver. 1. There is a question, however, as to the precise sense of **ἀμώμους.** The adjective means both "without blame" (*inculpatus*) and "without blemish" (*immaculatus*). In the LXX it is a sacrificial term, applied in the latter sense to victims (Exod. xxix. 1; Lev. i. 3, 10, iii. 1, 6, 9, 10, xxii. 19, etc.). It has this sense of "without blemish" also in Heb. ix. 14; 1 Pet. i. 19; *cf.* the use of the noun in 2 Pet. ii. 13. In the Pauline writings it is found, in addition to the present passage, in Eph. v. 27; Phil. ii. 15 (according to the best reading); Col. i. 22. In the first and third of these occurrences it is rendered by tbe RV "without blemish," in the second, "blameless". On the ground of usage, especially in the LXX, many commentators conclude for the second sense. Light., *e.g.*, takes the point of the two adjectives to be that the former denotes the *consecration* of the victim and the latter its *fitness* for the consecration (*Notes on Epistles of Paul*, p. 313). The Vulg. gives *immaculati*, and Wycl. "without *wene*". On the other hand, there is nothing in the verse to suggest the idea of *sacrifice* or a *victim*. The parallel passage, also, in Col. i. 22, where we have not only **ἁγίους** and **ἀμώμους** but a third adjective **ἀνεγκλήτους**, is on the whole on the side of "blameless". That, too, is the meaning of the word in classical Greek (*e.g.*, Herod. ii., 177), and in inscriptions (C. I., 1974). Little indeed depends on the decision between the two senses; for both terms, "without blemish" and "without blame," may have *ethical* applications. There is the further question, however, whether in this statement Paul has in view the *standing* of believers or their *character*—whether he thinks of them as justified or as designed to be sanctified. The arguments in support of the objective relation to God being a view here (Mey., Haupt, etc.) are weighty. It is held, *e.g.*, that **γίγνεσθαι** would be more appropriate than **εἶναι** if the personal sanctification of believers was in the writer's mind; that in that case the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** would more naturally have come in *before* the **κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ**; above all, that the tenor of the section as a whole is on the side of the first view, the idea all through the paragraph (vv. 3-14) being what God does for us, not what we are now or are meant to be inwardly to Him, and the objective facts of the forgiveness of sin, adoption, etc., being clearly introduced in vv. 7 ff. On the other hand the ethical sense is strongly advocated by many (Chrys., Theophy., Alf., Ell., Candl., Abb., etc.) on the broad ground that it is so much Paul's way to point us to newness and holiness of life as the great end of the Divine purpose and the Divine call (Phil. ii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Titus ii. 14). This is supported further by the presence of the qualifying **ἐν ἀγάπῃ**, if it is attached to ver. 4; and by the weighty consideration that the **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους** in the

r 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19; Col. i. 22; Jude 24; Levit. iv. 17 vat. ʳκατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν[1] ἀγάπῃ, 5. ˢπροορίσας[2] ἡμᾶς εἰς ᵗυἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ[3] ᵘεἰς αὐτόν, κατὰ τὴν ᵛεὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος

s ver. 11 reff. t Rom. viii. 15, 23, ix. 4; Gal. iv. 5 only †. u = Col. i. 20. v Matt. xi. 26 ‖; Luke ii. 14; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11; Ps. v. 12.

[1] **εν αγαπ.** is joined with the foregoing by LP, f, Vlg.; with the following by d, g, Orig., Chrys., Thdrt.

[2] **προωρισας** D*P.

[3] **Χρ. Ιησ.** B, Chr.; **Χρ.** Or., Hil.

parallel passage in Col. i. 22 is followed immediately by a reference to continuing "in the faith, grounded and stedfast, and not moved away from the hope of the Gospel". Something depends, however, on the position of the following **ἐν ἀγάπῃ**, on which see below.—**κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ**: *before Him;* that is, before God. Read **αὐτοῦ**, not (as Harl., etc.) **αὑτοῦ**; see Winer-Moul., *Gram.*, pp. 188, 189. So, too, in the parallel passage Col. i. 22. The present approbation of God is in view, not His future judgment. Light. thinks that God Himself is thus regarded as the great **μωμοσκόπος**, who inspects the victims and takes cognizance of blemishes. But this is to import a priestly notion which is not expressed in the context. This phrase might be specially appropriate to the idea of the *standing* or *relation* of believers as supposed to be conveyed by **ἀμώμους**. But it also suits the idea of *character*—**ἀμώμους** "in God's sight," "under the eye of God as Witness and Judge, and so *in truth and reality*". The terms **ἐνώπιον, κατενώπιον, κατέναντι** are also used in this sense in the NT, and do not appear to occur in profane Greek. They are peculiar to the LXX, the *Apocrypha*, and the NT. All three are used by Paul, **κατενώπιον** and **κατέναντι** sparingly (the former only here and in Col. i. 22, the latter in Rom. iv. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19); most frequently **ἐνώπιον** (Rom. iii. 20, xii. 17, xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 29; 2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.), which is also much employed in Luke and Revelation, never in Matthew or Mark.—**ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *in love.* What does this qualify? The divine *election*, say some (Œc., etc.). But the remoteness of the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** from the **ἐξελέξατο** makes this, if not an impracticable, at least a less likely connection. It is possible, indeed, also to retain the connection of the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** with ver. 4 and yet give it the sense of the *Divine* love, if we take it to qualify not the **ἐξελέξατο** alone, but the whole clause which it concludes. In that case the idea would be that the electing act and the object it had in view, namely holiness and blamelessness on our part, were both due to God's love and had their explanation in it. The choice, however, appears to be between attaching the clause to the preceding **ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους** and attaching it to the following **προορίσας**. Commentators and Versions are widely divided on the question. The former is the connection in LP, the Goth. and Copt. Vv., the Vulg., the texts of Stephens, WH, and the Revisers, and it is preferred by Eras., Luth., Beza, Calv., Grot., Wetst., Alf., Light. The latter is the connection in the Syr.-P, and is followed by LTTr *marg.*, RV *marg.*, Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., Theophy., August., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Olsh., Hof., Bleek., Mey., Ell., V. Sod., Haupt, Abbott, etc. The propriety of understanding the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** as meant to qualify the **προορίσας** is urged on such grounds as these—that the Pauline Epistles furnish no other instance of **ἅγιος** or **ἄμωμος** having attached to it any *grace* or *virtue* defined by **ἐν** as the form in which the holiness or blamelessness shows itself (Haupt); that it is befitting that the *love* which is its principle and ground should get emphatic expression when the Divine **προορισμός** is first introduced (Ell., etc.); that this connection is most in harmony with the ascription of praise (Mey.), and with the genius of the paragraph as a whole, which is concerned with what God is to us rather than what we are required to be to Him. On the other hand in support of attaching the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** to the preceding, it is pointed out that in view of the subsequent **κατ' εὐδοκίαν** there is less reason for introducing **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** in so emphatic a position before the **προορίσας**; that, if not in the Pauline Epistles themselves, yet elsewhere both within and without the NT we have instances analogous to the connection of **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** with **ἀμώμους** here—*e.g.*, 2 Pet. iii. 14, **ἀμώμητοι . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ**; Jud. 24, **ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει**; *Clem. Rom.*, 50, **ἵνα ἐν ἀγάπῃ εὑρεθῶμεν δίχα προσκλίσεως ἀνθρωπίνης ἄμωμοι** (cited

by Light., *Notes; ut sup.*, 313), and above all that it is Paul's usual, if not constant, habit to place **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** *after* the clause it qualifies (Eph. iv. 2, 15, 16, v. 2; Col. ii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 13; *cf.* also, though in association with other terms, 1 Tim. iv. 12; 2 Tim. i. 13). On the whole this connection is to be preferred, and the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** will then define the holiness and blamelessness, which are the end and object of God's election of us, as having their truth and perfection in the supreme Christian grace of love.

Ver. 5. **προορίσας ἡμᾶς**: *having fore-ordained us.* Better, *in that He fore-ordained us.* Wycl. gives "hath bifore ordeyned us"; Tynd. and Cranmer, "ordeyned us"; and so the RV, "fore-ordained". But the Genevan, the Rhemish and the AV, following the *praedestinavit* of the Vulg., give "did predestinate us," "hath predestinated us," "having predestinated us". While in Romans and Ephesians the AV adopts "predestinated," in 1 Cor. ii. 7 it has "foreordained". It is best to adopt *foreordain* all through, as **προορίζειν** means to *determine before.* The verb seems not to occur either in the LXX or in any Greek writer before Paul. It is found in Heliodorus, Ignatius, etc. In the NT it is always used of God as determining from eternity, sometimes with the further definition **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7)—decreeing to do something (Acts iv. 28); fore-ordaining things or persons (1 Cor. ii. 7; Rom. viii. 29 ff.); or, as here, appointing one beforehand to something. The **πρὸ** in the compound verb expresses the fact that the decree is prior to the realisation of its object. The aor. part. may be taken as *temporal* (so the Syr.-Phil.), in which case the *foreordination* would be something prior (not in *time*, indeed, but in *logical* order) to the *election*, and the election would be defined as proceeding on the foreordination (Ell., Alf., etc.). But it may also be taken as *modal*, not prior to the election but coincident with it, and expressing the mode of its action or the form which it took—"in that He fore-ordained us" (Mey., etc.). On this use of the aor. part. see Winer-Moul., *Gram.*, p. 430. This is the more probable view, because no real distinction appears to be made between the **ἐκλογή** and the **προορισμός** beyond what may be suggested by the **ἐκ** in the one and the **πρό** in the other; the idea in the **ἐκλογή** being understood to be that of the *mass from* which the selection is made, and that of the **προορισμός** the *priority* of the decree (Ell.). It is also to be noticed (*cf.* Mey.) that both in Romans (viii. 29) and in 1 Peter (i. 2) it is the **πρόγνωσις**, not the **προορισμός**, that is represented as antecedent to the election or as forming its ground. This Divine **προορισμός**, like the Divine **ἐκλογή**, has in the Pauline writings, in which it receives its loftiest, most complete, and most unqualified statement, not a speculative but an intensely practical interest, especially with regard to two things of most immediate personal concern—the believer's incentive to live in newness and holiness of life (*cf.* ii. 10), and his encouragement to rest in the Divine salvation as for him an assured salvation.—**εἰς υἱοθεσίαν**: *unto adoption.* Or, as the RV gives it, following the *adoptio filiorum* of the Vulg., "unto adoption as sons". It is a Pauline term, and conveys an idea distinct from that of *sonship* and explanatory of it. The sonship of believers, the fact that they are children of God, with the privileges and responsibilities belonging to such, finds frequent expression in the NT writings. But it is only in the Pauline Epistles that the specific idea of **υἱοθεσία** occurs, and there in five instances (Rom. viii. 15, 23, ix. 4; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5). In one case it is applied to the special relation of Israel to God (Rom. ix. 4); thrice (Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5) it is used of the present position of believers in Christ; once (Rom. viii. 23) it refers to their future consummation, the resurrection of life that will be the full manifestation of their sonship. It is a term of *relation*, expressing our sonship in respect of *standing.* It appears to be taken from the Roman custom, with which Paul could not fail to be acquainted. Among the Jews there were cases of informal adoption, as in the instance of Mordecai and Esther (Esth. ii. 7). But adoption in the sense of the legal transference of a child to a family to which it did not belong by birth had no place in the Jewish law. In Roman law, on the other hand, provision was made for the transaction known as *adoptio*, the taking of a child who was not one's child by birth to be his son, and *arrogatio*, the transference of a son who was independent, as by the death of his proper father, to another father by solemn public act of the people. Thus among the Romans a citizen might receive a child who was not his own by birth into his family and give him his name, but he could do so only by a formal act, attested by witnesses, and the son thus adopted had

in all its entirety the position of a child by birth, with all the rights and all the obligations pertaining to that. By "adoption," therefore, Paul does not mean the bestowal of the full privileges of the family on those who are sons by nature, but the acceptance into the family of those who do not by nature belong to it, and the placing of those who are not sons originally and by right in the relation proper to those who are sons by birth. Hence **υἱοθεσία** is never affirmed of Christ; for he alone is Son of God by nature. So Paul regards our sonship, not as lying in the natural relation in which men stand to God as His children, but as implying a new relation of grace, founded on a covenant relation of God and on the work of Christ (Gal. iv. 5 ff.).—**διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *through Jesus Christ;* in this case not *in* Christ but *through* Him. That is, it is through the mediation of Christ that our adoption as sons is realised; *cf.* Gal. iii. 26-iv. 7. Elsewhere the *ethical* side of the sonship is expressed. For God not only brings us into the relation of sons, but makes us sons in inward reality and character, giving us the filial mind, leading us by His Spirit, translating us into the liberty of the glory of His children (Rom. viii. 12, 14, 21; Gal. iv. 6).—**εἰς αὐτόν**: *unto Himself*, that is, not unto *Christ*, as De Wette, V. Soden, etc., still think, but unto *God*. Here, as in ver. 4, we read **αὑτοῦ**, not **αὐτοῦ** (as Stephens, Mill, Griesbach, etc., put it), the writer giving it as from his own standpoint. How is this to be understood? It may mean simply that God Himself is the Father to whom we are brought into filial relation by adoption. In that case the point would be the glory of the adoption, inasmuch as it is God Himself and none less than He who becomes our Father by it and to whom the foreordination into the position of sons looks. Or it may be the deeper idea that God Himself is the *end* of the foreordination, as Christ is its medium or channel. The **εἰς** is not to be confused with **ἐν**, nor would the idea thus be reduced to that of simple possession. Here the **εἰς** may rather have its most definite force, expressing the *goal* of all. The final object of God's foreordination of us to the standing of sons is to bring us to Himself, into perfect fellowship with Him, into adoring, loving relation to Himself as the true End and Object of our being.—**κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the good pleasure of His will.* Wycl. gives "by the purpose of His will"; Rhem., "according to the purpose of His will"; Tynd., "according to the pleasure of His will"; Cran., Gen., AV, "according to the good pleasure of His will". The noun **εὐδοκία** (Vulg.-Clem., *beneplacitum*) is a biblical term. It is not current in profane Greek, but represents the רָצוֹן of the OT (especially in the Psalms), and occurs a good many times in Sir. In the NT it is found thrice in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 26; Luke ii. 14, x. 21), and six times in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. x. 1; Eph. i. 5, 9; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11), but nowhere else. It has the sense (*a*) of *will* (Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21), passing into that of *desire* (Rom. x. 1); and (*b*) of *good will* (Luke ii. 14; Eph. i. 9; Phil. i. 15, ii. 13), passing into that of *delight* or *satisfaction* (2 Thess. i. 11). Here it is taken by most (Mey., De Wette, Stier., Alf., Ell., Abbott, etc.) in the sense of *beneplacitum*, *purpose*, *sovereign counsel*, as equivalent to **κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ** in ver. 11. Light., *e.g.*, is of opinion that, while its central idea is "satisfaction," it will "only then mean 'benevolence' when the context points to some person *towards whom* the satisfaction is felt". He refers to **ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα** in Matt. iii. 17, and contends that without such indication of a personal object "the satisfaction is felt in the action itself, so that the word is used absolutely, and signifies 'good pleasure,' in the sense of 'desire,' 'purpose,' 'design'" (*Notes*, *ut sup.*, 314). But in the Pauline Epistles, when it is used of God, it is a term of grace, expressing "good pleasure" as *kind* intent, *gracious* will, and even when used of man it conveys the same idea of *goodness* (Rom. x. 1; Phil. i. 15). Nor does the connotation appear to be different in the occurrences in the Gospels (Matt. xi. 26; Luke ii. 14; x. 21). In the present passage it is only in relation to the grace of His dealings with sinful men that reference is made to the will of God. The clause in question presents that grace in the particular aspect of its sovereign, unmerited action. It adds the last note to the statement of the wonders of the Divine election by expressing the fact that that election and God's foreordination of us unto adoption are not due to any desert in us or anything outside God Himself, but are acts of His own pure goodness, originating only and wholly in the freedom of His own thoughts and loving counsel.

Ver. 6. **εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *to the praise of the glory of his*

αὐτοῦ, 6. εἰς [w] ἔπαινον [x] δόξης [1] τῆς [2] χάριτος αὐτοῦ, [y] ἧς [3] [z] ἐχαρί- τωσεν ἡμᾶς [a] ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ, 7. [b] ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν [4] τὴν [c] ἀπολύτρωσιν

w See Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7. x = Rom. iii. 23; Col. i. 27. y attr., Acts i. 1 reff. z Luke i. 28 only †; Sir. xviii. 17; Ps. xvii. 25 Symm. a Vv. 3, 4 reff. b Col. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30. c Luke xxi. 28; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35; Dan. iv. 32, Chis. MS.; see Ps. lxviii. 18; Isa. lxiii. 4.

[1] **της δοξης** DE. [2] **της** om. Dam.

[3] **εν η,** with ℵ[3]DEF (om. **η**) GKL, most MSS., Syr.-P., Bas., Chr. (*hoc loco*), Thdrt., Dam., Victorin., Ambrstr.; text AB 6, 17, 23[1], 47, 57, al., Orig. Chr.; **η** Thl.; **και** 1. After **ηγαπ.** insert **υιω αυτου** D[1]EFG, syr.*, d, e, f, g, vg., Syr.-P., Goth., etc.

[4] **εσχομεν** ℵD, Copt. (*accepimus*), Eth., Iren.[310]; text ℵ[3]AB[1]D[2, 3]EFGKLP, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Syr.utr., Arm., Goth., Iren.[293], Or., Cyr., Thdt., Victorin., Jer.

grace. Twice again in the same context we have the phrase "to the praise of his glory" (vv. 12, 14). Here it is the glory specifically of God's grace, and the praise of that is now stated to be the ultimate end of God's foreordination of us unto adoption, as our adoption itself has been declared to be the object of the fore-ordination. God's final purpose in His eternal determinations, and the supreme end to which all that He wills regarding us looks, are the manifestation and adoring recognition of His grace in its gloriousness. So Chrys. puts it briefly **ἵνα ἡ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ δόξα δειχθῇ**. The phrase means more than "the praise of his glorious grace". It expresses the setting forth on God's part, and the joyful confession on man's part, of what the Divine grace in these eternal counsels is in the quality of its splendour, its magnificence. That this is the idea is shown by the subsequent mention of the "riches" of the same grace (ver. 7).—**ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς**: *with which he freely gifted us*; literally, *with which he graced us*. The AV follows Beza's *in qua nos acceptos sibi effecit* in rendering it "wherein he made us accepted". The RV, which gives "wherewith he endued us" in the margin, deals better with it in the text, "which he freely bestowed on us". The reading **ἐν ᾗ** of the TR, supported by such MSS. as DEGL, the mass of the cursives, the Vulg., etc., must give place to **ἧς**, which is given by ℵBA, Eth., Syr., etc., and is adopted by LT (eighth ed.) TrWHRV. The **ἧς** is by attraction for **ἥν** (*cf.* similar genitives by attraction in iv. 1; 2 Cor. i. 4), the explanation being found in the influence of such usages as **μάχην μάχεσθαι, ὕβριν ὑβρίζειν, κλῆσιν καλεῖν, χάριν χαριτοῦν.** See Win.-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 203; Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 289. The verb **χαριτόω**, following the analogy of other verbs in **-οω**, means *gratia aliquem afficere*. But this may have two senses (*cf.* Harl., Ell.), either to *make one agreeable*, *possessed of grace* (Sir. xviii. 17; Ps. xvii. 26 (Symmachus), Clem. Alex., *Paed.*, iii., 11), or to *bestow grace on one*, to *compass one with favour* (Test. xii Patr., Jos. i.). The verb is of rare occurrence, whether within or without the NT. It is commonest in ecclesiastical and Byzantine Greek. In the NT it is found only twice, here and in Luke i. 28. In both instances some would give it the former sense. In the present passage, *e.g.*, Chrys. makes it **ἐπεραστοὺς ἐποίησε**, and so substantially Cornel. a Lapide, Bisping, and various RC interpreters. The latter sense, however, is rightly preferred by Beng., Ell., Alf., Light., Mey., Haupt, etc., as more in harmony with the general sense of **χάρις** in the Pauline Epistles, and with the fact that the main idea in the context is what God in His gratuitous goodness does for us.—**ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ**: *in the Beloved*. The doubtful explanatory term **υἱῷ αὐτοῦ** is added by some ancient authorities (DEFG, Vulg., Goth., Jer., etc.). Again it is not "*through* him," but "*in* him". The grace is bestowed in and with Christ Himself. It is in the gift of the Son that the gift of grace becomes ours and that the splendour of the grace is seen. The designation **ὁ ἠγαπημένος** as applied to Christ is peculiar to this one passage so far as the NT is concerned. In the NT its nearest equivalent is the title **τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ** in the somewhat similar passage in Col. i. 13. *Cf.* also **ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός** (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Mk. i. 11, ix. 7; Luke iii. 22, ix. 35), **ὁ ἀγαπητός μου** (Matt. xii. 18); and in the OT Ps. xxvii. 6 (LXX); Is. v. 1. Outside the NT the term **ὁ ἠγαπημένος αὐτοῦ** is used of Christ in the *Ep. of Barn.* (3, 4). Light. points also to similar designations in Ignatius, Clem. Rom., and the *Ascensio Isaiae* (*Notes, ut sup.*, 316).

Ver. 7. **ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρω-**

σιν: *in whom we have the redemption.* Here and in the parallel passage in Col. i. 14 the readings vary between ἔχομεν and ἔσχομεν. In the present sentence, though ἔσχομεν has the support of some good authorities (ℵD, Copt., Eth., etc.), the weight of documentary evidence is largely on the side of ἔχομεν (Bℵ^c AD^b EFGKL, Vulg., Syr., Goth., etc.). What is in view, therefore, is something possessed now, and the writer describes that as τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν—"*the* redemption," *i.e.*, the redemption familiar to every Christian, long expected and now accomplished. This ἀπολύτρωσις is viewed sometimes as a thing of the future (Luke xxi. 28; Rom. viii. 23; Eph. iv. 30; and probably also Eph. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30); sometimes as a present possession (as here; Rom. iii. 24; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15). That the ἀπολύτρωσις here is a redemption not from the power or pollution of sin, but from its guilt, its condemnation, its penalty, is made plain by the defining clause which follows, identifying it with the *forgiveness* of sins. This is not the only aspect in which it is presented in the Pauline Epistles. The verb λυτροῦσθαι is applied there to a redemption from "all iniquity," Tit. ii. 14, as in 1 Pet. i. 18 it is used of a redemption from a "vain manner of life". But it is the primary aspect of the word and its cognates, and the one that is at the foundation of the other. The noun ἀπολύτρωσις is of rare occurrence, found only in a few passages in profane Greek (Plut., *Pomp.*, xxiv., 2; Joseph., *Antiq.*, xii., ii., 3; Diod., *Frag.*, lib. xxxvii., 5, 3 (Dindorf.); Philo, *Quod omn. prob. lib. sit.*, § 17); and in the NT itself only ten times in all. The verb ἀπολυτροῦσθαι is not found in the NT at all; the simple λυτροῦν, λυτροῦσθαι thrice (1 Pet. i. 18; Luke xxiv. 21; Tit. ii. 14) and the noun λύτρωσις thrice (Luke i. 68, ii. 38; Heb. ix. 12). The proper idea is that of a release, deliverance, or redemption effected by payment of a price or ransom (λύτρον). It is argued indeed that this idea cannot be said to be the essential or primary idea of ἀπολύτρωσις, because it is used in connections in which the notion of a *payment* is not in view (so Abbott); and that, therefore, we are not entitled to say that it means more than *deliverance*. It is true that, as is the case with most words, the definite, specific sense passes at times into the more general sense of "deliverance" (Heb. xi. 35; *cf.* Exod. vi. 6). But in profane Greek and in the LXX the primary sense of the verb, the noun, and their cognates is that of a redemption effected by payment of a price, or a release granted on receiving a price (Plut., *Pomp.*, 24; Plato, *Leges*, 11, p. 919(*a*); Polyb., xxii., 21, 8; Exod. xxi. 8; Zeph. iii. 1); and in the Pauline Epistles it denotes the deliverance accomplished at the cost of Christ's death from the Divine wrath and the penalty of sin. So it is understood, *e.g.*, by Origen, *in loc.*, Mey., Alf., Ell., etc.; and as the ἄφεσιν κ.τ.λ. shows that the "redemption" here in view is one in relation to the *guilt* or *penalty* of sin, so the διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ shows that it is a redemption by payment of a price. This is consistent with Paul's doctrine of the Divine wrath, redemption, propitiation, expiation, and the curse of the law (Rom. i. 18, iii. 23, v. 5 ff.; 1 Cor. vi. 20; Gal. iv. 4). It has its foundation also in Christ's own declaration of the purpose of His coming, *viz.*, to give His life a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45).—**διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ**: *through His blood.* Christ's "blood," therefore, is that by which the redemption is effected—the price (τιμή, 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23) of the deliverance, the "ransom" that had to be paid for it (Matt. xx. 28; Mk. x. 45). The same idea appears in the teaching both of Peter and of John (1 Pet. i. 18; Rev. v. 9). The term occurs repeatedly in the NT, and in various forms—τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1 Cor. x. 16), τοῦ Κυρίου (1 Cor. xi. 27), τοῦ ἀρνίου (Rev. vii. 14, xii. 11), τοῦ σταυροῦ (Col. i. 20). What is its import? It means more than the *death* of Christ. It means that death in a particular aspect—as a sacrifice, a death having a definite efficacy. It is a *sacrificial* term, based on the use of the blood of victims, offered under the OT Law, for purposes of purification and expiation (Lev. xvii. 11; Heb. ix. 7, 12, 18-22, 25, x. 4, xi. 28, xiii. 11). It looks back also to Christ's own words in the institution of the Supper (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mk. xiv. 29), and denotes the ratification of a new relation between God and men by a new covenant sacrifice. It is used with reference to the purchase of the Church (Acts xx. 28; Rev. v. 9), the grace of access to God (Heb. x. 19), the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews (Eph. ii. 13), the reconciliation of all things to God (Col. i. 20); but also and most definitely to the changed condition of sinful men, and that most frequently on the objective side, as a new relation. As in the Levitical system there was a purificatory use of blood in the case of certain matters

of uncleanness (Lev. xiv. 5, 50), so in the NT the "blood" of Christ is used with reference to the ethical power of Christ's death in purifying or in overcoming (1 Pet. i. 19; 1 John i. 7; Rev. xii. 11). But its special use is with reference to justification (Rev. v. 9), the position of non-condemnation (Heb. xii. 24), the cleansing of the conscience (Heb. ix. 14), the making of peace between God and the world (Col. i. 20), the manifestation of the righteousness of God in the passing over of sins (Rom. iii. 25), the remission of sins (Heb. ix. 22). Its primary idea, as is shown by usage and by OT analogy, is not that of renewing power or moral effect, but that of expiation, the removal of guilt, the restoration of broken relations with God. The important passage indeed in Lev. xvii. 11, which speaks of the "blood" as reserved by Jehovah for the altar, for the purpose of "covering" sin or making "atonement" for it, and declares that the atonement is made by the blood by reason of "the *life* of the flesh" that is in it, has been held by not a few (including Bähr and other distinguished scholars) to express only the idea of self-surrender. On this ground the piacular efficacy of the OT sacrifices, and, therefore, of the sacrifice of Christ, has been denied. But the "covering" of sin or making "atonement" for it by sacrifice, is in many passages of the OT definitely connected with the *forgiveness* of sin (Lev. iv. 26, v. 18, etc.); the passage in Lev. xvii. 11 embodies the idea that "life" is the offering by which the transgressor "covers" his sin or finds forgiveness for it; and in passages like the present it is this kind of efficacy that is definitely ascribed to the "blood" of Christ.

The attempt has been made to prove that this great phrase, "the blood of Christ," covers two ideas which ought to be distinguished, namely, that of the blood as *shed* and that of the blood as *offered*, or *death* and *life* as two different conceptions. Thus the phrase in question is interpreted as setting forth Christ's *life* in two distinct aspects, namely, as *laid down* in the act of dying and as *liberated* by the same act and made *available* for us, so that we are saved by having it communicated to us. So West., *Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 293 ff.; *Epistles of St. John*, pp. 34 ff. But neither in the present paragraph nor in any other Pauline passage is there anything to bear this out. Paul, indeed, speaks largely of the Christ who having died is now alive, and of what is effected for us by His *life* (Rom. v. 8-11; Phil. iii. 10, etc.). But what the Living Christ does for us in the forgiveness of sin, or in the subjugation of sin, is done as the power of what He did in dying for us.—**τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων**: *the forgiveness of our trespasses*. The term **ἄφεσις**, while used occasionally in the general sense of *release* (Luke iv. 18; *cf.* Isa. lxi. 1), expresses statedly the idea of the *letting go* of sin (**ἀφιέναι τὴν ὀφειλήν**, Matt. xviii. 32; **ἀφιέναι τὰ ὀφειλήματα, τὰ παραπτώματα**, Matt. vi. 12, 14, etc.), its dismissal or pardon, in the sense of the remission of its penalty (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, etc.), and as distinguished from **πάρεσις**, the *praetermission* or passing by of sin in simple forbearance (Rom. iii. 25). The term **παράπτωμα** describes sin as *lapse*, *misdeed*, *trespass* (nearly equivalent to **παράβασις**, *transgression*, and **ἁμάρτημα**, *evil deed*, these differing not so much in their use as rather in the metaphors underlying them), as distinguished from **ἀνομία**, *lawlessness* or *iniquity*, **ἀδικία**, *unrighteousness* or *wrong*, and **ἁμαρτία**, which is applied not only to *acts* of sin, but to sin as a *power*, a *habit*, a *condition* (*cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, § lxvi.; Fritzsche, *Rom.*, i. 289; Light., *Notes*, *ut sup.*, on *Rom.*, v., 20).—**κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the riches of His grace*. The readings vary between **τὸν πλοῦτον** (TR, following ℵ[3]D[3]KL, etc.) and **τὸ πλοῦτος** (LTTrWHRV, following Bℵ[1]AD[1], etc.). The masculine is the usual form, but the neuter is found in the best MSS. in several passages in the Pauline Epistles (2 Cor. viii. 2; Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. i. 27, ii. 2). Elsewhere in the NT the masculine prevails. Winer explains the exchange between the two forms as due to the popular lauguage, as **ὁ** and **τὸ πλοῦτος** are used indifferently in modern Greek (Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 76). The great word **χάρις**, "grace," which has been used twice already in these opening verses, touches the pulse of all Paul's teaching on the redemption of sinful man. It has a large place in all his Epistles, and not least in this one. For here it meets us at every turning-point in the great statement of the Divine counsel, the securities of the forgiveness of sin, the way of salvation. While it has the occasional and subordinate senses of *loveliness* (Col. iv. 6), *favour* or *good will*, whether of God or of man (Luke ii. 40, 52; Acts ii. 47, iv. 33, vii. 10, etc.), in the Pauline writings it has the particular sense of *free gift*, *undeserved bounty*, and is used specially

διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν [d] ἄφεσιν τῶν [d] παραπτωμάτων, κατὰ τὸ [e] πλοῦτος [1] τῆς χάριτος [2] αὐτοῦ, 8. [f] ἧς [3] [g] ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς [h] ἐν

d here only; see Col. i. 14.
e Ch. ii. 7, iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2.
f attr., Rom. iv. 17; Col. i. 23; ch. ii. 4, 10 al.
g trans., 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12.
h = ver. 17; Col. i. 9, 28.

[1] το πλουτος ℵ*ABD*EFGP 31, 47, 59, 67; το πληθος 17; τον πλουτον ℵ[3]D[3]KL, etc., Or., Cyr., Bas., Chrys., Euthal., etc.

[2] For χαριτος, χρηστοτητος A 109, Copt.; text BDG, f, etc.

[3] For ης, *quae* d, e, f, g, Ambrst.

of the goodness of God which bestows favour on those who have no claim or merit in themselves (Rom. iii. 24, v. 17, 20; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Gal. i. 15, etc., etc.), or of that free favour of God as a power which renews men and sustains them in the Christian life, aiding their efforts, keeping them from falling, securing their progress in holiness (2 Cor. iv. 15; vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 12, etc.). The *freeness* of this Divine favour in the form of grace, the *unmerited* nature of the Divine goodness, is what Paul most frequently magnifies with praise and wonder. Here it is the mighty measure of the largesse, the grace in its quality of *riches*, that is introduced. This magnificent conception of the *wealth* of the grace that is bestowed on us by God and that which is in Christ for us, is a peculiarly Pauline idea. It meets us, indeed, elsewhere (*cf.* the *plenteous* redemption of the Psalmist, Ps. cxxx. 7; the *multitude* of the Divine mercies, Ps. lxix. 13, 16, and loving kindnesses, Ps. lxiii. 7; the *fulness* of Christ, John i. 16; Col. i. 19, etc.); but nowhere so frequently or with such insistence as with Paul. *Cf.* the *riches* of God's goodness (Rom. ii. 4), His glory (Rom. ix. 23), His wisdom (Rom. xi. 33), His mercy (Eph. ii. 4), the glory of His inheritance (Eph. i. 18), the glory of the mystery (Col. i. 27); also the exceeding riches of His grace (Eph. ii. 7), his riches in glory by Christ Jesus (Phil. iv. 19), the riches of the pre-incarnate Christ (2 Cor. viii. 9), the riches of Christ the Lord (Rom. x. 12), the unsearchable riches of Christ (Eph. iii. 8). That our redemption cost so great a price, the blood of Christ, is the supreme evidence of the riches of the Divine grace. And the measure of what God does for us is nothing less than the limitless wealth of His loving favour.

Ver. 8. **ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς ἡμᾶς**: *which he made to abound towards us.* Both in profane and Biblical Greek **περισσεύειν** is usually intrans. It is so used in the vast majority of cases in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 5, viii. 2, ix. 12; Phil. i. 26, etc.). In later Greek, however, it has also, though not frequently, the trans. sense, and there are some instances of this also in the NT (Luke xv. 17, according to the better reading; 2 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 8; 1 Thess. iii. 12). Here, therefore, two interpretations are possible, *viz.*, "wherewith he abounded" (as in Syr., Vulg., Arm., AV, RV marg., etc.), or "which he made to abound" (as in Goth., Eth., RV, etc.). The latter sense, that of furnishing richly so that there is not only enough but much more, is on the whole in better harmony with the context. It is also supported by grammar, inasmuch as it is uncertain whether the NT presents any instance of attraction where the genitive of the relative represents the dative. Such attraction is possible in classical Greek (*cf.* G. Krüger, *Untersuch.*, p. 274; Jelf, *Gram.*, 822; Winer-Moult., *Gram.*, p. 204); but the instances referred to in the NT (Rom. iv. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 6) may admit of another explanation. It is also possible, indeed, to take the **ἧς**, not as a case of attraction, but as under the immediate regimen of **ἐπερίσσευσεν**. For there are at least some instances of **περισσεύειν τινος** in the sense of abounding *in* something; *cf.* **ἵνα . . . παντὸς χαρίσματος περισσεύῃς** in Ignat., *Pol.*, 2, and **περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων** in Luke xv. 17 (the reading of the TR with ℵDQR, etc.; **περισσεύονται**, however, being accepted by TrWHRV with BAP, etc.). The transitive sense, however, is further favoured by the force of the following **γνωρίσας**, as Winer points out. The **εἰς ἡμᾶς**, expressing the objects to whom the "abounding" is directed, is like the **εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς** of Rom. v. 15, the **εἰς ἡμᾶς** of 2 Cor. i. 5, the **εἰς ὑμᾶς** of 2 Cor. ix. 8. In the last-named passage, indeed, **περισσεύειν** occurs both in the sense of *making* to *abound* and in that of *abounding*, and in both cases, though with different shades of meaning, it is followed by **εἰς**.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ φρονήσει**: *in all wisdom and prudence.* The clause expresses the particular forms in which God made His

grace to abound towards us, or the gifts in which His abounding grace was to be seen, namely, those of insight and practical intelligence or discernment with regard to the deep things of His saving counsel. There is considerable difference of opinion, however, with respect to the connection of the clause, its application, and the precise import of its terms. By some (Theod., Griesb., etc.) the words are attached to the following **γνωρίσας** and taken to define the way in which God made known the "mystery of His will". But the reason already given, drawn from Paul's usage, for attaching the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (ver. 4) to the statement preceding it, holds good also here. Not a few (Rückert, De Wette, Alf., etc.) understand the clause to refer to *God*, and to express the thought that the supremacy of His wisdom was seen in the bestowal of His grace so abundantly on us, that it was "in His manifold wisdom and prudence, manifested in all ways possible for us, that He poured out His grace upon us" (Alf.). But it is difficult to adjust the terms to such a use. For it is doubtful whether **φρόνησις** in the sense which it bears here can be predicated of God. The instances which are cited (Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12) are extremely few. They are also of doubtful relevancy, inasmuch as the **φρόνησις** in these passages represents a Hebrew word with a somewhat different idea, rendered by the RV "understanding". Neither is the **πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ** (Eph. iii. 10) a valid analogy, the thought expressed there being that of the many and various ways in which the Divine wisdom is manifested and realised. The same must be said of the phrase **φρόνησις θεοῦ** in the narrative of Solomon's decision (1 Kings iii. 28); for it expresses a prudence or intelligence given to Solomon by God or divine in quality. Even were it more certain than it is that there is biblical warrant for affirming **φρόνησις** of God, the **πάσῃ** puts that reference out of the question here; **πᾶς** being an extensive, not an intensive, definition, expressing not the *highest* wisdom and prudence, but *all possible* wisdom and prudence, *every kind* of such attributes (*cf.* Winer-Moult., p. 137). It is true that there are cases in classical Greek which might entitle us to take **πᾶσα σοφία** as equivalent to **πᾶσα ἡ σοφία,** "the whole of wisdom," "the sum of wisdom" (*cf.* Kühner, *Gram.*, ii., § 465; *Anm.*, 8). But there does not appear to be any certain example of that in NT Greek. Further, it is the *grace* of God that is magnified in the paragraph, and that not in respect of other qualities in God Himself, but in respect of what it does for us. Hence most (Harl., Mey., Ell., Abb., Haupt, etc.) understand the clause to refer not to God the Giver, but to us the receivers. This is borne out also by the **ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει** of Col. i. 9; by the place assigned to Christian wisdom in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians; and also to some extent by such partial parallels as these: **ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ** (Col. iii. 16); **ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει** (1 Cor. i. 5), etc.

There remains, however, the question as to the precise sense of the two nouns. **Σοφία** is of frequent occurrence in the NT generally and in the Pauline writings in particular; **φρόνησις** occurs only twice in the whole NT, *viz.*, in Luke i. 17 (where the RV renders it "wisdom") and here. As in the present passage the two nouns are also conjoined in 1 Kings iii. 12, iv. 29; Prov. i. 2, viii. 1; Dan. i. 17, ii. 21, 23. So, too, in Joseph., *Antiq.*, ii., 5, 7, viii., 7, 5. There is a distinction between them which is variously put in Greek and Roman literature. Aristotle, *e.g.*, defines **σοφία** as **ἐπιστήμη καὶ νοῦς τῶν τιμιωτάτων τῇ φύσει,** and **φρόνησις** as **περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ περὶ ὧν ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι** (*Eth. Nic.*, vi., 7). Plato deals with **φρόνησις** as the wisdom of action, prudential wisdom or sagacity (*Laws*, i., 631 C; 632 E, etc.), and as the faculty by which we judge **τί πρακτέον καὶ τί οὐ πρακτέον** ([Plato], *Def.*, 411). Philo takes **σοφία** to relate **πρὸς θεραπείαν Θεοῦ** and **φρόνησις** to relate **πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνου βίου διοίκησιν** (*De Prom. et Poen.*, 14). Cicero again describes the former as *rerum divinarum et humanarum scientia* and the latter as *rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque scientia* (*Off.*, i., 43); while others explain **σοφία** as **ἐπιστήμη θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων** and **φρόνησις** as **ἐπιστήμη ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν** (Sext. Emp., p. 720; Plut., *Mor.*, 1066 D). In all these definitions **σοφία** is the larger idea, wisdom in the most general sense, and **φρόνησις** is the secondary idea, expressing a particular result or application of **σοφία.** So it seems to be also substantially with the Biblical use of the terms. **Σοφία** is the collective moral intelligence, "insight into the true nature of things" (Light.), and in the Pauline Epistles it is this intelligence in especial as knowledge of the Divine plan of salvation long hidden and now revealed; while **φρόνησις** is the prac-

πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ [i] φρονήσει [1] 9. [k] γνωρίσας [2] ἡμῖν τὸ [l] μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν [m] εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ,[3] ἣν [n] προέθετο [o] ἐν

i Luke i. 17 only; 3 Kings iii. 28.
k John xvii. 26; Ezek. xliv. 23; Eph. and Col. fr.
l Ch. iii. 3, vi. 19 al.; Col. i. 26 al.; Mark iv. 11; Dan. ii. 29 al.
m ver. 5 reff.
n Rom. i. 13, iii. 25 only; Exod. xl. 4.
o Vv. 3, 4 reff.

[1] For φρονησ., γνωσει 17; συνεσει 71.

[2] γνωρισαι FG 76, d, e, f, g, Vlg., Goth., Hil., Theophyl., Victorin., Ambrst., Aug., etc.

[3] αυτου om. DEFG, d, e, g, Goth., Copt., Tert., Victorin., Hil.

tical use of wisdom, the product of wisdom (*cf.* Prov. x. 23, ἡ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν), "the right use and application of the φρήν" (Trench), the faculty of discerning the proper disposition or action. The riches, the abounding riches, of the grace expended on us stood revealed in the bestowal of these gifts of spiritual comprehension and practical discernment with reference to the deep things of the Divine Counsel and the Divine Revelation.

Ver. 9. **γνωρίσας ἡμῖν**: *having made known unto us.* Better, "in that He made known unto us". As in ver. 5 the aor. part. is *modal*, not *temporal*, expressing an act not conceived as prior to that intimated by the definite tense, but coincident with it and stating the way in which it took effect. The ἡμῖν means to us *Christians* generally, not to us *Apostles* particularly, and the knowledge in question is spiritual understanding or insight. It was in giving us to know a certain secret of His counsel that God made His grace to abound toward us in all wisdom and discernment. The revelation of this secret to our minds meant the bestowal on us of all that is implied in wisdom and intelligence.—**τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**: *the mystery* (or *secret*) *of His will.* The gen. is the ordinary *gen. objecti*, the mystery *touching* or *concerning* His will; not the *gen. subjecti*, the mystery *originating* in His will, nor the *appositive* gen., as if it were simply another form for "His hidden will". The word μυστήριον, which in classical Greek meant something *secret*, especially the secrets of religion communicated only to the initiated and by them to be kept untold, is used in the Apocryphal books of things hidden, *e.g.*, the counsels of God (Wisd. ii. 22; Judith ii. 2), and in the NT occasionally of things not clear to the understanding (1 Cor. xiii. 2, xiv. 2), or of the mystic meaning of things — sayings, names, appearances (Eph. v. 32; Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5). But its distinctive sense in the NT is that of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret now open. In this sense it is applied to the Divine plan of redemption as a whole (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 19; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 9, 16, etc.), or to particular things belonging to that Divine plan—the inclusion of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 25; Eph. iii. 3, 9), the transformation of Christians alive on earth at Christ's return (1 Cor. xv. 52), the union of Christ and the Church (Eph. v. 32). It does not convey the idea of something that we cannot take in or understand even when it is declared to us. It is peculiarly frequent in the kindred Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, ten out of the twenty-six or twenty-seven occurrences being found in them. Nor is it confined absolutely to the things of grace. Paul speaks also of the "mystery of lawlessness" (2 Thess. ii. 7). The redemption accomplished through Christ—this is the secret hidden for ages in the Divine Counsel and now revealed. This also is the truth, the disclosure of which to our understandings meant so large a gift of grace in the way of insight and spiritual discernment.—**κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ**: *according to His good pleasure.* This is to be attached neither to the μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, which needs no further definition, nor to the following προέθετο, κ.τ.λ., but to the γνωρίσας, precisely as the previous προορίσας was declared to be κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (ver. 5). The opening of this secret to us after the silence of ages had its ground and reason in nothing else than the gracious counsel or free purpose of God.—**ἣν προέθετο**: *which He purposed.* This verb προτίθεμαι occurs only thrice in the NT, and all three instances are in the Pauline Epistles: once of human purpose (Rom. i. 13), once of the Divine action (Rom. iii. 25), and once (here) of the Divine purpose. The *eternal* purpose of God is in view, as the context shows. The προ in the compound verb, however, does not express the idea of the *pre-temporal*. It appears to have the local sense—*setting before oneself* and so *determining*.

αὐτῷ 10. [p] εἰς [1] [q] οἰκονομίαν τοῦ [r] πληρώματος τῶν [s] καιρῶν, [t] ἀνα-κεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ,[2] τὰ [3] ἐπὶ [4] τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

p = Matt. x. 18. q = Ch. iii. only; see ch. iii. 2; Col. i. 25; Luke xvi. 2 reff. r = Gal. iv. 4 only. s See Mark i. 15; Luke xxi. 24 reff. t Rom. xiii. 9 only †.

[1] For **εις, κατα την** A. [2] Omit **τω** 116, 143; **Χρ. Ιησ.** 143.

[3] Insert **τε**, a few cursives, Epiph., Cyr., etc.

[4] **εν τοις** ℵ[3]AFGKP, etc., Copt., Chr., Thdrt., Epiph., Thl., Ir.; text ℵ*BDEL, Goth., Eus., Thdrt., Dam., Oec., Tert., etc.

—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: *in Himself*. Some make it "in him," that is, in *Christ* (Chrys., Luth., Bengel, Hofm., Light., Wycl., Vulg., etc.), and this would be quite in accordance with the subsequent statement of the eternal purpose as one which God "purposed in Christ Jesus the Lord" (Eph. iii. 11). But God and His will are the subjects in view here, and the mention of *Christ* seems too remote for the **αὐτῷ** to refer naturally to Him. The purpose is God's own free determination, originating in His own gracious mind. The reading **ἐν αὑτῷ** is adopted by Mey., Ell., etc., while **ἐν αὐτῷ** is given by Lachm., Tisch., WH, Harl., etc. The question whether the NT knows any other form than **ἑαυτοῦ** as the reflexive of the third person is still debated. It is urged (*e.g.*, by Bleek, Buttm., etc.) that the NT does not use **αὑτοῦ**, but only **ἑαυτοῦ** in most cases or at least the vast majority, on such grounds as these, *viz.*, that the MSS. have **ἀπό, ἐπί, ὑπό**, etc., and not **ἀφ', ἐφ', ὑφ'**, before **αὐτοῦ**; that in the second person we find only **σεαυτοῦ**, not **σαυτοῦ**; and that the first and second personal pronouns are often used in the NT instead of the reflexive, though not when the pronoun is immediately dependent on the verb. Lightfoot concludes that "**αὐτοῦ**, etc., may be used for **ἑαυτοῦ**, etc., in almost every connection, except where it is the direct object of the verb" (see his note on Col. i. 20). On the other hand, Ell. is of opinion that the reflexive form is in place "where the attention is principally directed to the subject," and the non-reflexive where it is "diverted by the importance of the details". Winer, while admitting that in most passages **αὐτοῦ**, etc., would suffice, would write **αὑτοῦ**, etc., certainly in a few cases such as John ix. 21 (**αὐτὸς περὶ αὑτοῦ λαλήσει**) and Rom. iii. 25 (**ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς . . . εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ**), and would prefer it also in such passages as Mark vii. 35; Luke xii. 34, xix. 15; Rom. xiv. 14; Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 2; as also here in Eph. i. 9. See Buttm., p. 111; Win.-Moult., p. 188; Bleek, *Heb.*, ii., p. 69.

Ver. 10. **εἰς οἰκονομίαν**: *unto a dispensation*. This expresses the *end* which God had in view in that which He purposed. Some (Erasm., Calv., etc.) give **εἰς** the *temporal* sense of *usque ad*. But the idea is rather the more definite one of *design*. God had His reason for the long delay in the revelation of the "mystery". That reason lay in the fact that the world was not ripe for the dispensation of grace which formed the contents of the mystery. In classical Greek the word **οἰκονομία** had the two meanings of (*a*) *administration*, the management of a house or of property, and (*b*) the *office* of administrator or steward. It was used of such things as the arrangement of the parts of a building (Vitruv., i., 2), the disposition of the parts of a speech (Quint., *Inst.*, iii., 3), and more particularly of the financial administration of a city (Arist., *Pol.*, iii. 14; *cf.* Light., *Notes, sub voc.*). It has the same twofold sense in the NT—an *arrangement* or *administration* of things (in the passages in the present Epistle and in 1 Tim. i. 4), and the *office* of administrator—in particular the stewardship with which Paul was entrusted by God (1 Cor. ix. 17; Col. i. 25). The idea at the basis of the statement here, therefore, as also in the somewhat analogous passage in Gal. iv. 1-11, is that of a great household of which God is the Master and which has a certain system of management wisely ordered by Him. *Cf.* the figure of the Church as the household of God (1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2-6; 1 Pet. iv. 17), and the parables which run in terms of God as **οἰκοδεσπότης** (Matt. xiii. 27, xx. 1, 11, xxi. 33; Luke xiii. 25, xiv. 21).—**τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν**: *of the fulness of the times*. That is, a dispensation *belonging to* the fulness of the times. The gen. cannot be the *gen. objecti* (Storr, etc.), nor the *epexegetic* gen. (Harl.), but must be that of characteristic quality, "a dispensation *proper to* the fulness of the times" (Mey.), or it may express the *relation of time*, as in **ἡμέρα**

ὀργῆς (Rom. ii. 5), κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας (Jude 6). In Gal. iv. 4 the phrase takes the more general form τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου; here it has the more specific form τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν, the fulness of the *seasons*, or series of appointed, determinate times. The idea of the *fitness* of the times, it is probable, is also expressed by the καιρῶν as distinguished from χρόνων, the former being a qualitative term, the latter a quantitative (see Light., *Notes*, p. 70). *Cf.* Heb. i. 1, and especially the πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός of Mark i. 15. In classical Greek πλήρωμα appears to have both the passive sense, "that which is filled," and the active, "that which fills". The former is rare, the latter is sufficiently common. See Lidd. and Scott, *Lex.*, and Rost u. Palm., *Wortb.*, *sub voce*. In the NT likewise it seems to have both senses (though this is questioned); the passive being found in the great doctrinal passages in the Pauline Epistles (Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13, etc.), the active occurring more frequently and in a variety of applications (Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 21, vi. 43, viii. 20; Rom. xi. 12; 1 Cor. x. 26). With reference to *time* it means "complement"—the particular time that completes a long prior period or a previous series of seasons. The purport of the statement, therefore, appears to be this: God has His household, the kingdom of heaven, with its special disposition of affairs, its οἰκονόμος or steward (who is Christ), its own proper method of administration, and its gifts and privileges intended for its members. But these gifts and privileges could not be dispensed in their fulness while those for whom they were meant were under age (Gal. iv. 1-3) and unprepared for them. A period of waiting had to elapse, and when the process of training was finished and the time of maturity was reached the gifts could be bestowed in their completeness. God, the Master of the House, had this fit time in view as the hidden purpose of His grace. When that time came He disclosed His secret in the incarnation of Christ and introduced the new disposition of things which explained His former dealings with men and the long delay in the revelation of the complete purpose of His grace. So the Fathers came to speak of the incarnation as the οἰκονομία (Just., *Dial.*, 45, 120; Iren., i., 10; Orig., *C. Cels.*, ii., 9, etc.). This "œconomy of the fulness of the seasons," therefore, is that stewardship of the Divine grace which was to be the trust of Christ, in other words, the dispensation of the Gospel, and that dispensation as fulfilling itself in the whole period from the first advent of Christ to the second. In this last respect the present passage differs from that in Gal. iv. 4. In the latter "the fulness of the time" appears to refer definitely to the mission of Christ into the world and His work there. Here the context (especially the idea expressed by the next clause) extends the reference to the final completion of the work—and the close of the dispensation at the Second Coming.—ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι: *to sum up*. Or, having regard to the Middle Voice, "to sum up for Himself". The sentence thus introduced is one of the select class of passages which refer to the cosmical relations of Christ's Person or Work. It is one of great doctrinal importance. Its exact import, however, is very differently understood by different interpreters. Every word in it requires attention. There is *first* the question of its precise relation to the paragraph of which it forms part. The inf. is taken by most (Mey., Ell., etc.) to be the *epexegetic* inf., conveying something complementary to, or explanatory of, the preceding statement, and so = "namely (or to wit), to sum up". It is that inf., however, in the particular aspect of *consequence* or *contemplated result* = "so as to sum up" (so Light.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 399, 400). But with what part of the paragraph is this complementary sentence immediately connected? The doctrinal significance of the sentence depends to a considerable extent on the answer to the question, and the answer takes different forms. Some understand the thing which is explained or complemented to be the whole idea contained in the statement from γνωρίσας onwards, 'at once the content of the μυστήριον, the object of the εὐδοκία, and the object reserved for the οἰκ." (Abb.). Others limit it to the μυστήριον (Bez., Harl., Kl.), or to the προέθετο (Flatt, Hofm.). Others understand it to refer to the εὐδοκίαν in particular, the ἣν . . . καιρῶν clause being regarded as a parenthesis (Alf., Haupt); and others regard it as unfolding the meaning of the immediately preceding clause—the οἰκονομίαν τ. π. τ. κ. (Mey., etc.). The last seems to be the simplest view, the others involving more or less remoteness of the explanatory sentence from the sentence to be explained. So the point would be that the *œconomy*, the new order of things which God in the purpose of His grace had in view for the fulness of the seasons, was one which had for

its end or object a certain *summing up* of all things. But in w at sense is this *summing up* to be understood? The precise meaning of this rare word **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** has to be looked at. In the classics it is used of *repeating summarily* the points of a speech, gathering its argument together in a summary form. So Quintilian explains the noun **ἀνακεφαλαίωσις** as *rerum repetitio et congregatio* (vi., 1), and Aristotle speaks of the **ἔργον ῥητορικῆς** as being **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν** (*Frag.*, 123). In late Greek the verb means also to present in *compendious form* or to *reproduce* (*Protev. Jac.*, 13). The simple verb **κεφαλαιοῦν** in the classics denotes in like manner to *state summarily*, or *bring under heads* (Thuc., iii., 67, vi., 91, etc.), and the noun **κεφάλαιον** is used in the sense of the *chief point* (Plato, *Laws*, 643 D), the *sum of the matter* (Pind., *P.*, 4, 206), a *head* or *topic* in argument (Dionys. Hal., *De Rhet.*, x., 5), a *recapitulation* of an argument (Plato, *Tim.*, 26, etc.). In the NT the verb **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** occurs only twice, namely here and in Rom. xiii. 9; in which latter passage it is used of the *summing up* of the various commandments in the one requirement of love to one's neighbour. The simple verb **κεφαλαιοῦν** occurs only once, *viz.*, in Mark xii. 4, where it has the sense of *wounding in the head;* but the text is uncertain there, TTrWH reading **ἐκεφαλίωσαν** with BℵL, etc. The noun **κεφάλαιον** is found twice, *viz.*, in Acts xxii. 28, where it has the sense of a *sum of money* (as in Lev. vi. 5; Num. v. 7, xxxi. 26), and in Heb. viii. 1, where it means the *chief point* in the things that the writer has been saying. The prevailing idea conveyed by these terms, therefore, appears to be that of a logical, rhetorical, or arithmetical summing up. The subsequent specification of the objects of the **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι,** however, makes it plain that what is in view here is not a logical or rhetorical, but a real or objective summing up. Further, as the verb comes not from **κεφαλή** but from **κεφάλαιον,** it does not refer to the summing up of things under a *head*, and the point of view, therefore, is not that of the *Headship* of Christ—which comes to distinct expression at the close of the chapter. On the other hand it does not seem necessary to limit the sense of the word (with Haupt) to the idea of a *résumé* or *compendious presentation* of things in a single person. The question remains as to the force of the prep. in the compound verb. The **ἀνα** is taken by many to add the idea of *again*, and to make the result or end in view the bringing things back to a unity which had once existed but had been lost. So it is understood by the Pesh., the Vulg., Tertull. (*e.g.*, in his *Adv. Marc.*, v., 17, "affirmat omnia ad initium recolligi in Christo"; in the *De Monog.*, 5, "adeo in Christo omnia revocantur ad initium," etc.), Mey., Alf., Abb., etc. On the other hand, Chrys. makes the compound verb equivalent to **συνάψαι**; and the idea of a return to a former condition is negatived by many, the **ἀνα** being taken to have simply the sense which it has in **ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀνακρίνειν, ἀνακυκᾶν, ἀναλογίζεσθαι, ἀναμάνθανειν,** etc., and to express the idea of "*going over* the separate elements for the purpose of uniting them" (Light., *Notes*, p. 322). Usage on the whole is on the side of the latter view, and accordingly the conclusion is drawn by some that this "summing up" is not the recovery of a broken pristine unity, but the gathering together of objects now apart and unrelated into a final, perfect unity. Nevertheless it may be said that the verb, if it does not itself definitely express the idea of the restoration of a lost unity, gets that idea from the context. For the whole statement, of which the **ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι** clause forms part, runs in terms of a *redemption*, and the cognate passage in Col. i. 20 speaks of a final *reconciliation* of all things.—**τὰ πάντα**: *all things*. An all-inclusive phrase, equivalent to the totality of creation; not *things* only, nor yet *men* or intelligent beings only (although the phrase might bear that sense, *cf.* Gal. iii. 22), but, as the context shows, all created objects, men and things. *Cf.* the universal expression in Col. i. 20.—**ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *in Christ*, or rather "in the Christ," the introduction of the article indicating that the term has its official sense here. The same is clearly the case in ver. 12, and, as Alford notices, the article does not seem to be attached to the term **Χριστός** after a prep. unless some special point is in view. The point of union in this gathering together of all things is the Christ of God. In Him they are to be unified.—**τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: *the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth*. Or, according to the better reading and as in RV marg., *the things upon the heavens, and the things upon the earth*. The reading of the TR, though supported by AGK, most cursives, Chrys., etc.,

καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς· 11. ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν ᾧ καὶ [u] ἐκληρώθημεν[1] [v] προορισθέντες [w] κατὰ [x] πρόθεσιν[2] τοῦ τὰ[3] πάντα [y] ἐνεργοῦντος κατὰ τὴν [z] βουλὴν

u Here only. 1 Kings xiv. 41. v Acts iv. 28; Rom. viii. 29, 30; 1 Cor. ii. 7; ver. 5 only †. w = Phil. ii. 3 reff. x = Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; ch. iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Acts xxvii. 13; 2 Macc. iii. 8. y 1 Cor. xii. 6, 11; Phil. ii. 13. z = Acts ii. 23, iv. 28, xiii. 36; Heb. vi. 17.

[1] For **εκληρ.**, **εκληθημεν** (*gloss*) ADEFG, it., d, e, g; text BאKLP, al., d, e, f, g, Vlg., Euseb., Euthal., Cyr., Chrys., Thdt., Dam., etc.

[2] Before **προθ.** insert **την** D[1]FG, al. After **προθ.** insert **του Θεου** DEFG 10, 46, 71-3, 80, Copt., Eth., Slav., Ambrst.

[3] Before **παντα** om. **τα** D[1]FG 109, Thdrt.

must give place to **τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, which is adopted by LTTrWH on the basis of BאDL, etc. It is an unusual form for the compound phrase, the term **ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** being ordinarily coupled with **ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς** (*cf.* iii. 15; also the parallel in Col. i. 20, where the **ἐπί** is poorly attested). The **ἐπί** in **ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς**, however, may have the force of *at*, which it has in such phrases as **ἐπὶ πύλῃσιν** (*Il.*, iii., 149), **ἐπὶ πύργῳ** (*Il.*, vi., 431), **ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ** (Acts iii. 10, 11), the heavens being regarded, as Meyer thinks, as "the stations at which the things concerned are to be found". The phrase in its two contrasted parts defines the preceding **τὰ πάντα**, making the all-inclusive nature of its universality clear by naming its great divisions. It is not to be understood as referring in its first section to any particular class, *spirits in heaven*, *departed saints of Old Testament times*, *angels* (as even Chrys. and Calv. thought), *Jews*, and in its second section specifically to *men* or to *Gentiles*. It explains the universality expressed by **τὰ πάντα** as the widest possible and most comprehensive universality, including the sum total of created objects, wherever found, whether men or things.—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: *in him*. Emphatic resumption of the **ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ** and transition to the following statement, solemnly re-affirming also, as Ell. suggests, *where* the true point of unity designed by God, or the sphere of its manifestation, is to be found.

The passage has been supposed (Orig., Crell., etc.) to teach the doctrine of a Universal Restoration. But interpreted as above it has nothing to do with any such doctrine, whether in the sense of a final salvation of all unrighteous and unbelieving men or in that of a final recovery of all evil beings, devils and men alike. Nor, again, does it refer particularly to the case of the *individual*. It speaks, as Meyer notices, of the "aggregate of heavenly and earthly things," and of that as destined to make a true unity at last. Another view of the general import of the statement, which has been elaborated with much ability by Haupt, requires some notice. Pressing to its utmost the sense of a *résumé* or *summary*, which he regards as the idea essentially contained in the terms in question, he contends that the meaning of the statement is that in Christ, who belongs at once to humanity and to the heavenly world, should be seen the compendious presentation of all beings and things—that in His person should be summarised the totality of created objects, both earthly and heavenly, so that outside Him nothing should exist. He looks for the proper parallel to this not in Col. i. 20, but in Col. i. 16, 17, where it is said of Christ that "in Him were all things created" and that "in Him all things consist". And he appeals in support of his view to the use of the kindred verb **συγκεφαλαιοῦσθαι** in Xen. (*Cyr.*, viii., 1, 15, viii., 6, 14), where it expresses the organisation of a multitude of slaves under one representative, in whom they and their acts were so embodied that Cyrus could transact with all when dealing with the one. But the idea of Christ's agency in the first creation and the continuous maintenance of things is not expressed in the passage in Ephesians, and while it is the preexistent Christ that is in view in Col. i. 16, here it is the risen Christ. It remains, therefore, that the present passage belongs to the same class as Rom. viii. 20-22; Col. i. 20, etc., and expresses the truth that Christ is to be the point of union and reconciliation for all things, so that the whole creation shall be finally restored by Him to its normal condition of harmony and unity.

Ver. 11. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ**: *in whom also we*. The **καί** does not qualify the *subjects* (for there is no emphatic **ἡμεῖς**, nor is there any such contrast between **ἡμεῖς** and **ὑμεῖς** here as appears in verses 12, 13),

but refers to what is expressed by the verb and presents that as something additional to what has been expressed by the preceding verb. The "we," therefore, designates Christians inclusively, and the **καί** gives the sentence this force —"not only was it the purpose of God to make known the secret of His grace to us Christians, but this purpose was also fulfilled in us in point of fact and we were made His own—not only chosen for His portion but actually made that". The AV "in whom also we" seems to follow the erroneous rendering of the Vulg., *in quo etiam nos*. Equally at fault are those (including even Wetstein and Harless) who limit the "we" to Jewish Christians here.—**ἐκληρώθημεν**: *were made a heritage*. The reading **ἐκλήθημεν**, found in a few uncials and favoured by Griesb., Lachm., Rück., may be a gloss from Rom. viii. 13, or possibly a simple case of mistaken transcription due to the faulty eyes of some scribe. The verb **ἐκληρώθημεν** is of disputed meaning here. This is its only occurrence in the NT. The compound form **προσκληροῦν** also occurs in the NT, but only once (Acts xvii. 4). In classical Greek **κληροῦν** means to *cast the lot*, to *choose by lot*, and to *allot*. Both in the classics and in the NT **κλῆρος** denotes a *lot*, and then a portion *allotted*. The cognate **κληρονομεῖν** means to *get by lot*, to obtain an *allotted portion*, and so to *inherit;* and **κληρονομία**, in the LXX often representing נַחֲלָה, signifies a *property inherited*, or a *possession*. In the OT it is used technically of the portion assigned by lot to each tribe in the promised land, and of the Holy Land itself as Israel's possession given by God (Deut. iv. 38, xv. 4). In the NT it gets the higher sense of the blessedness of the Messianic kingdom, the Christian's destined possession in the consummation of the Kingdom of God. The affinities of **κληροῦν** show that it may have the definite sense of *heritage*. It is alleged indeed by some (*e.g.*, Abb.) that the only idea expressed in **κληροῦν** is that of assigning a *lot* or *portion*, and that the notion of an *inheritance* does not belong to it. But the portions of land assigned by lot to the tribes of Israel on their entrance into Canaan were secured inalienably, and the lots belonging to each family were so secured to the family from father to son that it was impious to let them go into the hands of strangers (*cf.* the case of Naboth, 1 Kings xxi. 3). Thus the idea of *lot* or *portion* passed over into that of *inheritance*. Thus, too, in the OT the blessings of the people of God, recognised to be possessed by God's free gift and not by the people's merit, came to be described in terms of a *heritage*, and God Himself, the Giver of all, was looked to as the supreme portion of His people, the possession that made their inheritance (Ps. xvi. 5-11). But in the OT there was also the counter idea that Israel was the portion or inheritance of the Lord, chosen by Himself to be His peculiar possession. At times these two ideas meet in one statement (Jer. x. 16). The question, therefore, is—which of these two conceptions is embodied in the **ἐκληρώθημεν** here? Or may it be that the word has a sense somewhat different from either? Some take this latter view, understanding the word to mean *appointed by lot*, or *elected by lot*, *sorte vocati sumus* as the Vulg. makes it. So Syr., Goth., Chrys., Erasm., Estius, etc. So also the Genevan Version gives "we are chosen," and the Rhemish "we are called by lot". The point thus would be again the sovereignty of the Divine choice, the Christians in view being described as appointed to their Christian position *as if* by lot. But when our *appointment* or *election* is spoken of it is nowhere else said to be by *lot*, but by the purpose or counsel of God. Retaining, therefore, the general conception of an *inheritance*, some take the passive **ἐκληρώθημεν** for the middle, and render it simply "we have obtained an inheritance" (AV., Conyb.). The passive, however, must be accepted as a real passive, and the choice comes to be between these two interpretations: (*a*) *we were made partakers of the inheritance*, *in hereditatem adsciti*, *enfeoffed* in it (Eadie), and (*b*) *we were made a heritage* (RV), God's **λαὸς ἔγκληρος**, taken by Him as His own peculiar portion. The former is the view of Harl., Mey., Haupt, etc., and so far also of Tyndale and Cranmer, who translate "we are made heirs". It deals with the pass. **κληροῦσθαι** on the analogy of such passives as **πιστεύομαι, φθονοῦμαι, διακονοῦμαι**; it has the advantage of being in accordance with the idea regularly conveyed by the cognate terms **κληρονομία, κληρονομεῖν**; and it points to a third gift of God of the same order with the previous two—forgiveness, wisdom, inheritance. The other interpretation, however — "made a heritage," "taken for God's inheritance"—is to be preferred (with Grot., Olsh., De Wette, Stier., Alf., etc.) as being on the whole more consistent with usage; more in

a Acts iii. 19, vii. 19; Rom. i. 11, 20 al.
b Ver. 6 reff.
c Here only.
d 1 Cor. xv. 19; Ps. xxxii. 21.

τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, 12. [a]εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς [b]ἔπαινον δόξης[1] αὐτοῦ[2] τοὺς [c]προηλπικότας [d]ἐν τῷ χριστῷ[3]· 13. ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς,[4]

[1] της δοξ. A, al., Chr., Thdrt., Oec.; text ℵBDEFGKLP 1, 35, 48, 57, all Eus. Cyr., Dam., Thl.

[2] After δοξ. omit αυτου D[1]FG, d, e, g, Tert.

[3] τους to χρ. om. 115; τω om. FG 1, 59.

[4] For υμεις, ημεις ℵ[3]AKL 13, 39, 44-6, all Thl., Oec.

harmony with the import of the other passives in the paragraph; sustained, perhaps, by the use of προσκληροῦν in Acts xvii. 4, where the idea is rather that of *being allotted* to Paul as disciples than that of joining their lot (AV and RV = "consorted with") with Paul; and, in particular, as suggested by the εἰς τὸ εἶναι that follows—εἰς τὸ ἔχειν rather than εἰς τὸ εἶναι being what would naturally follow the statement of an inheritance which we received.—**προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν**: *having been foreordained according to the purpose.* The fact that we were made the heritage of God is thus declared to have been no incidental thing, not an event belonging only to time or one having its explanation in ourselves, but a change in our life founded on and resulting from the eternal foreordaining purpose of God Himself. The *purpose* of God is expressed here by the term πρόθεσις, the radical idea in which is that of the setting of a thing before one. It occurs six times in the Pauline Epistles, and is not confined to one class of these, but appears alike in the Primary Epistles, the Epistles of the Captivity, and the Pastoral Epistles (Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, iii. 10). Outside these Epistles it occurs only twice in the NT, both times in Acts (xi. 23, xxvii. 13) and of human purpose.—**τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργοῦντος**: *of Him who worketh all things.* The πάντα has the absolute sense, and is not to be restricted to the "all things" that belong to the Divine grace and redemption. The foreordination of men to a special relation to God is connected with the foreordination of things universally. The God of the chosen is the God of the universe; the purpose which is the ground of our being made God's heritage is the purpose that embraces the whole plan of the world; and our position as the κλῆρος and possession of God has behind it both the sovereignty and the efficiency of the Will that *energises* or is operative in all things.—**κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ**: *after the counsel of his will.* The distinction between βουλή and θέλημα is still much debated, scholars continuing to take precisely opposite views of it. On the one hand, there are those who hold that θέλειν and its cognates express the will as proceeding from *inclination*, and that βούλεσθαι and its cognates express the will as proceeding from *deliberation* (Grimm, Wilke, Light., etc.). On the other hand, there are those who contend that θέλειν is the form that conveys the idea of *deliberation* and βούλεσθαι that which carries with it the idea of inclination. In many passages it is difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate any real distinction, the terms being often used indiscriminately. But in connections like the present it is natural to look for a distinction, and in such cases the idea of *intelligence* and *deliberation* seems to attach to the βουλή. This appears to be supported by the usage which prevails in point of fact in the majority of NT passages, and in particular by such occurrences as Matt. i. 19. Here, therefore, the will of God which acts in His foreordaining purpose or decree, in being declared to have its βουλή or "counsel," is set forth as acting not *arbitrarily*, but *intelligently* and by deliberation, not without reason, but for reasons, hidden it may be from us, yet proper to the Highest Mind and Most Perfect Moral Nature. "They err," says Hooker, with reference to this passage, "who think that of God's will there is no reason except His will" (*Ecc. Pol.*, i., 2). It is also implied in this statement that the Divine foreordination, whether of things universally or of men's lots in particular, is neither a thing of necessity on the one hand nor of caprice on the other, but a thing of freedom and of thought; and further, that the reasons for that foreordination do not lie in the objects themselves, but are intrinsic to the Divine Mind and the free determination of the Divine Will.

Ver. 12. **εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *to the end that we should be unto the praise of His glory.* The art. **τῆς** is inserted by the TR before **δόξης**, but on slender authority. It is omitted by most of the primary uncials and other important documents. On the other hand, the **αὐτοῦ** after **δόξης** is omitted by a few ancient authorities, especially D¹F. This clause states the ultimate end which God had in view in foreordaining us to be made His **κλῆρος**. It was not for our own privilege (as the Jews with their limited and exclusive ideas had misinterpreted the object of God in His election of them), but that through us His glory might be set forth. *Cf.* the prophetic declaration, "the people which I formed for myself, that they might set forth my praise" (Isa. xliii. 21); and such passages as Ps. cxliv. 12; Sirach xxxix. 10; Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7. The sentence is best connected with the principal verb, not with the **προορισθέντες** which defines the **ἐκληρώθημεν**, but with the **ἐκληρώθημεν** itself. It is also to be taken as a whole, containing one idea, precisely as is the case with the other **εἰς ἔπαινον** sentences in vv. 6, 14. To break up the clause so as to take the **εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς** to express the *end* or *object*, further defined by the **τοὺς προηλπικότας**, and to make **εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ** an incidental or parenthetical clause, is in the highest degree artificial and out of harmony with the other sentences. The question remains as to the persons included in the **ἡμᾶς**—whether Christians generally, or Jews or Jewish Christians specially. In order to answer that question the force of the following clause must be determined.—**τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *we who had* (RV marg., "have") *before trusted in Christ.* Better, *we, to wit, who have aforetime hoped in the Christ.* The article defining the **προηλπικότας** is most naturally taken as placing the **προηλπικότας** in *apposition* to the **ἡμᾶς** and as explaining the **ἡμᾶς** now in view to be a particular class, and not the subjects of God's grace generally. The attempt is made, indeed, in more than one way (*e.g.*, by Hofm., Harl., Abb., Haupt, etc.) to construe **τοὺς προηλπικότας** as the predicate, so that the sense should be, "to the end that we should be those who have before hoped (or believed) in Christ". But this is not a construction naturally suggested by the simple form of the sentence. It has also the disadvantage of not being in harmony with what is the prevalent, though not invariable, use of the article as distinguishing subject from predicate, and it turns the **εἰς ἔπαινον κ.τ.λ.** awkwardly into a parenthetical sentence—"to the end that we, to the praise of His glory, should be those who have before hoped in Christ". It is to be further noticed that the **προ** in **προηλπικότας** must have its proper force, expressing a hope cherished before the event. Some understand this differently, taking the **προ** to express the fact that Jewish Christians *preceded* Gentile Christians in hoping in Christ (Beza, Grot., Beng., etc.). Others (De Wette, etc.) would make the event in view as the object of hope the *second* Advent of Christ, the *Parousia* of the Epistles. But the point appears to be that there were those, namely, pious Jews of OT times, who cherished a hope in the Christ of promise and prophecy before the appearance of Christ in history. The words are entirely appropriate as a description of those who looked for Christ before He came. The prep. **ἐν** is most naturally understood as is the **ἐν** after the simple **ἐλπίζειν**, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xv. 19, and the **ἐλπίζειν** itself must have the natural sense of *hoping*, not *believing* or *trusting*. Yet, again, the object of the hope is here not **Χριστός**, but **ὁ Χριστός**, "*the* Christ," "the Messiah". The sense consequently is, "we, to wit, who have reposed our hope in the Christ before He appeared". These things help us to answer the question—Who are the persons referred to? They are, say some, *Christians generally*, as those who hope in the Christ who is to return, and of whom it may be said, speaking of them from the standpoint of the final fulfilment at Christ's second Advent, that they are those who have reposed their hope in the Christ who is to come. This is urged specially on the ground that, as all through the preceding paragraph Paul has spoken of things pertaining to Christians generally and has used the terms "we," "us" of Christians without distinction, it is unreasonable to suppose that at this point he changes all and puts a restricted meaning on the **ἡμᾶς**. On this view the following **ὑμεῖς** must also be taken not as referring to a distinct class of Christians, but simply as applying to the Ephesian readers in particular what is said of all Christians as such. It must be allowed that much may be said in favour of this view. But on the other hand it is just at this point that Paul introduces a **ὑμεῖς** as well as a **ἡμᾶς**—a fact that naturally suggests a distinction between two classes; as in chap. ii.

e 2 Cor. vi. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15; James i. 18. ἀκούσαντες τὸν [e] λόγον τῆς [e] ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς [1] σωτηρίας ὑμῶν,[2] ἐν [3] ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες [f] ἐσφραγίσθητε [4] τῷ [g] πνεύματι τῆς

f = 2 Cor. i. 22; ch. iv. 30; see Rev. vii. 3 al. g Here only; see Rom. i. 4, viii. 15; xi. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 13; 2 Tim. i. 7; Heb. x. 29.

[1] **της** om. FG. [2] **ημων** K 74, 115, 122, Copt., etc.

[3] **εν ω και** om. Ambrst.; om. **και** DEFG, d, e, g, Copt., Goth., Arm., etc.

[4] **εσφραγισθη** B; **-ημεν** Did.

11-22 he draws out the distinction definitely and with a purpose between two classes who became believers in the Christ in different ways and at different times. Hence it appears simplest (with Mey., etc.) to regard Paul as speaking in this clause specially of those who like himself had once been Jews, who had the Messianic prophecies and looked for the Messiah, and by God's grace had been led to see that in Christ they had found the Messiah. In the following **ὑμεῖς**, therefore, he refers to those who had once been Gentiles and had come to be believers in Christ. This is supported by the explanatory nature of the clause introduced by **τούς**, by the proper sense of the **προηλπικότας**, and by the introduction of **τῷ Χριστῷ** in place of **Χριστῷ**.

Ver. 13. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς**: *in whom ye also*. The reading **ἡμεῖς** appears in certain manuscripts of importance (AKLℵ[3] *e*, *f*, *g*, etc.); but the weight of documentary authority is greatly on the side of **ὑμεῖς**. Taking, therefore, the **καὶ ὑμεῖς**, as contrasted with the previous **ἡμᾶς**, to refer to the readers of the Epistle as *Gentiles* in distinction from the writer and those whom he couples with himself as having formerly been *Jews*, we have in this verse and the following a paragraph which gives first a description of the evangelical standing and experience of Gentile Christians such as these Ephesians were, and then a statement of the fact that, in their case as in that of the others, God's ultimate end in His gracious dealing with them was the praise of His glory. The opening clause, however, presents some difficulty. The sentence is left with something unexpressed, or its form is disturbed. How is it to be construed? It is natural to think first of explaining it by supplying some verb for the **ὑμεῖς**, and as the substantive verb is often left to be understood, some introduce **ἐστέ** here = "in whom ye also are," "in whom ye also have a part" (Mey., Alf.). But the great Pauline formula **ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι** can scarcely be dealt with thus, the **εἶναι** in it has too profound a sense to allow of its being dropped and left to be understood as is possible with the ordinary substantive verb. Others, therefore, look to the immediately preceding **προηλπικότας** for the word that is to be supplied (Erasm. Calv., Beza, Est., etc.; and so AV "in whom ye also *trusted*"). But to make this applicable to Gentile believers requires us (unless the Second Advent is supposed to be the object of the hope) to supply only **ἠλπίκατε** not **προηλπίκατε**, and to give the verb the modified sense of *trusting* or *believing*. Much more may be said in favour of supplying the definite verb **ἐκληρώθημεν** which rules the larger sentence (Erasm. in his *Paraphrase*, Cornel. a Lap., Harl., Olsh., etc.) = "in whom ye also were made God's **κλῆρος**, or possession". The comparative distance of the **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς** from **ἐκληρώθητε** is no serious objection, especially in view of the fact that it is the definite verb, and not a qualifying participle, that is in view. There remains, however, yet another method of explanation, *viz*., to regard the sentence as an interrupted construction, in which the expression of the main thought, that of the **ἐσφραγίσθητε**, is delayed by other preliminary ideas, the second **ἐν ᾧ** being a *resumption* and continuation of the first (Theod. Mops., Jer., Beng., De Wette, Rück., Bleek, Bisp., Ell., Humphrey, Abb., Von Sod., Haupt). This solution of the difficulty appears on the whole to be the best, and it has been preferred by the majority of interpreters. It seems to be favoured by the Syr., Copt. and Eth. Versions, and is adopted by the RV—"in whom ye also, having heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation—in whom, having also believed, ye were sealed". The interruption of the regular construction in the statement of the fact of their having been "sealed" appears to be caused by the introduction of the idea of the primary Christian requirement of *faith* after the mention of the *hearing*. It is objected that the distance between the one **ἐν ᾧ** and the other is much less than is usual in such cases, and that in a

resumption we should expect not **ἐν ᾧ καί**, but **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς**. But *anacoloutha* are quite in Paul's way, and they are not all of one type or one extension (*cf.* Win.-Moul., p. 704), and the **καί** (*minus* the **ὑμεῖς**) is appropriate as giving an ascensive force to the **πιστεύσαντες**. This view of the construction has the advantage also of enabling us to retain substantially the same sense for the **ἐν ᾧ** in these three occurrences (vv. 11, 13), and it makes the defining participles **ἀκούσαντες** (with its clause) and **πιστεύσαντες** important preparations for the statement of privilege in the **ἐσφραγίσθητε**, each contributing something proper in its own place to the order of ideas. Hence both the first **ἐν ᾧ** and the second are to be connected with the **ἐσφραγίσθητε** = "in whom, on hearing and believing, ye were sealed"; it being *in Christ*, in virtue of our union with Him, that we receive the gift of the Spirit.—**ἀκούσαντες**: *having heard* (or, *on hearing*). This comes in its proper order, the *first* in the series of things, preparing the way for the sealing of the Spirit. In the narratives of cases of reception into the Christian Church in the Book of Acts we discover this order of grace: hearing, repentance, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (ii. 37, 38), or hearing, faith, baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost (viii. 6, 12, 17). Yet this is not an invariable order. Sometimes only hearing, baptism, and the gift of the Holy Ghost (xix. 5, 6) are mentioned; and in such instances as those of Paul (ix. 17) and the men of Cæsarea (x. 44-47), the gift of the Holy Ghost appears to have preceded the administration of baptism. On the importance of *hearing*, that is, access to the preached word, *cf.* Rom. x. 13-17, where the **πιστεύειν** is declared to come by the **ἀκούειν**.—**τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας**: *the word of the truth*. The **λόγος** here is evidently the word of preaching, and it is said to be "of the truth," not with any particular reference, as Meyer justly observes, to the OT word as one that dealt with types and shadows rather than realities (Chrys.), or to the word of heathenism as the word of error (Corn. a Lap., etc.), but in the sense in which our Lord Himself spoke of the *truth* and the *word* (John xvii. 17; *cf.* Col. i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 15; James ii. 17). The gen. is not that of apposition (Harl.), but the *gen. objecti*, "the word concerning the truth;" or, as Ell. suggests, the gen. of ethical *substance* or ethical *content*, "the word of which the truth is the very essence, or content".—**τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν**: *the gospel of your salvation*. Further definition of "the word of the truth". The preached word which has the truth for its essential content is that which brought you the good tidings of salvation. Here, again, the gen. is not that of *appos.* or *identity* (Harl., etc.), but most probably that of *content* or *subject matter* (Mey., Ell., etc.). Elsewhere we have the **εὐαγγέλιον** defined as that of *the Kingdom* (Matt. ix. 35), of *God* (Rom. i. 1), of *the Kingdom of God* (Mark i. 14), of *Christ*, *Jesus Christ*, *His Son*, etc. (Rom. i. 1, 9, 16; Mark i. 1), of *peace* (Eph. vi. 15), of *the grace of God* (Acts xx. 24), of *the glory of the blessed God* (1 Tim. i. 11), of *the glory of Christ* (2 Cor. iv. 4). Nowhere in the NT is the word **εὐαγγέλιον** used so frequently and in such a variety of applications as in the Pauline Epistles. It is never used in Luke's Gospel, in John's Gospel or Epistles, in Hebrews, or in James; in Matthew's Gospel it occurs four times, in Mark eight times, in Acts twice, in Peter once, and in the Apocalypse once. The noun **σωτηρία**, which has so large a place in the rest of the Pauline writings, is of rare occurrence in these Epistles of the Captivity. It is found thrice in the Epistle to the Philippians, but only once in this profound Epistle to the Ephesians (in vi. 17 we have the other form **τὸ σωτήριον**), and not even once in the sister Epistle to the Colossians.—**ἐν ᾧ**: *—in whom, I say*. With the former **ἐν ᾧ** the writer turned from the case of those like himself who, having been Jews, had been made God's **κλῆρος** in Christ, to that of Gentiles like these Ephesians who also had been made partakers of God's grace in Christ, though in a different way, not as having had the hope of the Jews in a promised Messiah, but simply as having heard the word of Christian preaching. The particular gift of grace which it was in his mind to state as bestowed on these Gentile Christians was the sealing of the Spirit. With this second **ἐν ᾧ**, "—in whom, I say," he takes up the statement which had been interrupted by the mention of the way in which they had come to receive the grace, and brings it (with a further reference to the antecedents to the sealing) to its intended conclusion. This **ἐν ᾧ**, therefore, is not to be dealt with differently from the former and made to relate to the **εὐαγγέλιον**, as if = "in which Gospel having also believed, ye were sealed" (Mey.). It simply continues the idea of the previous **ἐν ᾧ**, expressing the fact that the grace which came to the Gentile who heard the word of preaching,

[h] ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, 14. [g] ὅς [1] ἐστιν [i] ἀῤῥαβὼν [2] τῆς [k] κληρονομίας ἡμῶν εἰς [l] ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς [m] περιποιήσεως, εἰς [n] ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

h Constr. Mark xv. 16; Gal. iii. 16; ch. iii. 13, vi. 17; Phil. i. 28 al. fr. i 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 only; Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20. k=Acts xx. 32; Col. iii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 4. l Ver. 7 reff. m 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9 from Mal. iii. 17; 2 Chron. xiv. 13. n Ver. 6 reff.

[1] For **ος, ο** (*gramm. emendn.*) ABFGLP 57, 67^2, 71, all, Ath., Euthal., Chr.; text אDEK, most MSS., d, Chr.-comm., Thdrt., Did., Thl., Oec.

[2] **αραβων** FG 37, 76, Euthal., etc.

like the grace which came to the Jew who had the Messianic hope, was bestowed "in Christ," and had its ground in Him.—**καὶ πιστεύσαντες**: *having also believed*. The **καί** belongs not to an implied **ὑμεῖς** but to the **πιστεύσαντες**. It is the *ascensive* **καί**, adding to the first condition of *hearing* the second and higher of *believing*. The object of the **πιστεύσαντες** is the previous **λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας**, "having also believed that word of preaching;" not the **ᾧ**, "believing also in whom" (Calv., Bez., Mey.). In Biblical Greek the phrase **πιστεύειν ἔν τινι** is of very rare occurrence, especially in the sense of believing or confiding in a *person* (Ps. lxxviii. 22; Jer. xii. 6). In Mark i. 1 it has **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον** as the object. In John iii. 15 both the reading and the connection are uncertain; in John xvi. 30 the idea is "by this". The **πιστεύσαντες** here expresses something prior to the fact conveyed by the definite verb, not contemporaneous with it (Harl.). The sealing was *in Christ* (**ἐν ᾧ**), and it followed on their **πίστις**.—**ἐσφραγίσθητε**: *ye were sealed*. The verb **σφραγίζειν** (= חָתַם) in the NT expresses several distinct ideas, *e.g.*, *confirming* or *authenticating* (John iii. 32, vi. 27; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. ix. 2); *securing* (Matt. xxvii. 66; Rev. xx. 3); *keeping secret* (Rev. x. 4, xxii. 10; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in Rev. v. 1, 2, 5, 9, vi. 1, viii. 1, etc.); *marking* as one's possession or as destined for something (Rev. viii. 3-8; *cf.* **σφραγίς** in 2 Tim. iii. 4; Rev. ix. 4). Here and in iv. 30 the idea seems to be either that of *authenticating* or *certifying* them to be of God's heritage, or that of *marking* them as such. The two ideas are near akin. The latter will be more applicable, if (with Theophyl., Chrys., Cornel. a Lap., Alf., etc.) we take the attestation to be the objective attestation to others, the evidence to our fellows that we are the chosen of God; the former, if (with Mey., Ell., etc.) we take it to be the attestation to our own consciousness. This hope or assurance which is given to ourselves seems rather in view here (*cf.* Rom. viii. 16). There is no reason to suppose that there is any allusion here to any peculiar use of the seal whether in Jewish custom or in heathen religious service. Nor is the rite of Baptism specially referred to. In ecclesiastical Greek, indeed, baptism came to be denoted by the term **σφραγίς**; but there is no instance of that in the NT. The terms **σφραγίς, σφραγίζειν**, are used in the Pauline Epistles of *circumcision* (Rom. iv. 11), of the *contribution* from Macedonia and Achaia (Rom. xv. 28), of the Corinthians as the *witnesses* to Paul's apostleship (1 Cor. ix. 2), of the inward *certification* of believers (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30), and of the *destination* or *ownership* of the Church or congregation of believers (2 Tim. ii. 19).—**τῷ Πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ**: *with the Holy Spirit of promise*. The Spirit is that by which (*instrumental* dative) the sealing is effected; and that Spirit is called the Spirit *of promise*, not in the active sense of *bringing* or *confirming* the promise (Calv., Bez., etc.), but in the passive sense of having been announced by the promise, or being the *object* or *content* of the promise in the OT. The **τῷ ἁγίῳ**, thrown emphatically to the end of the clause, designates the Spirit solemnly in respect of the essential personal quality of holiness. Taken together with the general tenor of the paragraph and with the fact that in the **ὑμεῖς** Gentile Christians as a whole are addressed, and not any select number or class, it is clear that what is in view here is not the extraordinary or miraculous gifts of the Spirit, but that bestowal of the Spirit in which all believers shared, which was the subject of the great OT prophecies (Joel iii. 1-5; Isa. xxxii. 15, xliv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, xxxix. 29; Zech. xii. 10), and of which a new heart, a new spirit, was to be the result.

Ver. 14. **ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν**: *which is an earnest of our*

inheritance. So with the RV, rather than "who is the earnest," etc., of the AV. The reading **ὅ** is preferred by Lachm., Alf., WH, etc., as supported by ABGL, Athan., Cyr., Chrys., etc. The TR is the reading of ℵDK, Thdrt., Damasc., Theophyl., etc.; the masc. form **ὅς** being due to attraction to the following **ἀρραβών**, as, *e.g.*, in **τῷ σπέρματί σου ὅς ἐστι Χριστός**, Gal. iii. 16. The word **ἀρραβών** (or **ἀραβών**, the form preferred by Tisch. and regarded by WH as only Western, *cf.* Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, II., App., p. 148) is the LXX reproduction of the Heb. עֲרָבוֹן which occurs in Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20 and is rendered "pledge". It is found in classical Greek of earlier date than the LXX (*e.g.*, Isaeus, *De Cir. her.*, 23; Aristotle, *Pol.*, i., 11; Menander, *Frag. Com.* (Meineke), iv., pp. 268, 283; etc., *cf.* Light., *Notes, ut sup.*, p. 323), and is supposed, therefore, to have come from the Phœnicians into Greek use. At an early date it was introduced also into Latin, but by what channel we know not. In Latin it occurs in the three forms *-arrabo*, *rabo* (*e.g.*, in Plautus, *Truc.*, iii., 20), and *arra* (*e.g.*, Aul. Gell., xvii., 2). It survives in the forms *arra*, *arrhes* in the languages most directly derived from the Latin; as also in our *arles*, the obsolete English *earlespenny*, etc. Etymologically, it appears to have expressed the idea of *exchange*, and so its primary sense may have been that of a "pledge" simply. But it came to mean more than **ἐνέχυρον**, or *pledge*, in the sense of something exchanged between two parties to a contract or agreement. Its proper sense is that of *earnest*—part of the price to be received or part of the thing that is to be possessed, given in assurance that the full payment or the complete possession will follow. Wycl. gives "ernes"; the Rhemish, "pledge"; Tynd., Cran., and the Genevan, "earnest". The idea is similar to that elsewhere expressed by **ἀπαρχή**, "first-fruits" (Rom. viii. 23). The "earnest of the Spirit" is mentioned by itself in 2 Cor. v. 5; in 1 Cor. i. 22, as here, it is introduced along with the *sealing* of the Spirit. To the truth expressed by the latter it adds the higher idea that the believer possesses already in reality, though but in part, the lifeof the future; the inheritance of the present and the inheritance of the future differing not in kind but only in degree, so that even now we have the life and blessedness of the future in the way of foretaste. It is doubtful whether the term is also meant to suggest the idea of *obligation* on the believer's side, as Light. thinks, who takes it to intimate that "the Spirit has, as it were, a lien upon us".—**εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν**: *unto the redemption.* The "unto" of the RV is to be preferred to the "until" of the AV. The clause is to be connected not with the **ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβών, κ.τ.λ.**, but with the main statement, *viz.*, the **ἐσφραγίσθητε**, and the **εἰς** expresses not the idea of *time* but that of *purpose*. It is the first of two purposes which God is here declared to have had in *sealing* them. In that operation of His grace God had it in view to make them certain of the complete redemption which was to come at the consummation of the Kingdom of God. The **ἀπολύτρωσις** here, as the tenor of the passage plainly indicates, is the final, perfected redemption, as in iv. 30, Rom. viii. 23, and probably 1 Cor. i. 30.—**τῆς περιποιήσεως**: *of the possession.* The "*purchased* possession" of the AV is less apt, as the verb **περιποιεῖσθαι** expresses the general idea of *preserving*, *acquiring*, *gaining for oneself*, without specific reference to a *price*. But what is the import of the phrase here? The form of the noun **περιποίησις** and its use point to the active sense, *preserving*, *acquiring*. In 2 Chron. xiv. 13 it is said of the Ethiopians that they fell **ὥστε μὴ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς περιποίησιν**, so "that they could not recover themselves" (RV text), or, "so that none remained alive" (RV marg.). The word occurs in the NT five times in all (Eph. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In three of these instances it certainly has the active sense (1 Thess. v. 9, **περιπ. σωτηρίας**; 2 Thess. ii. 14, **περιπ. δόξης**; Heb. x. 39, **περιπ. ψυχῆς**), and it would be most natural to take it in that sense here. But it is difficult to adjust that to the genitive case dependent on the **ἀπολύτρωσιν**. The most plausible rendering on that view is that proposed by Abbott, *viz.*, "a complete redemption which *will give possession*". The noun may be taken, however, in the passive sense, and a more natural meaning results. Some then understand it of the inheritance we are to possess. So Aug. and Calv. make it = *haereditas acquisita;* Matthies, "the promised glorious possession"; Bleek, "the redemption which is to become our possession". So, too, Macpherson takes the "possession" to be the "inheritance of the saints" here, as he takes the previous **ἐκληρώθημεν** to mean "made possessors of our lot". But all

15. **Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ, [o]ἀκούσας τὴν [p]καθ' ὑμᾶς [p]πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ [1] καὶ τὴν [q]ἀγάπην τὴν [2] [q]εἰς πάντας τοὺς [r]ἁγίους,** 16. **οὐ**

o constr., Matt. xi. 2; Acts. xxiii. 16; Gal. i. 13; Col. i. 4; Philem. ver. 5. p constr., Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3; πίστ. ἐν, Gal. iii. 26; Col. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Paul only. q Rom. v. 8; Col. i. 4; 1 Pet. iv. 8. = ἀγ ἐν, 1 John iv. 16. r = ver. i. reff.

[1] Insert **Χριστω** DEFG, d, e, g, Goth., Syr.-P., Eth., Victorin.

[2] **αγαπην την** om. (*homæotel.*) ℵAB 17, al., Cyr., Jer., Aug.: **την** om. D[1]FG also.

becomes plainer if we understand the idea to be rather that of God's possession in us, the **περιποίησις** being taken as the equivalent of the OT סְגֻלָּה, סְגֻלָּה מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים, by which Israel is designated as the possession acquired by the Lord for Himself (Exod. xix. 5; *cf.* Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18; Ps. cxxxv. 4). It is true that the LXX rendering of סְגֻלָּה is usually **περιούσιος**. But that is not the only form that is adopted. In Ps. cxxxv. 4 the phrase is **εἰς περιουσιασμὸν ἑαυτῷ**; and in Mal. iii. 17, where Aquila has **περιούσιος**, the LXX has **εἰς περιποίησιν**. Further, in Isa. xliii. 21 the same idea is expressed by the corresponding verb—**λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην** (*cf.* Acts xx. 28, **τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο**). So, too, Peter, with this passage in view, describes the spiritual Israel of the NT as **λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν** (1 Pet. ii. 9); while in Titus, ii. 14, again, we have **λαὸν περιούσιον**. This interpretation is that of the Syriac, Erasm., Calvin, etc., and it is preferred by most recent commentators, including Harless, Meyer, Ell., Alf., etc. It is adopted also by the RV, which renders it "*God's* own possession". Wycliffe, however, gives "purchasynge"; the Genevan, "that we might be *fully* restored to liberty"; the Rhemish, "the redemption of acquisition"; the AV, Tyndall and Cranmer give "the purchased possession".—**εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *unto the praise of his glory*. The second end of the *sealing*, or rather the second aspect of the ultimate purpose of God in the sealing. The final end on our side of that great act of grace is the consummation of the redemption of those who have been made God's own people. On God's side the final end of the same grace is "the praise of His glory"—the adoring confession of the glories of the Divine Nature and Mind so revealed to men. The **αὐτοῦ** refers to the main subject here, not Christ *in* whom we obtain the grace, but God *by* whom it is willed—the Eternal Origin of all.

Vv. 15-23. Second Section of the Epistle: in which the writer expresses his own feelings and desires towards the Ephesians, and in doing so leads them to the highest conception both of Christ's own supremacy and of the grandeur of that Church of His of which they had been made members. The wonders of the grace thus shown them give him occasion, he tells them, for increasing thanksgiving. But his thanksgiving also prompts him to prayer on their behalf. Seeing to what they had already attained in the Christian life into which that marvellous grace had brought them, especially in faith and in brotherly love, his prayer is that they may increase in these yet more and more, and in particular that they may have an enlarging insight into the hope that springs from their calling, the inheritance which is reserved for them, and the present power of Christ which is the guarantee for all that they have and look for.

Ver. 15. **Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγώ**: *For this cause I too*. **διὰ τοῦτο** might cover the contents of the entire preceding paragraph, pointing back to ver. 3 and indicating that in his thanksgiving to God, in behalf of these Ephesians, the Apostle had in his mind the whole counsel and eternal choice of God of which he first made mention, and the whole operation of grace in the lives of the Ephesians in the several particulars afterwards instanced. In view, however, of the transition from the more general "us" to the more definite "ye also" in ver. 13 it is probably more accordant with the tenor of thought to take the **διὰ τοῦτο** to refer to the signal manifestation of God's grace in the sealing of these believers, who had been taken from the dark pagan world, with the Spirit which was both assurance and foretaste of an inheritance undreamt of in their heathenism. The **κἀγώ** is best explained by the same **καὶ ὑμεῖς**. It means simply "I on my side," and does not imply as some, including, even Meyer, suppose, that the writer was thinking of a co-operation be-

tween those addressed and himself in thanksgiving and prayer.—**ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ**: *having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus*. It has been wrongly inferred from the **ἀκούσας** that the writer had no personal acquaintance with those addressed and knew of their conversion only by the report of others. Philemon was well known to Paul, who spake of him indeed as his **ἀγαπητός**, his **συνεργός**, and his son in the faith (ver. 19). Yet Paul uses with reference to him almost the same terms as those used here—**εὐχαριστῶ . . . μνείαν σου ποιούμενος . . . ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν κ.τ.λ.** (ver. 4, 5). Besides, what the writer speaks of here is not their conversion but their faith and love, and it is only in harmony with all that we know of Paul that he should have used every opportunity of keeping himself in communication with them and watching their progress. Through Tychicus, or some other visitor or messenger, tidings of their Christian walk may have come to him now (*cf.* Introduction). In any case he finds his first and foremost reason for thanksgiving in the report of the way in which the fundamental Christian requirement was made good among them —that of *faith*, their faith in the Lord Jesus Himself. The phrase here is not the usual **τὴν ὑμετέραν πίστιν**, or **τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν**, but **τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν**. The sense, however, is substantially the same. Some good grammarians indeed seek to establish a distinction between the two phrases, and claim a special partitive or distributive sense for the one with **κατά**. Ellicott, *e.g.*, points to the fact that the form **ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις** is adopted only once by Paul, while **πίστις ὑμῶν** occurs some seventeen times in his Epistles, and concludes on the whole that the former may denote "the faith of the community viewed objectively," "*the faith which is among you*," whereas the latter expresses "the subjective faith of individuals". Alford, also, gives the former the sense of the "faith which prevails among you" (on the analogy of **τῷ κατ' αὐτοὺς βίῳ** in Thuc., vi., 16), and takes it to imply that some in the Ephesian Church may not have had the faith. So the RV gives in its text "the faith . . . which is among you"; marg., "*in* you". But the analogies referred to (*e.g.*, **τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ**, John viii. 17, as contrasted with **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς** in Acts xviii. 15; *cf.* Ell.) scarcely bear this out, and there is much to show that the latter form had become, or was on the way to become, simply a periphrasis for the former. Such phrases as **ὡς καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν**; the above **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς**; and **τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν** (Acts xvii. 28, xviii. 15, xxvi. 3) may be thus explained; and in later Greek **κατά** with an acc. is frequently used where the older classical Greek would have had the gen. case, *e.g.*, **ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπόθεσις** = *the resignation of government*, Diod., S., i., 65. So, while in the NT **κατά** may usually retain its distributive force, in cases where it is followed by the acc. of a personal pronoun it may mean nothing more than the poss. adj. or the gen. of the personal pronoun. As Buttmann points out, strictly speaking it is not so much that "the case was periphrased but that the prepositional phrase *displaced* the simple case"; as it was easy for the Greek language to make prepositional phrases *dependent immediately* upon substantives, and natural, therefore, for it in its later developments to carry this further and employ "prepositional expressions even where the earlier language still preferred the simple case" (*Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 156; *cf.* Bernhardy's *Syntax*, p. 241; Win.-Moult., pp. 199, 241, 499; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 133).—**καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους**: *and your love toward all the saints*. The reading is uncertain. The Received Text inserts **τὴν ἀγάπην**, which has the support of such authorities as ℵ[3]DGKL, Syr., Boh., Lat., Copt., Goth., Thdrt., etc., and is adopted by Tisch. and Tregelles (the latter bracketing it in margin). It is regarded by WH as a Western and Syrian insertion from Col. i. 4. The **τὴν ἀγάπην** is omitted by ℵ[1]BAP, 17, Orig., Cyr., Jer., etc., and is deleted by Lach., WH and RV. The documentary evidence is on the side of the omission. But the difficulty is to find in that case a suitable sense. Hort thinks that Philem. 5 furnishes a parallel, as it might be rendered (with RV marg.) "hearing of thy love and faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus and toward all the saints". But the *love* is expressed there. Dale would render it "having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus Christ which is among you and shown toward all the saints," as if the point of the latter clause was the *reality* or *manifestation* of the faith. But in the Greek there is nothing corresponding to the "shown". The **πίστις**, in short, if it belongs to both clauses, must be introduced in two different aspects, as *belief* in the first clause and as *faithfulness* in the second. But in the absence of any

[s] παύομαι [1] [t] εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [u] μνείαν ὑμῶν [2] ποιούμενος [v] ἐπὶ τῶν προςευχῶν μου, 17. ἵνα ὁ [w] θεὸς [w] τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὁ [x] πατὴρ τῆς [y] δόξης, δῴη [3] ὑμῖν [a] πνεῦμα [z] σοφίας καὶ [a] ἀποκαλύ-

s = Acts vi. 13 al.; Col. i. 9; Isa. xxxviii. 20.
t = John xi. 41; Rom. i. 8 al. fr.
u Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 3; 1 Thess. i. 2, iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 3; Philem. 4. Paul only.
v = Rom. i. 10; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4 only.
w Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; 1 Pet. i. 3 only; abs., here only.
x = 2 Cor. i. 3; James i. 17.
y Acts vii. 2.
z Exod. xxviii. 3; see 2 Tim. i. 7.
a = ch. iii. 3.

[1] **παυσομαι** DE, Victorin.

[2] Omit **υμων** ℵABD 17, 33-5-7-9, 73, 116-8, all, d, e, Goth., Hil.; text D[3]EKLP, vg., Syr.utr., Cop., Arm., Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., etc.

[3] **δῳ** B, 63, Cyr.

intimation of a double presentation of **πίστις** this is awkward exceedingly. The Revisers nevertheless render it—"the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which *ye shew* toward all the saints". The insertion in any case is of early date, and the omission may have been due to the eye of some ancient scribe being deceived by the two occurrences of **τήν**. The grace in question, whether their love or their faithfulness, was of catholic quality, taking *all* the saints for its objects.

Ver. 16. **οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *cease not to give thanks for you.* The **παύομαι** is most naturally connected with the nearer participle. There is no reason why the remoter participle should be made the leading term, as some construe it, rendering it so—"I cease not, while giving thanks for you, to make mention," etc. (Abbott). The verb **εὐχαριστεῖν**, which is used in later Greek both in the sense of *feeling thankful* and in that of *giving thanks*, occurs in none of the NT Epistles except in that bearing Paul's name. In these it is found some twenty-six times. It also appears once in Revelation, twice in Acts, and more frequently in the Gospels.—**μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιούμενος**: *making mention of you.* Documentary evidence is against the insertion of **ὑμῶν**. Though it is supported by considerable authorities (D[3]K LP, Vulg., Syr., Boh., Orig., etc.), it has no place in ℵBAD[1], etc., and is omitted by LTTrWH and the Revisers. The subject of the **μνεία**, therefore, must be understood. It may be **ὑμῶν**, or it may rather be the preceding **πίστιν** and **ἀγάπην**. In the phrase **μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι** the noun seems to have the sense of *mention*. In other connections it has the sense of *mindfulness* (**μνείαν ἔχειν τινός**, 1 Thess. iii. 6) or that of *remembrance* (Phil. i. 3).—**ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου**: *in my prayers.* On **ἐπί** as here = *in* see Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 137; Win.-Moult., p. 470; Bernh., *Synt.*, p. 246. The *local* reference proper to **ἐπί** (as the preposition answering the question Where?), however, is not wholly sunk in the *temporal* sense. See Ell. on 1 Thess. i. 2. Winer takes it to express the idea of something *attaching* itself to something else. The word for prayer used here is one of frequent occurrence in the NT, sometimes joined with **δέησις** (*e.g.*, Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6, etc.), and sometimes with **ἔντευξις** as well (1 Tim. ii. 1). The most general term is **προσευχή** = *precatio*, and that term is not used but of prayer to *God*. **Δέησις**, which can be used also of addresses to men, has the more definite sense of *petitio, rogatio;* while **ἔντευξις**, which means a *falling in with, conference, conversation*, and goes beyond the idea of *intercession* (as our AV renders it), expresses prayer as the converse of the soul with God, with the notion of urgency and filial confidence. See Huther and Ell. on 1 Tim. ii. 1; Win.-Moult., *sub* **δέησις**; Light. on Phil. iv. 6; Trench, *Syn.*, *sub voce.*

Ver. 17. **ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ.* In the parallel passage in Col. i. 9 the **ἵνα** is preceded immediately by **αἰτούμενοι**, and has the reduced or sub-telic force which it has after verbs of asking, expressing the content of the prayer, but that in the light of *purport.* Here the **ἵνα** relates to the general idea of the sentence, instead of being immediately dependent on any verb for *asking.* It has more of the idea of *purpose*, therefore, in it. It is to be admitted, however, that in NT Greek the proper *telic* sense of **ἵνα** is seen in the process of *weakening* and passing over into the force of **ἵνα** as the sign of the inf. in modern Greek. Yet, even when expressing simple *result* or *event*, it has behind it the Hebrew idea of events as the results of Divine purpose;

cf. Blass, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 224, 225; Buttm., *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 236-241; Ell. on Phil. i. 9. It is most usual for Paul to speak of God as the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ or as His *God and Father*. Here he speaks simply of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ". The designation, though misunderstood and misapplied by the Arians and their successors in modern times, is entirely consistent with Christ's own words (Matt. xxvii. 46; John xx. 17) and with the highest view of His Person. In the Eternal Godhead the Son has His life from the Father, the One Fount of Deity, and is subordinate in the sense in which *son* is subordinate to *father*, while He has the same Divine being. In the ministry of redemption our Lord, while the Son of the Eternal Father, is the Christ of God, God being revealed in Him, *sending* Him (Gal. iv. 4), *exalting* Him (Phil. ii. 9), receiving back the kingdom from Him (1 Cor. xv. 24). In respect of His mission, His mediation, His official work and relations, He has God as *His* God, whose commission He bears and whose redeeming purpose He is to fulfil.—**ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης**: *the Father of glory*. This is not to be taken in the reduced sense of "the glorious Father". On the other hand it is not to be dealt with as if the **δόξα** referred to Christ's *divinity*, as in the exigencies of the controversy with Arian views some were driven to interpret it, arguing that the one phrase, "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ," applied to His human nature and the other, "the Father of the glory," to His divine nature (Athan., Greg. Naz.). Nor yet, again, is **δόξα** to be regarded as referring to Christ's glorified humanity (Stier). Taking the **δόξης** in its proper sense and with the full force of the gen. case, some give the **πατήρ** the sense of *author* or *maker*, understanding God to be designated as the Source of glory (Erasm., Grot., Olsh., etc.). For this some appeal to such instances as Job xxxvii. 28; Jas. i. 17. But that is at the best a rare sense of **πατήρ** and one otherwise unknown to Paul. More is to be said in favour of the idea that the gen. designates God as the Father who *gives* glory, the glory bestowed on Christ Himself (*cf.* Acts iii. 13) no less than that reserved for Christians. It is best, however, to take it as the gen. of *characteristic quality*—the Father to whom glory belongs (Mey., Ell., etc.); *cf.* the same designation in Ps. xxix. 3; Acts vii. 2; also "the King of glory," Ps. xxiv. 7; "the Lord of glory," 1 Cor. ii. 8; "the cherubims of glory," Heb. ix. 5, etc. The appropriateness of the title here lies in the preceding definition of the final end of God's counsel and grace—**εἰς ἔπαινον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.**—**δώῃ ὑμῖν**: *may give unto you*. Lachm., Fritzsche (*Rom.*, iii., 230) and Haupt (who refers to the confirmation furnished recently by two inscriptions of the second century given in Dittenb., *Syll.*, 462_{17}, 466_{9}) give the Ionic conj. **δώῃ**; WH give **δώῃ** *vel* **δῷ** in the margin, but **δώῃ** in the text. The latter form is to be preferred, although opinion is still divided to some extent on the conj. and opt. forms. Blass, *e.g.*, takes the **δώῃ** in the present passage to be really a conj. and to be best represented by the **δῷ** of Cod. B. He is inclined to regard the forms **δοῖ, δώῃ** as both conj. and opt. (*Gram. of N.T. Greek*, pp. 49, 211). As in the NT **ἵνα** in the vast majority of cases is followed by the conj. or the fut. indic. even after past tenses, it would be most natural to accept the conj. form here. But this Ionic form of the conj. appears to be strange to the NT and to be "without analogies in later Greek" (Butt., *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, p. 46). On the other hand, the form **δώῃ** seems to be recognised as a later Greek equivalent to **δοίη**, and Winer accepts it as an opt. pres. in NT Greek, pointing to such passages as Rom. xv. 5; 2 Tim i. 16, 18 (ii. 7); John xv. 16, as well as Eph. i. 17, iii. 16, and the comp. **ἀποδώῃ** of 2 Tim. iv. 14 (Win.-Moult, *Gram.*, p. 94.—**πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως**: *the Spirit of wisdom and revelation*. The question here is whether the **πνεῦμα** is to be understood in the subjective sense of our *spirit*, or in the objective sense of the Holy Spirit. The former view is adopted by Chrys., Thdrt., Rückert, De Wette, Bleek, and more recently by Abbott and the Revisers, the RV rendering being "a spirit of wisdom and revelation". This is urged on the analogy of such occurrences as Rom. viii. 15, xi. 8; Gal. vi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 7. But there is much against this. As Meyer points out, it is doubtful whether in the NT there is any case in which, when the **πνεῦμα** is spoken of as *given*, it is not the *objective* **πνεῦμα.** But apart from this, the matter in view is what the Ephesians were themselves to be, not what they were to do for others, and although it is easy enough to suit the subjective view of the **πνεῦμα σοφίας** ("a wise spirit") to this, the difficulty is to adjust to this the subjective view of the **πνεῦμα ἀποκαλύψεως.** The fatal objection, indeed, to the interpretation

b=Col. i. 9. **ψεως** [b] **ἐν** [c] **ἐπιγνώσει** [d] **αὐτοῦ,** 18. [e] **πεφωτισμένους τοὺς** [f] **ὀφθαλμοὺς**
c=ch. iv. 13; Col. i. 9, 10, ii. 2; **τῆς** [f] **καρδίας ὑμῶν,**[1] [g] **εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς**[2] **τίς ἐστιν ἡ** [h] **ἐλπὶς τῆς**

1 Tim. ii. 4 al.; Heb. x. 26; 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8, ii. 20; Paul and 2 Pet. only. d obj.-gen. aft. ἐπ. always. e=ch. iii. 9; Heb. vi. 4; see x. 32; Ps. xviii. 8. f Here only; see Matt. xiii. 15. g Ver. 12 reff. h Ch. iv. 4 only; constr., see Col. i. 23.

[1] **τ. οφθ. τ. διανοιας υμ.** (*explany. corrn.*), with MSS., Cyr.-Jer., Thdrt., Oec.; text ℵABDEFGKLP, most curs., Goth., Syr., Cop., vg., Arm., etc. **υμων** om. B 17. etc.

[2] **ινα οιδατε** FG.

in question lies in the sense of the **ἀποκάλυψις,** which has the stated meaning not of *understanding* mysteries but of *disclosing* them; and the tenor of the paragraph makes it impossible to suppose that in the one case, that of the **σοφία,** Paul had in view a gift that was to make themselves wise, and in the other, the **ἀποκάλυψις,** a gift that was to render them capable of disclosing mysteries to others. How difficult it is to give **ἀποκάλυψις** its proper sense on the subjective view appears from the renderings proposed, *e.g.*, De Wette's, Rückert's, or Abbott's. The first makes it = "the quality of mind which consists in wisdom (mediate knowledge) and revelation (susceptibility for the immediate knowledge of divine truth)"; the second takes it as = "a wise heart and open for His revelation"; the third gives "a spirit of wisdom," but leaves the rest unattempted. But **ἀποκάλυψις** is not a *susceptibility* for knowledge, nor a *mind open* to revelation, nor anything like that. It is necessary, therefore, to take **πνεῦμα** as = the *Holy Spirit*, with Mey., Ell., Haupt. and most. The fact that the phrase is **πνεῦμα** and not **τὸ πνεῦμα** is no objection to that. The attempts made by Middleton, Harless, and others to make out an established distinction between the two forms, the one referring regularly to the personal Spirit of God and the other to the indwelling influence of the Spirit or the spirit of the believers as ruled by the Holy Spirit, cannot be regarded as successful; the terms **πνεῦμα, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ** being free to drop the article as proper names or terms of understood meaning. But what is the particular idea then in each of the two words **σοφία** and **ἀποκάλυψις**? It cannot be that the latter refers specifically to the **χάρισμα** of prophecy (so Olsh., etc.). For that is presented as a gift bestowed only on *some*, whereas the prayer here contemplates gifts for *all* those addressed, and there is nothing to indicate that a gift for the time being only is in view. Nor can it well be that the second noun expresses the means by which the gift intimated by the first noun was to take effect,—the gift of revelation bringing about the gift of wisdom (Harl.); for we should expect the order in that case to be reversed. The distinction between the terms is rather that of the gift of spiritual understanding generally and the gift of special revelations in particular, *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 10; and so far the second is the higher idea. What Paul prays for on behalf of these Ephesian converts is that God might continue to bestow upon them the gift of His Holy Spirit already imparted to them, and that to the effect both of making them wise to understand the things of His grace and of disclosing to them more of the mysteries of His kingdom.—**ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ**: *in the knowledge of him*. The **αὐτοῦ** refers to *God*, as the context shows, not to *Christ*. The term **ἐπίγνωσις** occurs with special frequency in the Epistles of the Captivity and in 2 Peter with reference to the knowledge of *God* or of *Christ*, as in the Pastoral Epistles and Hebrews it is used of the knowledge of the *truth*. It *means* a knowledge that is true, accurate, thorough, and so might be rendered "full knowledge," notwithstanding the fact that the simple **γνῶσις** may be used at times in much the same sense (as possibly in 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 8). The use of **γινώσκω** and **ἐπιγινώσκω** in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 points to the intensive sense of the compound form. The **ἐν** is not to be dealt with as = **εἰς** (Grot.) or **διά** (Beza), but must have either the *instrumental* sense or the *local*. It was by the knowledge of God Himself, or, as it may be better put, *within* the sphere of that knowledge that the gift of enlightenment and the reception of further disclosures of the Divine Counsel were to make themselves good. The only gifts desired for these converts were gifts of a spiritual order, meaning a better acquaintance with God Himself. The clause **ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ** is connected by some (Chrys., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) with the sentence which *follows*, and by

others only with the ἀποκαλύψεως. But the course of thought and the balance of the terms point to it as qualifying the two gifts specified in the preceding sentence.

Ver. 18. πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν: *the eyes of your understanding* (heart) *being enlightened*. For the διανοίας of the TR, which is very poorly attested, καρδίας is to be read (with LTTrWHRV) on the authority of the best MSS., representing the different families (ℵBADFKL, etc.). The ὑμῶν is to be retained, though it is omitted by B 17, etc., and is bracketed by WH. The syntax of the sentence is difficult, but is best taken (with AV, Bez., Beng., Bleek, Mey., etc.) as an acc. absol. The existence, indeed, of the acc. absol. in the NT is still doubted by some good grammarians (Winer, Blass, etc.), and alleged cases are disposed of as *anacoloutha*. But such a construction, though of much rarer occurrence than the gen. absol., was not unknown to classical Greek (*cf.* Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, ii., p. 406), even where there was no repetition of the subject (*cf.* Mey., *in loc.*), and there appear to be at least a few instances of it in the NT, *e.g.*, certainly in Acts xxvi. 3 (admitted by Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 347), and probably in Rom. viii. 3, etc. The syntax is otherwise explained here (*e.g.*, by Harl., Stier, etc.) as a case of apposition, the ὀφθαλμούς continuing the πνεῦμα, as if = "that He may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation—enlightened eyes," an explanation in the highest degree awkward and next to impossible in view of the τούς. The presence of the article before ὀφθαλμούς and its absence before πεφωτισμένους point to a case of tertiary predicate (Buttm.), so that the sense would rather be "give unto you the Spirit—to wit, eyes enlightened". Others (Ell., etc.) account for it as an instance of lax construction and abnormal case (by no means rare in the NT), the πεφωτισμένους standing for πεφωτισμένοις and the τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς being the defining acc. = "that he may give unto you—being enlightened as to the eyes of your heart" (Ell., etc.). Only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek is φωτίζω used of the inward enlightenment which means a *spiritual, saving* knowledge of the things of God; *cf.* φωτισθέντες as applied to those who had become Christians (Heb. vi. 4, x. 32), and the subsequent use of the same term to describe the "baptised" in early Christian literature. The unusual figure of speech, "the eyes of your heart," is peculiarly appropriate here. The gift in question is the special gift of *knowledge* or insight, hence the figure of the *eyes*. The knowledge is a *spiritual* knowledge; hence "the eyes of the *heart*," καρδία being the "inner man," the seat and centre of the mental and spiritual life, with special reference at times to the faculty of *intelligence* (Matt. xiii. 15; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27; Rom. i. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Heb. iv. 12, etc.).—εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς: *that ye may know*. The *object* of the enlightenment, *viz.*, *knowledge*, a fuller knowledge of certain things now specified.—τίς ἐστιν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ: *what is the hope of his calling*. The τίς is to be taken in its proper sense, not "how great" nor "of what kind," but "what"—what the hope really and essentially is. The κλῆσις αὐτοῦ is the call of which *God* is the author, and that is an effectual call. In the Gospels the κλητοί are contrasted with the ἐκλεκτοί, the "chosen" being the select few of the "called" (Matt. xxii. 14). In the Epistles the "*called* of God" are always those to whom the *call* has come with effect, who have listened to it and been made believers. The κλήσεως is best taken as the gen. of efficient cause (Mey., Ell., etc.)—the hope *effected*, *wrought* by the call. Hence the ἐλπίς is not the *object* hoped for (a sense which it has occasionally in the NT, *e.g.*, Tit. ii. 13; Col. i. 5; probably also Gal. v. 5; Heb. vi. 18), but the attitude of mind, the subjective hope, the assured Christian expectation.—καὶ τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ: [*and*] *what the riches of the glory of his inheritance*. The best critics (LTTrWHRV) omit the καί of the RV, the diplomatic evidence (ℵ[1]BAD[1]F 17, etc.) being decidedly against it, although it has the support of ℵ[3]D[3]KL as well as certain Versions and Fathers. It does not follow from this omission, however, that we have not three distinct things mentioned in the three clauses, or that the second and third, which refer to the *inheritance* and the *power*, are only co-ordinate with the first, specifying two things relating to the ἐλπίς (so Haupt). The κληρονομία is not the inheritance which God has in us (a sense which the word seems never to have in the NT), but the inheritance which God gives to us and which is the object of our hope. The αὐτοῦ is the gen. of *origin*. The magnificence of this inheritance, the perfected blessedness of the Consummation, is expressed by a series of terms setting it forth in respect of the glory belonging to it and the riches pertaining to that glory,

[h i] κλήσεως [i] αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίς [1] ὁ [k] πλοῦτος τῆς [l] δόξης τῆς [m] κληρονομίας [m] αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς [n] ἁγίοις, 19. καὶ τί τὸ [o] ὑπερβάλλον [2] [p] μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ [q] εἰς ἡμᾶς [3] τοὺς πιστεύοντας [r] κατὰ τὴν [s] ἐνέργειαν

i Rom. xi. 29; Phil. iii. 14.
k See ver. 7 reff.
l Col. i. 27.
m Ver. 14 reff.; constr., here only. n Ver. 1 reff. o 2 Cor. iii. 10, ix. 14; ch. ii. 7, iii. 9 only; see Job xv. 11. p Here only; Exod. xv. 16. q=2 Cor. ix. 13; ch. iii. 2; see ἐφ', ch. ii. 7. r=Ver. 5; Col. i. 11. s Phil. iii. 21; ch. iii. 7, iv. 16; Col. i. 29, ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9, 11; Paul only.

[1] και before τις om. ℵABDFG, 17, 59, Goth., Ambrst.; insert ℵ[3]D[3]EKLP, MSS. nearly vss., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst. MS., Jer., al.

[2] υπερβ. om. FG; υπερμεγεθος 63. [3] εις υμας DFGP 17, 31-7, al.[3], Ambrst.

and these as qualities for the better knowledge of which a new illumination of the Spirit is desired. The **δόξης** and the **κληρονομίας** are genitives of *possession* or of *characteristic quality*.—**ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις**: *in the saints.* How is this to be connected? Many (Harl., Rück., Olsh., Alf., etc.) attach it immediately to **κληρονομίας** = "the inheritance given by God among the saints," or, as Alf. paraphrases it, "*His inheritance in*, whose example and fulness and embodying is in, *the saints*". This would have been a more reasonable interpretation if the **κληρονομίας** had been followed by **τῆς**; in the absence of the article it would suit better if the **κληρονομία** could be taken as meaning God's inheritance in us. It is best on the whole to regard the **ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις** as related to the idea of the clause as a whole and as expressing the sphere within which (**ἐν** = among) these riches of the glory of the inheritance are known and realised. The **κληρονομία** is the *future* inheritance, which is ours at present only in foretaste. The "saints" are the whole community of those set apart to God in Jesus Christ (*cf.* Acts xx. 32, xxvi. 18), and that community contemplated specially in its future completeness. This is the seat of the inheritance, or the circle within which alone it is to be found in its riches and glory.

Ver. 19. **καὶ τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ**: *and what the exceeding greatness of his power.* The **αὐτοῦ** refers again to *God*, and the *power* of God is introduced in respect of that surpassing greatness which belongs to it alone and which is the guarantee of the fulfilment of the Christian hope. The context and the subsequent mention of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ show that it is the *future* of believers that is still distinctively in view. So in these three clauses Paul leads the readers on from the hope itself which becomes theirs in virtue of their being called of God, to the splendour of the inheritance to which the hope points, and from this again to that in God Himself which makes the fulfilment of the hope and the possession of the inheritance certain, namely the limitless efficiency which is His prerogative.—**εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας**: *to us-ward who believe.* No better rendering of **εἰς ἡμᾶς** here could be devised than the "to us-ward" of the AV which is wisely retained by the RV. The clause is best attached to the whole thought of the preceding sentence, and not to the **δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ** alone. The **εἰς** expresses the idea of "ethical direction" (Ell.), indicating the objects toward whom this Divine power will go forth—those, namely, who are believers. The **ἡμᾶς** connects these Ephesian believers, in whom the Divine power has worked mightily even now (*cf.* the conjunction of *faith* and the *power of God* in 1 Cor. ii. 5), with that whole community of the saints which was mentioned in the former sentence as the circle within which at last the complete possession of the inheritance will be made good.—**κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ**: *according to the working of the strength of his might.* Another impressive accumulation of terms, further describing that boundless efficiency of God in which we have our security for the realisation of the hope however new, and the possession of the inheritance however rich in its glory. **Ἐνέργεια,** which in the NT is never used but of superhuman power whether Divine (Eph. iii. 7, iv. 16; Col. i. 29, ii. 12) or Satanic (2 Thess. ii. 9), denotes power as *efficiency*, *operative*, *energising* power. **Κράτος** is power as *force*, *mastery*, power as shown in *action*: **ἰσχύς** is power as *inherent*, power as possessed, but passive. The phrase, therefore, means "the efficiency of the active power which expresses inherent might". This again is best understood as defining the whole preceding statement, not as belonging simply to the **πιστεύοντας.** For, while the idea that our *faith* is the result of God's power, is clearly expressed elsewhere (*e.g.*, Col.

τοῦ [t] κράτους τῆς [t] ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, 20. [u] ἣν [u] ἐνήργησεν[1] ἐν τῷ χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, [v] καὶ [w] ἐκάθισεν[2] [x] ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς [y] ἐπουρανίοις[3] 21. [z] ὑπεράνω πάσης [a] ἀρχῆς καὶ [b] ἐξουσίας[4] καὶ [c] δυνάμεως καὶ [d] κυριότητος καὶ παντὸς [e] ὀνόματος [f] ὀνομαζομένου

t Ch. vi. 10 only; Isa. xl. 26; Dan. iv. 27; see Col. i. 11; 2 Thess. i. 9.

u Ver. 11 reff. v Constr., Col. i. 21, 26; Heb. viii. 10; 2 John 2. w Trans., 1 Cor. vi. 4 only; intrans., see 2 Thess. ii. 4 reff. x=Rom. viii. 34 reff. y Ver. 3 reff. z Ch. iv. 10; Heb. ix. 5 only; Deut. xxvi. 19. abc=Luke xii. 11; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. i. 16, ii. 15; Tit. iii. 1. d Col. i. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8 only †. e=Acts iv. 12; Phil. ii. 9; Heb. i. 4; Rev. iii. 5. f Luke vi. 13, 14; Acts xix. 13; Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. v. 1, 11; ch. iii. 15, v. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 19 only.

[1] **ενηργηκεν** AB, Euth., Cyr., Procop.; text ℵDEFGKLP, MSS. appy. (Vss. and Lat. Fathers ambiguous), Eus., Cyr., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[2] For **εκαθισεν**, **καθισας** ℵAB 10, 17, 23, 57, 80, al.$_{10}$, Eus., Cyr., Procop., Tert., Jer., Ambr., Pel.; text rest of MSS., MSS., it., Copt., Goth., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Thl., Oec., al. After **καθισας** insert **αυτον** ℵA 17, 23, 57, 80, al., Copt., al., Eus., Procop., Lat. Fathers.

[3] For **επουρ.**, **ουρανοις** B, 71, 213, Hil.

[4] **εξουσιας και αρχης** B.

ii. 12), that is not what is in view here. The **κατά** is best taken here in its proper sense of *measure*, *standard* or *proportion*. What the clause sets before us, therefore, is that the *measure* of that surpassing power of God which is the guarantee of our hope, is the operation of the exertion of the might that dwells in God as seen in the historical case instanced in the following sentence, *viz.*, the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.

Ver. 20. **ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν**: *which He wrought in the Christ when He raised Him from the dead.* The **ἣν** refers to the preceding **ἐνέργειαν**. The documentary authorities vary between the **ἐνήργησεν** of the TR (after ℵDFKL, etc.) and **ἐνήργηκεν** which is the reading of BA, etc., and is preferred by LTTr (marg.) WH (with the other in margin). The aorist is more in keeping with the definite historical event referred to; the succeeding aorists on the other hand favour the perfect, making it the more difficult reading to account for. Here again the article with the **Χριστῷ** may give it the official sense "the Christ". This is the more probable in view of the use of the **ἐν** as well as the relation of the statement to the *hope* and the *inheritance*. The surpassing power of God was not only *manifested* in the case of our Lord, but was wrought *in* Him, and in Him not as an individual member of the race, but as "the Christ," the Anointed of God, in whom we are represented and have our Head. The result of that working of God's energy in Him was His resurrection from the dead—an event which, as Paul uniformly teaches, had a power not for Himself only but for us. The **ἐγείρας** may have the force (coincidence in time) given it by the AV and the RV, etc., "when he raised Him"; or it may be better taken as the defining, explanatory aor. (as in **γνωρίσας**, ver. 9), "in that He raised Him".—**καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ**: *and seated Him on His right hand.* The **ἐκάθισεν** of the TR, supported by such MSS. as DFKL, the Copt. and Goth. Versions, etc., must give place to **καθίσας**, the reading of BℵA 17, etc., adopted by LTTrWHRV. A few authorities (ℵA 17, etc.) insert **αὐτόν** before **ἐν δεξιᾷ**. The exaltation to the place of honour and authority following the resurrection is a further witness to what the **ἐνέργεια** of God can effect.—**ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenlies.* That the phrase has the *local* sense here (*cf.* on ver. 3 above) is made abundantly clear by the terms **ἐγείρας, καθίσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ**—all terms with a local reference. The phrase **οὐρανοῖς** indeed is found instead of **ἐπουρανίοις** in a few ancient authorities (B, Hil., Vict.).

Ver. 21. **ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος**: *over above all rule, and authority, and power, and lordship.* The intensive force "*far* above" is given to the **ὑπεράνω** by Chrys., Theoph., Stier, the AV, the RV, etc. But it can scarcely be sustained in face of the actual use of the word in Heb. ix. 5 (*cf.* Ezek. xliii. 15); the tendency of late Greek to substitute compound for simple forms without substantial change of sense; the non-intensive use of the cognate form **ὑποκάτω** (Mark vi. 11; Luke viii. 16; John i. 51); and the testimony of the Syriac and other ancient Versions, which render it simply

"above" (*e.g.*, Vulg., *supra*). "Over above," therefore, is to be preferred to "far above". The πάσης is "all" in the sense of "every," every particular kind of ἀρχή that can be named. The terms are given in the abstract form, not as if only *principles* and *forces* were in view, and not *personal* powers, but because "*classes* or *categories* of personal beings are expressed, just as, *e.g.*, ἐξουσία is said of human *authorities*, which consist of *persons*" (Mey.). The use of the abstract ἀρχαί, etc., instead of the concrete ἄγγελοι, etc., enhances the conception of the absolute, all-embracing dominion of Christ. But what manner of powers or authorities do these terms designate? The fact that the immediate subject here is the *heavenlies* and Christ's position in them at once excludes such interpretations as identify these ἀρχαί, etc. with *earthly* powers (Morus); with every kind of dignity wheresoever found (Erasm., Olsh., etc.); with the Jewish hierarchy (Schoett.); or with the various orders of *Gentile* powers (van Til). The leading idea of the section and the apparent purport of similar statements (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22) point to the angelic world as meant. The fact that nothing is said here of Christ's triumph over Satanic powers suggests further that only angels of good,—heavenly intelligences, are in view. Can any definite distinction then be made out between the terms? And can it be said that the enumeration means that the world of good angels has its distinct orders and grades of angelic dignity and power? The passage must be read in connection with the analogous enumerations in Eph. iii. 10; Rom. viii. 38; 1 Pet. iii. 22, and especially Col. i. 16. Differences in the enumerations then at once appear. In Eph. iii. 10 we have only the ἀρχαί and ἐξουσίαι; in Rom. viii. 38, ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις; in 1 Pet. iii. 22, ἄγγελοι, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις. And in the most direct parallel (Col. i. 16) we find θρόνοι, κυριότητες, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι. The Pauline passages themselves, therefore, show no such identity either in the *number* or in the *succession* of authorities as would be consistent with a determinate doctrine of graduated orders. Nor can it be inferred from the words in Matt. xviii. 10 (as Meyer thinks) that such gradations are recognised by our Lord Himself. It is true that in the non-canonical writings of the Jews (*e.g.*, *Test. XII. Patr.*, etc.) the idea of variety of ranks among the angels appears, and that in the later Rabbinical literature it took strange and elaborate forms. But between these and the simple statements of the NT there is no real likeness, and there is nothing here to point certainly either to an *ascending* scale or to a *descending*. It is held by some indeed (*e.g.*, Meyer) that the angelic authorities are named here according to the latter scale, beginning with the highest and proceeding to the lower and the lowest. For this two reasons are offered, *viz.*, *first* that it would be natural for the writer, who has led the reader up to the right hand of God as the position possessed by Christ, to give his enumeration of the powers subject to Christ in the succession of first, second and third in rank; and *second*, that in the various references made to them, the ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις are given in the same order. But the former is a very precarious reason; and the latter is not valid, inasmuch as in none of the passages appealed to do we get all these three terms together (Eph. iii. 10; Col. i. 16, ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22). Nor is it possible to establish any clear distinction of sense and application between the four terms introduced here, such as that attempted, *e.g.*, by Alford who, including in the list *earthly* as well as heavenly powers and *evil* as well as good spirits, regards ἀρχή as the supreme expression of dignity, ἐξουσία as official power in all its forms, primary or delegated, δύναμις as *might* or the "raw material" of power, and κυριότης, as the pre-eminence of lordship. We must take the terms, therefore, not as dogmatic terms either teaching or implying any doctrine of graduated ranks, differentiated functions, or organised order in the world of angels, but as rhetorical terms brought together in order to express the unique supremacy and absolute sovereignty proper to Christ, and meaning simply that whatever powers or dignities existed and by whatever names they might be designated, Christ's dominion was above them all. This is suggested also by the further generalisation that follows.—καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου: *and every name that is named*. The ὄνομα here is not to be taken as a title of dignity, but (as the ὀνομαζομένου shows) has the simple sense of *name*. There is an advance in the statement of Christ's supreme rank, but it is simply from the idea of a supremacy over all heavenly intelligences to that of a supremacy over all created objects by whatsoever name called.—οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι: *not only in this world* (or *age*),

οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ [g] αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ [h] μέλλοντι· 22. καὶ πάντα [i] ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸν [k] ἔδωκεν [l] κεφαλὴν

g Matt. xii. 32; Rom. xii. 2 al. fr.
h Matt. xii. 32; Heb. vi. 5.
i Luke ii. 51 al. fr.; Ps. viii. 6.
k John iii. 16, 35; ch. iv. 11; Heb. viii. 10, x. 16; Rev. passim.
l=1 Cor. xi. 3; ch. iv. 15; ver. 23; Col. i. 18, ii. 10, 19 only.

but also in that which is to come. The statement of Christ's absolute and unmatched supremacy is brought to its height by this last generalisation, which embraces within its sweep the totality of created objects not only as they now are, but as they may hereafter be in any possible future. The word **αἰών** here as elsewhere, has the idea of *duration* at its foundation. It means "age," "*aeon*," and as used of the *world* presents it, in distinction from **κόσμος**, in its temporal aspect, "this present state of things". The Jews spoke of the period before Messiah's Advent as הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה, "this age," and of the period introduced by that event as הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, "the coming age". So the NT writers designate the period preceding the final Return or Parousia of Christ **ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος** (also **ὁ νῦν αἰών**, 1 Tim. vi. 17; **ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰών**, Gal. i. 4; or simply **ὁ αἰών**, Matt. xiv. 22), and the period beginning with the Parousia **ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων** (also **ὁ αἰὼν ἐκεῖνος**, Lk. xx. 35; **ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, Mk. x. 30; Lk. xviii. 30; *cf.* **οἱ αἰῶνες οἱ ἐπερχόμενοι**, Eph. ii. 7).

This paragraph gives simply a positive statement of the exaltation of Christ, His sovereign and unshared supremacy over all. It makes no reference to Jewish or Gnostic speculations inconsistent with this. It is different with the great section in the sister Epistle to the Colossians. There we see that such speculations were rife in at least one of the Churches of the Lycus valley. The statements in that Epistle have an unmistakable reference to theosophic notions akin to the Gnostic ideas of emanations—notions of angelic intermediaries between God and the world; against which the Apostle has to assert the exclusive relation of Christ to the whole system of things, seen and unseen, earthly and celestial, as the Creator of all, the Upholder of all, the One Being in whom resided all the forces pertaining to the maintenance and administration of things. The literature of Judaism makes it also clear that by Paul's time the Jews had constructed a somewhat elaborate system of Angelology, with theories of graduated positions and distinctive functions. The *Book of Enoch* (lxi. 10) speaks of "angels of power and angels of principality". The *Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (xx. 1, 3) describes the heavenly host as consisting of ten troops—lordships, principalities, powers, cherubim, seraphim, thrones, etc. In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Levi 3) six orders are named, of which the highest are the **θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι**, occupying the seventh heaven, while the **δυνάμεις** are the fifth in order and are assigned to the third heaven. The same general doctrine appears also in Ephraem Syrus (i., p. 270), who gives three great divisions of the celestial world, *viz.* (1) **θεοί, θρόνοι, κυριότητες**; (2) **ἀρχάγγελοι, ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι**; (3) **ἄγγελοι, δυνάμεις, χερουβίμ, σεραφίμ**. In the *De Princip.* of Origen (i., 5, 3, etc.) five orders are named, rising from the **τάξις ἀγγελική** to **ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, θρόνοι**, and finally **κυριότητες**. But the conception of a great, graduated angelic hierarchy was elaborated most fully by the author of the remarkable book, *De Coelesti Hierarchia*, the so-called Dionysius the Areopagite. There we find a scheme of orders in three sets of three, descending from the highest to the lowest: Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones; Dominations, Virtues, Powers (or Authorities); Principalities, Archangels, Angels. Hence the sublime description in Dante (*Paradiso*, canto xxxviii.) and Milton's "Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers" (*Paradise Lost*, v., 601).

Ver. 22. **καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ**: *and He put all things under His feet*. The **ὑπέταξεν** is coordinate with the previous **ἐνήργησε**. These two things God did: He wrought His mighty power in raising and exalting Christ and He subjected all things to Him. The idea expressed by the **ὑπέταξεν** here is not the limited idea of a subjection of opposing objects, which we have in 1 Cor. xv. 27, but the wider idea of placing all created things under the sovereignty of Christ. The words recall those of Ps. viii. 7, but do not give these in the form of a quotation. That Psalm speaks of Man as he was meant by God to be, with dominion over all the creatures. Here that ideal is presented as made real in Christ, the exalted, sovereign Christ. The act re-

ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ [m] ἐκκλησίᾳ, 23. ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ [n] σῶμα αὐτοῦ, τὸ [o] πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ [1] πάντα [p] ἐν πᾶσιν [o] πληρουμένου.

m Absol., Acts ii. 47; see Matt. xvi. 18; epp. passim. n=Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27; ch. iv. 4 al.; Col. i. 18 al. o Matt. ix. 21; Mark ii. 21, viii. 20; John i. 16; Rom. xi. 12, 25, xiii. 15, xv. 29; 1 Cor. x. 26, 28; Gal. iv. 4; Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13; Col. i. 19, ii. 9. p=ch. v. 10; Col. i. 9; Gal. v. 14.

[1] Before παντ. om. τα some mss.; insert MSS., most mss.-ff.

ferred to, therefore, by the aor. ὑπέταξεν may be the definite gift of absolute dominion consequent on the exaltation. The raising of Christ to God's right hand was followed by the placing of all things under His feet and making Him, *de facto*, sovereign over all.—**καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**: *and gave Him as head over all things to the Church*. The RV agrees with the AV and the Bishops' Bible in rendering it "and gave Him *to be* head". Tynd. and Cran. have "hath made Him above all things the head"; the Rhemish, "hath made Him head over all the Church". The two ideas of Christ's Headship over all things and His Headship over the Church appear to be in the statement. The question is how they are related, and what is the precise idea attaching to each of the significant terms. The ἔδωκεν is not to be taken in the technical sense of *appointed*, *installed* (as expressed by נָתַן, τιθέναι), but, as is indicated by the simple dat. τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, in its ordinary sense of *gave*. Christ in the capacity or position here ascribed to Him is presented as a *gift* of God to the Church. Having exalted Him to the highest and invested Him with supreme dominion, God *gives* Him to the Church. The πάντα in ὑπὲρ πάντα must have the sense it has in πάντα ὑπέταξεν, not "all *authorities*," but "all *things*". The κεφαλή, therefore, must express an absolute headship over all the created world, visible and invisible, not a particular, higher headship over other subordinate headships, Apostles, Bishops, etc., in the Church. Further, as the subsequent statement about the σῶμα shows, it must have the full sense of *head*, organic head, and neither that of *sum* nor that of *highest dignity* only. The term ἐκκλησία, again, obviously has here its widest Christian sense. Used by the Greeks to designate an *assembly of the people called for deliberation* (*cf.* Acts xix. 39), and by the LXX as the equivalent of the Hebrew קָהָל, the *congregation of Israel*, especially when called in religious convention (Deut. xxxi. 30, etc.), it expresses in the NT the idea of the fellowship or assembly of believers meeting for worship or for administration. And it expresses this in various degrees of extension, ranging from the small company gathering for worship in one's house (the ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκον, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, etc.), or the single congregation of village or city (Acts v. 11, viii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 17, etc.), to the larger Christian communities of provinces and countries (τῆς Ἀσίας, Γαλατίας, Ἰουδαίας, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 2, 22), and finally to the Church universal, the Church collectively, the whole fellowship of believers throughout the world (Matt. xvi. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24, etc.). Here and in the other occurrences in this Epistle the word has this largest extension of meaning, with the further mystical idea of a unity vitally related to Christ, incorporated in Him, and having His life in it. If the terms then are to be so understood, how is their connection in the sentence to be construed? The τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ is immediately dependent on ἔδωκεν, and cannot well be taken as a *dat. commodi* = "for the good of the Church" (De Wette), as if it were attached immediately to the ὑπὲρ πάντα. The κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα may then be taken either as in *apposition* to αὐτόν—"gave Him, head over all things, to the Church," *i.e.*, gave Him, *this* head over all things, to the Church (Chrys., Stier, etc.); or as having a predicative force—"gave Him *as* head over all things" (Ell., etc.). The latter is to be preferred both as the easier construction and as more congruous with the anarthrous κεφαλήν. Thus the purport of the clause is that God, in giving Christ to the Church, gave Him in *the capacity* of Head over all things. There is no distinction or comparison, therefore, between two headships, as if one were over the world or over the state, and the other over the Church. Christ's Headship over the Church, so far as this clause is concerned, is rather implied than expressed. The idea of the Headship over the Church is more distinctly conveyed by the sentence which follows, with the further description of the Church as the σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Here the great idea is

still that of the Headship of Christ over all things. Having that supremacy He is given by God to the Church, and as given in the capacity of universal Head He is given to the Church as her Head also.

Ver. 23. **ἥτις ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ**: *which is His body*. The **ἥτις** (not **ἥ**) introduces a profound statement, the interpretation of which is much contested. It is supplementary to the preceding, and further defines the relation between Christ and the Church in respect of His Headship. The **ἥτις**, therefore, has something of its qualitative force, pointing to what belongs to the nature of the Church (Meyer), and in that way giving the ground of God's gift of Christ to the **ἐκκλησία**. Or (with Ell., etc.) it may be taken in the subdued, *explanatory* sense—"which indeed". The word **σῶμα**, which passes readily from its literal meaning into the figurative sense of a *society*, a number of men constituting a social or ethical union (*cf.* Eph. iv. 4), is frequently applied in the NT Epistles to the Church, with or without **τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, as the mystical body of Christ, the fellowship of believers regarded as an organic, spiritual unity in a living relation to Christ, subject to Him, animated by Him, and having His power operating in it. The relation between Christ and the Church, therefore, is not an external relation, or one simply of Superior and inferior, Sovereign and subject, but one of life and incorporation. The Church is not merely an institution ruled by Him as President, a Kingdom in which He is the Supreme Authority, or a vast company of men in moral sympathy with Him, but a Society which is in vital connection with Him, having the source of its life in Him, sustained and directed by His power, the instrument also by which He works.—**τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου**: *the fulness of Him that filleth all in all*. The preceding sentence carries the idea of the *Church* far beyond the limited conception of a concrete institution or outward, visible organisation, and lifts us to the grander conception of a great spiritual fellowship, which is *one* under all varieties of external form and constitution in virtue of the presence of Christ's Spirit in it, and *catholic* as embracing all believers and existing wherever any such are found. It is the conception of the Church which pervades this Epistle (*cf.* iii. 10, 21; v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32). It appears again in similar terms in the sister Epistle (Col. i. 18, 24), and elsewhere in the varied phraseology of the "royal priesthood" (1 Pet. ii. 9) and the "Church of the Firstborn" (Heb. xii. 23). It is this supreme idea of the Church as a spiritual order the essence of which is a living relation to Christ, that receives further expression in the profound sentence with which the paragraph closes. The great difficulty here is with the term **πλήρωμα** itself. The other terms are easier. For the **πάντα** of the TR, which has the most meagre attestation, **τὰ πάντα** (supported by the great uncials, etc.) must be substituted (with Beng., Griesb., LTTr WHRV). The "all" therefore must be taken here in the sense which it has in i. 10—"*the* all," the whole system of things, made by Christ and having in Him the ground of its being, its continuance, its order (Heb. i. 3; Col. i. 16, 17; 1 Cor. viii. 6). The **ἐν πᾶσιν** will have a corresponding extension of meaning, "with all *things*," not merely with all *blessings*, *gifts* or *spiritual requirements*. The universe itself and all the things that make its fulness (*cf.* "the *earth* . . . and the *fulness* thereof," Ps. xxiv. 1) are alike made and maintained by Christ. The prep. is taken by some in its primary force of *in*. But it is difficult then to find a natural sense for the clause; the interpretations proposed, *e.g.*, "in all points" (Harless), "in all modes of manifestation" (Bleek), etc., going beyond the actual terms. It is best to understand it as the instrumental **ἐν**, of which we have an instance in ch. v. 18 (Mey., Ell., Alf., and most) "with all things". Some strangely take **ἐν πᾶσιν** as masc. here, supposing the point to be that Christ supplies in *all His believing members* all the things with which they need to be provided (Haupt, Moule). The **πληρουμένου** may be a pure passive, and so it is taken by some (Vulg., Chrys., etc.). In that case Christ would be described as Himself "filled as to all things". It occurs, however, also as a middle with an active sense (Xen., *Hell.*, v., 4, 56; vi., 2, 14, etc.). So it is rendered here by some of the Versions (Syr., Copt., Goth., Arm.), and the sense of "filling" best suits the context. The middle, however, probably retains something of its proper reciprocal or reflexive force, conveying the idea of filling the totality of things *for Himself*.

What is to be said now of the term **πλήρωμα** itself? There are some interpretations which may at once be set aside, *e.g.*, *the means of fulfilling* (Rück.), the Church being described as the medium or instrument by which Christ accomplishes His destined work of bringing all things back to God; *coetus numer-*

osus, with reference to the *multitude* of those who are subject to Christ (Storr, Rosenm., etc.); *perfection*, in the objective sense of the term, the Church being Christ's perfect work (Oltr.)—a meaning which goes beyond the term itself; *the totality of the aeons*, in the Gnostic sense, Christ and the Church being viewed here in union and the two ideas, "that which makes full" and "that which is made full," being supposed to pass over the one into the other (Baur). The choice is between the active sense of "that which fills or completes" and the passive sense of "that which is filled". The former is favoured by Chrys., Œcum., Aquin., Schwegler, Abb., etc., and it must be admitted to be linguistically possible. Verbals in -μα, it is true, have usually the pass. sense, and this one formed from πληροῦν (which means both to *fill* and to *fulfil*) would most naturally be taken as = "that which is filled," or "that which is fulfilled or completed". It is argued indeed by Light. in a weighty dissertation on "The meaning of πλήρωμα" (*Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, pp. 257-273) that nouns of this formation are always passive, expressing either the *product* of the action denoted by the active verb, or that action itself regarded as a *completed* thing; and further that in the case of πλήρωμα, if we follow out the idea of *fulfilling* rather than that of *filling*, we shall not require to give it now an active sense and again a passive, but shall be able to take it in all its occurrences as a real *passive*, denoting *result* in one aspect or another. But, while it is possible enough to understand it in this way in all the passages in the Epistles, it is difficult to carry the passive sense through the various occurrences in the Gospels (*e.g.*, Matt. ix. 16; Mark ii. 27, viii. 20). Nor does it seem easy to adjust the properly passive sense to all the passages either in the LXX (*cf.* Ezek. v. 2; Dan. x. 3), or in profane Greek (*e.g.*, Soph., *Trach.*, 1203; Eurip., *Troad.*, 824; Philo, *de Abr.*, ii., p. 39), without putting somewhat strained interpretations on some of the cases. The idea, however, that results from allowing πλήρωμα to have the active sense here is not germane to the general scope of the paragraph. That idea is that the Church is that which makes Christ Himself complete. A head, however perfect in itself, if it is without members, is something incomplete. So Christ, who is the Head of the Church, requires the Church to make His completeness, just as the Church which is His body requires Him as the Head to make it a complete and living thing. But the main thought of the whole paragraph is what Christ is and does in relation to the universe and the Church, not what the Church is to Him or does for Him, and the πληρουμένου cannot have the sense of "Him who is being filled" without putting a forced meaning on the τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. Hence πλήρωμα is to be taken in the passive sense here, as is done by most commentators, and the idea is that the Church is not only Christ's body but that which is *filled by Him*. In Col. i. 19, ii. 9 the whole πλήρωμα, or every plenitude of the Godhead, the very fulness of the Godhead, the totality of the Divine powers and qualities, is said to be in Christ, so that He alone is to be recognised as Framer and Governor of the world, and there is neither need nor place for any intermediate beings as agents in those works of creating, upholding and administering. Here the conception is that this plenitude of the Divine powers and qualities which is in Christ is imparted by Him to His Church, so that the latter is pervaded by His presence, animated by His life, filled with His gifts and energies and graces. He is the sole Head of the universe, which is supplied by Him with all that is needed for its being and order. He is also the sole Head of the Church, which receives from Him what He Himself possesses and is endowed by Him with all that it requires for the realisation of its vocation.

CHAPTER II. Vv. 1-10. A new paragraph begins at this point. This is denied indeed by some, who would connect the καὶ ὑμᾶς of ii. 1 immediately with the ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας of i. 19 (Knatchbull), the ἐνήργησεν of i. 20 (Bengel), or the καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν, etc., of i. 22 (Lachm., Harl.). But none of these connections yields a sufficiently clear and harmonious sense. The last, indeed, which proposes to separate ii. 1 from i. 23 merely by a comma and which would make the καὶ . . . συνεζωοποίησεν a statement parallel to the αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν, etc., as well as continuous on it, would require ἡμᾶς rather than ὑμᾶς. All three, too, take seriously from the point and power of the closing verses of chapter i., which are given in a strain of lofty and majestic affirmation suitable to the winding up of a great argument. We have, therefore, a new section here, in which a particular application is made of what has been affirmed in the preceding paragraph. These first ten verses speak of

II. 1. Καὶ ὑμᾶς[1] ὄντας [a] νεκροὺς τοῖς [b] παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς [b] ἁμαρτίαις,[2] 2. ἐν αἷς ποτὲ[3] [c] περιεπατήσατε [e] κατὰ τὸν [d] αἰῶνα τοῦ [d] κόσμου τούτου, [e] κατὰ τὸν [e] ἄρχοντα τῆς [f] ἐξουσίας τοῦ [g] ἀέρος, τοῦ[4]

a = John v. 25; Rom. xi. 15; Col. ii. 13; Rev. iii. 1.
b Here only; παρ. Matt. vi. 14.
c Rom. viii. 1, 4, xiv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 3 al.; 2 John 6.
d Here only; see Gal. i. 4.
e = John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11.
f Ch. i. 21 reff.
g Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17 only; Ps. xvii. 11.

[1] ημας 44, 45, 48, etc.

[2] For αμαρτ., επιθυμιαις B. After αμ. ins. υμων ℵBDEFGP, d, e, f, g, m[87], Vulg., Syr., Copt., Eth., Goth., Or., Euthal., Thdrt., Luc., Victorin., etc.; text KL, most mss., Ar.-pol., Chr.-text-comm., Dam., Thl., Oec.

[3] Omit, L.

[4] τουτου FG, etc.

a further manifestation of that power of God which was seen in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, namely, in the raising of the Ephesians themselves from the death of sin into a new life unto God, and that not of works but of grace.

Ver. 1. **καὶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας νεκρούς**: *and you, being dead*. The construction is broken, the writer turning off into two relative sentences (vv. 2, 3) before he introduces his leading verb. His original statement is taken up again, as some think, at the **καὶ ὄντας νεκροὺς** of ver. 5 (Griesb., Rück., etc.). But the resumption begins rather with the **ὁ δὲ Θεὸς** of ver. 4 (Mey., Ell., etc.). So the **ὑμᾶς ὄντας** here is under the *regimen* of the **συνεζωοποίησε** (ver. 5), and the **καί** has the force of "and you too," "you, also, as well as Christ". The **ὄντας** expresses the condition they were in when God's power wrought in them. The **νεκρούς** means neither *dying* nor *mortal*, nor yet, again, *condemned to death*, but *dead*. Meyer, indeed, contends for the sense of "made liable to eternal death," as he also takes the following **συνεζωοποίησεν, συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν** as proleptic terms. But the whole series of terms is best understood to express things done then and states belonging to the actual present. The **νεκρούς**, therefore, means *ethically* or *spiritually* dead, and what had been said of the power of God in Christ's case is now applied to the case of the readers themselves. The power that raised Christ from the dead and exalted Him is also the power that took them out of the state of spiritual death and gave them a new life and a new dignity with Christ.—**τοῖς παραπτώμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις**: *through your trespasses and sins*. On the authority of such uncials as ℵBDG, such Versions as the Syr. and the Vulg., and such Fathers as Theod., **ὑμῶν** is to be inserted after **ἁμαρτίαις**. The dat. is the instrumental dat., "by trespasses," not *in* them, nor even *in respect* of them (Moule). Etymologically, **παράπτωμα** points to sin as a *fall*, and **ἁμαρτία** to sin as *failure*. It is impossible to establish any clear distinction between the two nouns in the plural forms, as if the one expressed *acts* and the other *states* of sin, or as if the former meant single trespasses and the latter all kinds of sins. Here sin is that which makes dead—the cause of the death-state. In the kindred passage in Col. ii. 13 we have the same idea expressed by **τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν**, if, with the best MSS. and critics, we omit **ἐν**. The TR inserts **ἐν** before **παραπτώμασι**, in which case sin would be presented there as itself the state of death.

Ver. 2. **ἐν αἷς ποτὲ περιεπατήσατε**: *wherein in time past* (RV, "aforetime") *ye walked*. The **αἷς** takes the gender of the nearer noun, but refers to both the **παραπτώμασι** and the **ἁμαρτίαις**. Trespasses and sins were the domain in which they had their habitual course of life in their former heathen days.—**κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**: *according to the course* (or *age*) *of this world*. As the **ἐν** of the former clause gave the stated sphere within which their pre-Christian life moved, so the **κατά** of this clause and the next gives the standard to which it conformed and the spirit by which it was ruled. The phrase **κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον** might have sufficed; the fuller form which introduces both **αἰὼν** and **κόσμος** is more expressive. The **κόσμος** is the world as the objective system of things, and that as evil. The **αἰών** is the world as a world-period—the world as transitory. In such a connection as the present **αἰὼν** comes near what we understand by "the spirit of the age," but is perhaps most happily rendered *course*, as that word conveys the three ideas of *tenor*, *development*, and *limited continuance*. This course of a world which is evil is itself evil, and to live in accordance with it is to live in trespasses and sins.—**κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα**

τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος: *according to the prince of the power of the air*. A yet darker colour is now given to the description of the former heathen walk of those addressed. Their life was determined and shaped by the master of all evil, the supreme ruler of all the powers of wickedness. The terms obviously designate Satan, but their precise sense is somewhat difficult to decide. Three different shades of meaning are suggested for **ἐξουσία** here, *viz.*, (*a*) supreme *right* or *power*, in which case the idea would be the prince to whom belongs the authority of the air; (*b*) the *domain* or *sphere* ot authority, as possibly in Col. i. 13 (Chrys., Theod., Hofm., Oltr.); (*c*) authority in the *collective* sense, the totality of evil powers, all that is known as evil authority. The third sense is supported in some measure by Rom. xiii. 1, 2, and is preferred by most. The idea thus becomes "the prince who rules over all that is called authority". The **ἀέρος** then is best taken as the gen. of place, denoting the *seat* of this overlordship of evil. The word **ἀήρ** cannot be taken as equivalent to *mundus* (Aquin.) or **οὐρανός** (Olsh.) or **σκότος** (Kl.) or **πνεῦμα** (Hofm.); neither can it express the *quality* of these evil powers—their incorporeal or aeriform nature (Hahn). In all its other NT occurrences (Acts xxii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 26, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17) it has the literal sense. It has it here, and it describes these demonic powers as between earth and heaven, in that "supra-terrestrial but sub-celestial region (**ὁ ὑπουράνιος τόπος**, Chrys.) which seems to be, if not the abode, yet the haunt of evil spirits" (Ell.). Thus the prince of evil is described as the Lord-Paramount over all the demonic powers; and these demonic powers, as having their seat in the air, are distinguished from the angels whose abode is in heaven (**ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν**, Matt. xxiv. 36). The Rabbinical literature has many extraordinary and grotesque speculations about the demons as being *winged* (Talmud, *Chagig.*, 2), as dwelling in the air (R. Bechai, *Pent.*, f. 139, 4), about the souls of devils as dwelling in a firmament under the sphere of the moon (*Tuf haarez*, f. 9, 2), etc. Such fancies were also entertained by the Greek philosophers, *e.g.*, the Pythagoreans (Diog. Laert., viii. 2). But these have little or no relation to the present passage. In Philo and in the Jewish Pseudepigraphic writings things more akin to it are found. There is, *e.g.*, the description of Beliar as the **ἀέριον πνεῦμα** (*Test.* xii. *Patr.* p. 729); of the "prince of this world" as dwelling in the *firmament* (*Ascens. Isa.*, 10); of the "air" as peopled by *souls* (Philo, *Gig.*, i. 263). But even these form very partial analogies, and the passages in the *Book of Enoch* (ch. xv., 10, 11, 12; xvi., 1), which have been taken to refer to the subject, are of uncertain interpretation (*cf.* Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 84). We have no definite knowledge, therefore, of the origin of this idea. But it seems to have been familiar enough to the readers to require no explanation.—**τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας**: *of the spirit that worketh now in the sons of disobedience*. How is the gen. **τοῦ πνεύματος** to be construed? It naturally suggests itself to regard the "spirit" now mentioned as in apposition to the "prince" just described. But to understand the gen. here as continuing the acc. **ἄρχοντα** (Rück., De Wette, Bleek, etc.) is to take too violent a liberty with grammar. The **τοῦ πνεύματος** is under the regimen of the **ἄρχοντα** as the **ἐξουσίας** is, and it adds something to the idea. The ruler over all that is called authority is also the ruler over this particular spirit. It is objected that the designation of a ruler over *a spirit* is an anomaly. But we have a parallel in the Pauline description of Christ as **Κυρίου πνεύματος** (2 Cor. iii. 18). The **πνεῦμα** here is not the spirit or mind of *man* (which would be inconsistent with the force of the **ἐξουσίας**), nor is it a *collective* term equivalent to the **ἐξουσία** (for its form is against that, as is also the statement of its operation). It is either (*a*) the evil *principle* or *power* that comes into men from Satan, *cf.* **τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου**, 1 Cor. ii. 12; **τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου**, 1 John iv. 3; **ἕτερον πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν**, Eph. iv. 23; or (*b*) the personal Spirit—that particular Spirit whose domain and work are in evil men. The latter is perhaps to be preferred, as in more definite accordance with the contrast with the Holy Spirit of God which seems to be in view. By **ἀπειθεία** is meant not merely *unbelief*, but *disobedience*. Its stated sense in the NT is that of "obstinate opposition to the Divine will" (Thay.-Grimm, *sub voce*). The term **υἱός** in its topical sense and followed by the gen. of a *thing*, expresses what is in intimate relation to the thing, what belongs to it and has it as its innate quality. "Sons of disobedience" are those to whom disobedience is their very nature and essential character, who belong wholly to it. It is a well-known Hebrew idiom, occurring often in the NT, especially in the case of Hebraisms of trans-

[h] πνεύματος τοῦ νῦν [i] ἐνεργοῦντος ἐν τοῖς [k] υἱοῖς τῆς [k] ἀπειθείας, 3. ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς[1] πάντες[2] [l] ἀνεστράφημεν ποτὲ ἐν ταῖς [m] ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς [m] σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, ποιοῦντες τὰ [n] θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν [o] διανοιῶν, καὶ ἦμεν[3] [p] τέκνα [q] φύσει [p] ὀργῆς[4] ὡς καὶ [r] οἱ λοιποί·

h=Luke ix. 55; Rom. viii. 15; 1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 John iv. 1 ff.

i Ch. i. 11 reff. k Ch. v. 6; Col. iii. 6 only; υἱ. = John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 5; see Isa. lvii. 4; ἀπ. Rom. xi. 30, 32; Heb. iv. 6, 11 †. l=2 Cor. i. 12 (and constr.); 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 18; see Heb. x. 33; Ezek. xix. 6. m Gal. v. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 11; 1 John ii. 16. n Plur., Acts xiii. 22 only, and Jer. xxiii. 26. o=Col. i. 21; ch. iv. 18; see note. p=Matt. xi. 19; John i. 12 al.; Rom. ix. 8; ch. v. 8; 1 Pet. i. 14; 2 Pet. ii. 14; Isa. lvii. 4. q Rom. ii. 14; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8 only. r 1 Thess. iv. 13, v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 20; Rev. xi. 13 al.

[1] και ημεις om. FGL; υμ. ADK.

[2] παντ. om. 17, 68, 74, 115, v.-ms., Syr., Ar.-erp., Tert., Ambrst.; παντες ημ. 73; *et nos et omnes* Fortun-in Aug.

[3] For ημεν, ημεθα ℵB 17, 73, Orig.$_4$; text ADEFGKLP, Clem., Did., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[4] φυσ. τεκ. ADEFGLP 3, 37, 80, 106-8-16, It., Vlg., Arm., Orig.$_1$, Did., Thdrt., Lat. Fathers; text ℵBK, al. pler. Orig.$_3$, Chr., Dam., Tert.; φυσει om. 109, Eth., Clem.; τεκνα οργης φυσει Cyr.; οργης τεκνα Clem.

lation. But the same or similar forms are found now and again in profane Greek, especially in inscriptions and in dignified speech (*cf.* Plato's use of ἔκγονος, *Phaedr.*, p. 275 D), the υἱὸς τύχης of the Tragedians, etc.; see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 161-166. The νῦν does not refer to the present in contrast with the future of the Parousia (Olsh.), nor with any other future; nor again is it = "*Even* now," which would have been καὶ νῦν. It looks back upon the previous πότε, and contrasts the present working of the πνεῦμα with the past. *Once* that spirit worked in all those addressed; *now* it works not in them indeed, but in those given over to disobedience to God's will. So the lordship belonging to the Prince of evil extends not only over all those malign powers whose seat is in the air, but also and more particularly over that Spirit who operates as an energy of wickedness in the hearts of men opposed to God.

Ver. 3. ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε: *among whom also we all had our life and walk aforetime.* The AV gives "also we all"; Tynd., Cov., Gen., "we also had"; Bish., "we all had"; RV, "we also all". The ἐν οἷς cannot mean "in which *trespasses*" (so Syr., Jer., Beng., etc.); for the ὑμῶν of ver. 1 is against that, and the form would have been ἐν αἷς as ruled by the nearest noun ἁμαρτίαις. It can only refer to the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας. The καὶ ἡμεῖς πάντες is in contrast with the καὶ ὑμᾶς of ver. 1 and the περιεπατήσατε of ver. 2. Paul had begun by speaking of the moral condition of these Gentiles before their conversion. He now adds that these Gentiles were in no exceptional position in that respect, but that all, Jews as well as Greeks, Jewish-Christians like himself no less than Gentile Christians like his readers, had been among those who once lived in obstinate disobedience to God. Paul seldom misses the opportunity of declaring the universal sinfulness of men, the dire level of corruptness on which all, however they differed in race or privilege, stood. So here the ἡμεῖς πάντες is best taken in its utmost breadth—not merely "all the Jewish-Christians" (Mey.), but = the whole body of us Christians, Jewish and Gentile alike included. For the περιεπατήσατε of ver. 2 we have now ἀνεστράφημεν, "had our conversation" (AV), "conversed" (Rhem.), "lived" (RV). Like the Heb. הָלַךְ it denotes one's walk, his active, open life, his way of conducting himself.—ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν: *in the lusts of our flesh.* Definition of the domain or element in which their life once was spent. It kept within the confines of the appetites and impulses proper to fallen human nature or springing from it. The noun ἐπιθυμία has its usual sense of *craving*, the craving in particular of what is forbidden; σάρξ in like manner has its large, theological sense, human nature as such, in its physical, mental and moral entirety, considered as apart from God and under the dominion of sin.—ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν: *doing the desires of the flesh and of the thoughts.* The ποιοῦντες is sufficiently represented by the "doing" of Wycl., Cov., Rhem., RV,

4. ὁ δὲ θεὸς, [s] πλούσιος ὢν [t] ἐν [1] [u] ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ [2] [v] ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, 5. καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς [3] [w] νεκροὺς τοῖς [w] παραπτώμασιν [4] [x] συνεζωοποίησεν [5] τῷ χριστῷ ([y] χάριτί [6] ἐστε σεσωσ-

s = here only; see ch. i. 7, 18.
t Constr., 1 Tim. vi. 18; James ii. 5.
u Rom. ix. 23 al.; Luke i. passim.
v Ch. i. 7; Luke ii. 8; John vii. 24; 1 Tim. i. 18 al.
w Ver. 1.
x Col. ii. 13 only †.
y = Rom. iii. 24, and Paul passim.

[1] Omit **εν** **א**.

[2] **αυτου** om. DFG 73, 118, d, e, g, Lat. Fathers; insert before **αγαπ.** 30, 115-20.

[3] **ημας** om. 73, 118, Cyr.-Jer.

[4] For **τοις παραπτ.**, **ταις αμαρτιαις** DE, etc.; **εν τ. παραπτ.** B, Syr., Copt., al.; B adds **και ταις επιθυμιαις**.

[5] Insert **εν** before **τω Χριστω** B 17, 73, 118, tol, Copt., Arm., Chr., Dam., Victorin., etc.

[6] Before **χαριτι** insert **ου** (= *cujus*), DEFG, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Victorin., Ambrosiast., Aug., etc.; **ου τη** D*E.

The AV and other Versions give "fulfilling". The word **θέλημα** is of very rare occurrence, except in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. It denotes properly the *thing willed*, but is used also of the Divine *purpose* (*e.g.*, Eph. i. 9), or *command* (*e.g.*, Eph. v. 17), etc. Here, as also in John i. 13, it denotes *inclination* or *desire*. The pl. **διανοιῶν** is best rendered "thoughts," with Wycl., Cov., Rhem. and RV margin; RV text, following the AV and other Versions, gives "mind". In the LXX the singular represents the OT לֵב, and denotes the *mind* in the large sense, inclusive of understanding, feeling and desiring. It is only the context that gives it the sense of *wicked* thoughts. Two sources of evil desire and impulse, therefore, are indicated here, *viz.*, our fallen nature in general and the laboratory of perverted thoughts, impressions, imaginations, volitions, in particular.—**καὶ ἤμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς**: *and were children by nature of wrath*. "Children," rather than "*the* children," as it is given by AV and all the other old English Versions (except Wycl., who has "the sons"). From what he and his fellow-Christians *did* in their pre-Christian life, Paul turns now to what they *were* then. The statement is so constructed as to throw the chief emphasis on the **ἤμεν** and the **ὀργῆς**. For **ἤμεν** the better attested form is **ἤμεθα**. Some good MSS. and Versions (ADGLP, Syr.-Harcl., Vulg.) read **φύσει τέκνα**, and that order is accepted by Lachmann, while a place is given it in the margin by Tregelles. The order **τέκνα φύσει**, however, which is that of **א**BK, Chrys., etc., and both the TR and the RV, is to be preferred. The **ἤμεν** makes it clear that it is no longer *doing* (**ποιοῦντες**) simply that is in view, but *being*, *condition*. The **τέκνα** is the same kind of idiomatic phrase as the former **υἱοί**, only, if possible, stronger and more significant. It describes those in view as not only worthy of the **ὀργή**, but actually *subject* to it, definitely *under* it. But what is this **ὀργή** itself? It is not to be identified with *punitive righteousness* (**τιμωρία**), *punishment* (**κόλασις**), future *judgment*, or the *effect* of God's present judgment of men, but denotes the *quality* or *affectus* of wrath. But is it *man's* wrath or *God's?* The word is certainly used of the passion of wrath in us (Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; Jas. i. 19, etc.), and so the whole phrase is understood by some to mean nothing more than that those referred to were given to violent anger or ungovernable impulse (*e.g.*, Maurice, *Unity*, p. 538). But this would add little or nothing to what was said of the lusts of the flesh and thoughts, and would strip the whole statement of its point, its solemnity, and its universality. It is the Divine wrath that is in view here; as it is, indeed, in thirteen out of twenty occurrences in the Pauline writings, and that, too, whether with or without the definite article or the defining **Θεοῦ** (*cf.* Moule, *in loc.*). This holy displeasure of God with sin is not inconsistent with His love, but is the reaction of that love against the denial of its sovereign rights of responsive love. The term **φύσις**, though it may occasionally be applied to what is *habitual* or to character as *developed*, means properly what is *innate*, *implanted*, in one by *nature*, and this with different shades of meaning (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Rom. ii. 14; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8, etc.). The clause means, therefore, that in their pre-Christian life those meant by

the ἡμεῖς πάντες were in the condition of subjection to the Divine wrath; and that they were so not by deed merely, nor by circumstance, nor by passing into it, but by nature. Their universal sin has been already affirmed. This universal sin is now described as sin by nature. Beyond this Paul does not go in the present passage. But the one is the explanation of the other. Universal sin implies a law of sinning, a sin that is of the nature; and this, again, is the explanation of the fact that all are under the Divine wrath. For the Divine wrath operates only where sin is. Here is the essential meaning of the doctrine of *original sin*. That it finds any justification here is denied, indeed, by some; even by Meyer, who admits, however, that elsewhere (*e.g.*, in Rom. vi.) Paul teaches that there is a principle of sin in man by nature, and that man sins actually because of that innate principle. But he argues that it is in virtue not of the principle itself, but of the acts of sin by which that principle expresses itself, that we are in a state of subjection to the Divine wrath. This, however, is to make a nature which originates sinful acts and which does that in the case of all men without exception, itself a neutral thing.

Ver. 4. **ὁ δὲ Θεὸς, πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει**: *but God* (or, God, however), *being rich in mercy*. A return is now made to the statement which was interrupted at ver. 2. The resumption might have been made by **οὖν**. The adversative **δέ**, however, is the more appropriate, as the other side of our case is now to be set forth—the Divine grace which meets the sinful, condemned condition, and which stands over the dark background of our death by sin and our subjection by nature to the Divine wrath. God who is wroth with sin, is a God of grace. His disposition towards those who are dead by trespasses and sins is one of mercy, and this no stinted mercy, but a mercy that is *rich*, exhaustless (for **πλούσιος, πλουτίζειν**, etc., *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18; Jas. ii. 5).—**διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς**: *by reason of His great love wherewith He loved us*. The use of the cogn. acc. **ἣν** adds to the force of the idea; *cf.* the use of the same phrase by our Lord Himself with reference to His Father's love, John xvii. 26. If *mercy* is God's attitude to sinful men, *love* is His motive in all that He does with them; and as the mercy is "rich" so the love is "great". With this great love God loved us when He chose us, and it is *on account of* that love (not "through" it, as Luther puts it) that He acts with us as He does. The **ἡμᾶς** has the widest sense here—all of us, whether Jew or Gentile.

Ver. 5. **καὶ ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν**: *even when we were dead by our trespasses*. The condition of death in which we are by nature is now reaffirmed, and in a still more emphatic way than in ver. 1. The **καί** is not the copula, simply attaching one statement to another (Mey.), nor a mere repetition of the **καί** of the opening verse, nor = "also," "also us" collectively (which would require **καὶ ἡμᾶς**), but the ascensive **καί** = *even* (Syr.-Phil., AV, RV, Ell., etc.). It qualifies the **ὄντας** (while the **νεκροὺς** is thrown emphatically forward), and heightens the sense of the *greatness* of the Divine power—as a power operating on us when we were yet held fast in the state of inexorable death. The **τοῖς** defines the trespasses as those already mentioned in connection with that state of death, and so has much the sense of "our".—**συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ**: *quickened us together with the Christ*. Some authorities (including B 17, Arm.) insert **ἐν** before **τῷ Χριστῷ**; which is favoured so far by Lachm. and gets a place in the margin with WH and RV. But the mass of authorities omit it. The **συν-**, therefore, of the compound verb refers to the **Χριστῷ**, and the idea expressed is that of fellowship with Him, not the fellowship or comprehension of Jew and Gentile alike in the Divine act of quickening (Beza). Here again the article probably designates Christ in His official relation to us. The *quickening* here in view is understood by some (including Meyer) to refer to the first act in the raising of the dead at the great day; the following verbs **συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν** being similarly understood in the literal sense, as referring proleptically to events that belong to the ultimate future. Thus the *standing* rather than the moral condition is supposed to be primarily in view, the idea being that when Christ was raised from the dead we also as members of His body were raised in principle with Him, so that the resurrection of the future which we await will be simply the application to the individual of what was accomplished once for all for the whole of His members then. It must be admitted that the analogous passage in Col. ii. 12, 13, which associates the *quickening* with the forgiveness of trespasses and the blotting out of the hand-writing of ordinances, on the whole favours that interpretation. Looking, however, to the express and particular

μένοι) 6. καὶ [z] συνήγειρεν καὶ [a] συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς [b] ἐπουρανίοις ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,[1] 7. ἵνα [c] ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς [d] αἰῶσιν τοῖς [d] ἐπερχομένοις τὸ [e] ὑπερβάλλον [f] πλοῦτος [2] τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν [g] χρηστότητι [3] [h] ἐφ'

z Col. ii. 12, iii. 1 only; Exod. xxiii. 5 alex.
a Trans., here only, intr., Luke xxii. 55; Exod. xviii. 13.
b Ch. i. 3 reff.
c Rom. ix. 17, from Exod. ix. 16; 1 Tim. i. 16 al(8), but Paul only.
d Here only; ἐπ. = Luke xxi. 26; James v. 1.
e Ch. i. 19 reff.
f Ch. i. 7 reff.
g Rom. ii. 4 al(8), but Paul only.
h See i. 19, εἰς ἡμ.

[1] εν Χ. Ι. om. FG, g, Hil.; *cum Chr. Jes.* Fortun.; omit Ιησου Orig., Cyr.

[2] τον υπερβαλλοντα πλουτον, with D[3]ELP, Or., Euseb., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; το υπερβαλλον πλουτος ℵBADFG 17, 67[2], Orig., Euth., etc.

[3] Before χρηστ. insert τη DE.

description of the worldly walk and the conversation in the lusts of the flesh, which is given in vers. 2, 3, and which seems to explain what is said in ver. 1 of the state of being "dead by trespasses and sins"; and having regard also to the application to the moral life which is made in the second half of the Epistle, most interpreters understand the *quickening* here affirmed to be that of regeneration—the communication of spiritual life.—**χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι**: *by grace have ye been saved.* So the RV, while the AV is content with "are ye saved". The idea is that they were saved and continued to be so. The **χάριτι** is put emphatically first—"by grace it is that ye have been saved". The parenthetical mention of *grace* is in place. Nothing else than grace could give life to the dead, but grace could indeed do even that.

Ver. 6. **καὶ συνήγειρεν**: *and raised us with Him.* That is, to life now, in a present spiritual renewal. The **συνήγειρεν** expresses the definite idea of *resurrection*, and primarily that of the physical resurrection. The introduction of this term and the following makes it not improbable that both ideas, that of the present moral resurrection and that of the future bodily resurrection, were in Paul's mind, and that he did not sharply distinguish between them, but thought of them as one great gift of life.—**καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *and seated us* (or, enthroned us) *with Him in the heavenlies.* Made us sharers with Him in dignity and dominion, so that even now, and in foretaste of our future exaltation, our life and thought are raised to the heavenlies where He reigns. But as Bengel notices, Paul pauses here and does not add the **ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ** which is said of Christ in i. 20.—**ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: *in Christ Jesus.* Not the **συνεκάθισεν** only, but the whole statement is qualified by this. This quickening, this resurrection, this seating of us with Him take effect in so far as we are *in* Him as our Representative, having our life and our completeness in our Head.

Ver. 7. **ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ**: *that He might shew forth in the ages that are coming the exceeding riches of His grace.* For the **τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα πλοῦτον** of the TR the neuter form **τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος** is preferred by most editors (LTTrWHRV). The satisfaction of His love was God's motive in quickening and raising them. The manifestation of His glory in its surpassing wealth is His final purpose in the same. The verb **ἐνδείκνυσθαι** occurs eleven times in the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, and nowhere else in the NT. The active is very rare even in the classics, and is never found in the NT. Hence the **ἐνδείξηται** is to be taken as a simple active (not as=shew forth *for Himself*), all the more by reason of the **αὐτοῦ**. What is meant by the **τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις**? Some give it the widest possible sense, *e.g., per omne vestrum tempus reliquum quum in hac vita tum in futura quoque* (Morus), "the successively arriving ages and generations from that time to the second coming of Christ" (Ell.). But it is rather another form of the **αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων** (Harl., Olsh., Mey., Haupt, etc.), the part. **ἐπερχόμενος** being used of the future (*e.g.*, Jer. xlvii. 11; Isa. xli. 4, 22, 23, xlii. 23; Luke xxi. 26; Jas. v. 1, etc.), and the future being conceived of as made up of an undefined series of periods. In other cases reduplicated expressions, **αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων**, etc., are used to express the idea of eternity. God's purpose, therefore, is that in the eternal future, the future which opens with Christ's Parousia, and in all the continuing length of that future, the grace of His ways with those once dead in sins should be declared and understood in all the grandeur of its exceeding riches.—**ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς**: *in kindness*

ἡμᾶς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[1] 8. τῇ γὰρ [i] χάριτί [2] ἐστε σεσωσμένοι [k] διὰ τῆς[3] πίστεως, [l] καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ [m] ἐξ ὑμῶν,[4] θεοῦ τὸ [n] δῶρον· 9. οὐκ [m] ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μή τις [o] καυχήσηται. 10. αὐτοῦ [5] γάρ ἐσμεν [p] ποίημα,[6]

i Ver. 5 reff. k Rom. iii. 22, 30; 2 Cor. v. 7, 9 al., ii. 16, iii. 26; Phil. iii. 9; Col. ii. 12 al.; 1 Pet. i. 5; =see Acts xv. 9. l 1 Cor. vi. 6; Phil. i. 28. m 2 Cor. iii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 30. n = here only; δωρεά, John iv. 10; 2 Cor. ix. 15 al. o Rom. ii. 17 al(34), but Paul only, exc. James i. 9; iv. 16, not in Col.; so also καύχημα and καύχησις, exc. James iv. 16. p Rom. i. 20 only; Gal. viii. 17.

[1] Ιησ. om. DEFG, d, e, g, Eth., Victorin., etc.

[2] αυτου χαριτι σεσ. εσμεν DE, d, e, al., Vss.

[3] Before πιστεως om. της ℵBD[1]FG 17, 67[2], 76, 80, Chr., Thl.-text, etc.; insert DEKL, most mss., Thdrt., Dam., Thl.-comm., Oec.

[4] υμων DFG 46, 52, 73, etc., Arm. Chr., Dam., etc.

[5] θεου γαρ ℵ.

[6] ποιηματα 47.

toward us. The ἐν is taken by some (Mey., etc.) as the instrumental ἐν, "by means of kindness". It is more natural to give it the proper force of "in," as defining the *way* in which the grace showed itself in its surpassing riches. It was in the form of kindness directed towards us. The χρηστότης, which means *moral goodness* in Rom. iii. 12, has here the more usual sense of *benignity* (*cf.* Rom. ii. 4, xi. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 6; Gal. v. 22; Col. iii. 12; Tit. iii. 4).—ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: *in Christ Jesus.* Again is Paul careful to remind his readers that all this grace and the manifestation of it in its riches have their ground and reason in Christ.

Ver. 8. τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι: *for by grace have ye been saved.* More exactly "by the grace," *i.e.*, by this grace, the grace already mentioned. *Grace* is the explanation of their own salvation, and how surpassingly rich the grace must be that could effect that!—διὰ τῆς πίστεως: *through faith.* That is, by faith as the instrument or means. Paul never says διὰ τὴν πίστιν, as if the faith were the ground or procuring cause of the salvation. It is the χάριτι, too, not the explanatory πίστεως that has the first place in Paul's thoughts here.—καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ἡμῶν: *and that not of yourselves.* That is, not as *proceeding from* yourselves or of your own performance. The sentence thus beginning with καὶ τοῦτο (*cf.* Rom. xiii. 11) is not parenthetical, but an integral part of the statement. But to what does the τοῦτο refer? To the πίστεως say some (Chrys., Theod., Jer., Bez., Beng., Bisp., Moule, etc.). The neut. τοῦτο would not be irreconcilable with that. The formula καὶ τοῦτο indeed might rather favour it, as it often adds to the idea to which it is attached. It may also be granted that a peculiarly suitable idea results—the opportune reminder that even their *faith*, in which at least they might think there was something of their own, has its origin in God's grace, not in their own effort. But on the other hand the *salvation* is the main idea in the preceding statement, and it seems best to understand the καὶ τοῦτο as referring to that salvation in its entire compass, and not merely to the one element in it, its instrumental cause, appended by way of explanation. Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον: *it is the gift of God.* Or, perhaps, "God's gift it is". The salvation is not an achievement but a *gift*, and a gift from none other than God. This declaration of the free, unmerited, conferred nature of the salvation is made the stronger not only by the contrast with the ἐξ ὑμῶν, but by the dropping of any connecting particle.

Ver. 9. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μή τις καυχήσηται: *not of works, that no one should glory.* The OT protest against glorying in any but the Lord and the prophet's jealousy for the honour of God (Jer. ix. 23, 24; Is. xlii. 8, 14, etc.) burn with a yet intenser flame in Paul, most of all when he touches the great theme of man's salvation. That the glory of that salvation belongs wholly to God and in no degree to man, and that it has been so planned and so effected as to take from us all ground for boasting, is enforced on Paul's hearers again and again, in different connections, with anxious concern and utmost plainness of expression (*cf.* Rom. iii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 29, iv. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Phil. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 10. αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα: *for we are His workmanship* (or, handiwork). The αὐτοῦ is emphatic—"*His* handiwork are we". The word ποίημα occurs only once again in the NT (Rom. i. 20, with reference to the works of

[q] κτισθέντες ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [r] ἐπὶ [s] ἔργοις [s] ἀγαθοῖς, [t] οἷς [u] προητοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς ἵνα [v] ἐν αὐτοῖς [v] περιπατήσωμεν.

11. Διὸ [w] μνημονεύετε ὅτι [1] [x] ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη [y] ἐν σαρκὶ, οἱ

q = ch. iii. 9, iv. 24; Col. i. 16, iii. 10 al. r = Gal. v. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 7. s Acts ix. 36; Rom. ii. 7, xiii. 3 al. fr. t Attr., ii. 7 reff. u Rom. ix. 23 only; Isa. xxviii. 24. v Rom. vi. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 2, x. 3, ch. v. 2; Col. ii. 6, iv. 5; 1 John i. 6, 7 al. w W. ὅτι, Paul only; Acts xx. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 5. x = John ix. 13; Rom. vii. 9, xi. 30 al. y Rom. ii. 28 reff.

[1] δια τουτο μνημονευοντες υμ. οι ποτε . . . FG, Dial.$_1$. Rec. υμ. ποτε ℵ^{3}D^{2}KLP, Syr.-P., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; ποτε υμεις ℵ*ABDE 17, 37, 73, 115, 116, d, e, f, Vulg., Dial., Diod., etc.

nature). Here, as the following clause shows, it expresses not *appointment* to something, but an actual *making*. The clause gives the reason for the statement that our salvation is not of *works*. We ourselves are a *work*, the handiwork of God, made anew by Him, and our salvation, therefore, is due to Him, not to ourselves.—**κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς**: *created in Christ Jesus for good works*. Further definition of the **ποίημα αὐτοῦ**. We are God's spiritual handiwork, in the sense that we were *created* by Him, made a new spiritual *creature* by Him when His grace made us Christians. This new creation was *in Christ*, so that except by union between Him and us it could not have taken place (Eph. ii. 15, iv. 24; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; Col. iii. 10). Also it was *with a view* to good works, **ἐπί** being used here (much as in Gal. v. 13; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 14) to express *object; cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 492. We ourselves then having been created anew by God, and good works being the *object* to which that new creation looked, not the cause that led to it, all must be of grace not of deeds (**ἔργων**), and there can be no room for boasting.—**οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς**: *which God afore prepared*. The **οἷς** cannot with any propriety be construed as a masc., "for whom He before appointed" (Erasm.); nor can it well be taken as the dat. of destination, "unto which God prepared us" (Luth., Schenkel, etc.); for that would require the insertion of a **ἡμᾶς**. Nor, again, can it be taken in the intrans. sense, so as to give the idea "for which God made previous preparation" (Stier); for while **ἑτοιμάζειν** *may* be used intransitively (Luke ix. 52), the compound verb does not appear to be so used. It is best taken (with the Syr., Goth. and Vulg. Versions and the best exegetes) as a case of attraction—**οἷς** for **ἅ**. The **προετοιμάζειν** is not quite the same as **προορίζειν**. It means to *prepare* or *place in readiness before*, not specifically to *foreordain* (Aug., Harl.). The **προ-** describes the *preparation* as prior to the *creation* (**κτισθέντες**). The subjects of the preparation also are the *good works themselves*, not the *ways* in which they are to be done. In relation to the question of human merit or glorying, therefore, good works are viewed in two distinct aspects. They are the goal to which God's new creation of us looked; they are also in God's eternal plan. Before He created us in Christ by our conversion He had destined these good works and made them ready for us in His purpose and decree. There is the unseen source from which they spring, and there is their final explanation.—**ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν**: *that we should walk in them*. God's purpose in the place which He gave to good works in His decree was that they should actually and habitually be done by us. His final object was to make good works the very element of our life, the domain in which our action should move. That this should be the nature of our walk is implied in our being His handiwork, made anew by Him in Christ; that the good works which form the Divine aim of our life shall be realised is implied in their being designed and made ready for us in God's decree; and that they are of God's originating, and not of our own action and merit, is implied in the fact that we had ourselves to be made a new creation in Christ with a view to them.

Vv. 11-22. The second half of this chapter makes a paragraph by itself. Its subject is the case of those Gentile believers whom Paul has immediately in view—their heathen past and their Christian present. They are reminded of what they once were—outside Christ, outside the special privilege of Israel, without hope, and without God; and of what they have come to be by the power of Christ's death—placed on an equality with the chosen people, brought nigh to the Father, made part of the house-

[x] λεγόμενοι [a] ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς [x] λεγομένης [b] περιτομῆς [y] ἐν σαρκὶ [c] χειροποιήτου, 12. ὅτι ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ[1] ἐκείνῳ [d] χωρὶς χριστοῦ [e] ἀπηλ-

x Matt. x. 2; Acts iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 4 al. a Paul only, exc. Acts xi. 3; Gen. xvii. 11, etc. b Paul only, exc. John vii. 22, 23; Acts vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2; Exod. iv. 26. c Mark xiv. 58; Acts vii. 48, xvii. 24; Heb. ix. 11, 24 only; Isa. ii. 18, of idols. d Rom. iii. 21 al. e Ch. iv. 18; Col. i. 21 only; Ps. lxviii. 8.

[1] Rec. before τω καιρ. insert εν with D[3]EKLP, Vss., Fathers; om. ℵABD[1]FG, Chr.-comm., Epiph., Cyr., Lat. Fathers.

hold of God and the living temple of the Lord.

Ver. 11. **Διὸ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ὑμεῖς ποτὲ**: *Wherefore remember that aforetime ye.* The order of the TR, ὑμεῖς ποτέ, is supported by such authorities as ℵ[3]D[3]G (with οἱ before ποτέ), Syr.-Harcl., etc. Some authorities place the ποτέ after the ἔθνη (Syr.-P., Boh.). But ποτὲ ὑμεῖς is the order of the best and oldest MSS. (ℵ*ABD*), the Vulg., etc., and is adopted by most (LTTrWHRV). As διὸ indicates, what follows is a personal, ethical application of what has been said; and the application is drawn not from the immediately preceding sentence, but from the contents of the prior paragraph as a whole. The great things done for them by God's grace should incline them to think of the past from which they have been delivered. The remembrance of that past will make them more thankful for their present privilege, and more careful to walk in the good works which God has in view for them. The sentence is interrupted by descriptive clauses, but is taken up again in the next verse; where a second ὅτι and the words τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ are introduced, resuming the ὅτι and the ποτέ of ver. 11. There is no need, therefore, to supply either ὄντες or ἦτε at this point. **τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί**: *Gentiles in the flesh.* The article is given to the ἔθνη, the *class* to which the readers belong being in view (Win.-Moult., pp. 132, 217). It is not repeated before the σαρκί, as the ἐν σαρκί makes one idea with the τὰ ἔθνη (Win.-Moult., p. 169). The term σάρξ also is to be taken literally, not as referring to the former unregenerate life, but (as the subsequent sentences show) in the sense of the *flesh* to which *circumcision* is applicable. They are reminded that they belonged to the class of the Gentiles, their bodies proclaiming their heathen character. — **οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία**: *who are called Uncircumcision.* A further definition of what they were as ἔθνη, suggestive of the low regard in which they were held as members of that class. The name *Uncircumcision!*—a name of contempt, was flung at them. The term ἀκροβυστία, which is unknown to profane Greek but is used in the LXX, is taken to be an Alexandrian corruption of ἀκροποσθία.—**ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου**: *by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hand.* So the RV. Better perhaps "by the so-called Circumcision, performed by hand in the flesh" (Ell.). Wicl. gives "made by hand in flesh". A description of the Jew, given in a tone of depreciation. Hence probably the change from οἱ λεγόμενοι to τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς. This sentence also is introduced with reference to the poverty of the previous condition of these Godless, Christless Gentiles. The point seems to be that the inferiority in which they were held, and which was expressed by the contemptuous name *Uncircumcision*, meant all the more as it was fastened on them by those to whom, while proudly calling themselves the *Circumcision*, the distinction was nothing more than an outward manual act performed on their bodies. The rite when its spiritual significance and use are in view, is spoken of with honour by Paul (Rom. iv. 11). As a mere performance, a barrier between Jew and Gentile, a yoke imposed by the former on the latter, a thing made essential to salvation, he spoke of it in terms of scorn and repudiation.

Ver. 12. **ὅτι ἦτε ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ**: *that ye were at that time apart from Christ.* The sentence interrupted by the description of those addressed as τὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ. is now resumed—*Remember, I say, that ye were.* The τῷ καιρῷ, corresponding to the previous ποτέ, refers to their pre-Christian days. In such phrases it is usual to insert ἐν (Donald., *Greek Gram.*, p. 487), and it is inserted by the TR (following AD[1]FG, etc.). But time *when* is also often enough expressed by the simple dat. (Win.-Moult., pp. 273, 274), and the balance of evidence is largely against the presence of the prep. here. The χωρὶς Χριστοῦ is the predicate to ἦτε, and is not a defining clause = "being at that time without Christ" (De Wette,

λοτριωμένοι τῆς [f] πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ [g] ξένοι τῶν [h] διαθηκῶν τῆς [i] ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ [k] ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ[1].

f Acts xxii. 28 only; 2 Macc. iv. 11.
g Constr., here only; *cf.* Soph., *Œd. Tyr.*, 219, 220, Plato, *Apol.* i.
h Acts iii. 25; plur., Rom. ix. 4; Gal. iv. 24 only.
i Gal. iv. 23; Heb. iv. 17 al.
k Here only.

[1] κοσμ. τουτω FG, Or., etc.

Bleek). It describes their former condition as one in which they had no connection with Christ; in which respect they were in a position sadly inferior to that of the Jews whose attitude was one of hoping and waiting for Christ, the Messiah. Their apartness from Christ, their lack of all relation to Him—this is the first stroke in the dark picture of their former heathen life, and the four to which the eye is directed in the subsequent clauses all follow from that.—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραήλ**: *alienated from the commonwealth of Israel.* The *alienation* is expressed by **ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι**, a strong verb, common enough in classical Greek (at least from Plato's time), corresponding to the OT זוּר (*cf.* Ps. lviii. 4), and used again in Eph. iv. 18; Col. i. 21. It does not necessarily imply a lapse from a former condition of attachment or fellowship, but expresses generally the idea of being a *stranger* as contrasted with one who is *at home* with a person or an object. The term **πολιτεία** has two main senses—a *state* or *commonwealth* (*e.g.*, 2 Macc. iv. 11, viii. 17), and *citizenship* or the rights of a citizen (Acts xxii. 28). The first of these is most in harmony with the theocratic term **τοῦ Ἰσραήλ**, and so it is understood by most. These Ephesians, therefore, had no part in the theocracy, the OT constitution under which God made Himself known to the Jew and entered into relation with him.—**καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**: *and strangers from the covenants of the Promise.* The **τῶν διαθηκῶν** is probably the gen. of *separation* or *removal.* That idea is usually expressed by a prep., but with verbs like **ὑποχωρεῖν, διαφέρειν, ἀποστερεῖσθαι**, and with some adjectives, it is also expressed by the simple gen. (Win.-Moult., pp. 243, 244). The word **ξένος**, which has the particular meaning of one who is not a member of a state or city, is used here in the general sense of *foreign* to a thing, having no share in it. The **διαθῆκαι** are the covenants with Abraham and the patriarchs (*cf.* Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. viii. 15). It is obviously the covenants of Messianic significance that are in view. That the Mosaic Law or the Sinaitic Covenant is not in view seems to follow from the mention of the **ἐπαγγελία**; for that Covenant was not distinctively of the Promise, but is described by Paul as coming in after it and provisionally (Gal. iii. 17-19). The **ἐπαγγελία** is the Promise, the one distinctively so called, the great Messianic Promise given to the fathers of the Hebrew people (Gen. xiii. 15, xv. 18, xvii. 8, etc.). The defining **τῆς ἐπαγγελίας** is attached by some (Rosenmüller, etc.) to the following **ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες**. But the *covenants* and the *promise* are kindred ideas, and make one thought here.—**ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες**: *having no hope.* With participles the subjective negative is much more frequently used than **οὐ**. In cases like the present, where the participle does not belong to the class of those expressing command, purpose, condition or the like, the use of **μή** is due to the *aspect* in which the matter in question presents itself to the writer—to the fact, *e.g.*, that he has a *genus*, not the individual, in view; *cf.* Ell. on 1 Thess. ii. 15, and Win.-Moult., p. 606. The statement here is absolute—**ἐλπίδα**, not **τὴν ἐλπίδα**. It is not only that they had not *the* hope, the Messianic hope which was one of the distinctions of the Israelite, but that they were utterly without hope. Ignorant of the Divine salvation and of Christ in whom it was found, they had nothing to hope for beyond this world. —**καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ**: *and without God in the world.* The last element in the darkness and misery of their former life. The adj. **ἄθεος**, which is never found in the LXX or in the Apocrypha, and only this once in the NT, in classical Greek means *impious* in the sense of denying or neglecting the gods of the State; but it is also used occasionally in the sense of *knowing* or *worshipping no God* (Æl., V. h., 2, 31), or in that of *abandoned by God* (Soph., *Œd. R.*, 633). Three renderings are possible here—*ignorant* of God, *denying* God, *forsaken* of God. The third is preferred by many (Mey., Ell., etc.), who think that the darkest colour is given to the picture of their old heathen condition by this men-

13. [l] νυνὶ δὲ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ [m] ποτὲ ὄντες [n] μακρὰν [o] ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε [1] [p] ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ χριστοῦ. 14. αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ

l Acts xxii. 1 (xxiv. 13 var. read.); Rom. vi. 22 al(19); Paul only. m Ver. 11 reff. n Luke xv. 20 al.; Acts ii. 39; here and v. 17 only in Paul; Isa. lvii. 19; Dan. ix. 7. o Abs., Luke xix. 11; John xix. 42; Phil. iv. 5. p Luke xxii. 20; Rom. iii. 25, v. 9; Heb. x. 19; Rev. i. 5; v. 9.

[1] εγεν. εγγ. ℵAB 17, 31, 37, etc., Eus., Euth., Dial., Epiph., Ir., Tert., al.; text DEFGKL, most mss., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al. For αιματι, ονοματι 49.

tion of the fact that they were without the help and protection of God. The first of the three senses, however, seems even more in harmony with the preceding negations. As they were without Christ, and without hope, so were they without God—without the knowledge of the one true and living and thus destitute of any God. So in Gal. iv. 8 Paul speaks of Gentiles like these as *knowing* not God and doing service unto them *which by nature are no gods*. The clause ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is connected by some with the whole preceding description (Koppe, etc.); by others with the two last sentences in the description—the ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες and the ἄθεοι (Abb.). But it rather makes one idea with the immediately preceding term ἄθεοι. It is difficult to say in what particular sense the κόσμος is used here—whether in the simple, non-ethical sense, or in the deeper sense which it has in John and also at times in some degree in Paul (1 Cor. i. 21, vi. 2, xi. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 10). Whichever is preferred—whether "without God in the world of men," or "without God in this *evil* world"—an appropriate idea results. But the implied contrast with the previous πολιτεία τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ leads most to decide for the latter. The domain of their life was this present evil world, and in it, alienated as it was from God, they had no God.

Ver. 13. **νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἵ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε**: *but now in Christ Jesus ye that aforetime were far off are become nigh.* In classical Greek νυνί is used only of *time*, mostly with *present* tenses, rarely with the future, and means *at this very moment*. In the NT it is used mostly of time, but also as a logical particle, bringing a statement to a conclusion, = *rebus sic stantibus, as the case stands* (Rom. vii. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.). Here it has the usual temporal meaning—*now* as contrasted with the previous period, the καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ. The ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is put emphatically first and is to be connected with the νυνί (Ell., etc.) rather than with the ἐγενήθητε, the point being this—*then* ye were separate from Christ, but *now* ye are in Him, united with Him, and so are become nigh. It is difficult, if not impracticable, to discover in each case a reason for the use of Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς instead of the simple Χριστός; and the Ἰησοῦ indeed is dropped by some ancient authorities (L., Iren., Orig., Tert., etc.). But the double designation is appropriate here—*then* they were without *Christ*, having no part in the Messiah in whom the Jew had hope; *now* they are in living, present, personal fellowship with the Saviour known among men as Christ Jesus. The μακράν repeats the idea of distance and separation previously expressed by ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι and ξένοι. The expression ἐγγὺς γίνεσθαι, to *come* or *become near*, which is common enough in profane Greek, occurs only here in the NT. The order of the TR, ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε, is supported by DFKL, etc.; but ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύς is the reading of BℵA, 17, Vulg., Goth., etc., and is adopted by most (LTTrWHRV). For the designation of the Gentiles as "far off" and the use of the phrase "bring nigh" in the sense of making them members of the theocracy, *cf.* Isa. lvii. 19; Dan. ix. 7; and for examples in Jewish literature, see Wetst., *in loc.*; Schöttg., *Horæ Hebr.*, i., 76. The verses which immediately follow refer to the removal of the ancient barrier between Jew and Gentile. The ἐγενήθητε ἐγγύς, however, need not be restricted to that. It is in contrast with the whole previous condition of separation from Christ, with all that that meant with regard to the commonwealth of Israel, the covenants, hope, and God. It is probably to be taken, therefore, in the large sense of being brought into the Kingdom of God, made near to God Himself and so brought to hope and privilege.—**ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in* (or, *by*) *the blood of Christ*. On the import of the phrase "the blood of Christ" see under i. 7 above. The ἐν here has much the same sense as the διά there. They both express *instrumentality*. If there is any difference between them it is that διὰ expresses simple, objective, instrumentality, while ἐν denotes what Ell.

[q] εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἓν καὶ τὸ [r] μεσότοιχον τοῦ [s] φραγμοῦ [t] λύσας, 15. τὴν [u] ἔχθραν, ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν [v] νόμον

q = here only; see Rom. v. 1. r Here only. s Matt. xxi. 33; Mark Luke xiv. 23, epp., here only; Num. xxii. 24. t = John ii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 10, 11, 12. u Luke xxiii. 12; James iv. 4 al.; Paul only; Gen. iii. 15. v Here only; see Rom. iii. 27, vii. 2, viii. 2.

calls *immanent* instrumentality, the action of the verb being regarded as *existing in the means*. See Ell. on the present passage and on 1 Thess. iv. 18. There is little to be gained, however, by attempting much finesse in such matters.

Ver. 14. **αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν**: *for He is our Peace*. As most commentators notice, the emphasis is on the **αὐτός**—"He and no other". But there is probably more in it than that. The selection of the abstract **εἰρήνη**, instead of the simple **εἰρηνοποιός**, suggests that the point of the **αὐτός** is not only "He *alone*," but "He *in His own person*". It is not only that the peace was made *by* Christ and ranks as His achievement, but that it is so identified with Him that were He away it would also fail,—so dependent on Him that apart from Him we cannot have it. And He is thus for us "*the* Peace" (**ἡ εἰρήνη**), Peace in the absolute sense to the exclusion of all other. *Peace*, the peace of the Messianic age, the peace that is to come by Messiah, is a frequent note in OT prophecy (Isa. ix. 5, 6, lii. 7, liii. 5, lvii. 19; Mic. v. 5; Hag. ii. 9; Zech. ix. 10). Here, as the next sentence shows, the peace especially in view is that between Jew and Gentile.—**ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν**: *who made both one*. Not "hath made," but "made," with reference to the definite act of His death, as suggested by the **ἐν τῷ αἵματι**. The **ἀμφότερα** is the abstract neuter—the two *parties* or classes. The sing. neut. **ἕν** (= one *thing*, one *organism*) expresses the idea of the *unity*, the new unity which the two long separate and antagonistic parties became; *cf*. the **ἕν** used even of the relation between Christ and God in John x. 16, and for the unity here in view, *cf*. Rom. x. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11.—**καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας**: *and broke down the middle wall of the partition*. The former clause began the explanation of how Christ became our Peace. That explanation is continued in this clause and in the following. The **καί**, therefore, is epexegetic = *to wit*, or *in that* (*cf*. Win.-Moult., p. 545). The gen. **φραγμοῦ** is not a mere equivalent to an adject. or a partic., as if = **τὸ μεσότοιχον διαφράσσον** (Grot., Rosenm., etc.), nor is it the gen. of *quality*, = "the middle wall whose character it is to divide"; but either (*a*) the *appos*. gen. or gen. of *identity*, = "the middle wall that is (or, consists in) the partition," or (*b*) the *posses*. gen., = "the wall pertaining to the partition". On the *latter* view of the gen. the **μεσότοιχον** (a word found only this once in the NT and of rare occurrence elsewhere) becomes the more definite and specific term, the **φραγμός** the more general, the former being, indeed, a part of the latter. That is to say, the **φραγμός** is the whole system of things that kept Jew and Gentile apart, and the **μεσότοιχον** is the thing in the system that most conspicuously divided them, and that constituted the "enmity," *viz*., the Law. It is best, however, to take the terms **μεσότοιχον** and **φραγμός** in the simple, literal sense of *division* and *separation*, which are not explained to be the Law till the **νόμος** is actually introduced in the subsequent clause; and, therefore, the *former* view of the gen. appears to be preferable. It is suggested that what Paul really expresses then is the fact that the legal system, which was meant primarily to protect the Jewish people against the corruption of heathen idolatry, became the bitter root of Jewish exclusiveness in relation to the Gentiles. This is to give the **φραγμός** here the sense of something that fences *in* or *encloses*, which it occasionally has (Soph., *Œd. Tyr*., 1387). But that is a rare sense, and the idea seems to be simpler. It is doubtful, too, whether Paul had in view here any material partition with which he was familiar. It could scarcely be the veil of the Temple that was rent at the Crucifixion; for that veil did not serve to separate the Gentile from the Jew. It might rather be (as Anselm, Bengel, and many more have thought) the wall or screen that divided the court of the Gentiles from the sanctuary proper, and of which Josephus tells us that it bore an inscription forbidding any Gentile from penetrating further (*Jew. Wars*, v., 5, 2; vi., 2, 4; *Antiq*., viii., 3, 2; xv., 11, 5). But even this is questionable, and all the more so as the wall was still standing at the time when this was written. For the use of **λύσας** *cf*. John ii. 19.

τῶν [v] ἐντολῶν ἐν [w] δόγμασιν [x] καταργήσας,[1] ἵνα τοὺς δύο [y] κτίσῃ [z] ἐν [z] ἑαυτῷ [a] εἰς ἕνα [b] καινὸν [2] [b] ἄνθρωπον, [c] ποιῶν εἰρήνην, 16. καὶ [d] ἀπο-

w Luke ii. 1; Acts xvi. 4, xvii. 7; Col. ii. 14 only; Dan. vi. 9. x Luke xiii. 7, but=(24) Paul only; see Rom. iii. 3 al. y Ver. 10 reff. z=Here only. a=Matt. xiii. 30, xxvii. 51 || Mark; Rev. xvi. 19; Jud. ix. 43. b Ch. iv. 24 only; see 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. c James iii. 18 only; see Matt. v. 9. d Col. i. 20, 21 only.

[1] **καταρτισας** DE. For **εαυτω, αυτω** ℵABFP 3, 14, 17, etc., al.$_8$; **εαυτω** ℵ^{3}DEKLP, most mss., Ath.$_2$, Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Thl., Oec.

[2] **κοινον** FG.

Ver. 15. **τὴν ἔχθραν**: *to wit the enmity*. Many (Luth., Calv., De Wette, etc.) take this to be a figure for the Mosaic Law. But the **ἔχθρα** is in antithesis to the **εἰρήνη** of ver. 14, and the specification of the Law comes in later. It is better, therefore, to take the **ἔχθρα** here in the abstract sense of *hostile, separating feeling*. But is it the enmity of Jew and Gentile to God (Chrys., Harl., etc.) or the enmity between Jew and Gentile? The statement of the **μεσότοιχον** as a mid-wall between **τὰ ἀμφότερα** decides for the latter. The argument in favour of this view is stronger still when the former view is connected with the idea that the **ἔχθρα** is the Mosaic Law. For the Mosaic Law could not be said to have been the cause of hostile feeling on the part of Gentiles to God.—**ἐν τῇ σαρκί αὐτοῦ**: *in His flesh*. The term **σάρξ** is taken by some (Stier, etc.) in a sense wide enough to cover Christ's incarnation and His entire incarnate life. But, apart from other difficulties, this is inconsistent with the definite mention of His *blood* and His *cross*. The term refers, therefore, to His death, and means His crucified flesh (*cf.* Col. i. 22). The great difficulty here, however, is the connection. Some attach the phrase immediately to **τὴν ἔχθραν** (Chrys., etc.), "the enmity which was in His flesh," as if the idea were "the hatred in the human race generally" or "the national hatred," the hatred in the Jewish people. But this would require **τήν** before **ἐν σαρκί**, and furnishes at best a forced meaning. Most commentators connect it with **καταργήσας**, supposing it to be put emphatically first. So it is taken, *e.g.*, by Meyer, who makes **ἐν σαρκί** begin the new clause. The RV takes the same view, but brings the **ἔχθραν** under the regimen of the **καταργήσας**—"having abolished in His flesh the enmity, *even* the law". There is much to say in support of this, especially in view of the Pauline statements in Rom. iii. 21, x. 14; Gal. iii. 13; Col. ii. 14, etc. On the other hand there is an awkwardness in bringing in the predication *before* the verb, and the parallelism is broken (*cf.* Alf.). It is best, therefore, to attach the **ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ** to the **λύσας** (Calv., Rück., Alf., etc.). The form of the sentence is better kept in this way. The appropriateness of the use of **λύσας** is then seen; for the verb **λύειν** (= *subvert, dissolve*), is equally applicable to the **μεσότοιχον** and to the **ἔχθραν**, the phrase **λύειν ἔχθραν** being common in ordinary Greek. On the other hand **καταργεῖν** is much less applicable to **ἔχθραν**. So the sense is—"who in His crucified flesh (*i.e.*, by His death on the cross) broke down the middle-wall of the partition, to wit the enmity" (*i.e.*, the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile).—**τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας**: *having abolished* (or, in that He abolished) *the law of commandments* (expressed) *in ordinances*. Further statement of the way in which Christ by His death on the cross removed the separation and the hostile feeling between Jew and Gentile, *viz.*, by abrogating the dividing Law itself. The Law is now introduced, and the term **ὁ νόμος** is to be taken in its full sense, not the *ceremonial* law only, but the Mosaic Law as a whole, according to the stated use of the phrase. This Law is *abolished* in the sense of being rendered *inoperative* (as **καταργεῖν** means), and it is defined as the Law **τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν**. What is the point of the definition? The article, which is in place with the **ἐντολῶν**, is omitted before the **δόγμασιν**, as the latter makes one idea with the former and further is under the regimen of a prep. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 139, 149, 151, 158). The Law is one of "commandments-in-decrees". What is in view is its character as mandatory, and consisting in a multitude of prescriptions or statutes. It *enjoined*, and it expressed its injunctions in so many decrees, but it did not enable. The Law was made up of **ἐντολαί** and these **ἐντολαί** expressed themselves and operated in the form of **δόγματα**, *ordinances*. The word **δόγμα** in the NT never means anything else than *statute*, *decree*, *ordin-*

καταλλάξῃ[1] **τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν** [e] **ἑνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ**[2] [f] **διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ,** [g] **ἀποκτείνας τὴν** [h] **ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ**[3]· 17. **καὶ** [i] **ἐλθὼν** [k] **εὐηγγελίσατο** [k] **εἰρήνην ὑμῖν**[4] **τοῖς** [l] **μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην**[5] **τοῖς** [m] **ἐγγύς,**

e Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. x. 17 al.
f Col. i. 20.
g=here only.
h Rom. viii. 7 reff.
i=Matt. ii. 8, 9, 23, iv. 13 al.
k Rom. x. 15 only.
l m Ver. 13 reff.

[1] **αποκαταλλαξει** KLP 72, 80, al.

[2] **εν ενι πνευματι προς τον θεον** Thdrt.

[3] **εν εαυτω** FG 115, Lat.-mss.-in.-Jer., Goth., Arm., Lat. Fathers (not Tert., Jer., al.).

[4] **υμιν** om. 73; **ημιν** 31, 44, $al._6$, Eth., Slav.-mss., Thl.-ms. Rec. om. **ειρηνην** with KL, al., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Tert., Eus., Euth., Dam., etc.; insert ℵABDEFGP 17, 71, 80, It., Vlg., Copt., Eth., Arm., Eus., Procop., Cypr., Hil., all.

[5] **εσχομεν** ℵ[1].

ance (*cf.* Luke ii. 1; Acts xvi. 4, xvii. 7; Col. ii. 14; in Heb. xi. 23 it is a variant for **διάταγμα**). Hence it cannot have any such sense here as *doctrines*, *evangelical teaching* (Theod.), *evangelical precepts* (Fritz.), the *faith* (Chrys.). Some taking the **ἐν** as the *instrumental* **ἐν** make it = "having abolished the law by injunctions" (Syr., Vulg., Arab., Grot., Beng., etc.). But the NT uniformly speaks of the abrogation of the condemning law as being effected by Christ's death, never by His *teaching*, or by evangelical *precepts*. Another turn is given to the sentence by taking **ἐν** in the sense of "in respect of," "on the side of" (Harl.), as if the idea were that the abrogation of the Law was limited to its mandatory side,—to the *orders* contained in it. But this would require **τοῖς** before the **δόγμασιν**; nor is it the way of the NT to speak of the Mosaic Law as done away by Christ only on one side.—**ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον**: *that He might create in Himself the two into one new man.* Statement of the object of the **καταργεῖν**. The masc. **δύο** is introduced now, instead of the **ἀμφότερα**, with a view to the **ἄνθρωπον**. One *man* was to be made out of the two *men*. The **κτίσῃ** is better rendered *create* with the RV than *make* with the AV. A new *creation* is in view. For **ἐν ἑαυτῷ** of the TR (with DKLℵ[3], etc.) **αὐτῷ** is to be preferred as the reading of ℵ[1]BAF, etc. (LTTrRV); WH gives **αὑτῷ**. In either case the sense is "in Himself"; not "by it" (Grot.) as if the reference were to Christ's *doctrine*, nor "through Himself" as if it were **δι' αὐτοῦ**. The new creation and the new union have their ground and principle *in* Christ. What was contemplated, too, was not simply the making of *one man* (**ἕνα ἄνθρωπον**) where formerly there were two, but the making of *one new* (**καινὸν**) *man*. The result was not that, though the separation between them was removed, the Jew still remained Jew and the Gentile still Gentile. It was something new, the old distinctions between Jew and Gentile being lost in a third order of "man"—the Christian man.—**ποιῶν εἰρήνην**: *making peace.* The **εἰρήνη** is still peace between the estranged Jew and Gentile, and the **ποιῶν** (*pres.*, not *aor.*) belongs to the object expressed by the **ἵνα**. In carrying out that purpose He was to make peace the one with the other.

Ver. 16. **καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους**: *and that He might reconcile them both.* Further statement of object, the **καί** continuing and extending it. Only at this point is the prior and larger idea of the reconciliation *to God* introduced, and even now it is in connection with the idea of the reconciliation of Jew and Gentile. For **τοὺς δύο** we now have **τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους**, not "the two" but "both of them together," *unity* being the aspect in which they are now presented. The **ἀπο-** in such compounds has sometimes simply an intensive meaning (**ἀποθαρρεῖν, ἀποθαυμάζειν, ἀποκαραδοκεῖν, ἀπεκδέχεσθαι**, etc.); sometimes, though less frequently, the sense of *again* (**ἀποδίδωμι, ἀποκαθίστημι, ἀποκατορθόω, ἀποκαταλαμβάνω**). It is doubtful which is the force of the **ἀπο-** here. In the context, it is true, so far as the relations of Jew and Gentile to each other are dealt with, we have simply the idea of a state of separation into two hostile camps giving place to a state of unity. But in the present clause the larger truth of a reconciliation *to God* is in view, and this favours the idea of a *restoration* to a condition which had been lost. The form **ἀποκαταλλάσσειν** occurs in the NT only here and in Col. i. 20, 21. In the LXX and once in the NT (Matt. v. 24) we have also **διαλλάττεσθαι**. But

the two appear to be practically indistinguishable. As derivatives of **ἀλλάσσειν** they both convey the idea of a change, not primarily in *feeling* (which is expressed by **ἱλάσκεσθαι** and its compounds), but in *relation*, and in *mutual* relation, on the side of God to man and on the side of man to God (*cf.* Rom. v. 9-11; 2 Cor. v. 18-20).—**ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ**: *in one body through the cross*. This cannot refer to *Christ's* body (Chrys., Beng., Harl., Hofm.), as if the point were either the reconciliation of *two* parties by *one body*, or the *one* offering of Christ that needed no repetition (Heb. vii. 27, etc.), or, again, the *one* sacrifice as contrasted with the multitude of the Levitical oblations. These are ideas alien to the context, and they are the less appropriate because Christ Himself is the *subject* of the **ἀποκαταλλάξῃ**. The reference is to the Jews and Gentiles now making one body; *cf.* the **ἓν σῶμα** in 1 Cor. x. 17; Eph. iv. 4; and especially in Col. iii. 15. His object was to bring the two long-sundered and antagonistic parties as one whole, one great body, into right relation to God by His cross. The **διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ** belongs rather to the **ἀποκαταλλάξῃ** than to the following **ἀποκτείνας** (von Soden). —**ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ**: *having slain the enmity thereby*. For **ἐν αὐτῷ** there is a variant reading **ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, slenderly supported (F 115, etc.); and some propose **ἐν αὑτῷ** (von Soden). But this **ἐν αὐτῷ** refers to the **σταυροῦ**, and the idea is not that Christ slew the enmity in Himself, but that He did it "by the cross," or, as some take it (Alf., etc.), "on the cross". The **ἔχθρα** here, again, is not the *Law* itself, nor the enmity of Jew and Gentile *to God* (though most take it so), but rather the **ἔχθρα** previously mentioned—the enmity between Jew and Gentile. Further, the **ἀποκτείνας** which *might* denote an action coincident with that denoted by the main verb, or might define the way in which the latter was made good, seems to have its proper sense of *priority*—"after He had killed". He had first to kill this enmity between the two before He could bring them both into right relations to God in the way indicated, *viz.*, in one body, as one great, united whole.

Ver. 17. **καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς**: *and He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh*. The TR reads simply **καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς** (with KL, the mass of cursives, the Syr., etc.). The primary uncials and other important authorities (BℵAD 17, Vulg., etc.) insert **εἰρήνην** (so LTTrWHRV). The repetition has rhetorical force. The **καί**, again, does not merely connect this statement with the former. It adds to the thought. Not only did Christ effect the reconciliation, but He also came and preached the glad tidings of it, and that not to one class but to both. The aor. partic. has probably its proper force of *priority* in relation to the def. aor. **εὐηγγελίσατο**. The *coming* in question preceded the preaching. The best rendering, therefore, will be neither "coming" (Eadie), nor "came and preached" (AV and RV), but "having come" (Mey., Ell., etc.). But to what *coming* does the **ἐλθών** refer? Not to the *incarnation* (Chrys., Anselm, Harl., etc.); for the preceding sentences, which speak of His blood and of the peace effected through His cross, make it clear that the time in view is not before the crucifixion but *after* it. Nor can the reference well be to the event of His Resurrection, nor even to His own direct teaching during the forty days (Beng.). What is in view is rather His coming in His Spirit (*cf.* John xiv. 18; Acts xxvi. 23, etc.). That the idea of His spiritual Advent in the Holy Ghost which is prominent in the Fourth Gospel is not a Johannine idea only, but one entirely consistent with Paul's teaching, appears from the Pauline doctrine of the dwelling of Christ Himself or His Spirit in the believer (Rom. viii. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 17, xiii. 5; Gal. ii. 20); as also from the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Apostle's preaching (Rom. xv. 18), etc. The preaching meant by the **εὐηγγελίσατο**, therefore, is Christ's mediate preaching through His Apostles and others, especially that declaration of His truth which made these Gentiles Christians. Those "afar off" are mentioned first, as the Gentiles in the persons of these Ephesians and other Asiatics were the writer's immediate concern.

Ver. 18. **ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα**: *for through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father*. Some take **ὅτι** as = *that*, the mention of the common access being taken as the *contents* of the **εὐηγγελίσατο**. But the subject of the preaching has already been given, *viz.*, **εἰρήνη**. Hence **ὅτι** = *for*, and the verse is a confirmation of the previous statement in the form of an appeal to the experience of those addressed. The fact that we, both of us, are now brought to God

18. ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν[1] τὴν [n] προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν [o] ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν [p] πατέρα. 19. [q] ἄρα οὖν[2] οὐκέτι ἐστὲ [r] ξένοι καὶ [s] πάροικοι, ἀλλ' ἐστὲ[3] [t] συμπολῖται τῶν [u] ἁγίων καὶ [v] οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ,

n Rom. v. 2; ch. iii. 12 only. o Phil. i. 27; ch. iv. 3, 4. p=1 Cor. viii. 6; 1 Pet. i. 17; John, passim. q Rom. v. 18, vii. 3, viii. 12, ix. 16, 18; Gal. vi. 10 al[3].; Paul only. r=Matt. xx. 5, 35 al.; Acts xvii. 21; Heb. xi. 13; 3 John 5; Ruth. ii. 10. s Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11 only; Gen. xxiii. 4. t Here only; Jos., *Antt.*, xix., 2, 2. u Ch. i. 1 reff. v=Gal. vi. 10; 1 Tim. v. 8 only; Isa. iii. 6.

[1] **εσχομεν** ℵ[1]. [2] Omit **ουν** FG., Or.

[3] Rec. om. **εστε** with D[3]EKL, Syr., Cop., Arm., Orig., Bas., Euth., etc.; insert ℵABCD[1]EFG 31, 71-3, It., Vlg., Goth., Bas., Lat. Fathers.

through Him is a witness to the truth of what I have just said, *viz.*, that Christ came and preached peace to both. The privilege referred to is a present and continuing privilege (**ἔχομεν**, not **ἐσχήκαμεν** as in Rom. v. 2)—one to which effect is being given now, *viz.*, **τὴν προσαγωγήν**, "the introduction," or "*our* introduction". This noun denotes, properly speaking, the *act of bringing to one*, and then the *approach* or *access* (Herod., ii., 58; Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 5, 45). It is urged by some (Mey., Ell., etc.) that both here and in Rom. v. 2 it has the primary *trans.* sense, and denotes the privilege of being *brought* to God or *introduced* to Him. Christ would thus be presented in the character of "Bringer," perhaps with some allusion to the office of the **προσαγωγεύς** through whom in Oriental courts one was brought into the royal presence. But the difference in idea between *access* (**πρόσοδος**) and "admission" (Ell.) or "bringing" (**προσαγωγή**) is slight, and there seems sufficient justification for the *intrans.* sense. The **ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι**, which is strangely taken by some (Anselm, Rosenm.) as = **ὁμοθυμαδόν**, "with one mind," obviously refers to the Holy Ghost. That is made clear both by the mention of the *coming* and *preaching* in the Spirit, and by the reference both to *Christ* and to the *Father*. The **ἐν** is not = *by*, but *in*, with reference to the *element* in which alone we have the access. As that right is ours only *through* Christ (**δι' αὐτοῦ**), so it is made ours in actual experience only *in* the Spirit, and Jew and Gentile have it alike because it is one and the same Spirit that works in both. So both have continuous access to God from whom once they were far removed, to Him, too, in the benign character of the *Father* (**τὸν πατέρα**) whom they can approach without fear.

Ver. 19. **ἄρα οὖν οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι**: *So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners.* At this point Paul brings to their conclusion the statements made in vv. 14-18, and draws from them the natural, comforting inference. The conclusive **ἄρα** is one of Paul's favourable particles. In his writings and in the NT generally it is sometimes placed second in the sentence, and sometimes (contrary to classical use) first. The combination **ἄρα οὖν** is peculiar to Paul, and takes the first place in the sentence. In this form it has less of the *ratiocinative* force and more of the *collective; cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 371; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 273. **ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι**, a comprehensive expression, including "all who, whether by natural and territorial demarcation, or by the absence of civic privileges, were not citizens" (Ell.). The term **πάροικος** in ordinary Greek means a *neighbour*. In the LXX it represents תּוֹשָׁב (nine times) or גֵּר (eleven times). Here it stands for the classical **μέτοικος**, which never occurs in the NT, is found only once in the LXX (Jer. xx. 3) and means one who comes from one country or city and settles in another, but does not rank as a **πολίτης** or **ἀστός** having the right of citizenship (*cf.* Acts vii. 6, 29; 1 Pet. ii. 11). There is no reference to *proselytes* in particular (Baumg.).—**ἀλλὰ συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων**: *but fellow-citizens with the saints.* Most critical editors (LTTrWHRV) insert **ἐστέ** after **ἀλλά**, on the authority of BℵACD, etc. The form **συνπολῖται** is preferred by Tisch., WH, Ell., Alf., etc. The word belongs mostly to late Greek. The **ἁγίων** is not to be restricted to *Jews*, the *patriarchs*, or *OT believers*, but is a comprehensive name for *Christians*, the whole community of believers in Christ without distinction of Jew and Gentile. The Jewish people were once "the saints" of God, and Gentiles stood outside having no part in their **πολιτεία**. Now all Gentile believers, like these Ephesians, form part of that greater "Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16) which con-

20. [w] **ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ [x] θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,[1] ὄντος [y] ἀκρογωνιαίου [2] αὐτοῦ [3] χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[4] 21. ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα [5]**

w Acts xx. 32 (rec.); 1 Cor. iii. 10, etc.; Col. ii. 7; Jude 20 only.
x = Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. vi. 1.
y 1 Pet. ii. 6 only; Isa. xxviii. 16.

[1] **κ. προφ.** om. 4[1], Marcion-in. Tert. [2] Insert **λιθου** DEFG, Orig., Eus., Chr.

[3] Omit **αυτου** ℵ*, Copt., Orig., Victorin.

[4] Rec. **Ιησ. Χρ.** with CDEFGKLP, etc., d, e, g, Syr., Ps.-Just. Orig.[1], Eus., Euth., Thdrt., Chr., Victorin, Jer. Ez. 40, Is. 60; **Χριστου Ιησου** ℵ*AB 17, 39, 47, al., Vlg., Goth., Copt., Orig.[2], Thl., Ambrst., Jer. Ez. 28, Aug., oft. all.

[5] Rec. after **πασα** insert **η** with ℵ[1]ACP, Arm, Orig., Euth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; text ℵ*BDEFGKL, most mss., Clem., Orig., Bas., etc.

sists of all Christians, and share in all the rights of such.—**καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *and of the household of God.* So in Gal. vi. 10, **πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως.** In Greek writers of the later period **οἰκεῖος** is used frequently with the gens. of abstract nouns (**οἰκεῖοι φιλοσοφίας, ὀλιγαρχίας**, etc.) in the general sense of one *closely connected* with philosophy, etc., but without any specific reference either to the *house* of God, or to the **οἰκεῖοι** as forming one *family*. With the present case, however, it is different. The phrase **οἰκεῖοι Θεοῦ** naturally suggests the idea of members of God's *household* or *family* (Mey.); *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 2, 5, 6, x. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 17.

Ver. 20. **ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ**: *being built upon the foundation.* From the idea of the *house* or *household* of God contained in the **οἰκεῖοι** Paul passes by an easy transition to that of the *building* of the spiritual **οἶκος**. The **ἐπι-** in the comp. verb probably expresses the notion of building *up*; the second **ἐπί** with the dative **θεμελίῳ**, that of *resting on* the foundation—which also might have been expressed by the gen. The forms **ὁ θεμέλιος** and **τὸ θεμέλιον** both occur, the former much more frequently than the latter in Greek literature generally. The latter, however, is found frequently in the LXX, and at least once quite unmistakably in the NT (Acts xvi. 26).—**τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν**: *of the Apostles and Prophets.* The omission of **τῶν** before **προφητῶν** does not necessarily identify the Apostles and Prophets as one and the same persons (Harl.); *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 162. It indicates, however, that they both belong to the same *class*. The *gen.* is variously understood as (1) the gen. of *apposition* = the foundation which *is* or *consists in* the Apostles; (2) the gen. of *originating cause* = the foundation *laid by* them; (3) the *possess.* gen. = "the Apostles' foundation"—in the sense of that on which they built (Anselm, Beza, etc.), or as = that on which they also were built (Alf.). The choice seems to be between (1) and (2). The former has been the view of many from Chrys. down to Von Soden and Abbott, and is favoured so far by Rev. xxi. 14. But the second has the suffrages of the majority of modern exegetes (Rück., Harl., Bleek, Mey., Ell., etc.). It is more in accordance with 1 Cor. iii. 10 (although it is the worth of teachers that is immediately in view there), and more especially with Rom. xv. 20, where the *Gospel* as preached by Paul appears to be the "foundation". Here, therefore, it seems best on the whole to understand the Gospel of Christ as preached by the Apostles to be the "foundation" on which their converts were built up into the spiritual house. But who are these **προφῆται**? The OT prophets, say many (Chrys., Theod., Jer., Calv., Rück., etc.)—a view certainly favoured by the use made of the writings of these prophets in the NT, and by the view given of them as "evangelists before the time" (Moule); *cf.* Luke xxiv. 25; Acts iii. 18, 21, 24, x. 43; Rom. xvi. 26. But the natural order in that case would have been "Prophets and Apostles," and the previous statements referred clearly to *Christian* times—to the preaching after Christ's death. Hence the **προφῆται** are to be understood as the *Christian* prophets, of whom large mention is made in the Book of Acts and the Epistles—the NT prophets who in this same Epistle (iii. 5) are designated as *Christ's* prophets and are named (iv. 11) among the gifts of the ascended Lord to His Church. The frequency with which they are referred to (Acts xi. 28, xv. 32; 1 Cor. xiv., etc.) and the place assigned to them next to the Apostles (Eph. iv. 11) show the prominent position they had in the primitive Church. The

z = Matt. xxiv. 1 ‖ Mark; 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 1.

[z] οἰκοδομὴ [a] συναρμολογουμένη [b] αὔξει [b] εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον [c] ἐν κυρίῳ, 22. ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς [d] συνοικοδομεῖσθε [e] εἰς [f] κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ[1] [g] ἐν πνεύματι.

a Ch. iv. 16 only. b Ch. iv. 15; Col. i. 10; 2 Thess. i. 3 reff. c Rom. xvi. 11, 12 al. fr.; Paul only. d Here only. e = Matt. x. 18 al. fr. f Rev. xviii. 2 only; Ps. lxxv. 2. g (Rom. ix. 1); ch. iii. 5, v. 18; vi. 18; Col. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 12; Jude 20.

[1] For τ. θεου, τ. Χριστου B.

statements made regarding them in the early non-canonical literature (*The Teaching of the Twelve*, Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, etc.) show how they continued to exist and work beyond the Apostolic Age, and help us to distinguish their ministry as that essentially of teachers and exhorters, whether itinerant or resident, from the essentially *missionary* ministry of the Apostles. Further the association of these *prophets* with the *Apostles* suggests that the latter term is not to be restricted here to the Twelve, but is to be taken as including *all* those to whom the name "Apostle" is given in the NT.—**ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.* A few documents, including ℵ[1], omit Ἰησοῦ. The Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the TR is supported by such authorities as CDFKL. The best reading, however, is Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, "Christ Jesus," which is found in BAℵ-corr., 17, Vulg., Copt., Goth., etc., and is adopted by LTTrWHRV. The word ἀκρογωνιαῖος (*cf.* the אֶבֶן פִּנָּה of Isa. xxviii. 16) is peculiar to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and is applied to Christ also in 1 Pet. ii. 6. It denotes the stone placed at the extreme corner, so as to bind the other stones in the building together—the most important stone in the structure, the one on which its stability depended. The αὐτοῦ refers to Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, not to the ἀκρογωνιαίου, nor to the θεμελίῳ (Beng.), the point being that to Christ Himself and none other the building owes its existence, its strength and its increase. He Himself, and neither Apostle nor Prophet, is at once the ultimate foundation (1 Cor. iii. 11) and the Head-stone of the Corner. Some have supposed that, the ἀκρογωνιαῖος being the stone inserted between two others to give strength and cohesion to the whole, there is a reference in the phrase to the union of Jew and Gentile. But this is to push the figure too far.

Ver. 21. **ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὔξει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *in whom each several building* (RV text; "every building," RV marg.), *fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.* The relative refers naturally to the nearest subject, what is also the leading subject, Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, not to the ἀκρογωνιαίου, far less to the remoter θεμελίῳ; the ἐν also has its full sense of *in*, not *by* or *on*. That is to say, it is *in Christ Jesus*, and only by connection with Him, that the οἰκοδομή is what it is here declared to be. The word οἰκοδομή appears to be confined to late Greek, no *certain* instance of it having been found in classical Greek. It occurs in Diod., Philo, Plut., Joseph., the LXX, Macc., etc. It is used both for οἰκοδόμησις and οἰκοδόμημα. In the NT it has sometimes the literal sense of οἰκοδόμημα (*e.g.*, Matt. xxiv. 1; Mark xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 1); and sometimes the figurative sense of *edification* (Rom xiv. 19, xv. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 29), or, as here, that of a *body of Christian believers*. The question of the text here is important. There is considerable support for πᾶσα ἡ οἰκοδομή (ℵ[3]ACP, Arm., etc.), and it is conceivable that itacism might have caused the omission of the ἡ. But diplomatic evidence is decidedly in favour of πᾶσα οἰκοδομή (Bℵ*DGKL, etc.). Adopting this reading (with LTTrWHRV) we have to ask whether the phrase is to be rendered *the whole building* or *every building*. The former rendering is certainly the one that first suggests itself, while the latter seems at first difficult to relate to the context. The former is defended as legitimate by some weighty authorities; *e.g.*, Winer, on the ground that the subject is "the Church of Christ as a whole," and Ellicott, who takes it to be a case of grammatical laxity. But the distinction between πᾶς with the article and πᾶς without it is so well maintained in the NT that only an absolutely intolerable sense can justify us in departing from it. The only exceptions to the general rule appear to be those that hold good also for ordinary Greek—in general and unqualified statements, with proper names, and with nouns which have acquired so stated a meaning that

they can drop the article, etc. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 138, and especially Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 119, 120; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 161, 162). The present instance does not come within the scope of these exceptions. It is not like **πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ** (Acts ii. 36), nor is it really analogous even to such cases as the **πᾶσα γῆ** of Thucyd., ii., 43, or the πᾶσα ἐπιστολή of Ignat., *Eph.*, 12. Hence the rendering here must be "every building" or "every several building". The present participle **συναρμολογουμένη** (the verb occurs in the NT only here and in iv. 16, and corresponds to the classical **συναρμόζειν**) describes the joining together as a process now going on. The pres. **αὔξει** (a form occurring in the NT only here and in Col. ii. 19, but common in Soph., Thucyd., Pind., etc.) in like manner expresses what is happening now, or, it may be, what is *normal.* The phrase **νάον ἅγιον** is sufficiently rendered "*a* holy temple" or "sanctuary". Some (*e.g.*, Mey.), supposing that Paul has the Jewish temple in view and means to say that the Christian Church is now the true Temple of God, the house made His own sanctuary by His dwelling in it, would render it "*the* holy temple". The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** is connected by some (Harl., etc.) immediately with **ἅγιον,** = a temple that is holy as being in the Lord; by others with **ναὸν ἅγιον** (Ell.); by others with **αὔξει** (Mey.). But it really qualifies the whole statement of the *joining* and *growing*. All this is in the Lord, *i.e.*, *in Christ*, as both the context and the general NT application of **Κύριος** show. The sense of the whole, therefore, is this—in Christ the Lord every several building that goes to make up the ideal Temple of God, every Christian community, the one now addressed not less than others, is at present being surely framed and fitted together, and is growing and harmoniously developing so that it may form part of the great mystical Body of Christ, the vast spiritual fellowship of believers which is God's true Temple.

Ver. 22. **ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι**: *in whom ye also are being built together into a habitation of God in the Spirit.* The relative refers again, as in ver. 21, to *Christ*, the **Κυρίῳ** just named, not to the **ναόν.** The **καί** (= *also*, not *even*) points to the dignity of the present position—"the exalted nature of the association in which the Ephesians shared" (Ell.). The **συνοικοδομεῖσθε** is not imper. (Calv.), but indic., the burden of the whole section being what was done for the readers and what was made of them. The **συν-** in the comp. verb might convey the idea of being built together with others; but, in view of the force of the **συναρμολογουμένη** it is rather to be understood as denoting the compact connection of one part with another, the orderly conjunction and co-ordination of all the various parts of the **οἰκοδομή** (Mey., Ell.); *cf.* the **συνέκλεισεν** in Gal. iii. 2. **κατοικητήριον** is best translated "habitation". Some draw a distinction between the **ναόν** as the whole Church and the **κατοικητήριον** as the individual Christians (Harl.). But the latter phrase simply expresses in another form the same idea as the former. The **κατοικητήριον** being that *of God* (**τοῦ Θεοῦ**), belonging to Him, inhabited by Him, is the same as the **ναός.** The **ἐν πνεύματι** is not to be taken as = "in a spiritual manner," as if in contrast with **ἐν σαρκί**; nor as making with the noun the idea of "a spiritual house"; but as = *in the Holy Spirit*, the anarthrous **πνεῦμα** having often that sense and the similar **ἐν Κυρίῳ** suggesting it. Nor should the **ἐν** be rendered "through" (AV) or "by" (Mey.). It is true that the *instrumental* use of **ἐν** gives a thoroughly good sense, *viz.*, that we are built together in Christ by the agency of the Holy Spirit—in respect of His dwelling and operating in us. But the idea is rather that of *in* the Spirit as the *element* of the life or the *condition* of the process. The phrase may be connected immediately with the **κατοικητήριον** as if = "a habitation of God realised in the Spirit," or it may be construed as a tertiary predication (Ell.) = "and it is in the Spirit". But it is best taken to qualify the whole statement of the **συνοικοδομεῖσθε,** = "in Christ as the ground and principle of all ye too are being built together into a habitation of God, and it is by your being in the Spirit that this is taking effect". Union with Christ, life in the Spirit—this explained what they were; this meant that they, as well as other Christian bodies, were being built up so as to be a habitation of God.

CHAPTER III. Vv. 1-13. These verses make a paragraph by themselves. Their main subject is the call of the Gentiles and Paul's Apostolic vocation in relation thereto. He reminds his readers of the mystery of that call, its revelation to the Apostles and prophets, his own destination to the ministry of preaching among the Gentiles, and the grace given him to make known the Divine dispensation

III. 1. Τούτου [a]χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ [b]δέσμιος τοῦ χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ[1] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν,[2] 2. [c]εἴγε [d]ἠκούσατε τὴν [e]οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος

a Luke vii. 47; Gal. iii. 19; ver. 14; Tit. i. 5; 1 John iii. 12; Jude 16 only; Prov. xvii. 17. b Acts xxiii. 18; 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. i. 9; Heb. xiii. 3; Zech. ix. 12. c = Col. i. 23; ch. v. 21; 2 Cor. v. 3; Gal. iii. 4; Paul only. d Ch. i. 15 reff. e = 1 Cor. ix. 17.

[1] For χριστ., κυριου C; ιησ. om. ℵDFG 61, Eth., Victorin.; ιησ. χρ. 115, lect. 1, Syr., Arm., Chr., Cyr., Theophyl., Jer., Ambr., etc.

[2] After εθν. add πρεσβευω DE 10, Slav., Ambrst.-comm.; κεκαυχημαι 71, 122, 219.

that opened the Church to those who were not of Israel. This with the view that they should not misunderstand his present position or be discouraged by it.

Ver. 1. **τούτου χάριν ἐγὼ Παῦλος ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: *for this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus.* The **τούτου χάριν** is referred by some (Mey., etc.) to the immediately preceding sentence; the fact that they are destined to make a habitation of God, and are being built together with a view to that end, being Paul's reason for pleading with them and praying for them. It is best referred, however, to the purport of the whole statement just brought to its conclusion; the fact that they are now what God's grace has made them and are meant by Him to form a spiritual habitation for Himself, being His reason for what He urges on them and what He does for them. **ἐγὼ Παῦλος**, a solemn and emphatic designation of the writer by himself, expressive rather of his personal interest in them than the consciousness of his authority (Mey.). For similar occurrences of the emphatic personal designation, with different shades of meaning, see 2 Cor. x. 1; Gal. v. 2; Col. i. 23; Philem. 19. The article with the **δέσμιος** expresses simply the *character* in which Paul appears at present or the *class* to which he belongs (*cf.* **Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός**, Philem. 1); not his *pre-eminence* among the Lord's prisoners, as if it = the prisoner *par excellence* (Mey.)—a claim surely which would neither be like Paul nor in harmony with the thought of the paragraph. The gen. **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is probably that of *originating cause*—one who has been made a prisoner by Christ; *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 8; Philem. 9, as also Eph. iv. 1. The **Ἰησοῦ** is omitted by Tisch. on the authority of such MSS. as ℵ*D*G; but it is rightly retained by most as found in Bℵ-corr.ACD[2,3], Vulg., etc.—**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνων**: *on behalf of you the Gentiles.* Paul was called specially to be a minister of Christ to the Gentiles (Acts xxi. 21, 28, xxii. 21), and his preaching Christ as for the Gentiles equally with the Jews provoked that enmity of the Jews which led to his imprisonment. It was thus for the Gentiles that he was a prisoner; and there is probably also the further thought in the **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** that Paul's imprisonment was to be for their good, helpful to their Christian life. For the idea with which the paragraph closes is that his afflictions were their *glory* (ver. 13). But what of the construction and connection here? The simplest adjustment is to insert **εἰμί** after **ὁ δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: "I Paul am the prisoner," etc. So the Syr., Chrys., Mey. and others. But this takes the point from the **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** and makes Paul assert and exalt himself as a sufferer in a way unlike him. It is best to take it as a broken construction, the statement with which Paul begins being, as in so many other cases, diverted into a different channel by the introduction of some subsidiary remark. Here he is turned off from what he meant to say by the polite reference in the **εἴγε** clause. Where then have we the resumption? Not at chap. iv. 1 (with the AV, Mich., Winer, etc.), for chap. iii. is not part of a parenthesis, but a paragraph complete within itself; nor at ver. 13, which is of too limited scope and fails to meet the full force of the **τούτου χάριν**; but at ver. 14, where the **τούτου χάριν** is repeated.

Ver. 2. **εἴγε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς**: *if so be that ye did hear of the dispensation of the grace of God that was given me to you-ward.* The comp. particle **εἴγε**, or **εἴ γε** (according to LTrWH), makes a supposition which is taken for granted, = "if, indeed, as I may assume". Whether the certainty of the assumption is in the particle itself or is derived from the context is still debated among grammarians. Some hold that in this case as in others the **γέ** simply strengthens the force of the simple particle, while others think that this is its significance, if not in every instance, at least in a considerable number of occurrences; *cf.* Mey. and Ell., *in loc.;* Win.-Moult., p. 561; Bäumlein, *Partikeln*, p. 64. Here it

τοῦ θεοῦ[1] τῆς δοθείσης μοι [f] εἰς ὑμᾶς, 3. ὅτι[2] [g] κατὰ [g] ἀποκάλυψιν [h] ἐγνωρίσθη[3] μοι τὸ [i] μυστήριον, καθὼς [k] προέγραψα ἐν [l] ὀλίγῳ, 4. [m] πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε [n] ἀναγινώσκοντες [o] νοῆσαι τὴν [p] σύνεσίν μου [q] ἐν τῷ

f = ch. i. 19 reff. g (Rom. xvi. 25); Gal. ii. 2 only. h i Ch. i. 9 reff. i k = here only; Rom. xv. 4; Gal. iii. 1; Jude 4 only; 1 Macc. x. 36. l = here only; Acts xxvi. 28, 29; see 1 Pet. v. 12. m = Luke xii. 47; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. ii. 14. n Matt. xii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 13. o Matt. xxiv. 15; Rom. i. 20; 1 Tim. i. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 7. p = Luke ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 9; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7. q (Ch. i. 15); 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Neh. xiii. 7; 3 Esdr. i. 33.

[1] τ. θεου inserted *before* της χαριτος D*D³EFG, d, e, g, Goth.; for του θεου, του Χριστου P; αυτου A.

[2] οτι om. BFG, d, e, Victorin., Ambrst., etc.

[3] εγνωρισε D³EKL, Eth., Dam., Theophyl., Oec., etc.; εγνωρισθη ℵABCD*FGP 6, 10, 17, 23, 31, 67, 73, 80, 137, 177, Vulg., Syr., Arm., Goth., Cop., Bas.

introduces a polite reminder of what these Ephesians certainly had heard—"a gentle appeal, expressed in a hypothetical form, and conveying the hope that his words had not been quite forgotten" (Ell.). On οἰκονομίαν, which means the *dispensation*, the *arrangement made* in the matter of something, not "the apostolic office" (Wiesel.), see under i. 10. The τῆς χάριτος is the gen. *objecti* or that of "the point of view" (Ell.) = the arrangement or disposition *in respect of* the grace of God. The χάρις itself is not the *apostolic office* (Est.), but the gift of grace that selected Paul and qualified him for that office; and so it (not the οἰκονομία, but the χάρις) is described as δοθείσης, *given*. The εἰς ὑμᾶς, admirably rendered by the AV "to you-ward," denotes the "ethical direction" (Ell.) of the gift of grace—the fact that it was bestowed on Paul not for his own sake, but with a view to their position.

Ver. 3. ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνώρισέ μοι τὸ μυστήριον: *how that by way of revelation he made known* (was made known) *to me the mystery*. The ὅτι is omitted by BD-lat., Ambros., etc., and is bracketed by L and WH, but is retained by most. The ἐγνώρισε of the TR (supported by D³KL, etc.) must give place to ἐγνωρίσθη, which is the reading of BℵACD¹F 17, Lat., Syr., Copt., etc., and is adopted by LTTrWHRV. On μυστήριον see under i. 9. Here it is the particular μυστήριον or "secret" of the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the chosen people—a disclosure of the Divine purpose which so often calls forth Paul's adoring wonder. The sentence explains and develops the preceding statement, giving what they heard (ἠκούσατε) of the peculiar dispensation made by God with Paul; and the prominent thing here, as indicated by the emphatic position of κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, is the way in which the "mystery" was made known to him, *viz.*, the way of *revelation*.—καθὼς προέγραψα ἐν ὀλίγῳ: *as I wrote afore in few words*. The ἐν ὀλίγῳ is wrongly taken by some as = πρὸ ὀλίγου, "a short time before". It is equivalent to the δι' ὀλίγων or the ἐν βραχεῖ, ἐν βραχέσι of classical Greek, and means *briefly* (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 28 and the συντόμως in Acts xxiv. 4). But what is the writing referred to? It might be a previous letter now lost (Chrys., Calv., etc.). The *aor.* might so far favour this, and the ἀναγινώσκοντες of ver. 4, which Meyer thinks excludes it, is not necessarily inconsistent with it. The δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι need not be limited to the reading of the present Epistle, but might equally well apply to the act of reading any other letter, and the terms might suggest indeed a fuller statement of the "mystery" in question than is given anywhere in the first part of this Epistle. The reference, however, might also be to something already said in the present letter, in which case the προέγραψα would have the force of "I *have* written already above". This is the generally accepted interpretation, the particular statement in view being that in chap. i. 9, 10, or rather (so Mey., etc.) that in chap. ii. 11-22, in which the inclusion of the Gentiles is the special topic.

Ver. 4. πρὸς ὃ δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ: *in accordance with which, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of the Christ*. The ὃ refers to the προγεγραμμένον indicated in the προέγραψα, the πρός with acc. expressing here, as often, the idea of the *standard* or *measure* of the νοῆσαι (Win.-Moult., p. 505; Bernhardy, *Synt.*, p. 205). Wicl. gives "as"; Cov., "like as"; Rhem., "according as"; Tynd., Gen., AV and RV, "whereby". The aor. νοῆσαι follows the present ἀναγινώσκοντες, the *perception* being re-

r Acts xiv. 16, xv. 21; ver. 21; Col. i. 26. [1] μυστηρίῳ τοῦ χριστοῦ, 5. ὃ ἑτέραις [1] r γενεαῖς οὐκ h ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς s υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς νῦν t ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς u ἁγίοις [2] u v ἀποσ-

s Here only; Ps. xxv. 7 al. t Matt. xi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 10; Phil. iii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 12. u Rev. xviii. 21 only. v 1 Cor. xii. 28; Rev. xviii. 20; ch. ii. 20, iv. 11.

[1] Rec. before ετερ. inserts εν with a few mss., Copt., Syr.; om. εν ℵABCDEFGK LP, most others, It., Vulg., Arm., Slav., Clem., Orig., Chr., Cyrr. Jer., al.

[2] Omit τοις αγιοις Orig., Thdrt.

garded as a single, accomplished act, the *result* of the process of reading. The verbs νοεῖν and συνιέναι when contrasted are supposed (*cf.* Tittmann, *Syn.*, p. 191, and Ell., *in loc.*) to differ as *merken*, "perceive," differs from *verstehen*, "understand". But such distinctions are precarious as regards NT Greek. The noun σύνεσις, which is applied sometimes to the understanding *mind* (Mark xiii. 33; Wisd. iv. 11), occurs repeatedly in the NT in the sense of mental *apprehension* (Luke ii. 47; 1 Cor. i. 19; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7). It is defined as "*insight* depending on judgment and inference" (Mey. on Col. i. 9), usually in the theoretical sense, but sometimes in the practical (*cf.* Mark xii. 33). It appears to denote *critical* understanding, the apprehension of the bearings of things, while φρόνησις conveys the idea of practical, ethical understanding (*cf.* Light. on Col. i. 9; Schmidt, *Synonymik*, chap. xiii., § 10, chap. cxlvii., § 8). Here σύνεσις is followed by ἐν (*cf.* also 3 Esdras, i. 3), συνιέναι ἐν being a common phrase for having understanding in a matter (2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Josh. i. 7; Dan. i. 17). As the σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ, etc., makes one idea, the article is dispensed with after the prep. The τοῦ Χριστοῦ is taken by some as that of *originating cause* (Hofm.), = the mystery of which Christ is the author; by others as the *gen. objecti*, = the mystery *relating to* the Christ (Abb., Haupt, etc.), by others still as the gen. of *apposition* (Mey., Alf., etc.), or of *identity* (Ell.), = the mystery which *is* the Christ, which He makes, or which is contained in Him. The latter is thought to be favoured by Col. i. 27. But the idea there is that of the Christ *in* us, which is not quite the same; and it seems best on the whole to take the second view, "the mystery relating to the Christ," *i.e.*, the revelation of the long-hidden purpose of God regarding the Christ as not for Israel only, but also for the Gentiles.

Ver. 5. **ὃ ἐν ἑτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: *which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men.* The TR inserts ἐν before ἑτέραις, as in Syr.-Phil. and Copt. But the insertion is due probably to the double dative, and the ἐν (which is not found in BℵACDFKL, etc.) is rightly omitted by LTTrWHRV. The γενεαῖς, therefore, is the dat. of *time;* the term γενεά, like the OT דּוֹר (of which it is the usual rendering in the LXX), meaning the *period* covered by a generation of men (Luke i. 20; Acts xiv. 16, xv. 21; Col. i. 26) as well as the *generation* or *race* itself. By τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων are to be understood, not the OT prophets (Beng.) as contrasted with the "Apostles and prophets" of the next clause, but *men* generally and in the absolute sense, in conformity with the γενεαῖς.—**ὡς νῦν, ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι**: *as now it was revealed to His holy Apostles and prophets in the Spirit.* The ὡς has its proper *comparative* force. The *fact* of the revelation made in pre-Christian times to the fathers and the prophets is not questioned. The matter in view is the *measure* or *manner* of the revelation. The νῦν = "now," *in these Christian times*, and the aor. ἀπεκαλύφθη defines the fuller revelation as made definitely at a former period in these times. The verb also has its proper force, as distinguished from the ἐγνωρίσθη and as describing the way, *viz.*, by *revelation*, that the truth was made known. The prophets of the OT dispensation were designated ἅγιοι (2 Kings iv. 9; Luke i. 20; 2 Pet. i. 21). Those of these Christian times are in like manner designated ἅγιοι, as men separated and consecrated to the office and distinguished from the mass of the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. They are further described as *His* (αὐτοῦ), *i.e.*, *God's* Apostles and prophets, God being the subject implied in the ἐγνωρίσθη and the ἀπεκαλύφθη. The terms ἀποστόλοις and προφήταις have the same sense here as in ii. 20, *viz.*, the *Christian* Apostles and prophets. The clause ἐν Πνεύματι defines the ἀπεκαλύφθη; not the προφήταις, as if = προφῆται θεόπνευστοι (Holzh., Koppe), for the προφῆται need no such

τόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ [v] προφήταις [w] ἐν πνεύματι,[1] 6. εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη [x] συγκληρονόμα καὶ [y] σύνσωμα καὶ [z] συμμέτοχα τῆς [a] ἐπαγγελίας[2] ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ[3] διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 7. οὗ ἐγενήθην[4] [b] διάκονος κατὰ τὴν [c] δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν[5] μοι κατὰ

w Ch. ii. 22.
x Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
y Here only.
z Ch. v. 7.

a Acts i. 4 reff. b = 1 Cor. iii. 5 al.; Col. i. 7, 23, 25. c John iv. 10; δ. χ., Rom. v. 15.

[1] After πνευματι insert αγιω DE 4, 19, 34, 38, 55, 61, 72, 74, 91, d, e, Eth.

[2] After επαγγ. insert αυτου D²D³EFGKL, etc., Vulg.-ed., Syr.₁, Thdrt., Dam., Hil., al.; om. ℵABCDP 17, 73, 106-9, Lat., d, e, tol., Syr., Copt., Arm., d, e, Orig.₃, Cyr., Chr., Jer., Pel., Sedul.

[3] εν τω χριστω DEFGKL, etc., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; εν Χριστω Ιησου ℵAB CP 17, 47, 73, Vulg., Goth., Cop., etc.

[4] εγενηθην ℵABDFGP 17, 31, 47, 72, 80, Euth., Oec.; εγενομην CD³EKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

[5] της δοθεισης ℵABCDFGP 10, 17, 23, 31, 39, 47, 57, 73, 80, 137, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Cop., Goth., Euth., Victor., Ambrostr.; την δοθεισαν D³EKL, al., pler., Goth., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl., Oec.

definition. As in ii. 22 the πνεῦμα here is the Holy Spirit, and the ἐν would most naturally be taken in the same sense as these. Here, however, most understand it as the *instrumental* ἐν. It seems to combine the two ideas of *agency* and *element* or *condition*, and describes the revelation as having been made *in and by* the Spirit.

Ver. 6. **εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα**: [to wit], *that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs*. The εἶναι = *are*, not *should be*, the "mystery" or secret revealed being a *fact*, not a purpose. The *obj. inf.* expresses the *contents* or *purport* of the ἀποκεκαλυμμένον (Win.-Moult., p. 400). **συγκληρονόμα** (or συνκληρονόμα, LTTr WHRV) = fellow-heirs *with the Jews*; the only occurrence of the word in the NT in this application (for other applications *cf.* Rom. viii. 17; Heb. xi. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 7).—**καὶ σύσσωμα**: *and fellow-members*. σύσσωμος (σύνσωμος, LTTr WHRV) in the NT occurs only here and is unknown to classical Greek, although Arist. uses συσσωματοποιεῖν (*De Mundo*, iv., 30). It was probably constructed by Paul for his present purpose. It means *belonging jointly to the same body*.—**καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**: *and fellow-partakers of the promise*. συμμέτοχος (συνμέτοχος, LTTrWHRV) is found in the NT only here and in v. 7. It occurs also in Joseph. (*Jew. Wars*, i., 24, 6), and in Justin (*Apol.* ii., 13). The verb συμμετέχω, however, is used in classical Greek (Eurip., *Supp.*, 648; Plato, *Theaet.*, 181 c, etc.), although it is not found in the NT. **τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**, not specifically the promise of the Spirit, but, as undefined, the promise of *Salvation*, the *Messianic* promise in its length and breadth. The three terms describe the Gentiles, therefore, first generally as heirs together with the believing Jews in all things, and then more particularly as belonging equally with them to the same corporate body and sharing equally with them in the Messianic promise. The TR inserts αὐτοῦ after ἐπαγγελίας. It is wanting, however, in the best documents (BℵACD¹, 17, etc.) and is to be omitted.—**ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: *in Christ through the Gospel*. For the τῷ Χριστῷ of the TR (with DFKL, etc.) read Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (with BℵC, 17, etc.). These words are best taken as qualifying all the three former terms. The joint-heirship, membership, and participation had their objective *ground* and *reason* in Christ Jesus, and were made the actual possession of these Gentiles by the *medium* or *agency* of the Gospel that was preached to them.

Ver. 7. **οὗ ἐγενόμην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *of which I became a minister according to the gift of the grace of God*. The TR reads ἐγενόμην (with CD³KL, etc.). The less usual form ἐγενήθην, however, is given by BℵD¹F, 17, etc., and is to be preferred. There is no difference, however, in the sense; ἐγενήθην being simply the Doric equivalent to ἐγενόμην, which reappeared in the LXX and in later Greek generally. διάκονος is a *servant*, *attendant* of any kind; also a *deacon* in particular (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12), or a *deaconess* (Rom. xvi. 1), and perhaps a *waiter*, one who serves at table (John

d Here only; see ch. i. 19 reff.

τὴν [d] ἐνέργειαν τῆς [d] δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. 8. ἐμοὶ τῷ [e] ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ[1] πάντων [f] ἁγίων[2] ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη,[3] τοῖς[4] ἔθνεσιν [g] εὐαγγελίσασθαι

e Here only; μειζότερος, 3 John 4. f Ch. i. 1 reff. g Ch. ii. 17 reff.

[1] ελαχιστω FG 49. Insert των before παντων P, al., mss., Goth., Cyr., Thdrt., Theophyl.; omit των ℵACDEFGKL, most mss., Orig., Dial., Did.

[2] Insert αποστολων Archel.

[3] After αυτη insert του θεου FG.

[4] Before τοις εθν. insert εν with DEFGKL, mss., nearly It., Vulg., Goth., Syrr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Lat. Fathers; omit ℵABC 23, 31, 61, Copt.

ii. 5, 9). Here it has the general sense of *minister*, as Paul designates himself again in 2 Cor. iii. 6; Col. i. 23. Once he calls himself ὑπηρέτης (1 Cor. iv. 1); but with no tangible difference in idea, except that ὑπηρέτης may suggest a still greater degree of subordination than διάκονος. The distinction drawn by some (Harless) between the two terms, as if διάκονος expressed activity in relation to the *service* and ὑπηρέτης activity in relation to the *master*, cannot be made good. τῆς χάριτος is probably the gen. of *apposition* or *identity* (as the χάρις in ver. 8 indicates), = the gift *consisting in* the grace; and the particular "grace" in view is the *office of the apostleship* or the *ministry to the Gentiles* (as vv. 2, 8 suggest), not the *gift of tongues* (Grot.) or the gift of the *Holy Ghost* (Flatt, etc.). That "grace," too, was *God's* gift (τοῦ Θεοῦ).—τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ: *which was given to me according to the working of His power.* For the τὴν δοθεῖσαν, qualifying the δωρεάν, of the TR (with CD³KL, etc.) the better reading is τῆς δοθείσης, qualifying the χάριτος (with BℵAD¹F, 17, etc.; so LTTrWHRV). As the former sentence affirmed the *gift* of the grace, this one states the *manner* of the bestowal. The *standard* or *proportion* of the giving was the *efficiency*, the *efficacious working* (ἐνέργειαν) of God's own power. The change in Paul when God made him an Apostle of Christ to the Gentiles was so great that he saw in it nothing less than the result of the Divine omnipotence.

Ver. 8. ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη: *to me, who am less than the least of all saints, was given this grace.* The τῶν inserted by the TR, on slender documentary evidence, before ἁγίων must be omitted as wanting in BℵACDFKL, etc. The thought of the dignity of the office he had received at the cost of such grace and power at once evokes the sense of his own utter unworthiness, to which he gives stronger expression here than even in 1 Cor. xv. 9, or 2 Cor. xii. 11. The form ἐλαχιστότερος, a comparative of the superlative ἐλάχιστος, is found only here. It belongs to a class of double comparisons which had a place probably in the popular modes of speech, but of which a considerable number are found in later literature, especially in poetry. The only other example in the NT is the double comparative μειζότερος in 3 John 4; *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of NT Greek*, p. 28.—ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸν ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτον τοῦ Χριστοῦ: *to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.* The TR inserts ἐν before τοῖς ἔθνεσιν with) DFKL, etc.); but it is not found in BℵAC, etc., and is best omitted. The former reading would define the *sphere* assigned to Paul in his ministry; the latter, the *subjects* of that ministry. For τὸν πλοῦτον the better accredited form is τὸ πλοῦτος. The τοῦ Χριστοῦ is prob. the gen. of *possess.*, = the riches that Christ *has*, or that are in Him. The πλοῦτος thus contained in Christ is the whole wealth of the salvation He bestows; and this is "unsearchable," *i.e.*, not in the sense of *inexhaustible*, but rather in that of *unfathomable*, "past finding out," such as cannot be fully comprehended by man; *cf.* Rom. xi. 33, the only other NT occurrence of ἀνεξιχνίαστον; also Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxxiv. 24, the only occurrences in the LXX. It is a picturesque and suggestive word, meaning literally such as cannot be *traced out by footprints.*

Ver. 9. καὶ φωτίσαι πάντας τίς ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων: *and to make all see what is the fellowship (dispensation) of the mystery which from all ages hath been hidden.* The πάντας which the TR inserts after φωτίσαι is omitted by some MSS. (including ℵ¹A) and certain Fathers (Hil., Jer., Aug., etc.). It is rejected by

τὸ [h] ἀνεξιχνίαστον [1] πλοῦτος [1] τοῦ χριστοῦ, 9. καὶ [k] φωτίσαι πάντας [2] τίς [l] ἡ οἰκονομία [3] τοῦ [m] μυστηρίου τοῦ [n] ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν

h Rom. xi. 33 only; Job. v. 9. i Neut., ch. i. 7 reff. k John i. 9; ch. i. 18 reff. l Ch. i. 10 reff. m Ch. i. 9 reff. n Matt. xi. 25 ‖ Luke; 1 Cor. ii. 7; Col. i. 26; 4 Kings iv. 27.

[1] **τον α. πλουτον**, with ℵ[3]D[3]EKLP, al., Fathers; **το . . . πλουτος** ℵABCDFG 17, 67[2]. For **του χρ.**, **αυτου** 17.

[2] Insert **παντας** ℵ[3]BCDEFGKLP, Vulg., Chr., Did., Euth., etc.; omit ℵA 67, Cyr., Hil., Aug., etc.

[3] For **οικον.**, **κοινωνια** with 57, al.

Tisch., accepted by RV in the text, and dealt with by WH as a *secondary* reading. The **κοινωνία** of the TR, which has the slenderest possible authority, must give place to the **οἰκονομία** of the RV with LTTrWH, which is the reading of BℵACDKFL, etc. If the **πάντας** is omitted the sense becomes, as it is given in the margin of the RV, "to bring to light what is" the dispensation. If it is retained, the idea will be that of the *enlightenment of all* as to what the dispensation is. The **πάντας**, however, which occupies an unemphatic position here, *after* the verb (in contrast with the emphatic position of **τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** *before* its verb) can scarcely bear the absolute sense of all *men*, Jew and Gentile alike, but refers to all the **ἔθνη** previously mentioned. The verb **φωτίσαι** is more than **διδάξαι** or **κηρύξαι**. It means to *illuminate*. Paul was not only to deliver his Apostolic message, but also to spiritually enlighten those who heard it, so that they should understand it. The particular thing in that message which is here in view is the **οἰκονομία** (on which see under i. 10), that is, the *dispensation* or *arrangement* of the mystery, to wit the admission of the Gentiles on equal terms with the Jews; the **μυστήριον** here having the same application as in iii. 6. The formula **ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων** occurs in the NT only here and in Col. i. 26; the forms **ἀπὸ αἰῶνος** and **ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος** also occur, the former in Luke i. 70 and Acts iii. 21, the latter in John ix. 32. It means literally "from the ages," "from the world-periods," that is, *from the beginning*, or *since the world began*. It is to be distinguished from **πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων** (1 Cor. ii. 7). The Divine decree was formed *before* the ages of the world began; the keeping of that decree hidden was *since* the ages of the world began, *i.e.*, "from the commencement of the ages when intelligent beings from whom it could be concealed were called into existence" (Ell.). In Rom. xvi. 25 we have the similar description of the **μυστήριον** as **χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου**.—**ἐν τῷ Θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *in God who created all things* [*through Jesus Christ*]. The "mystery" had its place of concealment in *God* Himself, in the Divine mind. And God is designated specially in respect of His *creative power*—"God who created all things" (not "*inasmuch as* He created all things," which would require the omission of the **τῷ**). The **τὰ πάντα**, which also occupies a somewhat emphatic position here, is not to be restricted either to the *physical* creation (Chrys.), or to the *spiritual* (Calv.), but has the absolute sense of *all that exists*. The TR adds **διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** to the **κτίσαντι** (with D[3]KL, etc.); but these words must be omitted, as the best authorities (BℵAC DF, 17, etc.) do not give them. But why is this reference to God as the *Creator of all things* introduced at this point? By way of confirmation, say some, of what has just been said of the "mystery" as having been hidden from the beginning in God; the point being that He who created all things must have had the contents of this "mystery" in His eternal plan (Mey.). To "enhance the idea of His omnipotence," say others; He who created all things having "*ordained* the mystery itself in the exercise of His undoubted prerogative of sovereign and creative power" (Ell.). Or, as others put it more precisely, its object is to take the wonder from the idea of the "mystery" having been so long unrevealed; the creation of all things by God being a fact which involves His perfect right to adjust all things as He will" (Alf.)—the *Creator of all* being "free to make what arrangements He pleased as to the concealment and revelation of His purpose" (Abb.). None of these interpretations can be said to be either very clear or very adequate. This designation of God as the Creator of all that exists is intended rather to express the *greatness* of the "mystery" that is now disclosed and of

[o] αἰώνων [1] [p] ἐν τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὰ πάντα [q] κτίσαντι,[2] 10. ἵνα [r] γνωρισθῇ νῦν [3] ταῖς [s] ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς [s] ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς [t] ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς

o Col. i. 26; plur., Rom. i. 25, ix. 5 al. fr.; 1 Cor. ii. 7, x. 11; ch. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. i. 2, xi. 3. p Col. iii. 3. q Ch. ii. 10 reff. r Ch. i. 9 reff. s Ch. i. 21 reff. t Ch. i. 3 reff.

[1] After τ. αιων. insert και απο των γενεων FG, g, Syr.

[2] After κτισαντι insert δια Ιησου Χριστου D[3]EKL, etc., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Thl., Oec.; om. ℵABCDFGP 17, 73, 177-8, al., It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Eth., Arm., Dial., Bas., Cyr., Tert., Jer., Ambr., Aug., Ambrst., Vig., Pel.

[3] νυν om. FG, Syr., all Orig., Tert., all; insert (etc.) Ath., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Jer.,g.

which Paul is to be a preacher. The main thought in the verse in question is the thought with which it starts, *viz.*, the marvel of that Apostolic commission of which Paul had been put in trust by the grace of God; and the majesty and the wonder of that commission are made the greater by the grandeur of the "mystery" the Divine disposition of which he was appointed to declare to all men. This "mystery," though long hidden, had been in the Divine mind from the first, and it had been there in such a sense that the whole scheme of created things had it in view, and in such wise that the knowledge of it was to be imparted even to the angelic world (*cf.* Haupt). Or, as it may be better put, the "mystery" now at last revealed by God and proclaimed by Paul to all men in all the sovereign and surpassing wisdom of the Divine dispensation by which it was hidden long and in the fulness of time at last disclosed, was one of God's own eternal secrets, one of His unsearchable thoughts, a thing that had its place from the beginning in His creative plan, a reserve in the Eternal mind that purposed and formed all that exists. And to Paul's hands did the surpassing grace of God commit the proclamation of a truth of such magnitude, the *illumination* (φωτίσαι) of so unsearchable a disposition of the Divine wisdom!

Ver. 10. **ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in order that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenlies might be made known.* To make the manifold wisdom of God known where formerly it was not understood is now declared to be the *object* in view. But the object of *what?* The creation of all things, says Harless; who connects the **ἵνα γνωρισθῇ** immediately with the **τῷ τὰ πάντα κτίσαντι.** But, while it is true that redemption is sometimes exhibited in relation to creation (John i. 1-14, etc.), and while Christ Himself is presented at times not only as the author and ground of creation but also as its end or object (Col. i. 16), the idea resulting here on that view would be that the purpose of God in creating all things was the proclamation of His wisdom to the *angelic world by the Church*. This, however, would be a statement without any parallel elsewhere in the NT. It is better, therefore, to connect the sentence immediately with the **τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου,** as is done by Meyer and many more. In that case the idea would be that the "mystery" was long hidden indeed, but hidden only with the design of being made known, and that on the widest possible scale—to angels no less than to men—in due time (*cf.* the general statement of principle in Mark iv. 22). There is much to be said in support of this, *e.g.*, the antithesis of the **νῦν** to the **ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων,** and the **γνωρισθῇ** to the **ἀποκεκρυμμένου,** etc. But it is best to take the verse as referring to the previous **ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη,** etc. (Ell., Alf.; and substantially De Wette, Hofm., etc.). The main idea in the paragraph from ver. 7 onwards is unmistakably that of the marvellous call and commission of Paul, and the wonder of the grace that made an Apostle and preacher of him is magnified the more by the Divine purpose revealed in that commission, to wit, the making known the manifold wisdom of God in His ways with sinful men and with the outcasts of the Gentile world in particular. It is objected indeed that this is to make Paul claim for his own preaching and as his own special work what belonged to other Apostles and preachers no less than to him. But all that is stated here goes in point of fact to enhance the idea of Paul's own personal insignificance, the extraordinary and unmerited nature of his call, and his absolute indebtedness to grace. "For this sublime cause," as Alford admirably expresses it, "the humble Paul was raised up—to bring about—he, the

[u] ἐκκλησίας ἡ [v] πολυποίκιλος [w] σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, 11. κατὰ [x] πρόθεσιν τῶν [y] αἰώνων ἣν ἐποίησεν [z] ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [1] τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν,

u Ch. i. 22 reff. v Here only. w = Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. i. 21, etc.; Rev. v. 12 al. x Ch. i. 11 reff. y 2 Tim. i. 9. z = Col. i. 16 reff.

[1] Before Χριστῳ insert τῳ ℵ[1]ABC 17, 37, 116, etc.; omit ℵC[3]DEKL, most mss., Ath., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; FG om. Χ. Ιησ.; Clem. om. Ιησ.

least worthy of the saints—that to the heavenly powers themselves should be made known, by means of those whom he was empowered to enlighten"—the manifold wisdom of God. The **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** can only mean *good* angels (*cf.* under i. 21 above); and these names of *dignity* (the term **ἄγγελος** is not used in this Epistle) are appropriate here as suggesting again the *greatness* of Paul's commission, and perhaps also (as Mey. thinks) the glory put upon the **ἐκκλησία**. That the **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** cannot mean any orders of earthly powers—Jewish, Gentile or Christian rulers or the like, is shown by the **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**. Nor can they refer to *demonic* powers, whether by themselves alone or as part of the angelic world, for this would scarcely be consistent with the mention of the *Church*, and further the Divine *power* would in that case be more in point than the Divine *wisdom*. Nor again is there anything in the context to suggest that Paul has in view the angels that ministered the law and the elemental powers honoured by the heathen (V. Soden). The **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** here, as elsewhere in the Epistle, has the sense = *in heaven;* see under i. 3 above. The **ἐν**, therefore, has its proper local sense, and is not = *in respect of*, as if the clause meant "in the case of the heavenly things". As the phrase makes one idea, too, with the **ἀρχαῖς** and **ἐξουσίαις**, defining them as *heavenly*, it requires no **ταῖς** after the **ἐξουσίαις**.—**διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: *through the Church*. The *Church*, therefore, that is, as is evidently meant here, the whole body of believers in the unity in which Jew and Gentile are now made one, is the *means* by which the Divine wisdom is to be made known and Paul's commission in that respect made good. The Church, which it was his high Apostolic vocation to build up by bringing multitudes of Gentile believers into its membership — the Church in which the breaking down of ancient barriers and the removal of the old enmity were now seen, was itself the living witness to the Divine **σοφία**, the "mirror," as Calvin puts it, "in which angels contemplate the wonderful wisdom of God". And that Divine wisdom is described as **πολυποίκιλος** (a word found only this once in the NT)—not with any reference to *Gnostic* ideas of **σοφία** (as Baur imagined), for the use of such a term as this in that connection is of later date (Iren., *Haer.*, i., 4, 1); nor simply in the sense of *very wise*, for which Aesch., *Prom.*, 1308, is mistakenly cited; but as = *multivarius, multiformis* (Vulg.), *having a great variety of forms*. The adj. is used of the rich variety of colours in cloths, flowers, paintings, etc. (Eurip., *Iph. T.*, 1149; Eubulus, *ap. Athen.*, 15, p. 679 D; *Orph. Hym.*, vi., 11; lxi., 4). In different ways had God dealt with men, with the Jew in one way and with the Gentile in another, in the long course of the ages. But in all these He had had one great end in view. Now in the *Church* the realisation of that end is seen, and in that great spiritual harmony angels can perceive the manifoldness and majesty of that Divine wisdom which by ways so diverse had been working to this great result. That angels have an interest in man's redemption and desire to look into it is stated in 1 Pet. i. 12. Here it is indicated that they are capable of an enlargement of insight into it.

Ver. 11. **κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων**: *according to the eternal purpose*. Literally, "according to the purpose of the ages" or "world-periods"; but represented with substantial accuracy by the "eternal" of the AV and the other old English Versions with exception of Wicl. and the Rhemish. The term **πρόθεσις** must be taken here as elsewhere in the proper sense of *purpose*, not in that of *foreknowledge* (Chrys.); and the clause is to be connected neither with the **σοφία** nor with the **πολυποίκιλος** in particular, but with the **γνωρισθῇ**. The disclosure of the manifold wisdom of God to the angelic world, contemplated in the commission given by God's grace to Paul, was of further-reaching moment than that. It was contemplated in God's eternal purpose and took place in accordance with that. The gen. **αἰώνων** may be a gen. of *time* (*cf.* Jude 6); Alf. compares our phrase "an opinion of years"; or it may rather be one of the many forms of the gen. of *possession*—"the purpose

12. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν [a]παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὴν[1] [b]προσαγωγὴν ἐν [c]πεποιθήσει[2] [d]διὰ τῆς πίστεως [e]αὐτοῦ. **13.** διὸ [f]αἰτοῦμαι [g]μὴ ἐγκακεῖν[3] [h]ἐν

a Acts ii. 29 al(4); 2 Cor. iii. 12, vii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 13; Philem. 8; Heb. iii. 6; 1 John ii. 28; adverbially only in Gospels. b Ch. ii. 18 reff. c 2 Cor. i. 15; Phil. iii. 4 only P.; 4 Kings xviii. 19. d Ch. ii. 8 reff. e Obj. gen., Acts iii. 16 al. fr. f Col. i. 9; 1 John v. 14, etc. g Luke xviii. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13 only. h = John v. 35; Rom. ii. 23 al.

[1] την om. ℵAB 17, 80; insert CD[2]KLP, Ath., Euthal., Thdrt., etc.

[2] For εν πεπ., εν τω ελευθερωθηναι D[1].

[3] εκκακειν CD[3]FGKL, etc., Fathers; ενκακειν (ℵB[3], al., εγκακειν), ℵABD 13, 17, 37, 39, 46, 47, etc.

pertaining to the ages," formed *before the foundation of the world* (i. 3), long hidden in the Divine Mind (iii. 9), but existent and in God's view from the beginning till now (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9).—**ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν**: *which he wrought in Christ Jesus our Lord.* The subject of the **ἐποίησεν** is the **πρόθεσις**, not the **σοφία** (Jer., Luth., etc.). The verb is rendered "purposed" by the RV; as it is also taken by many to mean *formed, constituted* (Calv., Harl., Hofm., De Wette, Alf., Abb., etc.). This use of the verb is somewhat like that in Mark iii. 6, xv. 1 (**συμβούλιον ποιεῖν**), etc., and gives a good sense. On the other hand, the use of **ποιεῖν** in such connections as **θέλημα ποιεῖν** (Matt. xxi. 31; John vi. 38; Eph. ii. 3), **γνώμην ποιεῖν** (Rev. xvii. 17), etc., seems to be sufficient justification for giving it the sense of *fulfilling, carrying out;* and the designation *Christ Jesus* (not *Christ* simply), pointing as it does to the historical Person, suggests that what is in view now is the *realisation* of the purpose rather than its *formation.* On the whole, therefore, it is perhaps best to render it "which He *wrought,* or *carried into effect,* in Him whom we preach as Christ Jesus our Lord" (Mey., Ell., etc.). The TR (with ℵ[1,3]C[3]DKL, etc.) gives **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**; the best critics (LTTrWHRV), on the authority of Bℵ*AC 17, etc., insert **τῷ** before **Χριστῷ**. The designation **ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν** is singular; *cf.*, however, the **τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον** of Col. ii. 6.

Ver. 12. **ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν**: *in whom we have boldness and access.* The second **τήν**, which is inserted by the TR, has the support of some good authorities, CD[3] KLP, Chrys., etc.; but is not found in BℵA 17, etc., and is to be omitted (with LTTrWHRV). As the **παρρησία** and the **προσαγωγή** meet in one idea the **τήν** does not require to be repeated. The article before the nouns has much the force of "*our* boldness and access". The **παρρησίαν** is not to be limited to *freedom of speech,* freedom in *preaching,* or boldness in *prayer,* but is to be taken in the large sense which it has in Phil. i. 20; 1 Tim. iii. 13; Heb. x. 19; and especially in 1 John ii. 28, iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14—*freedom of spirit, cheerful boldness,* "*the joyful mood of those reconciled to God*" (Mey.). The conjunction of the **προσαγωγή** with the intrans. **παρρησία** makes the intrans. sense of *access* more appropriate here than the trans. sense of *introduction; cf.* under ii. 18.—**ἐν πεποιθήσει**: *in confidence.* The noun **πεποίθησις** belongs to late Greek (Joseph., Philo., Sext. Empir., etc.). In the LXX it occurs once (2 Kings xviii. 19); in the NT it is found only in Paul (2 Cor. i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Phil. iii. 4, and here). It indicates the disposition in which the **παρρησία** and **προσαγωγή** are made good.—**διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ**: *through our faith in Him.* The **αὐτοῦ** is best taken as the *gen. objecti; cf.* Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16. Thus, as the **ἐν ᾧ** expresses the fact that *Christ* is the *ground* of our **παρρησία** and **προσαγωγή**, and the **ἐν πεποιθήσει** the state of mind in which we enjoy these blessings, so this clause declares the *means* by which they become our actual possession. The whole verse, moreover, is not so much a simple addition to the preceding statement as rather an indirect appeal to personal experience, in confirmation of what was said of the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose in Christ Jesus our Lord, the **ἐν ᾧ** having, as Ell. explains it, much the same force as **ἐν αὐτῷ γάρ**.

Ver. 13. **διὸ αἰτοῦμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *wherefore I ask that ye lose not heart in my tribulations in your behalf.* The **διό** is referred by some (Mey., etc.) to the immediately preceding verse, the possession of these great privileges of "boldness and access" on the part of the Ephesians being Paul's reason for urging on them the request

which follows. It is better, however, to refer the διό to the great thought of the whole paragraph, to which the statement in ver. 12 is subordinate, *viz.*, the dignity of the office committed to Paul and its significance for them. Because the great trust of the Apostleship among the Gentiles is what he has declared it to be for himself and for them, he puts this request before them. The αἰτεῖν, which sometimes expresses a *demand* (Luke i. 63; 1 Cor. i. 22), has the simple sense of *asking* here; and in such connections as the present αἰτοῦμαι has the full sense of asking *for one's self*. It is followed sometimes by the acc. and inf. (Luke xxiii. 23; Acts iii. 14), and sometimes, as here, by the simple inf. (Acts vii. 46). The idea in the verb ἐγκακεῖν is that of *losing courage*, *becoming faint of heart*. The form ἐκκακεῖν, which is given in the TR, appears in CD³FKL, etc. It is doubtful, however, whether that form occurs anywhere in ordinary Greek. It may have had a place in popular, *oral* use. The *written* form was ἐγκακεῖν, and that form appears here in most of the best MSS. (BℵAD¹, etc.). Hence LTrRV adopt ἐγκακεῖν; TWH, ἐνκακεῖν. But what is the construction here? Some supply Θεόν, and make the sense either (1) "I pray God that ye faint not," or (2) "I pray God that I faint not". But if the subject of the αἰτοῦμαι had been God, the Θεόν could scarcely have been omitted, as there is nothing in the context clearly to suggest it. And that it is the *readers*, not Paul himself, whose possible faint-heartedness is referred to appears from the force of the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and the ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν. Paul himself rejoiced in his tribulations (2 Cor. xii. 5, 10: Col. i. 24, etc.), and a prayer in such circumstances as the present betraying any fear about himself would be utterly unlike him. But he might have cause enough to apprehend that these converts might not all view painful things as he did. Hence ὑμᾶς is to be understood as the subject of αἰτοῦμαι (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20; Heb. xiii. 19). The ἐν before θλίψεσι has the proper sense of *in* (not "at" as RV puts it), pointing to the circumstances, sphere, or relation *in* which the faint-heartedness ought not to show itself (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 482, 483, and Ell., *in loc.*). These θλίψεις were ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (the phrase ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν going surely with the θλίψεσί μου, not with αἰτοῦμαι as Harless strangely puts it), as sufferings endured in virtue of Paul's Apostleship among the Gentiles; *cf.* Phil. i. 17. The defining article again is not required before ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, as the phrase makes in reality one idea.—ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν: *which are your glory*. The distinction between the definite or objective rel. ὅς and the indefinite, generic, or qualitative rel. ὅστις (*cf.* Jelf, *Gr. Gram.*, 816) is not always maintained in the NT, and indeed the use of ὅστις for ὅς is as old as Herod. (ii., 92) and Ionic Greek generally (Kühner, *Gr. Gram.*, ii., 906). In the Pauline Epistles, however, the distinction seems to be fairly maintained (Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 173), and ἥτις appears here to have the force of an *explanation*—"inasmuch as they are," "for indeed they are". The rel. is referred by some (Theod., Olsh., Harl.) to the μὴ ἐγκακεῖν, or to the whole sentence beginning with that; in which case ἥτις would stand for ὅ. But it is most naturally referred to the θλίψεσι. It is a case of attraction, but one in which the noun of the rel. clause gives its number (*cf.* Dem. *c. Aphob.*, p. 853, 31, and in the NT itself, Acts xxiv. 11; Phil. iii. 20) as well as its gender to the rel. (Win.-Moult., p. 206; Buttm., *Gram. of NT Greek*, p. 281; Donald., *Gr. Gram.*, p. 362; Madvig, *Syn.*, § 98). The clause, therefore, gives the readers a reason or motive for not yielding to faintness of heart. Paul's tribulations were endured in their behalf, and were of value for them. The greater the office of the sufferer, the more did the afflictions which he was content to endure for them redound to their honour; and the better this was understood by them, the less should they give way to weakness and discouragement.

Vv. 14-19. A paragraph containing an earnest prayer for the inward strengthening of the readers, the presence of Christ in them, their enlargement in the knowledge of the love of Christ, and the realisation in them of the Divine perfections.

Ver. 14. τούτου χάριν: *for this cause*. The sentence begun at iii. 1 and interrupted at ver. 2 is now taken up again. The τούτου χάριν, therefore, refers to the great statement of privilege in the latter part of the previous chapter. The ideas which came to expression in the digression in vv. 2-13, are also no doubt in view in some measure. The thought of the new relations into which the Ephesians had been brought by grace toward God and toward the Jews—the reconciliation of the Cross, peace effected where once there was only enmity, the place given them in the household of God—gave Paul cause for prayer in their behalf.—κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου: *I bow my knees*.

i = Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. vi. 4; Phil. iv. 14; Col. i. 24.

ταῖς [l]θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, [k]ἥτις ἐστὶν [l]δόξα ὑμῶν.[1] 14. [m]τούτου χάριν [n]κάμπτω τὰ [n]γόνατά μου [o]πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,[2] 15. [p]ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα [q]πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς [r]ὀνομάζεται, 16. ἵνα δῴη[3] ὑμῖν

k Attr., ch. i. 8 reff. l = 1 Cor. ii. 7, xi. 15; Phil. iii. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 20. m Ver. 1 reff. n Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11; Phil. ii. 10 only. o = Luke xii. 3; 1 Cor. xiii. 12. p = here only; Xen., *Mem.*, iv. 6, 12. q Luke ii. 4; Acts iii. 25 only; Num. i. 18. r Ch. i. 21 reff.

[1] ημων C 17, 31, 33, 37, 71, 72, 80, 116, Cop., Arm., Euth.

[2] Insert του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου ℵ[3]DEFGKL, Vulg., Goth., Syr., Arm., Orig., etc.; omit ℵ*ABCP 17, 67[2], al., Copt., Æth., Ar.-erp., Thdrt., Orig., Epiph., Euth., Cyrr., Dam., Jer. ("non, ut in latinis codd. additum est, '*ad Patrem Dom. nostri J. C.*,'—sed simpliciter '*ad Patrem*,' legendum").

[3] δῳ ℵBABCFG 17, 37-9, 116, Meth., Bas., Cyrr., etc.; δωη DEKLP, Valent., Orig., Ath., Chr., Euthal., etc.

A simple, natural figure for *prayer*, *earnest* prayer (Calv.)—not as if Paul actually knelt as he wrote (Calov.). The standing posture in prayer and the kneeling are both mentioned in the NT (*e.g.*, Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11, 13, for the former, and Luke xxii. 41; Acts vii. 60, xx. 36, xxi. 5, for the latter). For *kneeling* in the OT see 1 Kings viii. 54; Dan. vi. 10; *cf.* also 1 Kings xix. 18.—**πρὸς τὸν πατέρα**: *to the Father*. The **πρὸς** takes the place of the simple dat. which usually follows the phrase **κάμπτω γόνυ** (Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11), the idea here being that of *prayer*, and of God as the Hearer to whom it was *directed*. The TR, following ℵ[3]DFKL, Lat., Syr., Goth., etc., adds **τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. This is an addition which might very readily find a place in the text, the designation being a familiar one, occurring already indeed in this Epistle (i. 3). It does not appear, however, in Bℵ*C, 17, Copt., Eth., etc., and it is omitted by the best critics (LTTrWHRV).

Ver. 15. **ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται**: *from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named*. The **ἐξ οὗ** denotes the *origin* of the name, the *source* whence it is derived (*cf.* Hom., *Il.*, x., 68; Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 5, 8; Soph., *Œd. R.*, 1036). The verb **ὀνομάζομαι** is also followed by **ἀπό** (Herod., vi., 129); but **ἐκ** conveys the idea of more direct origination (*cf.* Ell., *in loc.*). The noun **πατριά**, for which **πάτρα** is the more usual form in classical Greek, never has the sense of **πατρότης**, *paternitas* (Syr., Goth., Vulg., Luth., and, so far, also Harl.). It means sometimes *ancestry* (Herod., ii., 143; iii., 75), but usually *family* (Exod. vi. 15, xii. 3; Num. i. 2; Luke ii. 4), *race* or *tribe*, *i.e.*, a number of families descended from a common stock (Herod., i., 200; Num. i. 16), *nation* or *people* (1 Chron. xvi. 28; Ps. xxii. 28; Acts iii. 25). In the LXX the **πατριαί** are the מִשְׁפָּחוֹת as distinguished from the **φυλαί**, מַטּוֹת. The Israelites were constituted of twelve **φυλαί** divided into a number of **πατριαί**, each of these latter again consisting of so many **οἶκοι**. Here the word seems to have the widest sense of *class*, *order*, *nation*, *community*, as the idea of *family* in the proper sense of the term is inapplicable to the case of the *angels*, who are indicated by **ἐν οὐρανοῖς**. Further, the anarthrous **πᾶσα πατριά** grammatically can only mean "every family" (see under ii. 21 above), not "the whole family" (Mich., Olsh., etc.). All such ideas, therefore, as that angels and men, or the blessed in heaven and the believing on earth, are in view as now making one great family, are excluded. Nor can **ὀνομάζεται** be made to mean anything else than "are named"—certainly not *exist*, or *called into existence* (Estius, etc.), or "are named *the children of God*" (Beng., etc.). The sense, therefore, is "the Father, from whom all the related orders of intelligent beings, human and angelic, each by itself, get the significant name of *family*, *community*". The various classes of men on earth, Jewish, Gentile, and others, and the various orders of angels in heaven, are all related to God, the common Father, and only in virtue of that relation has any of them the name of *family*. The *father* makes the family; God is the Father of all; and if any community of intelligent beings, human or angelic, bears the great name of *family*, the reason for that lies in this relation of God to it. The significant name has its origin in the

κατὰ τὸ [s] πλοῦτος [1] τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ [t] δυνάμει [2] [u] κραταιωθῆναι [v] διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ [w] εἰς τὸν [x] ἔσω [x] ἄνθρωπον, 17. [y] κατοικῆσαι τὸν

s Ch. i. 7 reff. t = Col. i. 11. u Luke i. 80, ii. 40; 1 Cor. xvi. 13 only; Neh. ii. 18. v Acts xxi. 4; Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 10 al. w = ch. ii. 21 al. x Rom. vii. 22; see 2 Cor. iv. 16. y Col. i. 19, ii. 9 al.

[1] τον πλουτον, with D³KL, etc., Fathers; το πλουτος ℵABCDEFGP 67², 116, Ath.-ms., Ephr.; το πληθος 17.

[2] εν δυν. FG, Copt.; δυναμιν Mac.

spiritual relationship. It is not possible, however, to give proper expression to the thought in English. In the Greek there is a play upon the words πατήρ, πατριά, which cannot be reproduced. Some have supposed that Paul has certain Rabbinical notions in view here, or that he is glancing at certain Gnostic theories, or at the vain worship of angels. But there is no ground for such far-fetched suppositions. The Rabbinical conceits regarding angels and the Gnostic speculations were both very different from anything suggested here.

Ver. 16. **ἵνα δῴη ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ**: *that He would grant you according to the riches of His glory.* The ἵνα introduces the subject of the prayer, representing it, however, also as the thing which he had *in view* in praying and which made the *purpose* of his prayer (see under i. 17 above). For the δῴη of the TR (with DKL, etc.), the RV (with LTTrWH) gives δῷ as in BℵACF, 17, etc. (see under i. 17 above). For τὸν πλοῦτον (TR, with D³KL, etc.) read again τὸ πλοῦτος, with ℵBACDF, etc. The δόξα is the whole *revealed perfections* of God, not merely His *grace* or His *power*; and the clause belongs more fitly to the δῷ than to the following δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι. The measure of the gift for which Paul prays on behalf of the Ephesians is nothing short of those perfections of God which are revealed now in their glorious fulness and inexhaustible wealth (*cf.* i. 7, 18; ii. 4, 7).—**δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ**: *to be strengthened by power through His Spirit.* The δυνάμει is taken by some as the dat. of *manner*, or as an adverbial expression = *mightily*. But the former mention of the ἐγκακεῖν suggests that the power is regarded here as *in* the subjects rather than as put forth by God. Others make it the dat. of *reference*, or take it to denote the particular *form* in which the *strengthening* was to take effect, *viz.*, in the form of *power* as contrasted with *knowledge* or other kinds of gifts. But there is nothing to suggest limitation to one special capacity. Such limitation indeed would be inconsistent with the comprehensive εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον. It is best understood as the *dat. instrum.* The *strengthening* was to take effect by means of *power imparted* or infused, and this impartation of power was to be made through the Spirit of God.—**εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον**: *into the inward man.* The "inward man" is viewed here as the *recipient*, that *into* which the strengthening was to be poured, or the *object towards* which the gift was directed. The εἰς, therefore, has its full force of "into," and is not to be reduced either to "in" (RV), or to "in regard of" (Mey.). The phrase ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος has certain parallels in classical Greek, *e.g.*, ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος (Plato, *Rep.*, ix., p. 589), ὁ εἴσω ἄνθρωπος (Plotin., *Enn.*, v., 1, 10); and it is conceivable that these philosophical expressions had become popularised in course of time, and had penetrated even into the common speech of Jews, or at least into the vocabulary of educated Jews. But the question is—What is the force of the phrase in the NT itself? The two terms ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος denote the two sides or aspects of the nature of man, soul and body, real and phenomenal, enduring and perishable (*cf.* the contrast in 2 Cor. iv. 16); as the terms ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καινὸς (νέος) ἄνθρωπος denote his twofold moral nature. The ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος itself occurs only thrice in the NT, and all three occurrences are in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. vii. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16). It has different shades of meaning there, but the same general sense, *viz.*, that of the *personal subject*, the *rational*, *moral self*, somewhat similar to the νοῦς in Rom. vii. 23, and the ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος of 1 Pet. iii. 4. In this ἔσω ἄνθρωπος the goodness of the law of God can be recognised so that one can delight in that law. But there is another law that wars against it and brings it into subjection (Rom. vii. 19-23). Hence the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος has to be regenerated, and so becomes "the new man," ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, that is created after God (ὁ κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθείς, Eph. iv. 24), or ὁ νέος ἄνθρωπος, that is renewed (ἀνακαι-

z Constr., ch. iv. 2; Col. ii. 2; ρ., Col. ii. 7 only; Isa. xl. 24.

χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, 18. ἐν ἀγάπῃ [a] ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ [a] τεθεμελιωμένοι, ἵνα [b] ἐξισχύσητε [c] καταλαβέσθαι [d] σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς [e] ἁγίοις τί τὸ [f] πλάτος καὶ [g] μῆκος καὶ [h] βάθος [1] καὶ

a Matt. vii. 25 ‖ Luke; Col. i. 23; Heb. i. 10, from Ps. ci. 25; 1 Pet. v. 10. b Here only; Sir. vii. 6 vat. c Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25; Phil. iii. 12, 13. d = Acts x. 2, xiv. 13 al. fr. e = ch. i. 1 reff. f g Rev. xx. 9, xxi. 16 only; Gen. i. 15. h i See Rom. viii. 39.

[1] **υψ. κ. βαθ.** BCDEFG 17, 37, 57, 73, 116, It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Eth., Arm., Ath., Cyr., Lucif.. Ambrst., Pel., Jer.; **βαθος και υψος** ℵAKL, etc., Syr., al., Orig., Chrys., Thdrt., al.

νούμενος, Col. iii. 10). The *strength*, therefore, which was to be communicated by the impartation of new spiritual power through the Holy Spirit was a gift to enrich and invigorate the deepest and most central thing in them—their whole conscious, personal being.

Ver. 17. **κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν**: *that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith*. The presence of Christ, His *stated* presence (**κατοικεῖν** as contrasted with **παροικεῖν** = sojourn, *cf.* Gen. xxxvii. 1), the taking up of His *abode* in them (*cf.* the use of **κατοικεῖν** in Matt. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26; 2 Pet. iii. 13; and also its application to Christ Himself in another relation in Col. i. 19), is also embraced in the scope of Paul's prayer. The *indwelling* expressed here by the comp. **κατοικεῖν** is also expressed by the simple **οἰκεῖν** (Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 16). Its *seat* is the **καρδία**—the centre of feeling, thinking, willing (*cf.* Delitzsch, *Bib. Psych.*, iv., 5). And the means or *channel* through which it takes possession of the heart is *faith*, the **διὰ πίστεως** indicating the receptivity which is the condition on our side. There remains, however, the question of the *construction*. The **κατοικῆσαι**, etc., may be taken as dependent on the **δῷ** and as forming a second boon contemplated in the gift prayed for, as if = "and that He may grant you also that Christ may dwell in your hearts" (Mey., Abb., etc.). Or it may be taken as dependent on the **κραταιωθῆναι**, etc., expressing the contemplated *result* of the gift of strength (inf. of *consequence*;, *cf.* Acts v. 3; Heb. vi. 10; Apoc. v. 5, xvi. 9, etc.), = "to the effect that Christ may dwell in your hearts". The omission of the connecting **καί** is no insuperable objection to the former; for cases of asyndeton are sufficiently common. But the second view (so Ell., Alf., etc.) is on the whole to be preferred, as it deals better both with the grammatical connection and with the emphatic position of the **κατοικῆσαι**. The former view has the difficulty of taking two somewhat different grammatical constructions as parallels, and it fails to bring out as the latter does the *advance* in the thought. The *indwelling of Christ* is the higher boon which is in view as the end and effect of the *strengthening*.—**ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι**: *ye having been rooted and grounded in love*. Nothing can legitimately be made of the anarthrous **ἀγάπῃ**, the article being often dropped before abstract nouns, and especially after a preposition (Win.-Moult., pp. 148, 149). As the **ἀγάπῃ** is also without any **αὐτοῦ** or other defining gen., it appears to have its most general sense here, not "the love of *God*" or "the love of *Christ*" in particular, but *love*, the Christian principle or grace which is "the bond of perfectness" (Col. iii. 14). In this love they are described (by two perf. partics.) as "having been *rooted* and *grounded*". If the terms **ἐρριζωμένοι, τεθεμελιωμένοι** were used in their proper etymological connotation, they might suggest much. The former might convey the idea of subjects deriving their life and growth from love; and the latter the idea of subjects built up on the basis of love as living stones in the Divine temple. But the terms are also used without any reference to their original, etymological sense — **ῥιζοῦν**, *e.g.*, in Soph., *Œd. C.*, 1591, means simply to *establish* something *firmly*. So here the two words probably express the one simple idea of being *securely settled* and *deeply founded*. Thoroughly established in love, having it not as an uncertain feeling changing with every change of experience, but as the constant principle of their life—this they must be if they are fully to apprehend the magnitude of Christ's love. Here, again, the *construction* is a difficult question. Westcott and Hort attach **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** to the **κατοικῆσαι** clause and the **ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ τεθεμελιωμένοι** to the **ἵνα** clause. But the **ἐν καρδίαις ὑμῶν** seems a proper and adequate conclusion and completion

of the idea of the *indwelling*. Many (including Meyer, Winer, Buttm., AV, RV, etc.) connect the whole clause with the **ἵνα**, = "in order that, being rooted and grounded in love, ye may be able". This gives an excellent sense, and examples of the transposition of part of a sentence from the natural place after the **ἵνα** to one *before* it are found elsewhere in the NT (*e.g.*, Acts xix. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. ii. 10; Col. iv. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 7; *cf.* Buttm., *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 389). On the other hand, the relevancy of most, if not all, of these examples is not above suspicion (*cf.* Ell. and Abb. *in loc.*), and it does not appear that in the present passage there is any such emphasis on the **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** as can explain its peculiar position. Hence it is better on the whole to connect it with the *preceding* (as is done in one way or other by Chrys., Luth., Harl., Bleek, De Wette, Alf., Ell., Abb., etc.), and take it as another instance of the nom. absol. or participial anacolouthon (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 715; Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 56, 9, 4; Buttm., *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 298; Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 285). So we translate it—"ye having been rooted and grounded in love in order that ye may be able," etc. The *rooting* and *grounding* are expressed by the perf. part., as they indicate the state which must be realised in connection with the indwelling of Christ *before* the ability for comprehending the love of Christ can be acquired.

Ver. 18. **ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις**: *that ye may be fully able to comprehend with all the saints*. The "may be strong" of the RV is a less happy rendering than usual, as it obscures the fact that the verb is different from that expressing the *strengthened* in ver. 16. The strong compound **ἐξισχύειν**, = to be *eminently able*, to *have full capacity*, occurs only this once in the NT and is rare in ordinary Greek. **καταλαμβάνειν**, = "take hold of" (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12, etc.) or in the sense of *mental* grasp (Plato, *Phaedr.*, 250 D), in its various NT occurrences in the *Middle* Voice (Acts iv. 13, x. 34, xxv. 25) has only the latter meaning. Here, therefore, it is = *understand*, not = *occupare*, *take possession of* (Goth., Kypke). The RV substitutes the more neutral *apprehend*—a word capable of either sense—for the "comprehend" of the AV. This gift of spiritual comprehension is contemplated further as to be possessed and exercised **σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγίοις**, not as a matter of private experience, the peculiar faculty of some, or an exceptional bestowment like the rare privilege of visions, but as a gift proper to the whole community of believers and one in which these Ephesians might share together with all God's people; for the phrase *cf.* i. 15, vi. 18; Col. i. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 13; Philem. 5; Rev. viii. 3; and for the sense of **ἅγιος** see under i. 1 above.—**τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ βάθος καὶ ὕψος**: *what is the breadth and length and depth and height*. So the AV. But *height and depth*, according to the RV. The order of the TR, **βάθος καὶ ὕψος**, is that of ℵKL, Syr., etc.; **ὕψος καὶ βάθος** is that of BCDG, 17, Vulg., Boh., etc. The latter is preferred by LTrWH, the former getting a place in the margin with Tr and WH. What is the object in view in the mention of these dimensions? It is left unnamed. Hence the many conjectures on the subject; *e.g.*, that it is the *Christian Church* (Mich., Koppe, etc.), or *Temple* (Bengel), the *work of redemption*, or the *mystery* previously noticed (Theophy., Harl., Olsh., Bleek, etc.), the mystery of the *Cross* (Est.), the *love of God* (Chrys., Erasm., Grot., etc.), the *wisdom* of God (De Wette), *love* (Moule), *all that God has revealed or done in us and for us* (Alf.). But the context naturally suggests the *love of Christ* (Calv., Mey., Ell.), that being the supreme theme and the one which is immediately set before us in express terms. The imagination of the Fathers, Augustine, Gregory Nyss., Jerome and others, ran riot in the endeavour to find some distinctive, spiritual meaning in each of the four things here named, the shape of the Cross, *e.g.*, being supposed to be signified (Estius), the Divinity of Christ being found in the figure of the *height*, His human nature in the *depth*, the extent of the Apostolic Commission in the *length and breadth*, etc. Nor are the feats of interpretation less forced or fanciful which have been performed by some more modern exegetes. But the terms *length*, *breadth*, *depth*, *height* are introduced with no other purpose than the simple and consistent one of setting forth the surpassing magnitude of Christ's love for us. The power to comprehend that love in its utmost conceivable grandeur and its furthest-reaching relations is what Paul prays God to grant his Ephesians.

Ver. 19. **γνῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge*. Literally, "the knowledge-surpassing love of Christ". The gen. **γνώσεως** is due to the **ὑπερβάλλουσαν** having the force of a *comparative* (*cf.* Aesch., *Prom.*, 944; Hom., *Il.*, xxiii.,

[l] ὕψος, 19. γνῶναί τε[1] τὴν [k] ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς [l] γνώσεως ἀγάπην[2] τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα [m] πληρωθῆτε [n] εἰς πᾶν[3] τὸ [n] πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

k Ch. i. 19 reff. l = 1 Cor. viii. 1, xiii. 2, 8 (see 1 Tim. vi. 20). m = Rom. i. 29, xv. 13; 2 Cor. vii. 4 al. n = Rom. xv. 29.

[1] τε om. DFG, Copt.

[2] αγ. της γν. A 74, 115, Syr., Ar.-pol., Jer. (*scientiam caritatis* Aug.₁).

[3] ινα πληρωθη παν B 73, 116.

847; Bernhardy, *Synt.*, iii., 48 B). That the Χριστοῦ is the *gen. subj.*, Christ's *love to us*, is made clear by the description of it as surpassing knowledge, which could not be said of our love to Him. The repetition of the same idea in contrasting senses in the γνῶναι and the γνώσεως has its point not in any antithesis between *theoretical* or *discursive* knowledge (Ell.) and *practical* knowledge, or between *false* knowledge and *true* (Holz), or between *human* knowledge and *divine* (Chrys.), but in the simple fact that there is a *real* knowledge of Christ's love possible to us, a knowledge that is capable of increase as we are the more *strengthened* by power in the inner man, while a *complete* or *exhaustive* knowledge must ever remain beyond our capacity. This petition for the gift of a true and enlarging knowledge (a knowledge which is obviously not a matter of mere intellect but of conscious, personal experience) is connected with the former petition for spiritual *comprehension* by τε, and this is presented in the character, not of a *climax*, but of an *adjunct*, an additional statement in supplement of the former. The simple τε (as distinguished from τε . . . καί) occurs rarely in the Gospels, with greater comparative frequency in Romans and Hebrews, but oftenest by far in Acts. It is used to connect single ideas in Greek poetry (seldom in Greek prose), and is occasionally so used in the NT (*cf.* Acts ii. 37, 40, xxvii. 4; and see Bernh., *Synt.*, xx., 17). In this case it seems to indicate a "closer connection and affinity" than καί (*cf.* Blass, *Gr. of N. T. Greek*, p. 263).—**ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God* (or, into the whole fulness of God). The great Vatican Codex (followed by 17, 73, 116) has an interesting variety of reading here, *viz.*, πληρωθῇ for πληρωθῆτε, the εἰς being also dropped. This reading gets a place in the margin of WH. On the difficult term πλήρωμα see under i. 10 and especially i. 23 above. The interpretation of this clause is much disputed. The εἰς cannot mean *with* or *in*, as it is taken by some, but must = "into" or "unto," expressing the *measure up to* which the being filled is to take effect, the *limit* of the filling, or the *goal* it has before it. The AV and the other Old English Versions erroneously give "with"; except Wicl., who makes it "in," Cov., who renders "into," and Rhem., "unto". The Θεοῦ may be the gen. of *originating cause*, = the fulness *bestowed* by God; or, better, the *poss.* gen., = the fulness possessed by God. The main difficulty is the sense of the πλήρωμα itself. Some explanations may be set aside as paraphrases rather than interpretations; *e.g.*, that πλήρωμα = the *Church* (Koppe, etc.); the *gracious presence of God*, the Divine δόξα, *filling* the people (Harl.); the *perfection of* God, in the sense of the highest moral ideal that can be presented to him "in whose heart Christ dwells" (Oltr.), etc. Nor can any good sense be legitimately got by taking it as = πλήρωσις—"that ye may be filled with the gifts with which God is wont to furnish men" (Grot.)—an interpretation that cannot be adjusted to the εἰς. The choice lies between two views, *viz.*, (1) that πλήρωμα has its primary, pass. sense—the fulness that is *in* God, or with which God Himself is filled; or (2) that it has the sense derived from this, *viz.*, *fulness*, *copia*, πλοῦτος, πλῆθος. The latter is preferred by Meyer, who appeals to such passages as *Song of Songs*, v., 12; Rom. xv. 29; Eph. iv. 13, etc., in support of it, and understands it to convey the special idea of *charismatic* fulness as bestowed by God. So he renders it, "in order that ye may be filled with Divine gifts of grace to such extent that the whole fulness of them (πᾶν has the emphasis) shall have passed over upon you". So also substantially De Wette, Abbott, and others, who refer to 2 Pet. i. 4. But there are weighty reasons for preferring the former view with Alf., Ell., Haupt, etc. It gives πλήρωμα the largest and profoundest sense, not restricting it to gifts of grace bestowed, but taking it to express the *sum* of *the Divine perfections* (so substantially Chrys.,

20. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ [o]ὑπὲρ[1] πάντα ποιῆσαι [p]ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ[2] ὧν [q]αἰτούμεθα ἢ [r]νοοῦμεν κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν [s]ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν,[3]

o = Philem. 21. p 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13; Matt. v. 37. q Ver. 13 reff. r Ver. 4 reff. s = Matt. xiv. 2; Rom. vii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 6; 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12: Gal. ii. 8, iii. 5, Paul esp.

[1] υπερ om. DEFG, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Ambrst., etc.
[2] και υπερεκ. Syr., Schr. et P., Ambrst. [3] εν υμιν A 39, 63.

Rück., etc.), the whole **ἀρετή** or *excellence* that is in God; *cf.* Chrysostom's **ὥστε πληροῦσθαι πάσης ἀρετῆς ἧς πλήρης ἐστὶν ὁ Θεός**. It brings the whole paragraph to a conclusion worthy of itself, lifting us to a conception which surpasses all that has preceded it, and carrying us from the great idea of the fulness in Christ to the still greater idea of the fulness in God. Nor is it any valid objection to it that what is thus put before us is what can never be attained in this life. It is an *ideal*, essentially the same as that contained in the injunction to be *perfect* as our Father in heaven is perfect (Matt. v. 48). This interpretation also is most in harmony with the great idea of the *indwelling* of Christ in our hearts, expressing indeed what is implied in that. In Christ the **πλήρωμα** of God dwells; so far as Christ dwells in us the **πλήρωμα** of God is in us. In that indwelling lies the possibility of our growing in moral excellence on to the very limit of all that is in God Himself. That they might be *strengthened* in the inner man so as to have Christ's living and abiding presence in them, and be lifted thereby to the comprehension of His love and the personal knowledge of that which yet surpasses all knowledge, and at last be filled with all spiritual excellence even up to the measure of the complete perfection that is in God Himself—this is the sweep of what Paul in his prayer desires for these Ephesians so late sunk in heathen hopelessness and godlessness.

Vv. 20-21. A fervent ascription of praise to God evoked by the thought of the great things which His grace has already wrought in these Gentiles, and the greater things of the future which the same grace destines for them and would have them attain to.

Ver. 20. **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν**: *Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.* So both AV and RV; as also the old English Versions, excepting Wicl. ("more plenteously than we axen"), Cov. and Rhem. ("more abundantly than we desire"). More exactly it = "able to do beyond all things, superabundantly beyond what we ask or think' (Ell.). The **τῷ** refers naturally to *God*, the main subject of the whole paragraph. The **δέ** has something of its proper adversative force, the contrast between the subjects of the Divine grace and the Divine Giver of the grace being to some extent in view. The doxology brings the whole preceding paragraph and the first main division of the Epistle to a fitting close. Its best parallel is in Rom. xvi. 25-27. The **ὑπὲρ** cannot be taken as an adverb (Beng.), but governs the **πάντα**. The **πάντα** again is not to be connected with the **ὧν** as if = "all that we ask"; the gen. **ὧν** is due to the *comparative* in the **ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ**, as in the previous case of the **ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως**. Further, the **ὑπὲρ πάντα** does not belong to the **δυναμένῳ**, but makes one idea with the **ποιῆσαι**. Thus we have two distinct descriptions of God here, the second of which explains and develops the thought of the first. He is described first generally in respect of the absoluteness of His power, as "able to do beyond all things," "able to do more than all," *i.e.*, One to whose efficiency there is no limit; and then with more particular reference to the case of Paul and his fellow-believers, as able to do above measure beyond anything with which our asking or even our thinking is conversant; superabundantly beyond the utmost requests we can make in prayer, nay beyond all that can suggest itself to our minds in their highest ventures. The verb **νοεῖν**, here used of *thinking* of as distinguished from *asking* for, has two main lines of meaning, *viz.*, to *understand* and to *ponder* or *consider*. The latter is in view here. The strong, cumulative **ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ** occurs again in 1 Thess. iii. 10, v. 13. Such compounds with **ὑπέρ** (**ὑπερλίαν, ὑπερπερισσεύω, ὑπερνικάω, ὑπερυψόω, ὑπεραυξάνω, ὑπερπλεονάζω**) are characteristic of Paul. They are not entirely limited to him (*e.g.*, **ὑπερπερισσῶς**, Mark vii. 37; **ὑπερεκχυννόμενον**, Luke vi. 38). But they are much more used by him

t 1 Cor. xiv. 21. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ᵗ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ[1] εἰς πάσας τὰς
19, 28.
u Here γενεὰς τοῦ ᵘ αἰῶνος[2] τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.[3]
only;
Dan. vii. 18.

[1] εν τ. εκκ. και εν Χρ. Ιη. ℵABC 17, 73, 80, 213, v., Copt., Jer., etc.; εν Χρ. Ιη. και (εν Ambrst.), τ. εκκλ. DFG, d, e, f, g, Victorin., etc.; εν τη εκκλησια εν Χριστω Ιησου text, D³(Χρ. Ιη. εν τ. εκκ. E)KLP, most mss., Syrr., al., Chrys., Thdrt., Dam.-text, Thl., Oec.

[2] του αιων. om. FG, tol.; *in omnia sæcula sæculorum*, d, e, Ambrst.

[3] αμην om. 57, 67².

than by any other NT writer, occurring nearly thrice as often in the Pauline Epistles and the Epistle to the Hebrews as in all the other NT books (*cf.* Ell., *in loc.*). Such bold compounds are "in keeping with the intensity of his pious feeling, which struggles after adequate expression" (Mey.).—**κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν**: *according to the power that worketh in us.* The "power" in question is doubtless the inward operation of the Holy Spirit. The **ἐν ἡμῖν** has the force of an appeal to consciousness. The power that we know to be operative in ourselves is a witness to God's ability to do superabundantly beyond what we ask or think. The efficient power of which we have experience in ourselves represents the measure and mode of the limitless capacity that is in God, and by the one we can conceive of the other and trust it. The **ἐνεργουμένην** must be taken here not as pass., but as middle (*cf.* Gal. v. 6). In Col. i. 29 we have the similar phrase **κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.** There it is used with reference to the Apostle's *labour* and *striving* at the time; here with reference to the possibilities of God's future dealings with his converts.

Ver. 21. **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: *unto Him be the glory in the Church in Christ Jesus* (better, "and in Christ Jesus"). In the **αὐτῷ** the great Subject of the ascription is named the second time with rhetorical emphasis, and as it stands first in the sentence **εἴη** (not **ἐστί**) is to be supplied. The article with **δόξα** defines it as the glory that is due to Him, or that befits Him. And that "glory" is to be given Him **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**, the Church being the domain in which the praise that belongs to Him is to be rendered Him. The reading of the TR, **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, follows such authorities as D³KLP, Syr., Eth., Arm., Goth. It is rendered by some "in the Church *which is* in Christ Jesus". But there is no evident reason for defining the Church here specifically as *in Christ*; for it is the *Christian* Church that is obviously meant, and there is no need to distinguish it from the Church of Israel. Such a construction, too, distinguishing one Church from another, would have been clearer if **τῇ** had appeared before **ἐν Χριστῷ**, although the absence of the article is not fatal to it (*cf.* 1 Thess. i. 1, etc.). Hence those who follow the TR take the words as two distinct clauses, **ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, understanding them to mean that the praise which is given in the Church is praise given in Christ in virtue of her union with Him as her Head, or taking them to point first to the Church as "the outward domain in which God is to be praised" and then to Christ as the "spiritual sphere in which this ascription of praise is to take place" (Mey.), it being only *in Christ* that believer or Church can really praise God. There is, however, a small, but important addition made to the text by some of the oldest and best authorities, by the insertion of **καί** before the **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.** The evidence is so strong (BℵAC, 17, Vulg., Boh., etc.) that the **καί** can scarcely be refused, and it is accepted by LTTrWHRV. So the sentence becomes "in the Church *and* in Christ Jesus," and the idea is that praise is to be given to God and His glorious perfections shown forth both in the Church which is the body, and in Christ who is the Head—in the Church as chosen by Him, and in the Christ as given, raised, and exalted by Him. So Haupt, with a somewhat similar idea, understands the sense to be that the glorifying of God takes place in outward-wise in the circle of the Church and at the same time in such inward-wise that it is in Christ.—**εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν**: *unto all generations for ever and ever. Amen.* More exactly "unto all the generations of the age of the ages. Amen." Another of these reduplicated, cumulative expressions by

IV. 1. [a] Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ [b] δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ,[1] [c] ἀξίως [d] περιπατῆσαι[2] τῆς [e] κλήσεως [f] ἧς ἐκλήθητε, 2. [g] μετὰ πάσης [h] τα-

a = Matt. viii. 5 al. fr.; Rom. xii. 1.
b Ch. iii. 1 reff. c Term and constr., Rom. xvi. 2; Phil. i. 27; Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12; Paul only, exc. 3 John 6. d = Acts xxi. 21 al. fr.; princ. Paul and John. e Rom. xi. 29; 1 Cor. i. 26; ch. i. 18; Paul only, exc. 2 Pet. i. 10. f Attr., ch. i. 7 reff. g = Matt. xxviii. 8; 1 Chron. xxix. 22 al. fr. h Acts xx. 19 (Paul); Phil. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18, 23, iii. 12; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. v. 5; see Ps. cxxx. 2.

[1] εν Χριστω ℵ Eth. [2] περιπατησατε 17.

which the mind of man working with the ideas of time labours to convey the idea of the eternal. The formula may be, as was suggested by Grotius, a combination of two distinct phrases of similar meaning, one in which continuance, endless continuance, is expressed in terms of **γενεά, γενεαί** (*cf. e.g.*, Luke i. 50; **εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν**, or **εἰς γενεὰς καὶ γενεὰς** with LTTrWHRV); and another in which the same idea is expressed in terms of **αἰών, αἰῶνες** (*cf.* **εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων**, Rev. xiv. 11; **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων**, Gal. i. 5, etc.). The peculiarity here is the conjunction of the two formulæ and the use of the sing. **αἰών** in the latter; *cf.* **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος**, 3 Esdr. iv. 38; **ἕως αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων**, Dan. vii. 18; **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [τοῦ αἰῶνος]**, Heb. i. 8; **εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος**, 2 Pet. iii. 18. The precise idea underlying the phrase is not quite clear. It may be that the everlasting future is thought of as one long "age" embracing in it an unnumbered succession of "generations" and making the sum and crown of all possible "ages". Or the "age of the ages" may have the force of a superlative, "the age *par excellence*," the "age beside which there is none other to be named," and that regarded as containing in itself all conceivable "generations". More precisely, the idea of the *Parousia* may be behind all, the age (**ὁ αἰών**) being the Messianic age which opens with the Parousia, brings all other "ages" with the "generations" belonging to them to an end, and is itself to endure for ever. Thus, as Meyer puts it, the idea is that the glory to be given to God in the Church and in Christ its Head is to "endure not only up to the Parousia, but then also ever onward from generation to generation in the Messianic æon—consequently to last not merely **εἰς τὸ παρόν**, but also **εἰς τὸ ἀΐδιον**". The **ἀμήν**, which occurs so frequently in our Lord's discourses at the beginning of an affirmation, is used here, as so often in the OT, at the close of the sentence in the sense of *so be it* (LXX, **γένοιτο**; *cf.* Num. v. 22, etc.). It was the people's assent in OT times to declarations made at solemn assemblies (Deut. xxvii. 15; Neh. v. 13, viii. 6, etc.). It was also their response to the prayers offered in the synagogue, and from 1 Cor. xiv. 16 we gather that this use of the word was continued in the Christian Church.

CHAPTER IV. Vv. 1-16. With the fourth chapter begins the second main division of the Epistle. As in others of Paul's Epistles the doctrinal statement is followed by the practical enforcement of duty. Doctrinal considerations are at the same time introduced again from point to point in support of the duties enjoined. The hortatory section commences with the earnest recommendation of a life in conformity with the Christian vocation, with special reference to the need of humility, loving consideration and unity.

Ver. 1. **παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord, beseech* (or, exhort) *you*. In more exact accordance with the *order* of the words—"I beseech you, therefore, I the prisoner in the Lord". The **οὖν** connects the practical charge with the preceding statement of doctrine and privilege, and establishes the one upon the other. The connection is taken by some to be with the statement just made in iii. 21 regarding the Church (Mey.). A reference of a larger scope, however, seems more in harmony with the contents of the paragraph. It is best, therefore, to understand the **οὖν** as basing the exhortations which follow on the whole preceding statement of the great things done for the readers by God's grace—from chap. iii. 6 onwards. The verb **παρακαλῶ** is rendered "beseech" by Wicl., Cov. (Test.), Rhem., AV, RV, while the Genevan gives "pray". But in Tynd., Cov., Cran., Bish., it is "exhort," and this is the more probable shade of meaning here in view of the context (Alf., Ell.). In classical Greek the dominant idea of the verb, except when it is used with reference to the gods, is that of *admonishing* or *exhorting*. In later Greek and in the NT the idea of *entreating* has its place along

with the other. For the force of the article in **ὁ δέσμιος** and the anarthrous **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, see under iii. 1 above. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** belongs not to the **παρακαλῶ** (Semler), but to the **δέσμιος**. It expresses the *sphere* within which his captivity subsisted or the *ground* of that captivity. He was a prisoner because of his connection with Christ, the Lord, and for no other reason. As in chapter iii., so here the idea of the dignity of his office seems to lie behind the mention of his imprisonment. He designates himself "the prisoner in the Lord" not with a view to stir the *sympathy* of the readers and enforce his exhortation by an appeal to feeling, but as one who could rejoice in his sufferings and speak of his tribulations as their "glory" (iii. 13; Gal. vi. 17).—**ἀξίως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε**: *to walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called.* As the phrase **καλεῖν κλήσει** occurs (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9, and, with **ἐν**, 1 Cor. vii. 20), the **ἧς** may be by attraction for **ᾗ**. As that, however, is a doubtful application of the law of attraction, and as the formula **κλῆσιν καλεῖν** is found in Arrian, *Epict.*, p. 122, it is to be explained rather as = **ἥν** (*cf.* i. 6; 2 Cor. i. 4; and Win.-Moult., p. 202). With the **ἀξίως τῆς κλήσεως** *cf.* **πολιτεύεσθαι ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**, Phil. i. 27; **περιπατεῖν ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος** (**καλέσαντος**), 1 Thess. ii. 12; **περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου**, Col. i. 10.

Ver. 2. **μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πρᾳότητος**: *with all lowliness and meekness.* Statement of moral dispositions which should *attend* their walk; **μετά** conveying the idea of *accompaniment*, *relation*, *association*, while **σύν** suggests closer *conjunction*, *fellowship*, especially a fellowship which *helps*. Krüger (*Sprachl.*, § 68, 13, 1) puts the distinction thus—"**σύν τινι** denotes rather *coherence*, **μετά τινος** rather *coexistence*" (*cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 488). As in the case of **πᾶσα σοφία** (i. 8), **πᾶσα ταπεινοφροσύνη** can mean only "all lowliness," "all *possible* lowliness," or "*every kind* of lowliness," not *summa humilitas*. The word **ταπεινοφροσύνη** is of very rare occurrence in non-biblical Greek, and when it does occur it has the sense of *pusillanimity* (Epictet., Diss., 3, 24, 56; Joseph., *Jewish Wars*, iv., 9, 2). It is not used in the OT; but in the NT it denotes one of the *passive* graces, unrecognised or repudiated in Græco-Roman ethics, which Christianity has glorified—the lowliness of mind which springs from a true estimate of ourselves—a deep sense of our own moral smallness and demerit (*cf.* Acts xx. 19; Phil. ii. 3; Col. iii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 5; Col. ii. 18, 23, of a false humility). **πρᾳότης**, or better **πραΰτης** (TTrWH) in the later form and without iota subscript; *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 26 (who regards the form **πρᾶος** as apparently "unknown to the language of the NT"); and Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 7 (who thinks there is not sufficient evidence to decide between **πραότης** and **πρᾳότης**). It means more than *modestia* (Vulg.), *mansuetudo*, **ἀταραξία**, *gentleness*, or *equanimity*, inasmuch as it has regard to our attitude towards God as well as towards men, and includes more than outward behaviour or natural disposition. It is a grace of the Spirit, the disposition of loving submissiveness in the first place to God and His dealings with us, and, as the consequence of that, of quiet restraint, mildness and patient abnegation of self in face of the provocations of others. It is a moral quality, therefore, with a far wider scope, a larger significance, a deeper and more vital relation to character than was thought of by the philosophers and moralists of the old world, who regarded it only as the opposite of **ἀγριότης**, *savageness* (Plato, *Symp.*, 197 *d*), **χαλεπότης**, *harshness* (Arist., *Hist. Anim.*, ix., 1), or **ἀποτομία**, *roughness* (Plut., *De lib. ed.*, 18); *cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, pp. 143, etc.; Schmidt, *Synon.*, 98, 2.—**μετὰ μακροθυμίας**: *with long-suffering.* This is best taken as an independent clause, which is developed in the following sentence. Some (Theod., Beng., etc.) attach both the **μετὰ πάσης ταπ.**, etc., and the **μετὰ μακρ.** to the **ἀνεχόμενοι** clause. But this gives one long sentence, which obscures the transition from idea to idea and makes the several clauses less distinctive. Others (Calv., Harl., Rück., Ols., etc.) attach the **μετὰ μακρ.** to **ἀνεχόμενοι**; but to make it part of that clause takes from the point of the **μακροθυμία** and disturbs the balance of the clauses, in which we have first the general idea of worthiness of walk, then certain particulars involved in that, and then the further explanation (in the **ἀνεχόμενοι** clause) of these various particulars or of the one last noticed. The term **μακροθυμία** means both *endurance* or *constancy* in presence of illness and trouble (Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Heb. vi. 12; James v. 10), and, as here (*cf.* also Rom. ii. 4, ix. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 6, etc.), the abnegation of revenge in presence of wrong—the opposite of **ὀργή** (Prov. xvi. 32), **ὀξοθυμία** (James i. 19), etc., and akin to **ὑπομονή** (2 Cor. vi. 4, 6; Col. i. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10; James v.

πεινοφροσύνης καὶ [l] πρᾳΰτητος,[1] μετὰ [k] μακροθυμίας, [l] ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, 3. [m] σπουδάζοντες [n] τηρεῖν τὴν [o] ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν τῷ [p] συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης.[2] 4. [q] ἓν σῶμα καὶ [r] ἓν

i 1 Cor. iv. 21 reff.; Ps. xliv. 4. k Rom. ii. 4 in Paul; James v. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 15; Prov. xxv. 15. l Term and constr., Matt. xvii. 17; ‖ Acts xviii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Col. iii. 13 Paul; Isa. lxiii. 15. m Gal. ii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Pet. i. 10, 15, iii. 14; Isa. xxi. 3. n = 1 Cor. vii. 37; 2 Cor. xi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23 al.; James i. 27 al. o Ver. 13 only. p Acts viii. 23; Col. ii. 19, iii. 14 only; Isa. lviii. 6. q Ch. ii. 16 reff. r Ch. ii. 18 reff.

[1] **πραοτητος** ADEFGLO, most others, Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; **πραυτητος** ℵBC 17; **υπακοης** 117.

[2] For **ειρ. αγαπης** K 1.

10, 11). The word belongs to later Greek (Plut., Macc., etc.), and the LXX; but in neither has it the exact sense it gets in the NT.—**ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *forbearing one another in love.* Explanation and application of the **μακροθυμία**. By a natural and familiar irregularity which gives effect to the logic of the statement rather than to the construction the partic. reverts from the acc. to the nom. (*cf.* Col. i. 10; Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 56, 9, 4). To attach **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (Orig., Lachm., Olsh., etc.) to the following **σπουδάζοντες** is to make the **ἀνεχόμενοι** abrupt and bare, and to disturb the harmonious form of the participial sentences. The duty of mutual forbearance is to be practised *in love.* It was to be a *loving* forbearance—a forbearance having its motive, its inspiration, its life, in love.

Ver. 3. **σπουδάζοντες τηρεῖν τὴν ἑνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος**: *giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit.* Further description of the mutual forbearance in respect of the *inward effort* required, but introducing also the larger, fundamental idea of *unity.* **σπουδάζω**, which conveys the idea of *exertion*, is better rendered "giving diligence" (RV) or "earnestly striving" (Alf.), than "endeavouring" (AV). **τηρεῖν** = *keep*, in the sense of maintaining with watchful care; suggesting also that what is to be *kept* is something already in our possession. **τοῦ Πνεύματος** is the gen. of *originating cause*, = the unity which the Spirit produces or works, and here the oneness in feeling, interest and purpose which is appropriate to the oneness in doctrine and privilege whereof the readers are immediately reminded. Commentators, even of the rank of Calvin, have interpreted the **πνεύματος** here as the *human spirit*, the Christian spirit of concord; while others (De Wette, etc.) have taken it to denote the spirit of the Christian community. But the **ἓν Πνεῦμα** of the following verse, the general NT doctrine of the Spirit of God as operating in the believer and in the Church (*cf.* ii. 22), and the analogy of such passages as 1 Cor. xii. 13, point clearly to the Holy Spirit.—**ἐν τῷ συνδέσμῳ τῆς εἰρήνης**: *in the bond of peace.* This is not to be attached to the next verse (Lach.), a connection which would again disturb the symmetry of the participial sentences and rob some of the statements which follow of their appropriateness. It defines the way in which the unity is to be kept. The **ἐν** is not the *instrumental* **ἐν**, = "by means of the bond of peace"; but, as in **ἐν ἀγάπῃ**, the *local* **ἐν** or that of *relation* specifying the *sphere* (Ell.), or the *ethical relation* (Mey.) in which the unity is to be maintained. The **εἰρήνης** might be the *gen. obj.*, = "the bond by which peace is kept," to wit, *love* (Beng., etc.). But it is best understood as the gen. of *apposition* (Mey.), or *identity* (Ell.), = "the bond which *is* peace". The unity, therefore, which is wrought among these Ephesians by the Spirit of God will be theirs in so far as they make peace the relation which they maintain one to another, or the bond in which they walk together. In Col. iii. 14 *love* is the "bond of perfectness"; but the construction and the idea are different here.

Ver. 4. **ἓν σῶμα καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα**: *There is one body and one Spirit.* This is not to be taken as part of the exhortation, **ἐστέ** or **γίνεσθε** being understood (Calv., Est., Hofm., etc.); for that would not be consistent with the following **εἷς Κύριος, εἷς Θεός**. It is a positive statement, made all the more impressive by the lack of **γάρ** or any connecting particle, and giving the objective ground, or basis in fact, on which the walk in lowliness, meekness, long-suffering and loving forbearance is urged, and of which it should be the result. The **σῶμα** is the whole fellowship of believers, the mystical body of Christ (*cf.* ii. 16; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, xii. 13; 1 Col.

s 1 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 7.

πνεῦμα, καθὼς καὶ[1] ἐκλήθητε [s]ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς [s]κλήσεως ὑμῶν· 5. εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, 6. εἷς θεὸς καὶ[2] πατὴρ

[1] και (after καθως) om. B 19, 32, 39, 43, 55, 114, 213-38, al., Vulg., Syr., Goth., Chr.$_1$, Ambrst.

[2] After θεος om. και 38, 47, 114, Syr., Ar.-erp., Eth., Chr.-text, Iren., Euseb.

i. 24). The **Πνεῦμα,** as in ii. 18, is the Holy Spirit who is in the Church and in whom we are "baptised into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). The idea that this great sentence means only that we are to be united so as to be one body and one soul, though supported by Calvin, is out of harmony with the larger scope of the following verses, and in any case stands or falls with the view that this verse is part of the exhortation.—**καθὼς καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν**: *even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling*. **καθὼς** (late Greek for the **καθά, καθό, καθάπερ** of the Atticists and the earlier writers; *cf.* under i. 4, iii. 3 above) illustrates and enforces the unity as something entirely in accordance with their calling, the **καί** marking this as a second thought suggested by the first. The **ἐν** may be *instrumental* (so Mey., referring to Gal. i. 6), the point then being that the calling came *by means* of one hope, *viz.*, that of the Messianic salvation. But it is rather = *in*, expressing the ethical domain or element in which the calling took place (Ell.). The **κλήσεως** is the gen. of *origin* or *efficient cause*, = the hope *originated* or *wrought* in you by your calling, as in i. 18 (Ell., Mey.); rather than the gen. of *possess.*, = the hope *belonging* to your calling. The fact that, when they were called out of heathenism, one and the same *hope* was born in them, is a fact in perfect keeping with the unity of the Christian body and the unity of the Divine Spirit operating in it, and the one confirms and illumines the other.

Ver. 5. **εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα**: *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*. "One Lord," that is Christ, He alone and He for all equally whether Gentile or Jew. "One faith," *i.e.*, one belief having Him as its object; **πίστις** having here its usual subjective sense of *saving trust*, not = that which is believed, the Christian *doctrine* or *creed* (Grot.)—a meaning which is at the best very rare in the NT and not quite certain even in most of the passages usually cited in support of it (Acts vi. 7; Gal. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 4, 19, ii. 7, iv. 1, 6, v. 8, vi. 10, 21), but most probable in Jude iii. 20. "One baptism"—the rite, one and the same for all, by which believers in Christ are admitted into the fellowship of His Church, and which is described as "into Christ" (Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27), into His *name* (Acts x. 38, 48, xix. 5), into the "name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). No mention is made of the Lord's Supper. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that elsewhere it is referred to as a token of unity (1 Cor. x. 17). Various explanations of the omission have been given—*e.g.*, the desire to preserve the rhythmical form of the sentence, together with the fact that the Lord's Supper did not as yet stand by itself, but was combined with ordinary Christian meals (Mey.); the fact that it was more a *representation* than a *condition* of unity (De Wette); the consideration that it is not like baptism an *initial*, *fundamental* rite, but one that comes to be observed after admission (Harl.). None of these reasons can be called satisfactory, nor have we the materials for an adequate explanation.

Ver. 6. **εἷς Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων**: *one God and Father of all*. This supreme name, **Θεὸς** or **ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατήρ,** is used both absolutely (1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Jas. i. 27), and with defining terms, *e.g.*, **τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,** i. x. (Rom. xv. 6; Eph. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3), **ἡμῶν** (Gal. i. 4; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. iii. 11, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 16), **πάντων** (here; *cf.* the longer designation **εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα,** 1 Cor. viii. 6). *Christian* unity being here in view, the name applies to the special Fatherhood of God in grace, not (with Holz., Abb.) to the universal Fatherhood of God and His relation to *all* men. Attention is rightly called by Mey. and others to the *advance* in the thought in these verses from *Church* to *Christ*, and from *Christ* to *God* who is One in the highest and most absolute sense—the One source of life and good in all His people, the one to whom both Christ and the Spirit are related.—**ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ διὰ πάντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν**: *who is over all, and through all, and in* [*you*] *all*. The **ὑμῖν** of the TR (following some cursives and

πάντων, ὁ [t] ἐπὶ πάντων[1] καὶ [u] διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.[2] 7. [v] ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν[3] ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ [w] μέτρον τῆς [x] δωρεᾶς τοῦ χριστοῦ. 8. διὸ [y] λέγει [z] Ἀναβὰς εἰς [a] ὕψος [b] ᾐχμαλώτευσεν[4] [c] αἰχ-

t Rom. ix. 5 al. u Constr., see Gal. i. 1; Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Rom. iii. 22; pec. to Paul. v Ver. 16 reff. w = Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. x. 13; vv. 14, 16; Paul only. x Ch. iii. 7 reff. y Gal. iii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 16; James iv. 6; Heb. x. 5. z Ps. lxvii. 18. a = Luke i. 78, xxiv. 49. b 2 Tim. iii. 6 only. c = Rev. xiii. 10 only; Num. xxi. 1; Jud. v. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 17.

[1] **ο επ. παντ.** om. 2, 46, Ps.-Ign., Cyr., Hil.

[2] After **πασιν** add **υμιν** some cursives, Ch., Thdrt., Theophyl., Oec.; **ημιν** DEFGKL 23, 37-9, 44-8, It., Vulg., Syr., Goth., al., Did., Dam., Iren., al.; **πασιν** alone, ℵABCO²P 17, 31, 67, 71, 73, 80, 109, 177, Copt., Eth., Arm., Marc., Orig., Euseb., etc.

[3] **υμων** B 38, 109, Thdrt.

[4] **ηχμαλωτευσας** AL 71, 114, al.₄, Eth. (and **εδωκας** after); **αιχμαλωτευσας** 47, 71.

Fathers), and the variant ἡμῖν (in DFKL, Lat., Syr., Goth., etc.) must be omitted (with LTTrWHRV) as having no support from BℵAC, 17, Copt., Eth., etc. The **πάντων** and the **πᾶσιν** are most naturally taken as masculines here, in harmony with the previous **πάντων**. The clause, therefore, expresses a three-fold relation of the One God and Father to the *all* who are His: *first*, the relation of *transcendence* (Mey.) or *sovereignty*—**ἐπί** (= **ὑπεράνω**, *over* or *above*) expressing the supremacy of absolute Godhead and Fatherhood; *second*, that of *immanence*—**διά** (= *through*) expressing the pervading, animating, controlling presence of that One God and Father; and *third*, that of *indwelling*—the **ἐν** expressing the constant abode of the One God and Father in His people by His Spirit. Neither the creative action of God (Est.), nor His providential rule (Chrys., Grot.), is in view, but what He is to the Christian people in His dominion over them and His gracious operative presence in them.

Ver. 7. **ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις**: *but unto each one of us was given the grace*. For ἡμῶν some few authorities (including, however, B) read ὑμῶν. After ἡ χάρις some few insert **αὕτη** (C², 31, etc.). The article before χάρις is omitted in BD¹FL, etc., but inserted in ℵACD³K, etc. The evidence is pretty evenly balanced. Hence WH bracket ἡ; TRV retain it; LTr omit it. The article defines **χάρις** as *the* grace of which the writer and his fellow-believers had experience, which they knew to have been given them (**ἐδόθη**), and by which God worked in them. What is given is not the **χάρισμα** but the **χάρις**, the subjective grace that works within and shows itself in its result—the *charism*, the gracious faculty or quality. The emphasis is on the **ἑκάστῳ**, and the **δέ** is rather the *adversative* particle than the transitional. It does not merely mark a change from one subject to another, but sets *the each* over against the *all*, and this in connection with the injunction to keep the unity of the Spirit. God's gracious relation to *all* is a relation also to each *individual*. Not one of them was left unregarded by Him who is the God and Father of all, but each was made partaker of Christ's gift of grace, and each, therefore, is able and stands pledged to do his part toward the maintenance of unity and peace. (*Cf.* Rom. xii. 6.)—**κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *according to the measure of the gift of Christ*. Statement of the *law* of the bestowal of grace. Each gets the grace which Christ has to give, and each gets it in the proportion in which the Giver is pleased to bestow it; one having it in larger measure and another in smaller, but each getting it from the same Hand and with the same purpose. The **δωρεᾶς** is the gen. of the *subject* or *agent*—the gift which Christ gives, as is shown by the following **ἔδωκε δόματα**.

Ver. 8. **διὸ λέγει**: *wherefore He saith, when He ascended on high*. The **διό** introduces the words which follow as a *confirmation* of what has just been said; and these words are not a parenthesis, but part of a direct and continuous statement; = "the fact that it is thus with Christ and His gift, and that the grace which we possess is bestowed by Him on each of us in varying measures as He distributes it, has the witness of God Himself in OT Scripture". The quotation which follows is obviously taken from Psalm lxviii. 18, and in the main in the form in which it is given in the LXX. There are difficulties in the rendering which Paul uses and in the application he makes of it. But they are not such as to

ustify the assertion that the passage is a quotation from some Christian hymn, and not from Scripture. There is nothing in the verse or in the context to suggest anything else than the Psalm. The question s raised whether the introductory λέγει is personal or impersonal; and whether, if personal, ὁ Θεός, or ἡ γραφή, or τὸ πνεῦμα is to be understood. OT quotations are usually introduced by the personal term in such forms as ὁ προφήτης λέγει (Acts ii. 17), ἡ γραφὴ λέγει (Rom. x. 17), Ἡσαΐας λέγει (Rom. x. 16, 20), Μωυσῆς λέγει (Rom. x. 19), Δαβὶδ λέγει (Rom. iv. 6), ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη λέγει (Rom. x. 6). Sometimes, again, passive forms are used, γέγραπται (Rom. x. 15), μαρτυρεῖται (Heb. vii. 17), etc. In other cases the simple φησί (1 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. viii. 15), εἴρηκε (Heb. iv. 4), or λέγει (Gal. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Eph. v. 8, v. 14) is used; and in one case the λέγει is introduced as continuing γέγραπται (Rom. xv. 10). Some, therefore, hold that, in cases like the present, λέγει is impersonal, = "it is said," as φησί is used impersonally in Attic (Abb.; *cf.* Light. on Gal. iii. 16). As the NT, however, makes a very limited use of impersonal verbs of any kind, most take these undefined verbs by which quotations are introduced as personal, and so it is with λέγει here. The subject to be supplied must be the one most readily suggested by the context; and here, as in most cases, that will be neither ἡ γραφή nor τὸ Πνεῦμα, but ὁ Θεός. The full formula λέγει ὁ Θεός occurs in Acts ii. 17, and is implied in the πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, "Σήμερον," ἐν Δαυεὶδ λέγων of Heb. iv. 7. It is also confirmed in some degree by the analogous mention of the *Holy Ghost* in Heb. x. 15 (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 656; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 75).—**Ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος**: *when He ascended on high*. In the Psalm the victorious Subject is addressed in the second person; here the "Thou" becomes "He". In the Psalm the ascent expressed by עָלִיתָ לַמָּרוֹם (= "Thou hast gone up to the height") is the triumphant ascent of the God of Israel to *Zion*, the place of His earthly rest, or (better) to heaven His proper habitation, after the victory He achieved for His people. Here it is the ascension of Christ to the right hand of God (*cf.* Acts ii. 33). The aor. part. has its most proper temporal orce, denoting something that preceded the main event in view. It means here, therefore, that Christ's ascension had taken place *before* He distributed the gifts of grace.—**ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν**: *He led captivity captive*. In the original שָׁבִיתָ שֶּׁבִי, the abstract αἰχμαλωσίαν (= "a body of captives") chosen according to a familiar usage (*cf.* Num. xxxi. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 11; see Win.-Moult., p. 282), instead of the concrete αἰχμαλώτους ("captives"), adds to the force of the sentence. The verb αἰχμαλωτεύω belongs to late Greek; it is pretty freely used in the LXX and the Apocrypha. The phrase is a general one, meaning nothing more than that He *made captives* (*cf.* Judges v. 12), and suggesting nothing as to who these captives were. Neither in the Psalm nor in Paul's use of it here is there anything to warrant the idea that the captives are the *redeemed* (Theod.), or *men in the bonds of sin on earth* (Harl.), or *souls detained in Hades* (Est., König, Delit., etc.). The most that the words themselves, or passages more or less analogous (1 Cor. xv. 25, 26) warrant us to say is that the *captives* are the *enemies* of Christ; just as in the Psalm they are the enemies of Israel and Israel's God. But these are left quite undefined, and the whole idea of the clause is subordinate to that next expressed, *viz.*, the giving of the gifts.—**καὶ ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**: *and gave gifts unto men*. The καί of the TR is found in BCℵ²D² KL, etc.; but is omitted in ℵ*AC²D*G, 17, etc. It is put in brackets by WH, and omitted by LT, but retained (on the whole rightly) by RV. Here the quotation diverges widely, both from the original Hebrew, which has לָקַחְתָּ מַתָּנוֹת בָּאָדָם (= "Thou hast received gifts among men"); and from the LXX which renders it ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ (or ἀνθρώποις). The idea in the Psalm is that of Jehovah, the Conqueror, *receiving* gifts, that is to say, *gifts of homage*; or, possibly, receiving the captured men themselves regarded as gifts or offerings, the בָּאָדָם being capable of that sense (*cf.* Ewald, *Aus. Lehrb. d. Hebr. Sprache*, § 287 *h*). The idea expressed here is that of the ascended Christ *giving* gifts to men; ἔδωκε being substituted for ἔλαβες, and τοῖς ἀνθρώποις for the generic ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ (or ἐν ἀνθρώποις).—Thus in order to suit the purpose of a testimony to the statement made regarding Christ and the gift of grace, the OT passage is materially changed. OT quotations introduced in the NT are given without much regard to the literal faithfulness with which

μαλωσίαν καὶ ἔδωκεν [d] δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.[1] 9. τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη, τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ [e] κατέβη[2] εἰς τὰ [f] κατώτερα[3] τῆς γῆς;

d Matt. vii. 11 ‖ Luke; Phil. iv. 17 only.
e = Rom. x. 7.
f Here only; Ps. lxii. 9.

[1] **εν ανθρωποις** FG, Orig., Euseb., Hil., Jer., etc.

[2] After **κατ.** insert **πρωτον** ℵ[3]BC[3]KLP, al., Vss., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst.-ms., Oec.-comm.; **προτερον** 120; ℵ*AC*DEFGO 17, 46, 67[2], 43, al., It., am., Copt., Sahid., Eth., Thdrt., Cyr., Chr.-comm., Oec.-text, Iren., Lucif., Hil., Jer., Aug., al.

[3] After **κατ τ.** insert **μερη** with ℵABCD[3]KLP, etc., vss. Orig.$_1$, all Aug.$_2$, al.; om. DEFG, d, e, g, Syr., Ar.-erp., Thdrt., Orig.$_1$, Iren.$_2$, Tert., Lucif., Hil., Ambrst., Jer.; **κατωτατα** Thdrt., Orig., Euseb., Cyr.

quotations are expected to be made in modern times; and in other passages made use of by Paul (*e.g.*, Rom. x. 6-10) we discover a remarkable liberty both in reproduction and in application. But in none is the change so great as in the present case. There is first the departure from the historical meaning of the Psalm; in which, however, this passage stands by no means alone. The Psalm in which this magnificent description of the victorious march of Israel's God occurs, celebrates the establishment of Jehovah's kingdom in the past and proclaims the certainty of its triumph over all enemies and in all nations in the future. It does this in connection with some great event in the history of Israel. All possible opinions have been expressed as to the particular occasion of the Psalm. It has been identified with the removal of the Ark to Zion in David's time (2 Sam. vi. 12, etc.; 1 Chron. xv.); with some unnamed victory of David or with David's victories generally; with the placing of the Ark in Solomon's Temple; with the victory of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram over Moab (2 Kings iii.; Hitzig); with the check given to the Assyrians in Hezekiah's time; with the consecration of the Temple of the Restoration (Ewald); with the return from the captivity (Hupfeld); with the struggle between Egypt and Syria for the possession of the Holy Land towards the close of the third century B.C.; with the victories of Jonathan or Simon in the Maccabean wars (Olsh.); with the struggle between Ptolemy Philometor and Alexander Balas (1 Macc. xiv.), etc. But all this uncertainty as to the particular date and occasion does not affect the fact that what is dealt with is some great passage in the history of the Jewish nation. The probabilities are that the Psalm belongs to the latter part of the Babylonian exile; but Paul passes by the actual historical intention of the words and puts on them a quite different sense. There is, *secondly*, the notable change from Jehovah *receiving* gifts to Christ *giving* gifts. Some have explained this by supposing that Pau followed a Hebrew text which read נתת, or some such form, instead of לקחת; but of this there is no evidence. It is possible, indeed, that the Apostle adopted a *traditional* version or interpretation of the passage which was familiar, and of which some indication is found in the Peshitta Syriac and the Chaldee Paraphrase (both having a rendering = "Thou didst give gifts to the children of men"). Something also may be said in support of the explanation that the לָקַח of the original, which is used elsewhere in the sense of *fetching* or taking *in order to give* (Gen. xviii. 5, xxvii. 13, xlii. 16, xlviii. 9, etc.), has that meaning here. But after all such explanations the fact remains that both the terms and the idea are changed. There is *thirdly* the Messianic interpretation. It is here that the justification of the change is found. The Psalm, there is good reason to believe, had been regarded as a Messianic Psalm; and the use made of it by Paul was in all probability in accordance with views of Messianic prophecy which had become current, and with a method of dealing with the OT which was generally understood. But in any case it is an *application* rather than an *interpretation* in the strict sense of the word that we have here. And the justification of such an application lies in the fact that the unknown event celebrated in the Psalm was a victory of the Theocratic King, and in that sense a part of that triumph of the Kingdom of God which was to be carried to its consummation by the Messiah.

Ver. 9. **Τὸ δέ, ἀνέβη, τί ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὅτι καὶ κατέβη πρῶτον**: *Now this, "He ascended," what is it but that He also*

descended [*first*]? The TR inserts πρῶτον, with B$\aleph^3$C^{3}KLP, most cursives, Syr., Vulg., Goth., Arm., etc. The omission of πρῶτον is supported by $\aleph$*AC*DG, 17, Boh., Sah., Eth., etc. The documentary evidence is pretty fairly balanced. The preponderance, however, on the whole, is on the side of the omission, especially in view of transcriptional probabilities. The word is deleted by LTTr; while WH and RV give it a place in the margin. The δέ has its usual *transitional* force, but with something added. It continues the thought, but does that in the form of an *explanation* or *application*; *cf.* Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 3; see also Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 303; Winer.-Moult., p. 553. What the precise point of the quotation is, and what the explanation amounts to which is thus introduced, are questions of no small difficulty. The answer will appear when the particular terms have been examined. The clause τὸ δέ, ἀνέβη is not to be taken as if Paul were limiting himself to a play upon the word. What follows shows that he had in view the historical fact expressed in the ἀναβάς, *viz.*, the Ascension. As in Matt. ix. 3; John x. 6, xvi. 17, the τί ἐστιν has the force of—*What does it mean? What is implied in the statement?* And the reply given by Paul in ὅτι καὶ κατέβη is that the *ascent* presupposes a previous *descent*. This of course is not given as an inference of universal application, but as one that holds good in the case in view, and one which gives Paul the warrant to use the quotation as he does. In the Psalm it was Jehovah that ascended, but that was only after He had first descended to earth in behalf of His people from His proper habitation in heaven. And so the Giver of gifts to whom Paul desires to direct his readers was One who had first come down to earth before He ascended. It was the belief of those whom Paul addressed (*cf.* the express statement in John iii. 13) that Christ's proper abode was in heaven. That belief is here taken for granted, and the conclusion consequently is drawn that the Giver who ascended is Christ.—εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς: *into the lower parts of the earth*. The *locality* or the *extent* of the descent is now defined. The question is whether the locality in view is this world as a scene of existence lower than heaven, or the under world as a deeper depth than earth itself. Does the sentence refer to Christ's *incarnation* and the subjection to which He humbled Himself on earth even unto death? Or does it point to His *descent to Hades*? And if the latter is the case, in what aspect and with what particular significance is His visit to the world of the dead presented? On these questions there has been and there continues to be great diversity of opinion. Both interpretations have large support. That the "lower parts of the earth" mean simply earth itself in distinction from heaven is the view of Calv., Grot., Mich., Winer, Harl., Thom., Reiche, de Wette, Hofm., Beyschlag, Schweitzer, Weiss, Pfleid., Bisping, Abb., Haupt and others. That they mean Hades is the view favoured by the Copt. and Eth. Versions, and by such interpreters as Iren., Tertull., Jer., Erasm., Estius, Beng., Rück., Olsh., Del., Bleek, Mey., Alf., Ell. (on the whole), etc. Those who adopt this latter view, however, are not wholly at one. The great majority indeed, especially among Patristic and Lutheran exegetes, understand Paul to affirm that Christ after His death made a manifestation of Himself in triumph to the world of the departed, and fulfilled a certain ministry there. That ministry is understood by some, especially among the Fathers, to have been concerned with the release of the souls of OT saints from the *Limbus Patrim*; by others, especially among certain classes of modern commentators, to have been a new proclamation of grace to the whole world of the departed or to certain sections of the dead; *cf.* Pearson on the *Creed*, *sub* Art. v.; Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 421, etc. But there are those, especially Calvinistic theologians, who take the writer to mean nothing more, if he refers to Hades at all, than that like other men Christ passed at death into the world of the departed and had experience there of the power of death for a time. Some (*e.g.*, Chrys., Theod., Oec.) are of opinion that the phrase points to the *death* or the *burial* of Christ, but do not press it beyond that. On the other hand, there are those (*e.g.*, Von Soden, Abb.) who take the descent to be to *earth* and not to Hades, but instead of identifying it with the incarnation regard it as *subsequent* to the ascension. What then is the most reasonable interpretation?

It must be said in the first place that neither grammar nor textual criticism gives a decisive answer. The τῆς γῆς may be taken equally well as the *appos.* gen., = "the lower parts which *are* or *make* the earth"; the *poss.* gen., = "the lower parts *belonging* to earth," Hades being conceived to be part of the earth, but its lower part; or the *comp.* gen., =

"the parts lower than the earth". But the *comparative* idea is not more pertinent to the one main line of interpretation than to the other. The **κατώτερα** may mean the parts lower than the earth itself, *i.e.*, Hades; but it may also mean the parts lower than heaven, *i.e.*, the earth. Nor does the variety in reading affect the sense, though much has been made of it. The word **μέρη** is inserted after **κατώτερα** by BℵCD[b]KLP, Syr.-P., Boh., Vulg., Arm., Chrys., etc. It is omitted by D*G, Goth., Eth., Iren., etc. It must be held, therefore, to belong to the text, but it is not inconsistent with either interpretation. The main arguments in favour of *Hades* being in view are these; that if *earth* were meant, it is difficult to understand why some simpler form such as **εἰς τὴν γῆν** or **εἰς τὴν γῆν κάτω** (Acts ii. 19) was not chosen; that the use of so singular a phrase as **τὰ κατώτερα,** which recalls the LXX rendering for תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, one of the OT expressions for the underworld, suggests at once that something lower than earth itself, a yet deeper depth, was intended (Mey.); that the accompanying phrases **ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν** and **ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα,** being expressions of largest extension, make it reasonable to give the widest possible sense also to the **κατώτερα**; and that justice is done to the peculiarity and the amplitude of the various expressions only by taking Paul's idea to be that as Christ rose in order to fill the whole world, He had first to pass in His victorious power through all the great divisions of the universe—heaven above, earth beneath, and even the subterranean world, in the assertion of His universal sovereignty. But there is much to be said on the other side. The superlative formula **τὰ κατώτατα** would have been more in point if the idea to be expressed had been that of a depth than which there was none deeper (Abb.), or that of a descent embracing all the several parts of the universe. In point of fact, too, it is not **τὰ κατώτερα,** but **τὰ κατώτατα,** that the LXX employs in reproducing the Hebrew תַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ. If *Hades* had been intended, it is strange that Paul did not select one or other of the more familiar and quite unambiguous phrases which are used elsewhere, *e.g.*, **ἕως ᾅδου** (Matt. xi. 23), **εἰς ᾅδου** (Acts ii. 27), or such a formula as **εἰς τὴν καρδίαν τῆς γῆς** (Matt. xii. 40), **εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον** (Rom. x. 7). It is also to be considered that, granting it is the *Ascension* and not merely the *Resurrection* of Christ that is expressed by the **ἀνέβη,** it was not from Hades, but from earth that He did ascend. Further, the point immediately in view is not any work that Christ did in the world and its several parts, but the identity of the Person who descended, and ascended, and gave gifts. This is made sufficiently clear by the repeated **αὐτός** (vv. 10, 11), and the idea of a Hades-visit or a Hades-ministry has no obvious relation to that. The great paragraph in Phil. ii. 5-10, which is in some sense a parallel, has also to be taken into account. There again the whole statement turns upon the two great ideas of the incarnation with the humiliation involved in it and the exaltation, and nothing is said about any visit of Christ to the underworld. Here, too, the whole idea of a descent to Hades appears to be foreign to the thought. It is not suggested by the passage in the Psalm; for there is not a word about Sheol in it. Neither is there any indication of it in the context in the Epistle. For there the bestowal of gifts is referred not to Christ's descent, but to His ascension, and no hint is given of any work done by Him in Hades with a view to that bestowal, or of any relation in which the world of the dead stands to His prerogative of *giving*. For these reasons we conclude that the phrase **τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς** means the *earth* as a scene of existence, lower than His native heavens, to which Christ descended.

Ver. 10. **ὁ καταβάς, αὐτός ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς**: *he that descended, he it is that also ascended* (or, *he himself also ascended*). It was the first thought of every Christian mind that Christ had come down from heaven to live and work among men on earth for their salvation. Founding on this Paul declares that He who descended, whom all knew to be Christ, He and no other was also the Person who ascended. So he reminds his readers of the source of all the gifts in operation in the Church or enjoyed by individual Christians—the ascended Christ. A peculiar force is claimed by some (Von Soden, Abb., Bruston) for the **καί** in **καὶ κατέβη.** It is argued that it represents the descent as *subsequent* to the ascent, and contemporaneous with the giving of the gifts. So the point is taken to be this—that the ascent would have been without a purpose unless it had been followed by a descent. This, it is thought, is the reason why Paul pauses to say that the ascending implied also a descending and that the Person in

g Ch. i. 21 reff. h Acts ii. 2, v. 28; = Rom. xv. 13. i Ch. i. 22 reff.

10. ὁ καταβὰς αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβὰς [g] ὑπεράνω πάντων [1] τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα [h] πληρώσῃ [2] τὰ πάντα. 11. καὶ αὐτὸς [i] ἔδωκεν τοὺς

[1] Omit, P 113 Thdrt., Euseb. [2] πληρ. εαυτω 47.

view not only ascended but also descended. Hence what is in the writer's mind here is held not to be the incarnation or humiliation of the pre-existent Christ, but the descent of the exalted Christ to His Church, supposed to be referred to also in such passages as ii. 17, iii. 17, v. 31, 32. But it is nowhere taught in the Pauline Epistles that a descent or a departure from heaven after the exaltation was necessary in order that the ascended Lord might bestow gifts upon His Church. The passages cited do not bear out any such idea. The first (ii. 17) does not refer to a coming of the glorified Christ; the second (iii. 17) speaks only of the spiritual presence of Christ in the heart; and the third (v. 31, 32) deals obviously with a "mystery" of *relations*, and has nothing to do with any coming of Christ out of heaven following on His ascension or required for the bestowal of His gifts. Nor is there any reason why the καί should have more than the familiar *additive* force.—**ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν**: *up above all the heavens.* So in Heb. vii. 27 our High Priest is described as ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος. There may be an allusion here to the Jewish ideas of a gradation of heavens, a series of *three* or, as the case rather appears to stand, *seven* heavens, with which the Pauline τρίτος οὐρανός (2 Cor. xii. 2) may also be connected; on the conceptions of a plurality of heavens which prevailed among the Jews, the Babylonians and other ancient peoples, see the writer's article on "Heaven" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. But the point of the phrase as we have it here is simply this—that whatever heavens there are or may be, Christ is above them all. So high has His ascension carried Him. It means the highest possible exaltation—the supremacy of One who shares in the sovereignty of God. For the term ὑπεράνω see on i. 21.—**ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα**: *that He might fill all things.* The use of the conj. with ἵνα after a past tense may be due to the fact that the "filling" is to be viewed as a continuous action (Ell., Alf.; *cf.* Klotz, *Devar.*, ii., p. 618), if it s not to be explained simply by the laxer employment of the conj. in NT Greek. The sense of *fulfilling* or *completing* has been given by many to the πληρώσῃ. Thus the idea has been taken by some to be that of the fulfilling of *prophecy* (Anselm, etc.), the *accomplishment* of all things that Christ had to do in His redeeming mission (Rück.), the *making of all perfect* (Oltr.), etc. But, as in i. 23, the verb has the sense of *filling*, and τὰ πάντα is to be taken again in its widest application, and is not to be restricted to the world of *believers* or to the Church of Jew and Gentile (Grot., Schenk., etc.). Nor is there anything to suggest that the *ubiquity* of Christ's body is in view, as some Lutherans have argued (Hunn., Calov., etc.). The idea that is in the paragraph is not that of a "diffused and ubiquitous corporeity," as Ellicott well expresses it, but that of a "pervading and energising omnipresence". The thought is the larger one that the object of Christ's ascension was that He might enter into regal relation with the whole world and in that position and prerogative bestow His gifts as He willed and as they were needed. He was exalted in order that He might take kingly sway, fill the universe with His activity as its Sovereign and Governor, and His Church with His presence as its Head, and provide His people with all needful grace and gifts. In OT prophecy to "fill heaven and earth" is the note of Deity (Jer. xxiii. 24).—We may be in a position now to determine Paul's object in introducing the passage from Ps. lxviii. and in applying it as he does. The general connection is clear enough. He bids his readers study lowliness, forbearance and unity, because there is one faith, one baptism, etc. They are not to be vexed or divided because one may have more of the gift of grace than another. All receive from Christ, each in his own way and measure as Christ wills; for, as the Psalm shows, all gifts come from Him. Now some take the point of the quotation to be this—He who is the subject of the Psalm is One whose seat is in heaven, a Sovereign Giver of gifts (Ell.). Others are of opinion that the words are cited in order to bring out the fact that Christ's bestowal of gifts "stands in necessary connection with His general position of

μὲν [k] ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ [k] προφήτας, τοὺς δὲ [l] εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ [m] ποιμένας καὶ [n] διδασκάλους, 12. πρὸς τὸν[1] [o] καταρτισμὸν τῶν

k Ch. iii. 5 reff.
l Acts xxi. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 5.
m John x. 2, etc., but = here only; see Jer. iii. 15; Ezek. xxxiv. passim.
n Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Heb. v. 12; James iii. 1.
o Here only.

[1] Omit τον 1, 109, 114, 121, 178.

filling the whole universe" (Mey.). But the case appears to be less involved than that, and to turn simply on the identification of the Person who is the source of the gifts. Paul has spoken of the grace as *given* (ἐδόθη, ver. 7), and he has quoted the words of the Psalm which say that "he gave gifts" (ἔδωκεν δόματα, ver. 8). But he has not *named* the Giver. Now he explains that the Giver is Christ; and that this is indicated by the Psalm itself, because it sings of One who went up on high, and of an ascent which presupposed a previous descent. Thus he identifies the subject of the Psalm with Christ; as elsewhere the Jehovah of the Prophets and the Psalms is identified with the Christ of the Apostles, and what is affirmed of the former in the OT is ascribed to the latter in the NT.

Ver. 11. **καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκε τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους**: *and He gave some Apostles.* That is, "He gave some *as* Apostles," or (with RV) "some *to be* Apostles". At this point Paul reverts to the statement in ver. 7, and having shown that the declaration in Ps. lxviii. applies to Christ, he proceeds to set forth the purpose (ver. 12) with which the gifts of the exalted Giver are bestowed and His grace given to such. But before he explains that purpose he specifies a series of gifts given with that in view. We have a somewhat similar enumeration in 1 Cor. xii. 28. But while the ruling idea there is that of *appointments* (ἔθετο) and the subject is *God*, here the particular idea is that of *gifts* (ἔδωκε) and the subject is Christ. Further, while the list in Ephesians begins with *Apostles*, *prophets*, *evangelists*, *teachers*, and continues in terms of *persons*, the statement in 1 Cor. takes note indeed of *Apostles*, *prophets*, and *teachers*, but thereafter passes from *persons* to *gifts* or *ministries*—miracles, healings, helps, governments, tongues. This has its significance, as we shall see. The αὐτός is again emphatic, = "he himself," "he and no other". The ἔδωκε is not to be taken as = ἔθετο, *appointed* or *set*. That it has proper sense of *gave* is clear from its relation to the preceding ἔδωκε δόματα. The "giving" refers to the *call* of the Church's Head, the point being the gift of Christ to the Church in the form of certain men chosen by Him and equipped by Him to do service toward the building up of His body and the bringing of all its members to the measure of the stature of His fulness. Further, the exhortation to unity (ver. 3) is still in view, Christ having given these "Apostles" and others in order that all His disciples may come to the unity of the faith (ver. 13). All through the statement, too, the primary thing is the *persons*, not the offices. Nothing is said of any special order or orders in the Church possessing exceptional prerogatives, or any office or rank to which peculiar or exclusive powers of grace were attached. The *men* are Christ's gifts to the Church and to every member of it; and they are given to do a certain work looking to a great end, *viz.*, to furnish His people and every individual believer among them (vv. 7, 16) for their particular service and their particular contribution to the building up of Christ's body. Nothing is said of the *time* when these gifts were given. But as they are the gifts of the exalted Christ, it is plain that the ἀποστόλους are not to be restricted to the original Twelve, but are to be taken in the wider sense, including not only Paul, but Barnabas (Acts xiv. 4, 14), probably James (1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. i. 19), Silvanus (1 Thess. ii. 6), perhaps also Andronicus and Junias (Rom. xvi. 7). The "Apostle" is described as one called by Christ (Gal. i. 1); one who has seen Christ and been a witness of His resurrection (1 Cor. ix. 1, 2; Acts i. 8, 21-23); one whose "signs" were "wrought . . . by signs, and wonders, and mighty works" (2 Cor. xii. 12); whose office also was not limited to a single church or locality, but was related to the world generally and to all the churches (Matt. xxviii. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 28). See also on chap. i. 1.—**τοὺς δὲ προφήτας**: *and some as prophets.* These are referred to along with the Apostles also in ii. 20, iii. 5, and in 1 Cor. xii. 28. With NT prophets we have also NT prophetesses. Agabus, those of Antioch Judas and Silas, the four daughters o Philip, are mentioned as having the gift of prophecy. As in the case of Agabus

ἁγίων, εἰς [p] ἔργον [q] διακονίας,[1] εἰς [r] οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ [s] σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ, 13. [t] μέχρι [u] καταντήσωμεν[2] [v] οἱ[3] [v] πάντες [u] εἰς τὴν

p q Here only.
q = Rom. xi. 13.
r = Rom. xiv. 19, xv. 2; Paul only.
s = 1 Cor. xii. 27; Col. ii. 17.
t Constr., here only; see Mark xiii. 30.
u Acts xvi. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 36; Phil. iii. 11; = Paul only.
v 1 Cor. x. 17 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal v. 14; Phil. ii. 21; Paul only; τὰ πάντα passim.

[1] Insert της before διακονιας D*FG.

[2] καταντησομεν 44-8, 72, 113, 219, Chr.; καταντησωμεν Clem., Orig., etc.; καταντησω FG.

[3] οι om. DFG, Clem.$_1$, Orig.$_1$.

this gift of prophecy included the prediction of events (Acts xi. 28, xxi. 10), but its chief function was edification. The prophets were preachers or exhorters, to whom revelations of spiritual truth were imparted, and who spoke in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι; Eph. iii. 5; Apoc. i. 10), but not in ecstacy or as one in a trance (ἐν ἐκστάσει, Acts x. 10, xxii. 17). Further, he was usually, if not always, itinerant. This order of prophets continued to have a place in the Church for a considerable period. Large mention is made of it in the *Didaché*, and in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, v., 17, reference is made to Quadratus and Ammia in Philadelphia. This may take the order on to Hadrian's time; *cf.* Selwyn, *The Christian Prophets*, and Gwatkin's article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, iv., p. 127. See also on ii. 20 above.—τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς: *and some as evangelists.* In 1 Cor. xii. 28 the *evangelist* is not mentioned. Here he is distinguished from the *Apostle* and the *prophet* and named as the third in the order of Christ's gifts to the Church. The εὐαγγελιστής is mentioned only twice again in the NT, *viz.*, in Acts xxi. 8, where Philip, one of the seven deacons is so designated; and 2 Tim. iv. 5, where Timothy is charged to "do the work of an evangelist". Like the *prophets* the *evangelists* were generally itinerant preachers or missionaries, though sometimes they had a stated place of abode or ministry. The term seems, therefore, to belong to the Pauline vocabulary. These *evangelists* were inferior to the Apostles, assisting them or delegated by them, but without their authority. They had the gift (χάρισμα) of the Spirit, as in the case of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); but, if we may judge by Philip's case (Acts viii. 5-18), they could not impart the Holy Ghost. Nor do they seem to have had the special revelations which were given to the prophets.—τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους: *and some as pastors and teachers.* The ποιμένες and διδάσκαλοι are distinguished from the former orders as being connected with particular churches, resident and not missionary or itinerant. The absence of the τοὺς δέ before διδασκάλους indicates also that the ποιμένες and the διδάσκαλοι were not two distinct orders, but designations of the same men (*cf.* the πρεσβύτεροι or ἐπίσκοποι; Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25, v. 2), in different functions, the former defining them according to their office of oversight, the latter according to their office of instruction and guidance. The ποιμήν would naturally also be a διδάσκαλος; but there is not the same reason for supposing that every διδάσκαλος would also be a ποιμήν. Nothing is said here of πρεσβύτεροι, ἐπίσκοποι, διάκονοι. The absence of such official terms points perhaps to the comparatively early date of the Epistle.

Ver. 12. πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων: *with a view to the full equipment of the saints.* The object with which Christ gave some men as Apostles, and some as prophets, etc., is now stated in a sentence consisting of three clauses. The precise construction and meaning of these clauses are by no means easy to determine. The main difficulty is the relation in which they stand to each other and to the preceding ἔδωκε. What that relation is will be best seen when the several terms have been examined. The sentence begins with πρός, but the two clauses which follow are introduced each by εἰς. Little can be made, however, of that. The nice distinctions of the classical period were not maintained in later Greek; and, while Paul's use of prepositions is for the most part remarkably precise, it is his habit to vary them, without any obvious difference in sense. Especially is this his way with those of kindred meaning and followed by the same case: *cf.* εἰς and πρός in Rom. iii. 25, and see Win.-Moult., pp. 512, 513. The noun καταρτισμός occurs only here in the NT; in 2 Cor. xiii. 9 we have κατάρτισις. The verb καταρτίζω which is found more frequently and expresses

the general idea of making ἄρτιος, *fit, complete*, is used in the sense of *repairing* literally (Matt. iv. 21; Mark i. 19), *restoring* in a spiritual or disciplinary sense (Gal. vi. 1), *perfecting* or *making perfect* (Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10, etc.), and also in that of *preparing, furnishing, equipping* (Polyb., i., 47, 6; v., 2, 11; Hdt. ix. 66; Luke vi. 40; Heb. x. 5, xi. 3, also Rom. ix. 22, with εἰς). The noun, therefore, may well have the meaning of *equipment* here.—**εἰς ἔργον διακονίας**: *for the work of ministration*. ἔργον has the simple sense of *business*—the work done in ministration. διακονίας is taken by most in the specific sense of *ministerial* service, service of an *official* kind in the Church. But, while this is a very frequent use (Acts i. 17, 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19; Rom. xi. 13, xii. 7, etc.), the word has also the more general sense of *service* (Heb. i. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Its cognates διακονέω, διάκονος have also the same sense (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; John xii. 26; Acts xix. 22; Phil. 13; Col. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 4, xi. 15, etc.). It is quite legitimate, therefore, to give the noun here the non-official sense, if the contest points to that. This also is in harmony with the *anarthrous* διακονίας.—**εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: *for the building up of the body of Christ*. *Cf.* πρὸς οἰκοδομήν in iv. 29, and πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας in 1 Cor. xiv. 12. The two figures of the Church as a *building* and a *body* are combined here. But in what relation do these clauses stand to each other and to the ἔδωκε? This is very differently put. Some take them to be three *parallel* or *coordinate* clauses dependent on ἔδωκε, as if = "Christ gave some as Apostles, and some as prophets, etc., with a view to these three things—the perfecting of the saints *and* the work of the ministry, *and* the edifying of the body of Christ. So substantially Chrys., Theophy., Oec., Calv., Beng., Klöp., etc., and the AV. To this it is objected that the εἰς ἔργον διακονίας would occupy an awkward position, and that the natural order would have been εἰς ἔργον διακονίας, πρὸς καταρτισμὸν, etc. With this sense of maladjustment of the clauses some (Grot., etc.) have even supposed a trajection. Others (Lachm., Harl., Tisch., Bleek, Hofm., Mey., Von Soden, Ell., Alf., Abb., etc.) take the second and third clauses, each introduced by εἰς, to be parallel to each other, and directly dependent on the ἔδωκε. They thus express the *immediate* object, while πρὸς καταρτισμὸν κ.τ.λ. denotes the *ultimate* end; as if = "Christ, with a view to the full, final perfecting of the saints, gave Apostles, prophets, etc. for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ". But this gives a somewhat awkward and involved construction, and reduces the force of the third clause, which would naturally be expected to bring us to the larger, ultimate purpose of Christ's giving. Olshausen modifies this interpretation to the effect of taking the second and third clauses as subdivisions of the first, = "Christ gave Apostles, etc., for the perfecting of the saints, on the one hand for the fulfilment of the teacher's office, and on the other hand, as regards the hearers, for edification". But no such distinction is in view here between *teachers* and *hearers*, the subjects being the ἅγιοι generally. None of these adjustments of the clauses quite meets the case. The proper construction, recognised so far by Erasm., Luther, De Wette, Rückert, Weiss, and more recently accepted by Haupt, is the simplest. It takes the sentence to be dependent as a whole on the ἔδωκε, and understands the three clauses as successive, the first looking to the second, the second to the third, the third forming the climax and expressing the ultimate object of the giving on the part of the ascended Christ. Thus the sense becomes—"Christ gave some men as Apostles, some as prophets, etc., with a view to the full equipment of the saints for the work of ministration or service they have each to do in order to the building up of the body of Christ". The building up of the Church—that is the great aim and final object; to that every believer has his contribution to make; and to qualify all for this is the purpose of Christ in giving "Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers". In this way each clause fits in naturally with the next, and the ultimate object is expressed last. This, too, is the only construction which does justice to the ἑνὶ δὲ ἑκάστῳ at the beginning of the statement (ver. 7) and the ἑνὸς ἑκάστου at its close. These are the terms which convey the ruling idea, *viz.*, that each member gets the gift of grace, and each has his part to do towards that upbuilding of the Church which is the great object of Christ's bestowments; and these Apostles, prophets, etc., are the means provided by Christ whereby all the members shall be made capable of performing their several parts in order that at last the whole Church may be built up in its completeness as the body of Christ.

ʷ ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ˣ ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ[1] εἰς ʸ ἄνδρα ʸ τέλειον, εἰς ᶻ μέτρον ᵃ ἡλικίας τοῦ ᵇ πληρώματος τοῦ

w Ver. 3 only. x Ch. i. 17 reff. y James iii. 2; see Col. i. 28, iv. 12. z Ver. 7 reff. a = Luke ii. 52, xix. 3 only; John ix. 21 b Ch. i. 21.

[1] τ. υιου om. FG, Clem.₁, Lucif.

Ver. 13. **μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἑνότητα**: *until we all attain unto the unity*. The AV wrongly makes it "come in"; Tynd., "grow up unto"; Cran., better, "come to". But best, "arrive at," or (with RV) "attain unto". The statement of the great object of Christ's gifts and the provision made by Him for its fulfilment is now followed by a statement of the *time* this provision and the consequent service are to last, or the point at which the great end in view is to be realised. It is when the members of the Church have all come to their proper unity and maturity in their Head. The tendency of late Greek to use the subj. without **ἄν**, especially after temporal particles, renders it doubtful whether much may be made of the unconditioned **μέχρι** here. The absence of **ἄν**, however, and the use of the *subj.*, seem to point to the event as *expected*, and not as a mere hypothetical possibility; *cf.* Mark xiii. 30; and see Hartung, *Partikl.*, ii., p. 291; Hermann, *Part.*, **ἄν**, p. 66; Win.-Moult., pp. 378, 387. **καταντάω**, followed in NT by **εἰς**, elsewhere also by **ἐπί**, conveys the idea of arriving at a goal (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 7; Phil. iii. 11), the aor. subj. also having the force of "shall have attained". **οἱ πάντες** evidently refers not to men generally, but to *Christians* and to these in their totality. The article goes appropriately with the **ἑνότητα**, the unity in view being the *definite* unity denoted by the words that follow.—**τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God*. **τοῦ υἱοῦ** is the *gen. obj.*, and it is best taken as dependent on both nouns. Some (*e.g.*, Haupt), however, are of opinion that the repetition of the article before **ἐπιγνώσεως** implies that the **τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ** is dependent only on the latter. The **καί** shows that the **ἐπιγνώσεως** is not an epexegesis of the **πίστεως**; and the **πίστις** (here in its usual Pauline sense of trusting, saving faith) and the **ἐπίγνωσις** express distinct, though related, ideas (*cf.* Phil. iii. 9, 10; 1 John iv. 16). The *unity* in view, therefore, is oneness in faith in Christ and oneness also in the full experimental knowledge of Him. The point of the clause is not any unity between faith and knowledge themselves, to the effect, *e.g.*, of rising from the former to the latter as a higher Christian endowment (Olsh.), but a unity which shall make all the members of Christ's body at one in believing in Him and knowing Him. The title **υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ** as applied to Christ occurs frequently in the Pauline as well as in the Johannine writings, but never in 2 Thess., Phil., Philem., or the Pastoral Epistles. In passages like the present, if they stood by themselves, it might be difficult to say whether the metaphysical, the theocratic, or the ethical idea is in view. But the analogy of such statements as those in Rom. i. 4, viii. 3, 32; Gal. iv. 4, and the general Pauline conception of Christ as a transcendent Personality, different from men as such, and to be named together with God, point to a relation to God in respect of nature as the force of the designation here.—**εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον**: *unto a perfect man*. **τέλειος**, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6, xiv. 20; Heb. v. 14, and as is suggested by the subsequent **νήπιοι**, means *perfect* in the sense of *full grown*. The state in which *unity* is lacking is the stage of immaturity; the state in which oneness in faith and knowledge is reached is the state of mature manhood in Christ (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 11). The singular **ἄνδρα** instead of **ἄνδρας** is appropriately used (as we have already had **ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος**) when the idea of *unity* is in view. The goal to be reached is that of a new Humanity, regenerated and spiritually mature in all its members.—**εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας**: *unto the measure of the stature*. A clause in apposition to the former, further defining the **τέλειον**, and giving a fuller and yet more precise description of the goal which is to be reached. Is **ἡλικίας**, however, to be rendered *age* or *stature?* The noun appears to have both senses. In Luke xix. 3 it is certainly = *stature*, and probably so also in Luke ii. 52; while in John ix. 21, 23 it is clearly = *age*, and most probably so also in Matt. vi. 27 and Luke xii. 25, altho the latter two are held by some to be referable to the other meaning; *cf.* Field,

χριστοῦ, 14. ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν [c] νήπιοι, [d] κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ [e] περι-φερόμενοι παντὶ [f] ἀνέμῳ τῆς [g] διδασκαλίας ἐν τῇ [h] κυβείᾳ [1] τῶν

c = 1 Cor. iii. 1 Paul.
d Here only; Isa. lvii. 20 vat.; Jos., *Antt.*, ix., 11, 3.
e = Heb. xiii. 9; Jude 12; Eccl. vii. 8.
f Matt. xi. 7; Jude 12.
g (Matt. xv. 9, Mark); Col. ii. 22 Paul only; Prov. ii. 17.
h Here only.

[1] κυβεια AB³CD³EKL, etc.; κυβια ℵB*D*FGO²P, Euthal., etc.

Otium Norv., iii., p. 4. The adj. ἥλικος in the NT has the idea of *magnitude* Col. ii. 1; James iii. 5), and that is its most frequent sense in non-Biblical Greek. Much depends, therefore on the context. The antithesis between τέλειον and νήπιοι favours the idea of *age* (so Mey., Harl., Abb., etc.). But the idea of *stature* is suggested by the μέτρον, the πληρώματος, the αὐξήσωμεν and the αὔξησιν, and is on the whole to be preferred (so Syr., Goth., Copt., Eth. prob., AV., RV., Erasm., Grot., Beng., Rück., Alf., Ell., etc.).—τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ: *of the fulness of Christ.* The πλήρωμα here is taken by some in the sense of *perfection*. So Rück., who makes it "the perfection possessed by Christ," and Oltramare who renders it "the measure of the height of the perfection of Christ". But τελείοτης is one idea, and πλήρωμα another. Not less foreign to the real meaning of the noun are such interpretations as "the gracious presence of Christ" (Harl.); "the perfect age of Christ" (Luth.; *cf.* Calvin's *plena aetas*); "the stature of the *full grown Christ*," etc. Nor can the phrase be taken as a designation of the *Church* (Storr; also Baur, who holds it = that with which Christ fills Himself or is completed, *i.e.*, the Church). For that would give the incongruous idea that we are to *attain to the Church*. The Χριστοῦ is the *poss. gen.*, and the phrase means the fulness that belongs to Christ, the sum of the qualities which make Him what He is. These are to be imaged in the Church (*cf.* i. 23), and when these are in us we shall have reached our maturity and attained to the goal set before us. Thus the whole idea will be this—"the measure of the age, or (better) the stature, that brings with it the full possession on our side of that which Christ has to impart—the embodiment in us the members, of the graces and qualities which are in Him the Head". It has also been asked whether the goal thus set before us is regarded as one to be reached in our present temporal life by way of development, or one to be attained to only in the future life. As between these two ideas the preference must be given (with Chrys., Oec., Jer., Luth., de Wette, etc.) to the former, in view of the general tenor of the exhortation introducing the paragraph, the point of iii. 19, the place given to *unity* and *maturity*, etc. So Mey. thinks it refers to the Christian condition to be reached "after the last storms and before the Parousia". Not a few of the Fathers, however, take the *resurrection* to be specially in view, and interpreters like Theod., Calv., etc., think it looks to the perfected life of the other world. But Paul gives no clear indication of the *time*, and it may be, therefore, that he has in view only the goal itself and the attainment of it at whatever time that may take effect.

Ver. 14. ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι: *that we may be no longer children.* Statement of *aim* following on the previous statement of *goal* or *limit*. The verse is regarded by some (Harl., etc.) as connected immediately with vv. 11, 12, and *coordinate* with ver. 13. Others understand it as an explanation of what the *attainment* of the goal spoken of in ver. 13 means. But it is best to take it as *subordinate* to the immediately preceding statement. That is to say, as ver. 13 has set forth the *goal* to be reached and the *limit* put upon the bestowal of the gifts referred to as given by Christ, this verse now gives the purpose which was in view in setting such a goal before us and in giving the gifts of Apostles, prophets, etc. (Mey., Ell., etc.). That purpose looks to a *change* which has to take place in us from the condition of νήπιοι and κλυδωνιζόμενοι to that of ἀληθεύοντες, αὐξάνοντες, etc. The μηκέτι implies something different from the existing condition, and that existing condition, we see, is one of immaturity, assailed, wavering faith, and subjection to the distracting influence of false teachers. In his address to the elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 29) Paul had spoken of "grievous wolves" that would enter the Ephesian Church after his departure. But the statement here is wide enough to apply to the Church generally and not merely to the Ephesians. νήπιοι, literally *infants*

(Matt. xxi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 11), and then *minors* (Gal. iv. 1), the *immature* or *untaught* (Matt. xi. 25; Rom. ii. 20; Heb. v. 13, etc.).—**κλυδωνιζόμενοι**: *tossed to and fro.* **κλύδων** means a dashing or surging wave (Luke viii. 24; James i. 6; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm's *Lex.*, *sub voce*); and **κλυδωνιζόμενοι** means tossed about by waves (*cf.* LXX of Isa. lvii. 20). In the changefulness and agitation which were the results of their unthinking submission to false teaching their **νηπιότης** or lack of Christian manhood was seen.—**καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας**: *and carried about by every wind of doctrine.* The **ἀνέμῳ** is the *instrum.* dat.; the article **τῆς** denotes that doctrine in the abstract is meant—"every kind and degree of it" (Ell.). **διδασκαλία** means *teaching*, either in the sense of *instructing* (Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17; 2 Tim. iii. 10, 16; Tit. ii. 7), or in that of *doctrine*, the thing taught (1 Tim. i. 10, iv. 6, vi. 1, 3; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1, 10). Here AV, RV, Ell., etc., take the second sense. "In the fact that now this, now that, is taught according to varying tendencies, there blows, now this, now that, *wind of doctrine*" (Mey.) —**ἐν τῇ κυβείᾳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: *in the sleight of men.* For **κυβείᾳ** TWH give the form **κυβίᾳ.** The prep. may be the *instrumental* **ἐν** (so Mey., Haupt, etc.). But the contrast with the following **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (ver. 15) points rather to the usual force of **ἐν** as = *in* (so Vulg., Copt., etc.), the **κυβεία** being the "*element*, the evil *atmosphere*, as it were, *in* which the varying currents of doctrine exist and exert their force" (Ell.). **κυβεία** means *dice-playing* (*e.g.*, in Plato, *Phaedr.*, p. 274 D), and then *deception, fraud.* Some (*e.g.*, Beza, Von Soden, etc.) give it the sense of *levity*, or *putting at stake*—a shade of meaning occasionally expressed by the verb **κυβεύειν** (*e.g.*, Plato, *Prot.*, p. 314 A). The idea expressed here by the **κυβεία** itself might be simply that of *hazard*, *unsettlement*, with reference to the *uncertainties* into which the **νήπιοι** were cast by the diverse forms of false teaching under which they fell (*cf.* Haupt). But it is in the character, not of *gamesters*, but *deceivers* that the false teachers are immediately presented (*cf.* Mey.). This "sleight of men" is in contrast with "the faith and the knowledge *of Christ*," or it may be with the pure, sure word of God by which the faith and knowledge of the Son of God came.—**ἐν πανουργίᾳ πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης**: *in craftiness with a view to the machination of error.* The renderings of the great Versions show how difficult it is to do justice to this sentence in English. The AV takes refuge in a paraphrase, "and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive". Wicl. gives "to the deceiving of error"; Cov., "to the deceitfulness of error"; Bish., "in craftiness to the laying in wait of error"; Rhem., "to the circumvention of error"; RV, "in craftiness, after the wiles of error". The Vulg. has *in astutia ad circumventionem erroris.* **πανουργία,** used in 1 Cor. iii. 19, of a *false wisdom*, means here, as in classical and also in later Greek, *cunning*, *knavishness*, *treacherous deceitfulness.* The **ἐν πανουργίᾳ** is taken by some as a definition of the **ἐν κυβείᾳ,** adding to the idea of *hazard* and *destruction* contained in the latter, the idea of *fraud.* But it is rather a distinct clause, emphasising the dishonesty and trickery of the false teaching. Its authors used all the arts of deception to persuade the **νήπιοι** that their self-made doctrine was the Divine truth. The prep. **πρός** is not to be identified with **κατά** (= *after*, *according to*), but has its sense of *with a view to*, *furthering*, *tending to.* The noun **μεθοδεία** (or **μεθοδία** according to TWH) is nowhere found in the NT except here and once again in this same Epistle (vi. 11), and seems not to occur in non-Biblical Greek, whether that of the LXX or that of the Classics. Its meaning here, however, may be safely taken to be *trickery*, *cunning arts*, *treacherous wiles*; as its verb **μεθοδεύω,** which means primarily to *pursue a plan*, whether *honest* (Diod. Sic., i., 81), or *dishonest* (Polyb., xxxiv., 4, 10), came to have the sense of *following craftily*, practising *deceitful devices* (Diod., vii., 16; 2 Sam. xix. 27). The gen. **πλάνης** is usually taken as the *gen. subj.*, = the **πλάνη** which practises craft. But it may rather be the *gen. obj.*, expressing the *object* or *result* of the **μεθοδεία,** = "the cunning art that works to error". The article gives the noun the abstract sense or the force of a personification, = Error. Here, as elsewhere, **πλάνη** has the passive sense of *error*, not the active sense of *seduction*, or *misleading* (Luth., de Wette, etc.). But the question remains as to the precise idea here. The term means properly speaking *error* in the sense of *straying from the way*, *wandering hither and thither.* That sense is frequent in classical Greek—Aeschyl., Eurip., Plato, etc. In the NT the word is usually said to be used of *mental* error, wrong opinion, as *e.g.*, in 1 Thess. ii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 18, iii. 17; Jude 11; 1 John iv. 6.

ἀνθρώπων, ἐν [l] πανουργίᾳ [1] πρὸς τὴν [k] μεθοδείαν [2] τῆς [l] πλάνης,[3]
15. [m] ἀληθεύοντες [4] δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ [n] αὐξήσωμεν [n] εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα,

i = Luke xx. 23; 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3 only; Josh. ix. 4. k Ch. vi. 11 only, see 2 Kings xix. 27; Polycarp. ad Phil., 7; 2 Macc. xiii. 18. l Matt. xxvii. 64; Rom. i. 27; Prov. xiv. 8. m Gal. iv. 16 only; Gen. xlii. 16. n Ch. ii. 21.

[1] Insert τῃ before πανουργια FG 39, 116.

[2] μεθοδειαν B[3]CD[3]E, etc., Chr., etc.; μεθοδιαν ℵB*D*FGKLO[2], etc., Euth.; τας μεθοδιας A.

[3] After πλαν. add του διαβολου A.

[4] For αληθ. δε, αληθιαν δε ποιουντες FG.

But it is doubtful whether that sense fully meets the case in some of the passages thus cited, *e.g.*, 1 John iv. 6. In such passages as Rom. i. 27; James i. 20, it denotes error in practice, a wrong way of life or action. This seems to be its force here. Consequently the idea of the clause is more definite than "in craftiness tending to the settled system of error" (Ell.). It means "in craftiness, furthering the scheming, deceitful art which has for its result the false way of life that strays fatally from truth."

Ver. 15. **ἀληθεύοντες δέ**: *but truthing it.* A participial clause qualifying the following **αὐξήσωμεν** and introducing the positive side of the change in view as contrasted with the negative aspect of the same in the **μηκέτι** clause. The **δέ** has the force of "but rather" or "but on the other hand". *Opposition* of one thing to another is usually expressed by **ἀλλά**; but the advers. **δέ** is also used at times with that force, with the difference, however, that **δέ** *connects* while it contrasts or opposes; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 551. The precise meaning of **ἀληθεύοντες** is disputed. The RV marg. makes it "dealing truly"; but that is a doubtful sense. Calvin takes it = *veritati operam dare*; Rückert, "holding fast the truth"; Ell., "holding the truth"; Olsh., "walking in truth"; Alf., "being followers of truth". But in classical Greek the verb seems to mean to *speak truth* as opposed to **ψεύδεσθαι** (Plato, *Rep.*, p. 589 c; Xen., *Anab.*, i., 7, 18, iv., 4, 15, etc.), and that is its sense also in Gal. iv. 16. It is best to take it here, too, as = "speaking truth"; or more definitely "confessing the truth". The point of this brief, but significant clause, therefore, may be this —these Ephesians had learned the saving truth (**ἡ ἀλήθεια**; *cf.* Gal. ii. 5, 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 22; Heb. x. 26, etc.) of Christ. They had been exposed to the treacheries and risks of false teaching. Christ had given them Apostles, prophets, and evangelists to secure them against all teachers of craft, and they are here charged to continue to confess the truth in which they had been instructed and so grow to the maturity of the Christian life. —**ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *in love.* The question is— to what is this to be attached? It is connected by many (Syr., Eth., Theophy., Oecum., Erasm., Calv., Rück., Bleek, de Wette, Alf., AV, RV, etc.) with the **ἀληθεύοντες**, and it is taken to express the idea that love is the element in which truth is to be spoken (or the truth confessed), if it is to conduce to unity and brotherliness. This construction is supported by the considerations that the simple **ἀληθεύοντες δέ** would be somewhat bald if it stood wholly by itself; that it is natural to associate *love* and *truth*; that the position of **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** *after* the **ἀληθεύοντες** and also the parallel structure of ver. 14 point to this connection; and that we thus get a contrast between **πανουργία** and **ἀγάπη** and again between **πλάνη** and **ἀληθεύειν**. The main argument for connecting the clause rather with the following **αὐξήσωμεν** (= "but speaking truth (or rather, confessing the truth) may in love grow up") is the fact that in ver. 16, where the climax is reached, **ἐν ἀγάπῃ** qualifies the main thought—that of the *growth* or the *edification* of Christ's body. This is a consideration of such weight as to throw the probability on the whole on the side of the second connection (Mey., Alf., Haupt, etc.).—**αὐξήσωμεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα**: *may grow up unto him in all things,* **αὐξήσωμεν,** which is under the regimen of the **ἵνα,** has here, as in ii. 21 and in various other passages of the NT, the intr. sense of *growing*. In earlier classical Greek it meant to *cause to grow*. That sense it has in the LXX and also occasionally in the NT (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7; 2 Cor. ix. 10), while the pass. is used to express *growing*. But from Arist. onwards it came also to have the *intr.* sense. Meyer takes **εἰς αὐτόν** to mean simply "*in reference* to him". The idea then would be that it is only by being *in relation* to Christ that

o Ch. i. 22 reff. p Ch. ii. 21 only. q Col. ii. 19 only; Isa. xl. 14 al. r Col. ii. 19 only. s Phil. i. 19 only

ὅς ἐστιν ἡ [o] κεφαλή, χριστός,[1] 16. ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα [p] συναρμολογούμενον καὶ [q] συμβιβαζόμενον διὰ πάσης [r] ἁφῆς τῆς [s] ἐπιχορηγίας

[1] ο Χρ. DG, etc.; omit ο ℵABC 17, 67[2], 73, Bas., Cyr., Did., Dam.

we can grow. But while it is true that the growth which is set before us as our aim depends wholly on our remaining in living relation to Christ, the phrase εἰς αὐτόν can scarcely bear this out, but, as restricted by Meyer, would mean only "as regards him". The εἰς αὐτόν must have a more definite sense. It might mean "into him" (AV, RV, Ell., etc.), in the sense of becoming wholly *incorporated* in Him, or made one with Him, or in the sense of growing till our life has "its centre *in* Him," as Ell. would put it. But this is an idea difficult to grasp, and not quite in harmony with the conception of Christ as *Head*. For the members to grow *into* the head is not a congruous idea. It is best, therefore, to give εἰς the sense of "unto," Christ the Head being the *end* and *object* of the growth of the members. This means more than that we are to grow into *resemblance* to Him, or that our growth is be according to His *example*. It means that as He is the source *from* which (ἐξ οὗ, ver. 16) the grace or power comes that makes it possible for us to grow, He is also the *object* and *goal* to which our growth in its every stage must look and is to be directed. This is more in harmony with the previous εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον and εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας, κ.τ.λ. The *extent* or *scope* of this growing into Christ is expressed by τὰ πάντα (the acc. of *def.* or acc. of *quantitative* object.; *cf.* Krüger, *Sprachl.*, § 46, 5, 4), = in all that belongs to our growth; in all the power and circumstances of our growth. The simple πάντα is so used in 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2. Here τὰ πάντα is in place, the idea being, as Meyer rightly observes, the definite idea of *all the points in which we grow*.—ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή, ὁ Χριστός: *who is the head even Christ*. With DGKL, Chrys., etc., the TR reads ὁ Χριστός. The article is rightly omitted, however, by LTTrWHRV on the authority of the oldest and best MSS., BℵAC, with Bas., Cyr., etc. Instead of the ordinary form of direct apposition εἰς αὐτὸν, Χριστόν, the relative form is adopted, probably with a view both to emphasis, and to definiteness in the connection with ἐξ οὗ, κ.τ.λ. Such constructions were usual in Greek of all periods; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 665; also 2 Cor. x. 13; Plato, *Apol.*, p. 41 A; Eur., *Hec.*, 764.

Ver. 16. ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα: *from whom the whole body*. Statement of the relation of the *whole*, following that already made regarding the several members. πᾶν τὸ σῶμα looks back on the οἱ πάντες. The ἐξ has its proper force of *origin* (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 1, xiii. 4, and especially the precise parallel in Col. ii. 19), and cannot be reduced to mean *per quem* (Morus., etc.). All growth in the body has its source in Christ, the Head.—συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον: *being fitly framed together and compacted*. Or, as RV, "fitly framed and knit together". The participles are presents, as expressing a process that is going on. For the former see on chap. ii. 21 above. The latter, to which TWH give the form συνβιβαζόμενον, expresses the general idea of *putting together*, but with various shades of meaning, *e.g.*, reconciling one to another (Herod., i., 74); *considering* or *concluding* (Acts xvi. 10); *demonstrating* (Acts ix. 22); *instructing* (1 Cor. ii. 16); and (as here and in Col. ii. 19) *compacting* or *knitting together* into one whole. Distinctions have been drawn between the two terms; *e.g.*, by Bengel, who took the συναρμολογουμένη to express specially the *harmony* of the building and the συμβιβαζόμενον its solidity; and by Ellicott, who thinks the idea of the former is that of the *aggregation* of the parts, and of the latter that of their *inter-adaption*. But at the most the difference does not seem to go beyond the notions of *joining* (ἁρμός = a *joint*) and *compacting* or *making to coalesce*.—διὰ πάσης ἁφῆς τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας: *by means of every joint of the supply*. Here the AV and the RV are in substantial agreement, the former giving "by that which every joint supplieth"; the latter "through that which every joint supplieth," with the marginal rendering "through every joint of the supply". The Vulgate gives *per omnem juncturam* The old English Versions vary, *e.g.*, Wicl., "by each jointure of under serving"; Tynd., "in every joint wherewith one ministereth to another"; Cov., "every joint of subministration"; Gen., "by every joint for the furniture thereof";

[t] κατ' [t] ἐνέργειαν [1] ἐν [u] μέτρῳ [2] [v] ἑνὸς [v] ἑκάστου [w] μέρους [3] τὴν [x] αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος [4] [y] ποιεῖται εἰς [z] οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

t Ch. i. 19, iii. 7; Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii. 9 only. u Ver. 7 reff. v Acts ii. 6 reff. w = Plat., *Legg.*, vii., p. 795 E, *ἐλαφρότητός τε ἕνεκα κ. κάλλους τῶν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ μελῶν κ. μερῶν.* x Col. ii. 19 only; 2 Macc. v. 16. y Constr., Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 al. z Ver. 12 reff.

[1] **κατ ενεργ.** om. FG, d, e, f, g, Arm., Iren., Lucif., al.

[2] **εν μετρ.** om. K 3, Arm.

[3] For **μερους**, **μελους** AC 14, al., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm , al., Cyr., Chrys., Jer., Pel., al.; text ℵBDEFGLO[2], f, g, Syr.-P., Eth., Goth., Bas., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Ir., Luc., etc.

[4] **του σωμ.** om. K.

Bish., "by every joint yielding nourishment". The clause is one of much difficulty, especially as regards the **ἁφῆς**. The word occurs only twice in the NT, here and in Col. ii. 19. The question is whether it means *joint*, *contact*, or *sensation*. In classical Greek it has a variety of meanings, *e.g.*, *touch* (Aeschyl., *Prom.*, 850), the *sense of touch* (Plato, *Rep.*, 523 E), *grasp* (Plut., 2, 86 F), a *junction* or *joint* in the body (Arist., *De Gen. et Corr.*, i., 8, 24), and also, it is contended, *feeling* (Plato, *Locr.*, p. 100 D, E; *Pol.*, vii., p. 523 E, etc.). In the present passage Chrys. and Theod. give it this last sense, **αἴσθησις**, *feeling*, *perception*; and among others Mey. follows this, rendering the clause "by means of such sensation of the supply" and denying indeed that **ἁφή** ever has the sense of **συναφή**, *vinculum*. But it seems clear that in the passage in Aristotle referred to above and in others, (*e.g.*, Arist., *De Coelo*, i., 11; Plato, *Axioch.*, p. 365 A) it has the sense of *joining*, *juncture*, *joint*. It is also clear that it has the sense of *adhesion*, *contact* (Arist., *Metaphys.*, iv., 4, x., 3; *Phys. Ausc.*, iv., 6; *De Gen. et Corr.*, i., 6). The meaning indeed for which Mey. contends seems to have little or no foundation in ancient Greek use. The choice lies between the other two. The sense of *contact* is preferred by some (*e.g.*, Oec., von Hofm.), the idea then being "by means of every contact which serves for supplying," or "by means of every contact of each member of the body with the power which Christ supplies". But most prefer the sense of "joint," both because all the most ancient Versions understand the clause to have the members of the body and their relation one to another in view, and because in the parallel passage (Col. ii. 19) **ἁφῶν** is coupled with **συνδέσμων**. If the sense of *feeling* is adopted the clause will naturally be attached to the following **αὔξησιν . . . ποιεῖται**, and will specify the way in which the *growth* is to be made. With the sense of *joint* the clause will be best attached to the participles preceding it (especially in view of the clause in Col. ii. 19), and will define the means by which the *framing* and *compacting* are effected. (See especially Light. on Col. ii. 19.) The term **ἐπιχορηγία**, which occurs again in Phil. i. 19, means *supply*, perhaps with something of the idea of the *large* and *liberal*, as Ell. suggests, belonging to the primary use of **ἐπιχορηγεῖν**. The **τῆς** points to the particular supply that comes from Christ, and the gen. may be taken as that of *inner relation* or *destination* (*cf.* **σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας**, Heb. ix. 21; see Win.-Moult., p. 235). The idea, therefore, appears to be that the body is fitly framed and knit together by means of the joints, every one of them in its own place and function, as the points of connection between member and member and the points of communication between the different parts and the supply which comes from the Head. The joints are the constituents of union in the body and the media of the impartation of the life drawn by the members from the head. Precisely so in Col. ii. 19 the *joints* and *ligaments* are mentioned together and are described as the parts by which the body receives its supplies (**ἐπιχορηγούμενον**) and is kept compact together (**συμβιβαζόμενον**).—**κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἐν μέτρῳ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου μέρους**: *according to an efficiency in the measure of each individual part*. For **μέρους** some good MSS., etc., read **μέλους** (AC, Syr., Boh., Vulg., etc.), and WH give it a place in their margin. But **μέρους** is to be preferred, as supported by such authorities as BℵDGKLP, Arm., etc. **ἐνέργειαν** = *energy* in the sense of *activity*, *working*. **ἐν μέτρῳ** = *in the measure*, *i.e.*, *proportionate to*, *in keeping with* (Mey.), or *commensurate with* (Ell.). **ἐν** can never have the sense of **κατά**. But

a = Gal. v. 3; Acts xx. 26 (Paul) only. 17. Τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ [a] μαρτύρομαι [1] [b] ἐν κυρίῳ, μηκέτι ὑμᾶς [c] περιπατεῖν καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη [2] περιπατεῖ ἐν [d] ματαιότητι

b 1 Thess. iv. 1 al. fr.; Paul only. c Ver. 1 reff. d Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18 only; Ps. xxx. 6.

[1] μαρτυρωμαι P.

[2] Before ἐθν. om. λοιπα ℵABD[1]FGO[2] 10, 17, 47, 51, 67[2], d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Copt., Sah., Æth., Clem., Cyr., Lat. Fathers; insert λοιπα ℵ[3]D[2, 3]EKLP, most mss., Syr., Goth., Chr., Dam., Thdrt., Thl., Oec.

it is used occasionally like the Heb. בְּ, in phrases expressing the *proportion* or *law in accordance* with which something is done (Thuc., i., 77, viii. 89; Heb. iv. 11; see Win.-Moult., p. 483). The clause is connected by some (de Wette, etc.) with τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας; by others (Harl., etc.) with the συναρμολογούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον; but it is best attached to the αὔξησιν . . . ποιεῖται. So it defines the *nature*, *law*, or *order* of the growth, describing it as proceeding in accordance with an inward operation that adapts itself to the nature and function of each several part and gives to each its proper measure. It is a growth that is neither monstrous nor disproportioned, but normal, harmonious, careful of the capacity and suited to the service of each individual member of Christ's body.—τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται: *maketh the growth of the body*. αὔξησις, common enough, together with αὔξη, in classical Greek, occurs only twice in the NT, here and Col. ii. 19. The Mid. ποιεῖται conveys the idea of making *for oneself*; or it may rather *strengthen* the sense, suggesting "the energy with which the process is carried on" (Ell.). See especially Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 438, for the use of the *appropriative* and *intensive* Middle. The repetition of the σῶμα, "the whole body . . . makes the increase of the body," is due probably to the desire to avoid ambiguity, as the pronoun might have been taken to refer to the μέρους.—εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ: *unto the building up of itself in love*. εἰς expresses the *object* and *end* of the carrying on of the growth, *viz.*, the completion of the body. The ἐν ἀγάπῃ might qualify the αὔξησιν ποιεῖται (so Mey.); but it is more fitly connected with the οἰκοδομήν, as denoting the ethical element or condition of that consummation and completion of the Church which is the object of the long-continued process of growth.

Vv. 17-24. A paragraph which takes up again the practical address begun with the first verse of the chapter, but interrupted at ver. 4, and contains solemn exhortations to withdraw from all conformity with the old vain pagan life.

Ver. 17. τοῦτο οὖν λέγω καὶ μαρτύρομαι ἐν Κυρίῳ: *this I say, therefore, and testify in the Lord*. The οὖν has here its simple, resumptive force (*cf.* Donald., *Greek Gram.*, § 548, 31; Win.-Moult., p. 555). It takes up the train of thought which had been broken off at ver. 4. The τοῦτο refers to the exhortation that follows. μαρτύρομαι is used of a solemn declaration, protest, or injunction of the nature of an appeal to God (*cf* Acts xx. 26, xxvi. 22; Gal. v. 3, etc.). ἐν Κυρίῳ, not = *by the Lord*, nor *on the Lord's authority*, but *in* the Lord, the writer identifying himself with Christ and giving the exhortation as one made by Christ Himself (*cf.* Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; also the classical εἶναι ἔν τινι, as in Soph., *Oed. Tyr.*, 314; *Oed. Col.*, 247, etc., and Abb., *in loc.*).—μηκέτι ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν: *that ye no longer walk*. The exhortation began (ver. 1) as a positive injunction to a worthy walk. It is now resumed in the negative form of an injunction against an unworthy Pagan walk. The περιπατεῖν, the ordinary *objective* inf., expresses the object of the ruling verb. After verbs like μαρτύρομαι such inf. conveys the idea of what *ought* to be and has something of the force of an imper. (*cf.* Acts xxi. 4, 21; Tit. ii. 2, etc.). It requires no δεῖν to be supplied (see Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, p. 884, 4; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 273; Win.-Moult., pp. 403, 405).—καθὼς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ: *as the* [*rest of the*] *Gentiles also walk*. λοιπὰ is inserted by the TR before ἔθνη, and is supported by ℵ[c]D[2, 3]KL, Syr., Goth., Chrys., etc. It is omitted, however, by Bℵ*AD*G, Boh., Eth., Vulg., etc., and must be deleted here (with LTTrWHRV). The καί associates the walk which they are charged to continue no longer with that of the Gentiles generally, and with their own former walk in their non-Christian days.—ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν: *in the vanity of their mind*. νοῦς is not

τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν, 18. [e] ἐσκοτισμένοι [1] τῇ [f] διανοίᾳ ὄντες, [2] [g] ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς [h] ζωῆς τοῦ [h] θεοῦ, διὰ τὴν [i] ἄγνοιαν [3] τὴν οὖσαν

e = Rom. i. 21, xi. 10 only; Ps. lxviii. 23.
f Ch. ii. 3 reff. g Ch. ii. 12 reff. h Here only. i Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14; Lev. xxii. 14.

[1] εσκοτωμενοι AB, Ath.; ℵAB 17, etc.; εσκοτισμενοι DEFGKLO²P, mss., appy., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., all.

[2] οντες om. FG 115, Thl.

[3] αγνωσιαν FG.

merely the intellectual faculty or understanding, but also the faculty for recognising moral good and spiritual truth (Rom. i. 28, vii. 23; 1 Tim. vi. 5, etc.). **ματαιότης**, a peculiarly biblical and ecclesiastical term, occurring in NT only here and in Rom. viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 18, and corresponding to the Heb. הֶבֶל, שָׁוְא, means *vanity* in the sense of *purposelessness, uselessness*. There is nothing in the clause to restrict it to the case of *idol-worshippers* or to that of the heathen *philosophers* (Grot.). It is a description of the walk of the heathen world generally—a walk moving within the limits of intellectual and moral resultlessness, given over to things devoid of worth or reality (*cf.* Rom. i. 21, **ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν**).

Ver. 18. **ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες**: *being darkened in their understanding*. For **ἐσκοτισμένοι** of the TR, with DGKLP, etc., the more classical form **ἐσκοτωμένοι** is given in BℵA, etc., and is preferred by LTTrWH. The **ὄντες** is more appropriately attached (with LTTr WHRV, Theod., Beng., Harl., de Wette, Alf., Ell., Abb., Mey., etc.) to this clause than to the following **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι** (Beza, Rück., etc.). The parallelism of the two clauses is better kept in this way, while the emphasis is thrown first on the **ἐσκοτωμένοι** and then on the **ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι**. The sentence is a further description of the walk of the Gentiles and an *explanation* of its *vanity*. Their walk is what it is because of the condition of moral darkness into which they fell and in which they continue. With **ἐσκοτωμένοι** compare the **ἐσκοτίσθη, κ.τ.λ.** of Rom. i. 21, and contrast the **πεφωτισμένοι** as the note of the new condition in Eph. i. 18. The **τῇ διανοίᾳ** is not to be taken as if this clause referred only to the *intellectual* condition. **διάνοια** covers the ideas not only of *understanding*, but also of *feeling* and *desiring*. It is the faculty or seat of thinking and feeling (Matt. xxii. 37; Luke i. 51, x. 27; Col. i. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 1). The dat. is that known as the dat. of *sphere* or *reference* (*cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, p. 84; Win.-Moult., pp. 263, 270), or the "local dat. ethically used" (Ell. on Gal. i. 22; Donald., *Greek Gram.*, p. 488).—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι**: *alienated*. Being in a state of moral darkness they also become alienated from the true life. The word is used of those who have estranged themselves from God, here and in ii. 12; Col. i. 21 (*cf.* the OT זוּר in Ps. lviii. 3; Ezek. xiv. 5, 7.—**τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *from the life of God*. This cannot mean the *godly life*, the way of life approved by God. For **ζωή** in the NT seems never to mean the *course* of life, but *life* itself, the principle of life as opposed to *death*. The two things are distinguished, *e.g.*, in Gal. v. 25. Nor is there any reference here to the life of the Logos (John i. 3) in the pre-Christian world (Harl.). For it is the **ἔθνη** as they were known to him that Paul has in view here. The **Θεοῦ**, therefore, is best taken as the gen. of *origin* (as in **δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ**, Rom. i. 17; **ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ**, Phil. iv. 7; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 233), = "the life that comes from God," the spiritual life communicated by God. Some (Ell., Abb., etc.) think that the phrase means more than this, and indicates that the life thus imparted to us by God is His own life, the very life possessed by Himself, in the profoundest and most real sense "the life of God" in us.—**διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς**: *because of the ignorance that is in them*. Explicit statement of the *cause* of their estrangement, which was implicitly given in the **ἐσκοτωμένοι**. The term **ἄγνοια** again is not a term merely of intellect. It denotes an ignorance of Divine things, a want of knowledge that is inexcusable and involves moral blindness (Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 14). It is further defined here not simply as **αὐτῶν** "*their* ignorance," but as an ignorance **οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς**—surely a phrase that is neither tautological nor without a purpose, but one that describes their ignorance in respect of its *seat*. Their alienation had its cause not in something external, casual, or superficial, but *in themselves*—in a cul-

ἐν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὴν [k] πώρωσιν τῆς [k] καρδίας αὐτῶν, 19. [l] οἵτινες [m] ἀπηλγηκότες [1] ἑαυτοὺς [n] παρέδωκαν τῇ [o] ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς [p] ἐργασίαν

k Mark iii. 5 only; π. Rom. xi. 25.
l = Luke ii. 4 al. m Here only. n = Rom. i. 24 etc.; 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 4.
o Mark vii. 22; Rom. xiii. 13 al. p = Here only; Luke xii. 58; Acts xvi. 16, 19, xix. 24, 25 only; Jonah i. 8.

[1] απηλγηκοτες Syr.-P., Clem., Orig., etc.; αφηλπικοτες FG; απηλπικοτες DE.

pable ignorance in their own nature or heart (*cf.* the ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία in Rom. i. 21).—διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν: *because of the hardening of their heart.* This clause, introduced by διά, as the former also is, is taken by most (Harl., Olsh., de Wette, Ell., Alf., etc.) to be an independent statement, coordinate with the διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν, and giving a further explanation of the *alienation.* Such coordination of clauses is somewhat frequent with Paul (*cf.* Gal. iv. 4, etc.). Others (Mey., Abb., etc.) attach it to the former clause, and take it to be a statement of the cause of the ἄγνοια. Thus their alienation would be due to their *ignorance,* and this *ignorance* would be caused by the hardening of their hearts. The τὴν οὖσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς thus loses its significance, and we should have to regard it as adopted instead of the simple αὐτῶν merely with a view to clearness of connection between the ἄγνοιαν and the διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν. The noun πώρωσις means *hardness,* not *blindness.* Formed from πῶρος = *hard skin* or *induration,* it means literally *the covering with a callus,* and in its three occurrences in the NT (here and Mark iii. 5; Rom. xi. 25) it is used of *mental* or *moral hardening;* as is also the verb πωρόω (Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 4).

Ver. 19. οἵτινες ἀπηλγηκότες: *who having become past feeling.* οἵτινες has its usual qualitative or *explanatory* force, = "who *as* men past feeling". The ἀπηλγηκότες is naturally suggested by the πώρωσιν. It expresses the condition, not of *despair* merely (Syr., Vulg., Arm., etc.), but of moral insensibility, "the deadness that supervenes when the heart has ceased to be sensible of the 'stimuli' of the conscience" (Ell.). A few MSS. (DFG, etc.) mistakenly read ἀπηλπικότες or ἀφηλπικότες, = *desperantes* (Latt., Syr., Arm., etc.).—ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ: *gave themselves up to lasciviousness.* In Rom. i. 26 Paul gives us the other side of the same unhappy fact —πάρεδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός. It is at once a guilty choice of men and a judicial act of God. ἀσέλγεια is *wantonness, shameless, outrageous* sensuality (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. vi. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.).—εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ: *to the working of all uncleanness with greediness.* The noun ἐργασία is used sometimes of *work* or *business* (Acts xix. 25); sometimes of the *gain got by work* (Acts xvi. 19; perhaps also Acts xvi. 16, xix. 24); sometimes of the *pains* or *endeavour* (Luke xii. 58). Hence some give it the sense of *trade* here (Koppe, RV marg. = "to make a trade of"). It might perhaps be rendered here "so as to make a *business* of every kind of uncleanness". But it seems rather to be simply = τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι. The εἰς denotes the *object,* the conscious object (Ell.) of the self-surrender. πάσης = every kind of; ἀκαθαρσία is moral uncleanness in the widest sense; ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ describes the condition or frame of mind in which they wrought the ἀκαθαρσία, *viz.,* that of *covetousness* or *greediness.* πλεονεξία is taken by some to mean ἀμετρία, inordinate desire or *insatiableness* (Chrys., Oec., Calv., Trench, etc.). It is repeatedly coupled indeed with sins of the flesh in the NT (1 Cor. v. 11; Eph v. 3; Col. iii. 5) and is akin to them as they all involve *self-seeking.* But its own proper meaning is *greed, covetousness,* and that sense is quite applicable here. See further on v. 3, 5. These two things ἀκαθαρσία and πλεονεξία ranked as the two great heathen vices. So the Gentiles, darkened and alienated from the life of God, had become men of such a character that they gave themselves wilfully over to wanton sensuality, in order that they might practise every kind of uncleanness and do that with unbridled greedy desire.

Ver. 20. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν: *but ye did not thus learn the Christ.* ὑμεῖς, in emphatic contrast with the ἔθνη yet unconverted. The οὐχ οὕτως is an obvious *litotes,* suggesting more than is expressed. Meyer compares Deut. xviii. 14. The phrase ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν has no precise parallel except the following αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε. The nearest analogies to it are the phrases which speak of *preaching Christ* (κηρύσσειν τὸν

[q] ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης[1] ἐν [r] πλεονεξίᾳ.[2] 20. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως [s] ἐμάθετε τὸν [s] χριστὸν, 21. [t] εἴγε αὐτὸν [u] ἠκούσατε καὶ [v] ἐν αὐτῷ

q Rom. i. 24; Paul only, exc. Matt. xxiii. 27; Prov. vi. 16. r = Here only; see Col. iii. 5. s Constr., Matt. xxiv. 32, Mark; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; Phil. iv. 9; Rev. xiv. 3. t Ch. iii. 2 reff. u Ch. i. 15 reff. v = Ch. i. 15; constr. here only.

[1] For ε. εργ. ακ. π.,—ε . . . θαρσιαν πασης A.

[2] For εν πλ.,—και πλεονεξιας DEFG 39, d, e, f, g, m, Slav. (not rec.), Clem., Ambrst., Aug., Sedul., Pel.-comm.

Χριστόν; Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. i. 19; Phil. i. 15), the γνῶναι αὐτόν in Phil. iii. 10, and the παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον in Col. ii. 6. It cannot = "ye learned the *doctrine* of Christ"; nor can it be taken as = "ye *learned to know* Christ"; for there are no relevant examples of such usages. Χριστόν must be taken as the *object* of the learning, and the form τὸν Χριστόν, especially looking to the following Ἰησοῦ (ver. 21), probably indicates that the *official* sense is in view here. The aor. further points to the definite time of their conversion. The Christ, the Messiah, He personally—that was the contents of the preaching which they heard, the *sum* of the instruction they received and the knowledge they gained then.

Ver. 21. εἴγε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε: *if indeed ye heard Him.* On εἴγε, = "if so be that," "if as I assume it to be the case," see in iii. 2 above. In the form of a delicate supposition it takes it as certain that they did hear. The αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε is to be understood as the ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστόν. The pronoun is placed for emphasis before its verb. The point, therefore, is this—"if, as I take it to be the fact, it was He, the Christ, that was the subject and the sum of the preaching which you heard then".—καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε: *and in Him were instructed.* ἐν αὐτῷ is not to be reduced to "*by* Him" (Arm.; also AV "taught by Him"), or "about Him," or "in His name" (Beng.), but has its proper sense of "*in* Him". The underlying idea is that of union with Christ. The ἐδιδάχθητε, therefore, refers probably to instructions subsequent to those which were given them at their first hearing (ἠκούσατε). It was *in fellowship* with Christ that they received these instructions.—καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ: *even as truth is in Jesus.* WH give καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθείᾳ, ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ as a marginal reading. The meaning of the clause is much disputed. That it expresses in some way the *manner* or *standard* of the instructions (ἐδιδάχθητε) is clear from the καθώς. But what the point and connection of the clause are it is by no means easy to determine. Wicl. gives "as is truth in Jesus"; AV and other old English Versions, "as the truth is in Jesus," as if it were ἡ ἀλήθεια. Some dispose of it as a parenthesis (Bez., Rück., etc.), as if = "if ye were so instructed about Christ, that would be false" (as in Him there is only truth, moral and religious truth). Others (Grot., etc.) make it = "as it really is," *i.e.*, "if ye were instructed in the Gospel as it really is in Jesus"; or (Jer., Erasm., Est., etc.) they supply a οὕτως to the ἀποθέσθαι and understand the καθὼς clause to refer to Jesus as the Pattern of moral truth or holiness. Jerome's explanation, *e.g.*, is this—*quomodo est veritas in Jesu sic erit et in vobis qui didicistis Christum.* Somewhat similarly others, connecting it with ἀποθέσθαι, take it to mean that as moral truth is in Jesus, so they on their part are to lay aside the old man (Harl., Olsh., etc.). Or, connecting it with ἐδιδάχθητε, they understand the point to be that they were instructed in a way implying a moral change, as in Jesus there is truth and, therefore, holiness (so de Wette substantially). Meyer makes the ἀποθέσθαι dependent on the καθὼς clause, so that the sense becomes this—"truth it is in Jesus that ye put off the old man"; and Abbott appealing to the use of ἀλήθεια in ver. 24 and in John iii. 21, makes it = "as it is true teaching in Jesus that ye should put off," etc. All these interpretations involve dubious constructions or impose unjustifiable senses on the ἀλήθεια. Feeling this others have adopted the bolder expedient of making Χριστός the subject of ἐστιν, the sense then becoming "as He (Christ) is truth in Jesus" (Cred., Von Soden). A better turn is given to this by WH, who would read ἀληθείᾳ and so get the sense "as He (Christ) is in Jesus in truth". In support of this it is urged that the αὐτόν, ἐν αὐτῷ show that *Christ*, the *Messiah*, is the leading subject. But this construction means that it was not enough to be instructed in a Messiah; that they had

w = John viii. 44; Rom. ix. 1.

[w] ἐδιδάχθητε καθώς ἐστιν [w] ἀλήθεια[1] [x] ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, 22. [y] ἀποθέσθαι[2] ὑμᾶς [z] κατὰ τὴν προτέραν [a] ἀναστροφὴν[3] τὸν [b] παλαιὸν [b] ἄνθρωπον

x See 1 Thess. iv. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 11.
y Acts vii. 58; = Rom. xiii. 12; Col. iii. 8; Heb. xii. 1; James i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1.
z = Rom. ix. 3, 5.
a Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Heb. xiii. 7; James iii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 15.
b Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9.

[1] Insert η before αληθεια FG. [2] αποθεσθε Eth., Victorin., Pelag., Dam.
[3] Omit την προτεραν αναστροφην L.

also to recognise that Messiah in the historical Jesus, and that in Him they would see the life which signified for them a putting off of the old man. There is no indication, however, in the context or in any word of Paul's belonging to this period of a form of false *Christian* teaching which distinguished between *Christ* and *Jesus*, or of Gentiles professing to believe in a Messiah but not in Jesus as that Messiah. It only remains, therefore, to fall back on the interpretation "if ye were instructed according to that which is truth in Jesus". The clause will then describe the *nature* or *manner* of the instruction, as the following clause expresses its substance. In form or character the instruction was in accordance with what was true, with what was true *in Jesus*, that is to say, with truth as seen embodied in Him (*cf.* Alf., Ell.). And instruction of that kind meant that they should put off the old man.

Ver. 22. **ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς κατὰ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον**: *that ye put off, as regards your former manner of life, the old man*. This is best connected with the **ἐδιδάχθητε**. It gives the *purport* or *contents* of the instruction. The inf., therefore, is the *objective* inf. (*cf.* in **μηκέτι περιπατεῖν**, ver. 17 above, and Donald., *Greek Gram.*, § 584). It has something of the force of an imperative, but is not to be taken as the same as an imperative, that use of the inf. being very rare in the NT, and found generally indeed only in the case of oracles, laws and the like (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 397). In such constructions as the present the *inf.* does not require the pronoun; but **ὑμᾶς** is introduced here with a view to lucidity, after the reference to *Jesus* in ver. 21 (so Ell., Alf., etc.). The figure in the **ἀποθέσθαι** is taken from the putting off of garments, and is parallel to the **ἐνδύσασθαι** of ver. 24. The **κατὰ** clause defines that in respect of which this *putting off* is to take effect, the prep. having here the general sense of "in reference to," not that of "in conformity with". **τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον**, contrasted with the **καινὸς ἄνθρωπος** (ver. 24), the **νέος ἄνθρωπος** (Col. iii. 10), the **καινὴ κτίσις** (Gal. vi. 15), is the former unregenerate self in its entirety (*cf.* Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 9).—**τὸν φθειρόμενον**: *which waxeth corrupt*. The pres. part. marks the corruption as a *process* that goes on, a condition that *progresses*. The point is missed by the "is corrupt" of the AV, but is well put by "waxeth corrupt" (Ell., RV); *cf.* also Gal. vi. 8. The "corruption," however, is to be understood as "destruction". The "old man" is in a condition of advancing destruction or ruin, and, therefore, should all the more be "put off". Some (*e.g.*, Meyer) take *eternal* destruction to be in view, the *pres.* part. expressing what is to *issue* in destruction or indicating the *certainty* of the future.—**κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης**: *according to the lusts of deceit*. **ἀπάτης** is the *gen. subj.*, not = "the deceitful lusts" (AV), but = the lusts which deceit uses or which are its instruments. The **ἀπάτη** is in contrast with **ἀλήθεια**, the article giving it the abstract force approaching a personification. **κατά** here = *in accordance with*. The process of corruption or ruin goes on in precise conformity with the nature of the lusts which the deceitful power of sin has in its service.

Ver. 23. **ἀνανεοῦσθαι δέ**: *and that ye be renewed*. For **ἀνανεοῦσθαι** a few MSS. (D[2] 17, 47, etc.) and some Versions (Syr., Copt., Vulg.) read **ἀνανεοῦσθε**, while **δέ** is omitted by F. In such connections **δέ** expresses both *addition* and *contrast*. It introduces a statement connected with the foregoing but giving the other side of that. Here it is the positive change which must follow the *putting off*. As the middle of this verb has the active sense, **ἀνανεοῦσθαι** must be taken as passive here, = "be renewed," not "renew yourselves" (Luth.). The verb expresses a spiritual change, a transformation from old to new. Whether it also conveys the idea of *restoration* to a *former* or a *primal* state is doubtful, so many compounds with **ἀνά** (**ἀναπληροῦν, ἀνακοινοῦν, ἀνισοῦν, ἀνιεροῦν**, etc.) expressing nothing more than *change*. For the supposed distinction between

τὸν [e] φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς [d] ἐπιθυμίας[1] τῆς [e] ἀπάτης, 23. [f] ἀνανεοῦσθαι[2] δὲ τῷ [g] πνεύματι τοῦ [g] νοὸς ὑμῶν 24. καὶ [h] ἐνδύσασθαι[3] τὸν

c = 1 Cor. xv. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 3; Jude 10.
d Mark iv. 19. e Matt. xii. 22, Mark; Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Heb. iii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 13 only, constr., 2 Pet. ii. 10. f Here only; Job xxxiii. 24. g Here only; *v.* = Rom. i. 28, vii. 32, xii. 2 al. h = Rom. xiii. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; Col. iii. 10.

[1] **τας επιθυμιας** Clem., Orig., Cyr., Hil., Aug., Jer., etc.; **την επιθυμιαν** DE, d, e, Tert., Luc., etc.

[2] **ανανεουσθε** D², 10, 14, 17, 31, 33, 37, etc., d, e, f, g, m, Sah., Copt., Syr., Clem., Chr., Cyr., etc.

[3] **ενδυσασθε** with much the same authorities as **ανανεουσθε**.

ἀνανεοῦσθαι as expressing *renovation*, making new, or giving a fresh beginning, and **ἀνακαινοῦσθαι** as referring to *regeneration* or change of nature, see Haupt and Ell. *in loc.*, and Meyer on Col. iii. 10.—**τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν**: *in the spirit of your mind*. The position of the **ὑμῶν** gives it a measure of emphasis, "*your* mind," "the mind that is in *you*," unless it be taken (with Haupt) to be placed last because it qualifies not the **νοὸς** only but the whole idea in **τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοός**. This difficult sentence has been understood to refer to the *Holy Spirit*, the **νοός** being dealt with as some form of the *poss. gen.* or the *gen. subj.*, and the **πνεύματι** as *dat. instr.* Thus the sense would be "renewed by the Holy Spirit *bestowed on*, or *possessed by*, your mind" (Œc., Theophy., Bull, Waterland, Fritz., etc.). This proceeds on the NT doctrine that it is by the Spirit of God that we are regenerated or renewed. But it leaves the point of the addition of **τοῦ νοός** obscure. This ancient interpretation has been adopted by some recent exegetes with certain modifications. Thus Ellicott is of opinion that the **πνεύματι** refers not to the *Holy Spirit* distinctly and separately as the Divine Agent, but to that Spirit as *united with the human spirit*. In this way he thinks the *poss. gen.* is in point, and the introduction of the **νοός** accounted for as the *receptaculum* of the **πνεῦμα**. But, while it is true that it is often difficult to say whether the regenerated mind of man or the Divine Spirit is particularly in view in the Pauline use of **πνεῦμα**, there seems to be no case in which the NT speaks of the Holy Spirit as *man's* Spirit, or attaches to **πνεῦμα** in the sense of the Divine Spirit any such defining term as **ὑμῶν** or **τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν**. Nor can it be said that **πνεῦμα**, in the sense of the Divine Spirit in union with man's spirit, has anywhere else any such designation as the one in the text. Nor, again, does the interpretation which turns upon this idea of *union* between God's Spirit and our spirit, and not simply on the *indwelling* of the Divine Spirit in us, really account in any satisfactory way for the **νοός**. It is necessary, therefore, to take **πνεῦμα** here as = *our* spirit, and that as at once distinguished from and related to the **νοῦς**. The **πνεῦμα**, then, appears to be the higher faculty in man, the faculty that makes him most akin to God, the organ of his spiritual life and his fellowship with God, under the bondage of sin by nature, but set free from that and made fit for the purposes of the Divine life by the Holy Spirit. The **νοῦς** (*cf.* on ver. 17 above) is the faculty of understanding, feeling, and determining, distinguished by Paul from the **πνεῦμα** (1 Cor. xiv. 14), represented as capable of approving the law, but incapable of withstanding the motions of sin (Rom. vii. 23), and itself the subject or seat of renewal (**ἀνακαίνωσις**, Rom. xii. 2). Further the regenerate human spirit and the Divine Spirit are described as distinct and yet co-operant (Rom. viii. 16). Here then the **πνεύματι** must be taken not as the *instrumental* dative (for renewal does not take effect by means of our spirit), but as the *dat. of ref.*, and the **νοός** will be the *gen. subj.* Thus the sense becomes "renewed in respect of the spirit by which your mind is governed" (Mey.), that is, in respect of the spiritual faculty, the moral personality whose organ is the mind or reason. Some, holding by the interpretation of **πνεῦμα** as *our* spirit, take the **νοός** to be the gen. of *appos.* (*e.g.*, August., *de Trin.*, xiv., 16, *spiritus quae mens vocatur*), or the *part. gen.*, = "the governing spirit of your mind" (De Wette). But the above construction is better, and it is the one adopted substantially by the AV and the other old English Versions, the RV, Mey., Haupt, Abb., and most commentators.

Ver. 24. **καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν**

i Ch. ii. 15 reff. [i] καινὸν [i] ἄνθρωπον τὸν [k] κατὰ θεὸν [l] κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ [m] ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.[1]

k 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, 11 only; see note. l Ch. ii. 10 reff. m Luke i. 75 only; Deut. ix. 5 al.

[1] For της αλ., και αληθεια DFG, d, e, g, m, Cyr., Hil., Lucif.

ἄνθρωπον: *and put on the new man*. For **ἐνδύσασθαι** the imper. **ἐνδύσασθε** is read by some authorities of consequence (ℵKB¹D², etc.). The aor. is appropriately used again, as before in ver. 22; "putting off" and "putting on" being acts, while *renewal* (**ἀνανεοῦσθαι**) is a process. For **καινὸς ἄνθρωπος** see on ii. 15 above.—**τὸν κατὰ Θεὸν κτισθέντα**: *which after God was created*. The aor. **κτισθέντα** suggests that the "new man" is regarded here not as a nature created anew for the individual, but as "the holy form of human life which results from redemption," created once for all in and by Christ, and participated in by the individual convert. (See Ell., *in loc.*, and Müller, *Christ. Doctr. of Sin*, ii., p. 392). The phrase **κατὰ Θεόν** has sometimes the simple sense of "godly," "in a godly manner" (2 Cor. vii. 9, 10, 11). Hence it is held by some to mean nothing more here than created "divinely" (Hofm.) or "according to the will of God" (Abb.). But **κατά** is also used to express *likeness* (1 Kings xi. 10; Heb. viii. 8; Gal. iv. 28; 1 Pet. i. 15, iv. 6). Here, therefore, it may mean "like God" or "after the image of God". That this is the sense is confirmed by the use of **κτισθέντα** (which recalls Gen. i. 27), and by the fuller parallel statement in Col. iii. 10: **τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν**. The clause, therefore, affirms a new creation of man, and describes that creation as being according to the image or likeness of God. It neither states nor suggests, however, that the image of God in which man was first created was lost and has been restored in Christ. What it does state is simply that this second creation, like the first, was in conformity with the Divine likeness or after the example of what God is.—**ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας**: *in righteousness and holiness of the truth*. For **τῆς ἀληθείας** some few authorities give **καὶ ἀληθείᾳ** (D¹G, Cypr., Hil., etc.). This clause specifies the things in which the new man was created and in which the likeness between him and God consisted. **ἐν**, therefore, denotes the quality or ethical condition in which the creation realised itself. **δικαιοσύνη** and **ὁσιότης** are coupled again in Luke i. 75 (*cf.* also Wisd. ix. 3; Clem. Rom., *First Corinthians*, xlviii., 4). Plato distinguishes in two ways between the idea of **δίκαιος** and that of **ὅσιος**. He defines **δίκαιος** as the *generic* term and **ὅσιος** as the *specific* (*Euthyp.*, p. 12 E); and he describes the former as having regard to our relations to *men*, the latter to our relations to God (*Gorg.*, p. 507 B). The latter distinction is also given by other Greek writers (Polyb., xxiii., 10, 8, etc.). It is not easy, indeed, to say how far this distinction holds good in the NT. But both in profane and in biblical Greek the two words, adjective, adverb or noun, are often combined in one statement (*e.g.*, Plato, *Protag.*, 329 C; *Theaet.*, 176 B; *Rep.*, x., 615 B; *Laws*, ii., 663 B; Joseph., *Antiq.*, viii., 9, 1; Luke i. 75; 1 Thess. ii. 10; Titus i. 8). In many of these cases the distinction between *integrity* and *piety* is certain, and it is suitable to all. The NT also clearly distinguishes between **δίκαιος** and **εὐλαβής** (Luke ii. 25). It may be said, therefore, that **δικαιοσύνη** and **ὁσιότης** are not used vaguely or interchangeably, but that, while both are of grace and both consequently have a new meaning Godward, the former expresses the right conduct of the Christian man more distinctively in its bearings on his fellow-men, and the latter the same conduct distinctively in its relation to God. **τῆς ἀληθείας** is not to be reduced to "true holiness" as in AV, but is to be taken as the gen. of *origin* and as qualifying *both* nouns. Further, **ἀλήθεια** with the article, contrasting with **τῆς ἀπάτης** of ver. 22, seems to be more than Truth in the abstract or a quasi-personification of Truth. It may mean "*the* truth" *par excellence*, the *evangelical* message, the objective truth given in the Gospel (**ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**, Gal. ii. 5, 14; or simply, as here, **ἡ ἀλήθεια**, John viii. 32, 40, xvii. 19; Gal. v. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 2, xiii. 8, etc.). The creation of the new man in the Divine likeness realises itself, therefore, in something better than the ceremonial rectitude of the Jew or the self-contained virtue of the heathen—in a righteousnes and a holiness born of the new truth contained in the Evangel.

Vv. 25-32. A paragraph containing a

25. Διὸ [n] ἀποθέμενοι τὸ [o] ψεῦδος [p] λαλεῖτε [p] ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων [q] μέλη. 26. [r] ὀργίζεσθε[1] καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε. ὁ ἥλιος μὴ [s] ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ[2] τῷ[3]

n Ver. 22 reff.
o John viii. 44; Rom. i. 25; Ps. v. 6.
p Zech. viii. 16. q Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 27. r Ps. iv. 4. s Here only; Deut. xxiv. 16.

[1] After οργ. insert δε PG; και om. Sah. [2] For επι, εν D 3, d, e, f, m, Vulg., etc.
[3] τω om. ℵAB, etc.

series of detached, practical exhortations, dealing with certain evils to be forsworn and duties to be fulfilled. These injunctions are all based on the preceding statement, or are delivered as applications of the foregoing charge to put off the old man and put on the new.

Ver. 25. **Διὸ ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος, λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος μετὰ τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ**: *Wherefore, putting off falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbour.* **διό**, with the enlarged forms **διότι, διόπερ**, is rare in the NT except in Luke and Paul, but frequent with these, especially with the latter. It is = *quamobrem*, *on which account*, and refers here to what was said about the new man and his creation **κατὰ Θεόν** as the ground for what follows. **τὸ ψεῦδος** includes *falsehood* in every form, of which *lying* **τὸ ψεύδεσθαι** (Col. iii. 8) is one chief instance. The partic. has its proper *aor.* force, expressing a thing understood to be done, completely and finally, = "having put off then once for all falsehood in its every form". **λαλεῖτε**, the continuous pres. following on the past act, has the force of "speak truth and speak it continually," as the result of that prior "putting off". The prep. **μετά** is appropriate here as the prep. of personal association and mutual action (Win.-Moult., pp. 470, 471). It is truth in intercourse between Christian brethren (**τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ**), not between Christians and their fellow-men in general, that is in view here (*cf.* Zech. viii. 16).—**ὅτι ἐσμὲν ἀλλήλων μέλη**: *for we are members one of another.* Reason for this practice of truth—a reason drawn not from the common conceptions of duty or social weal, but from the profound Christian idea of union one with another through union with Christ. As in the human body each member is *of* the other in connection and *for* the other in service, so in the spiritual body of which Christ is the Head the members belong one to another and each serves the other; *cf.* Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 15. But can untruth consist with a union in which each is of and for the other? Why the sin of falsehood is first named, and why the sins of anger, dishonesty and corrupt speech are next dealt with, we have no means of determining. The explanation lies no doubt in local and congregational circumstances which Paul did not need to particularise.

Ver. 26. **ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε**: *be ye angry, and sin not.* The words are taken from Ps. iv. 4, and follow the LXX rendering. The original Hebrew, רִגְזוּ וְאַל־תֶּחֱטָאוּ, is rendered by some "Tremble and sin not" (Ewald; AV, "Stand in awe and sin not"), *i.e.*, = "let wholesome fear keep you from this sinful course"; by others, as the LXX gives it (Hitz., Del., etc.). As used by Paul here the words recognise the fact that *anger* has its rightful place and may be a duty, while they indicate also how easily it may pass into the sinful. Great difficulty has been felt with this, and in various ways it has been sought to empty the injunction of its obvious meaning. Some take the first imperative *conditionally*, as if = "if ye are angry, do not sin" (Olsh., Bleek, etc.); others, in a way utterly at variance with the quotation, take **ὀργίζεσθε** as an *interrogative* (Beza, Grot.); others declare it impossible to take the first command as *direct* (Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 290), or deal with the first imper. as *permissive*, and with the second as *jussive* (Winer, De Wette, etc.), as if = "be ye angry if it must be so, but only do not sin". Such a construction might be allowable if the first imper. were followed by **ἀλλὰ καί** or some similar disjunctive: but with the simple **καί** it is inadmissible. Both impers. are real jussives, the only difference between them being in the **μή**—which also throws some emphasis on the second. The **καί** has here the rhetorical sense which is found also in *atque*, adding something that seems not quite consistent with the preceding or that qualifies it, = "and yet" (*cf.* Matt. iii. 14, vi. 26, x. 29, etc.). Nor is the difficulty in admitting **ὀργίζεσθε** to be a real injunction of anger anything more than a self-made difficulty. Moralists of different schools, the Stoics excepted,

[t] παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν, 27. μηδὲ [1] [u] δίδοτε [u] τόπον τῷ [v] διαβόλῳ. 28. ὁ [v] κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω, μᾶλλον δὲ [w] κοπιάτω [x] ἐργαζόμενος τὸ [y] ἀγαθὸν ταῖς χερσίν,[2] ἵνα ἔχῃ [z] μεταδιδόναι [3] τῷ [a] χρείαν ἔχοντι.

t Here only; 3 Kings xv. 30; 4 Kings xix. 3 al. u Luke xiv. 9; Rom. xii. 19; see Heb. xii. 17. v Particip., Gal. i. 23 al. fr. w Matt. vi. 28; Rom. xvi. 6. x Matt. vii. 23, xxvi. 10; Acts x. 35. x y Rom. ii. 10; Gal. vi. 10. z Luke iii. 11; Rom. i. 11, xii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 8 only; Job xxxi. 17. a Matt. iii. 14; Gospels pass.; 1 Cor. xii. 21, 24; 1 Thess. i. 8, iv. 9 al. Paul; 1 John ii. 27, iii. 17 (abs.); Rev. iii. 17 al.

[1] μητε mss. Chrys.$_1$, Thdrt.; μηδε ℵABDEFGKLP, Clem., etc.

[2] ταις ιδιαις χ. το αγαθ. ℵADEFG 37, 57, 73, 116, al.$_3$, it., v., Copt., Sah., Æth., Arm., Bas., Naz., Epiph., Jer., Aug., Pel.; το αγ. τ. ιδ. χ. K 10, 47-8, 71-2, 80, 117, Syr., Thdrt.; το αγ. (omg. τ. χερσ.) 17, 67^2, Clem.$_2$; ταις χερ. (omg. το αγ.), Tert.; al. vary; ταις χερσι το αγαθον ℵB, most mss., Chrys., Thl., Oec.

[3] μεταδουναι DFG.

have recognised the place of *anger* in a moral nature; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Plato's τὸ θυμοειδές; Butler's statement of the function of anger in a moral system as "a balance to the weakness of pity" and a "counterpoise to possible excess in another part of our nature," *Sermons*, Carmichael's ed., pp. 126, 128. A righteous wrath is acknowledged in Scripture as something that not only *may* be but *ought* to be, and is seen in Christ Himself (Mark. iii. 5). So Paul speaks here of an anger that is approvable and to be enjoined, while in the καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε he forbids only a particular form or measure of anger. As the following clause suggests, even a righteous wrath by over-indulgence may pass all too easily into sin.—ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν: *let not the sun go down upon your provocation.* For the expression ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω *cf.* Deut. xxiv. 13, 15; Jer. xv. 9; also Hom., *Il.*, ii., 413, and Plutarch's statement of the Pythagorean custom—εἴποτε προαχθεῖεν εἰς λοιδορίας ὑπ' ὀργῆς, πρὶν ἢ τὸν ἥλιον δῦναι τὰς δεξιὰς ἐμβάλλοντες ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι διέλυοντο (*De Am. frat.*, p. 488 B). τῷ, inserted by the TR, is supported by DFKLℵ^3, etc.; it is omitted by the best critics (LTTrWHRV) on the authority of Bℵ^{1}A, etc. The noun παροργισμός occurs only here in the NT; never, as it would appear, in non-biblical Greek; but occasionally in the LXX (1 Kings xv. 30; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; Neh. ix. 18). It differs from ὀργή in denoting not the *disposition* of anger or anger as a lasting mood, but *provocation*, *exasperation*, sudden, violent anger. Such anger cannot be indulged long, but must be checked and surrendered without delay. To suppose any allusion here to sunset as the time for *prayer* or to night as increasing wrath by giving opportunity of brooding, is to import something entirely foreign to the simplicity of the words as a statement of *limitation*.

Ver. 27. μήτε δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ: *neither give place to the devil.* The μήτε of the TR is supported by cursives and certain Fathers, but must be displaced by μηδέ, for which the evidence is overwhelming (BℵDFKL, etc.). μήτε properly used would have required μήτε, not μή, in the previous prohibition. μηδέ on the other hand is grammatically correct as it adds a *new* negative clause, = "also do not," "nor yet" (Hartung, *Partikl.*, i., p. 210; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 366; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 776). τόπον, = *room, opportunity; cf.* Rom. xii. 19. διάβολος is not = *calumniator* (Luth., etc.), as if the reference were to heathen slanderers of Christians (Erasm.), but = *the devil*, the word having always that sense in the NT when used as a *noun* (in 1 Tim. iii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3 it is probably an *adject.*); *cf.* Matt. iv. 1, 5, xiii. 39, xxv. 41, etc. It has that sense again in 1 Tim. iii. 6. The more personal name Σατανᾶς occurs more frequently in the Pauline writings, while it is used only once in John's Gospel (xiii. 27) and never in his Epistles. On the other hand διάβολος is strange to Mark.

Ver. 28. ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω: *let the stealer no longer steal.* Not ὁ κλέψας, = "he who stole," but pres. part. with a subst. force (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 444). Stealing was not wholly condemned by ancient heathen opinion. It was even allowed by the Lacedæmonians (Müller, *Dor.*, ii., p. 310). It was a vice into which the recently converted living in the old pagan surroundings, especially when unemployed, might all too readily slip. It has been thought strange,

29. πᾶς λόγος [b]σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ [c]στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ [c]ἐκπορευέσθω, ἀλλ' [d]εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς [e]οἰκοδομὴν τῆς [f]χρείας,[1] ἵνα [g]δῷ[2] χάριν

b Matt. vii. 17, 18; Luke xii. 33, xiii. 48; Luke vi. 43 only. c Matt. iv. 4 (from Deut. viii. 3), xv. 11; Rev. passim; Paul, here only. d = Phil. iv. 8. e = Ver. 12 reff. f Abs., Acts xxviii. 10; see Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16. g = James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5; see Exod. iii. 21; Ps. lxxxiv. 12.

[1] For χρειας, πιστεως DEFG 46, d, e, f, g, Jer., Bas.-oft., Naz., Anton., Max., Tert., Cyr., Hil., Aug., Ambrst., Pel., al.

[2] For δω, δοι DFG.

scarcely credible indeed, that professing Christians in these Asiatic Churches could have given way to thieving. But the Epistles bear witness to the existence of grosser offences against morality in the Churches (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. v. 1).—**μᾶλλον δὲ κοπιάτω**: *but rather let him labour.* **μᾶλλον δέ** has a *corrective* force, = *nay rather, but on the contrary rather; cf.* Rom. viii. 34; Gal. iv. 9.—**ἐργαζόμενος τὸ ἀγαθὸν ταῖς χερσίν**: *working the thing that is good with his hands.* The readings here vary considerably, notwithstanding the simplicity of the statement. The TR adopts the reading given by L, many cursives, Slav., Chrys., etc. In B, am., etc., the **ταῖς χερσίν** precedes **τὸ ἀγαθόν**. This latter with **ἰδίαις** inserted between **τὸ ἀγαθόν** and **ταῖς χερσίν** is found in K, some cursives, Syr.-Phil., etc.; while **ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν τὸ ἀγαθόν** is the reading of AD[1]EFG, 37, etc., Vulg., Goth., Copt., Sah., Eth., Arm., Jer., Epiph., etc. This last is the best, and is adopted by LTTr and by WH in the marg., though not in the text. **τὸ ἀγαθόν** as opposed to the **κακόν** of theft = *labour*, not *idleness; honest work*, not *stealing;* the use of *one's own* hands in toil, not robbing the hands of others. **ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι**: *that he may have to give to him that has need.* It has been thought strange by some that Paul simply forbids stealing and makes no reference to the duty of restitution. In point of fact he does more than that; for he declares the proper object of all Christian labour (*cf.* Olsh.), *viz.*, to acquire not merely for ourselves and our own need, but with the view of being able to help others.

Ver. 29. **πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω**: *let no corrupt speech proceed out of your mouth.* **πᾶς . . . μή**, the well-known Hebraistic form, the negative attaching itself to the verb, = "*non-utterance*—let that be for every corrupt word". **λόγος** = *word*, in the sense of a *saying, speech* or *utterance.* **σαπρός**, lit. *rotten* or *worn out* and unfit for use, and then *worthless, bad* (*e.g.*, qualifying *trees, fruit, fish* as the opposite of **καλός**, Matt. vii. 17, xii. 33, xiii. 48; Luke vi. 43, etc.). Here it does not seem to mean *filthy*, but, as the following clause, **ἀγαθός, κ.τ.λ.**, suggests, *bad, profitless, of no good to any one.* Some, however, give it the more specific sense, = *foul*, as including *scurrilous* and *unbecoming* utterance (Abb.).—**ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας**: *but such as is good for edification of the need.* **ἀλλ' εἴ τις**, = *but such as, but whatever;* lit. = "but if there is any . . . let it proceed out of your mouth" (Mey.). **ἀγαθός** with **πρός** or **εἰς** is sufficiently frequent in classical Greek in the sense of *suitable, serviceable for* something (*e.g.*, Plato, *Rep.*, vii., p. 522 A). The phrase **οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας** is somewhat difficult to construe. Its difficulty probably accounts for the reading **πίστεως** instead of **χρείας** in D[1]F, etc. It cannot be dealt with by inversion as it is put in the AV, "to the use of edifying"; nor as equivalent to "those who have need" (Rück.); nor as = "as there may be need" (Erasm., *qua sit opus*). Neither can it be a gen. of quality, as if = "seasonable edification". The **τῆς** must have its full value, especially after the anarthrous **οἰκοδομήν**; and the **χρείας** is best taken either as the *gen. obj.*, = "edification applied to the need" (Mey., Alf., Abb.), or the gen. of *remote reference* (Ell.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 235), "edification in reference to the need," *i.e.*, to the *present* need. So the Vulg. (am.) gives *ad aedificationem opportunitatis.*—**ἵνα δῷ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσι**: *that it may give grace to the hearers.* So the RV. The AV also gives "minister grace unto the hearers". The other old English versions likewise render **χάριν**, *grace*, except Tynd., who makes it "that it may have favour," and Cov., who renders it "that it be gracious to hear". Not a few (Theod., Luth., Rück., etc.) make it = *give pleasure.* But **χάρις** usually means *favour* or *benefit*, and the phrase **διδόναι χάριν** expresses the idea of *doing a kindness* to one (Soph., *Ajax.*, 1333;

τοῖς ἀκούουσιν. 30. καὶ μὴ [h] λυπεῖτε [1] τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον [2] τοῦ θεοῦ,[3] ἐν ᾧ [i] ἐσφραγίσθητε [k] εἰς [l] ἡμέραν [l] ἀπολυτρώσεως. 31. πᾶσα [m] πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργὴ [4] καὶ [n] κραυγὴ καὶ [o] βλασφημία [p] ἀρ-

h = Rom. xiv. 15. i Ch. i. 13 reff. k = Phil. ii. 16; 2 Tim. i. 12. l Here only; see ch. i. 7 reff. m Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14, from Ps. ix. 27; Heb. xii. 15 only. n = Acts xxiii. 9 only; see Matt. xii. 19. o = Col. iii. 8 al. p = (in epp.) Col. ii. 14 only; Matt. xiii. 12 and Gosp. passim; Acts xxii. 22.

[1] **λυπητε** KL, Cyr., al., Bas., Thdrt. [2] **το αγ. πν.** DEFG, d, e, g, Goth.
[3] **τ. θεου** om. 2, 49, Æth., Chr., Epiph., Tert.
[4] **οργ. κ. θυμ.** DEFG 37, 46, 55, 73, 116, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Copt., Clem., Ambrst., etc.

Plato, *Laws*, iii., p. 702 c; Exod. iii. 21; Ps. lxxxiv. 11); and in the NT it has this sense with the specific notion of *gracious* kindness or service (2 Cor. i. 15, viii. 6; James iv. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5). So it is here. The **λόγος** is the *subj.*, and the clause gives the Christian object of every *speech* or *utterance*, *viz.*, to do good to the hearers, to *impart a blessing* to them (Ell.). For words with a different result *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 14.

Ver. 30. **καὶ μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *and grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.* This is not a general exhortation, but one bearing, as the **καί** indicates, particularly on the preceding injunction. The utterance of evil or worthless words is repugnant to the holiness of the Spirit, and is to be refrained from as calculated to grieve Him. The injunction is made the more solemn by the designation of the Spirit as "the *Holy* Spirit" and the Spirit "of God". The Spirit is here regarded as capable of feeling, and so as personal. In Isa. lxiii. 10 we have a similar idea, following the statement that Jehovah was *afflicted* in all His people's affliction. These terms, no doubt, are anthropopathic, as all terms which we can use of God are anthropomorphic or anthropopathic. But they have reality behind them, and that as regards God's *nature* and not merely His acts. Otherwise we should have an unknown God and One who might be *essentially* different from what we are under the mental necessity of thinking Him to be. What *love* is in us points *truly*, though tremulously, to what love is in God. But in us love, in proportion as it is true and sovereign, has both its *wrath-side* and its *grief-side;* and so must it be with God, however difficult for us to think it out.—**ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε**: *in whom ye were sealed.* **ἐν ᾧ**, not "by whom" (Tynd., Cranm., Gen., Bish.), or "whereby" (AV), but "*in* whom," the Holy Spirit being the *environment* of the seal, the *sphere* or *element* in which it takes effect. On the *sealing* see on i. 13 above.—**εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως**: *unto the day of redemption.* **εἰς** is most simply taken as = *with a view to.* **ἀπολύτρωσις**, as in i. 14, Luke xxi. 28, Romans viii. 23, is the redemption of the future, and here specifically that redemption in its completeness and finality. The gen. is the gen. of *temporal relation*, = the day on which redemption will take effect, or manifest itself; *cf.* **ἡμέρα ὀργῆς** (Rom. ii. 2); **κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας** (Jude 6). The consideration, therefore, that it is in the Spirit they have their security and their assurance of reaching the day when their redemption shall be made perfect, is an additional reason for avoiding everything out of harmony with His holy being and action.

Ver. 31. **πᾶσα πικρία**: *let all bitterness.* The noun **πικρία** occurs thrice again in the NT, and with different shades of meaning (Acts viii. 23; Rom. iii. 14; Heb. xii. 15). Meyer makes it = *fretting spitefulness* here. But it seems to be more than that (*cf.* **χολὴ πικρίας** as a description of exceptional wickedness in Acts viii. 23), and to mean *resentfulness, harshness, virulence.* In James iii. 11 **τὸ πικρόν** is contrasted with **τὸ γλυκύ**, and in ver. 14 it qualifies **ζῆλον** which again is coupled with **ἐρίθειαν**. The **πᾶσα** has the force of "all manner of". Harshness in all its forms whether in speech or in feeling (the latter, perhaps, being specially in view as the contrasting **χρηστοί** suggests) is to be put away. —**καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή**: *and wrath and anger.* These two words are often conjoined in non-biblical Greek, in the LXX and in the NT (*e.g.*, Rom. ii. 8; Col. iii. 8; Rev. xvi. 19, xix. 15). So far as they differ, the distinction is that **θυμός** is *fury*, the more passionate and passing sentiment, the *burst* of anger, and **ὀργή** the settled disposition. So in Ecclus. xlviii. 10 we get the phrase **κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ**. See Trench, *Syn.*, pp. 123-125.—**καὶ κραυγή**: *and clamour.*

θήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ [q] κακίᾳ, 32. γίνεσθε δὲ [1] εἰς ἀλλήλους [r] χρηστοί, [s] εὔσπλαγχνοι, [t] χαριζόμενοι [u] ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν χριστῷ [2] ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν.[3]

q Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8. r = (in epp.) here only; Luke vi. 35; see ch. ii. 7 reff. s 1 Pet. iii. 8 only †. t Luke vii. 42, 43; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13; Col. ii. 13. t u Col. iii. 13.

[1] Omit **δε** B 32, 47, 69, 177, lect. 14, Clem., Orig., Dam., Oec.; for **δε, ουν** DFG, lect. 6, 14, it.; **τε** Syr., Æth.; **δε** ℵAD[3]EKLP, most mss., Vulg., Copt., Sah., Syr., al., Chrys., Thdrt., Thl., Tert., Jer., al.

[2] For **ο θ. εν Χρ., ο Χριστος** 14, 48, 62, al., Antioch.$_1$, Tert.; **ο θεος** 11, 39, Thdrt., Dam.; **ημιν** BDEKL, al., 25, Syr., Chr.-comm., Thdrt., Thl.

[3] **υμιν** ℵAFGP, all d, e, f, Vulg., Copt., Sah., Goth., al., Clem., Cyr., Chr.-text, Thl.-marg., Oec., Tert., Ambrst.-al.

κραυγή is sometimes the cry of *distress* (Heb. v. 7; Rev. xxi. 4). Here it is the outcry of *passion* (Acts xxiii. 9). **καὶ βλασφημία**: *and evil speaking*. Here it is obviously slanderous or injurious speech with reference to *brethren* (Matt. xii. 31, xv. 19; Mark iii. 28, vii. 22; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4). So **πικρία**, the harsh, virulent temper, works **θυμὸν καὶ ὀργήν**, wrath and anger, and these again induce **κραυγὴν καὶ βλασφημίαν**, passionate clamour and hurtful speech.—**ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ**: *be put away from you together with all malice*. **κακία** may mean either *wickedness* generally (Acts viii. 22; 1 Cor. v. 8, xiv. 20; 1 Pet. ii. 16); or *ill-will, malignity* in particular (Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3; James i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1). The context points to the latter here. So Wicl., Cov., Rhem., AV, RV; while Tynd. gives "maliciousness," and the Bish. "naughtiness".

Ver. 32. **γίνεσθε δὲ εἰς ἀλλήλους χρηστοί**: *but become ye kind one to another*. The **δέ** is omitted by B, *k*, 177, Clem., etc., while **οὖν** is substituted for it in D[1]F, 114. It is bracketed by WH and by Tr marg., and is omitted by L. But it is quite in place, having its combined *connecting* and *opposing* force; *cf.* on ver. 15 above. **γίνεσθε** (not **ἐστέ**), = "become ye," or "show yourselves," rather than "be ye". The idea is that they had to abandon one mental condition and make their way, beginning there and then, into its opposite. **χρηστοί**, = *kind, benignant*, used of *God* (Luke vi. 35; Rom. ii. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 3), but here (its only occurrence in the Epistles) of *men*.—**εὔσπλαγχνοι**: *tender-hearted*. There could be no better rendering. In Col. iii. 12 the same disposition is expressed by **σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ**. It is only in Scripture and in eccles. Greek that the adject. conveys the idea of *compassion* (*Pray. of Manass.*, 7; *Test. XII. Patr.*, *Test. Zab.*, § 9).—**χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς**: *forgiving each other*. Partic. co-ordinate with the **χρηστοί, εὔσπλαγχνοι**, denoting one special form in which the kindness and tender-heartedness were to show themselves. **χαρίζομαι** means either to *give graciously* (Luke vii. 21; Rom. viii. 32; Phil. ii. 9, etc.), or to *forgive* (Luke vii. 42; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10, xii. 13; Col. ii. 13, iii. 13). Some adopt the former sense here (Vulg., *donantes;* Eras., *largientes*). But the second is more in harmony with the context. For the use of **ἑαυτοῖς** as = **ἀλλήλοις** in classical Greek (*e.g.*, Soph., *Antig.*, 145) see Kühner, *Greek Gram.*, ii., p. 497; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 54, 2. In the NT the same use prevails (1 Cor. vi. 7; Col. iii. 13, 16, etc.). The two forms are often conjoined in the same paragraph or sentence, both in classical Greek (Xen., *Mem.*, ii., 7, iii., 5, 16, etc.) and in the NT (as here, Col. iii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 8, etc.). If there is any distinction between them, it is that the idea of *fellowship* or *corporate unity* is more prominent in **ἑαυτοῖς**; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 169, 170; Light. and Ell. on Col. iii. 13.—**καθὼς καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν Χριστῷ ἐχάρισατο ὑμῖν**: *even as also God in Christ forgave you*. **καθὼς** points to the Divine example; **καὶ** places the two instances, the Divine and the human, over against each other; the reference and the comparison indicate the supreme reason or motive for our fulfilment of the injunction. **ἐν Χριστῷ** is not "for Christ's sake" (AV) or *per Christum* (Calv.), but "*in* Christ" as in 2 Cor. v. 19; the God who forgives being the God who manifests Himself and acts *in* the suffering, reconciling Christ. The aor. should be rendered *did forgive* with Wicl., Tynd., Gen., Bish., RV (not "hath

V. 1. Γίνεσθε οὖν [a] μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς [b] τέκνα [b] ἀγαπητά, 2. καὶ [c] περιπατεῖτε [c] ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς[1] καὶ [d] παρέδωκεν [d] ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[2] [e] προσφορὰν καὶ [f] θυσίαν[3]

a 1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14; Heb. vi. 12 only.
b 1 Cor. iv. 14, 17; 2 Tim. i. 2; see Phil. ii. 15. c Ch. ii. 10 reff. d Gal. ii. 20; ver. 25 only.
e = Acts xxi. 26, xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 16; Heb. (5). e f Heb. x. 5, from Ps. xxxix. 6.

[1] ημας ℵ[3]DEFGKL, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Syr., Cop., Arm., etc.; υμας ℵ*ABP 32, 37, 71, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Clem., Euth., Dam., etc.

[2] υμων B 37, 73, 116, Sah., Eth., Dam., etc. [3] θυσιαν και προσφοραν ℵ.

forgiven" as in AV. etc.), the point being the forgiveness effected when Christ died. The reading ὑμῖν, supported by ℵAGP, 37, Sah., Boh., Vulg., Goth., Eth., etc. is to be preferred on the whole to ἡμῖν which appears in DKL, 17, 47, Syr., Arm., etc. L gives ἡμῖν in text; TrWHRV give it in margin.

CHAPTER V. Vv. 1-14. A paragraph ruled by the general idea of the imitation of God in the forgiving love which has been appealed to in the preceding verse. In the light of that Divine example Paul charges his readers to follow purity, unselfishness, sobriety and other graces, and to avoid all heathen vices and indulgences opposed to these.

Ver. 1. **γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *become ye therefore imitators of God*. **γίνεσθε**, as in iv. 32, = "become ye," rather than "be ye". This **γίνεσθε** also resumes the former **γίνεσθε** (iv. 32), and continues the general injunction expressed by it. The **οὖν** points to the same connection of ideas, while it introduces new exhortations based on the supreme fact of God's forgiving love in Christ. Of the duties inculcated on that basis the first and the one most immediately in view is that of the forgiveness of those who wrong us—a forgiveness which should be free, loving, ungrudging, complete as God's forgiveness is. The term **μιμητής** is used of the imitation of *men* (1 Cor. iv. 16, xi. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6; Heb. vi. 12), *Churches* (1 Thess. ii. 14), *things* (1 Pet. iii. 13 with **ζηλωταί** as var. reading). Only here is it used of the imitation of *God*—the loftiest and most exalting endeavour that can possibly be set before man, proposed to us also by Christ Himself (Matt. v. 45, 48).—**ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά**: *as children beloved*. Not merely "dear children" (AV). The compar. part. **ὡς** points to the *manner* or *character* in which the *imitation* is to be made good, and indicates at the same time a *reason* for it (Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 270). They are children of God, experiencing His love. Children should be like the father, and love should meet love; *cf.* Matt. v. 45.

Ver. 2. **καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ**: *and walk in love*. Here, again, **καί** *explains* in *connecting* and *adding*. The "imitation" must take effect in the practical, unmistakable form of a loving course of life.—**καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς**: *even as Christ also loved us* [*you*]. The reading **ὑμᾶς** (with Bℵ[1]A, Sah., Eth., etc.; TTrWHRV) is to be preferred to the **ἡμᾶς** of TR (with DKFLℵ[3], etc.). The aor. should have its proper historical force, "loved," not "hath loved" (AV). *Christ* is now introduced as the great Example, instead of *God*, and the Divine love as openly seen in Christ is given as the *motive* and the *pattern* of the love that should mark our walk.—**καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν**: *and gave Himself up*. Statement of the act in which Christ's love received its last and highest expression, *viz*., the surrender of Himself to death. The **καί** has something of its *ascensive* force. The idea of *death* as that to which He gave Himself up is implied in the great Pauline declarations, *e.g.*, Rom. iv. 25, viii. 32; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25.—**ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**: *for us*. The **ἡμῶν** of the TR, supported by ℵADFKL, etc., is to be preferred on the whole to the **ὑμῶν** of B, m, 116, etc., which is regarded by WH as the primary reading and given in marg. by RV. The prep. **ὑπέρ** seldom goes beyond the idea of "on account of," "for the benefit of". In classical Greek, however, it does sometimes become much the same as **ἀντί** (*e.g.*, Eurip., *Alc.*, 700; Plato, *Gorg.*, 515 c), and in the NT we find a clear instance in Philem. 13. In some of the more definite statements, therefore, on Christ's death as a sacrifice (2 Cor. v. 14, 15, 21; Gal. iii. 13, and here) it is thought that the more general sense is sharpened by the context into that of "in place of". But even in these the idea of substitution, which is properly expressed by **ἀντί** (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45), is not in the **ὑπέρ** itself, although it may

τῷ θεῷ [g] εἰς [h] ὀσμὴν [h] εὐωδίας. 3. [i] πορνεία [1] δὲ καὶ [k] ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα [2] [l] ἢ [l] πλεονεξία μηδὲ [m] ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς [n] πρέπει

g Ch. ii. 22 reff.
h Phil. iv. 18 only; Gen. viii. 21; Lev. i. 9 and pass.
i k Col. iii. 5; Gal. v. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21.
l See 1 Cor. v. 10; ver. 5.
m Ch. i. 21 reff.
n Constr., 1 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 1; Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26 only.

[1] **πορνεια** BD[3]KL, etc.; **πορνια** ℵAD*FGP, etc.

[2] **πασα** *after* **ακαθαρσια** ℵAP 17, 31, 39, Copt., Orig., etc.; *before* **ακαθαρσια** DEFGKL, Bas., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

be in the context; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 434, 435; Mey. on Rom. v. 6, Gal. iii. 13; Ell. on Gal. iii. 13.—**προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ Θεῷ**: *an offering and a sacrifice to God*. The primary idea in the whole statement is the love of Christ, and that love as shown in giving Himself up to death. This giving up of Himself to death is next defined in respect of its character and meaning, and this again with the immediate purpose of magnifying the love which is the main subject. The acc., therefore, is the *pred.* acc., = "as an offering". The defining **τῷ Θεῷ**, as its position indicates, is best connected with the **προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν**; not with **παρέδωκεν αὐτόν**, to which **εἰς θάνατον** is the natural supplement; nor with **εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας**, for that would place **τῷ Θεῷ** in an *emphatic* position not easy to account for. The term **προσφορά** is used in the NT of offerings of all kinds, whether bloody or unbloody, whether of the *meal offering*, מִנְחָה (Heb. x. 6; Ps. xl. 7), or of the bloody offering (Heb. x. 10) and the expiatory sacrifice (Heb. x. 18). When it has the latter sense, it has usually some defining term attached to it (**περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (Heb. x. 18), **τοῦ σώματος Ἰ. Χ.** (Heb. x. 10)). The term **θυσία** in like manner is used for different kinds of offerings. In the LXX it represents both מִנְחָה and זֶבַח, and in the NT in such passages as Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7, etc., it is used generally. Sometimes it is applied to unbloody oblations (Heb. xi. 4). Again (*e.g.*, Heb. ix. 23, x. 5, 26) it is sin-offerings, expiatory offerings that are in view. The two terms, therefore, cannot in themselves be sharply distinguished, but they get their distinctive sense in each case from the context. Here, as in Heb. v. 8, etc., it is possible that the two terms are used to cover the two great classes of offerings; in which case, as in Ps. xl. 6, 8, the **θυσίαν** will refer to the sacrifice of slain beasts. If that is so, the sin-offering, or oblation presented with a view to the restoration of broken fellowship will be in view. And this is in accordance with the particular NT doctrine of Christ's death as a *propitiation*, which has a distinct and unmistakable place in Paul's Epistles, though not in his only (Rom. iii. 23; 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10), and a *reconciliation* (Rom. v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19), as well as with the OT view of sacrifice offered in order to effect forgiveness and removal of guilt (Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35, v. 10, 13, 16, etc.).—**εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας**: *for a savour of sweet smell*. So Ell.; "for an odour of a sweet smell" (RV); "for a sweet smelling savour" (AV, Gen., Bish.); "in to the odour of sweetness" (Wicl.); "in an odour of sweetness" (Rhem.); "sacrifice of a sweet savour" (Tynd., Cov., Cranm.). Statement of the *acceptability* of Christ's sacrifice, taken from the OT רֵיחַ־נִיחוֹחַ, Lev. i. 9, 13, 17, ii. 12, iii. 5, etc. (*cf.* Gen. viii. 21; Phil. iv. 18), where **ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας** is defined as **θυσίαν δεκτήν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ**. The foundation of the phrase is of course the ancient idea that the smoke of the offerings rose to the nostrils of the god, and that in this way the Deity became partaker of the oblation along with the worshipper (Hom., *Il.*, xxiv., 69, 70). The phrase was naturally used oftenest of the burnt offering (Lev. ii. 9, 13, 17), and some have argued that there is nothing more in view here than the idea of self-dedication contained in that offering. But the phrase is used also of the expiatory offering (Lev. iv. 31).

Ver. 3. **πορνεία δὲ καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία**: *but fornication and all uncleanness*. The better order **ἀκαθαρσία πᾶσα** (LTTrWHRV) throws the emphasis on **πᾶσα**, = "fornication and uncleanness, every kind of it". The metabatic **δέ** carries the exhortation over to a prohibition expressed in the strongest terms, which is levelled against one of the deadliest and most inveterate temptations to which Gentile Christians were exposed. The term **πορνεία** is to be taken in its proper sense and is not to be restricted to any one particular form—the license prac-

o Ch. i. 1 reff. [o] ἁγίοις, 4. καὶ [p] αἰσχρότης[1] καὶ [q] μωρολογία ἢ [r] εὐτραπελία τὰ οὐκ
p q r Here only. [s] ἀνήκοντα,[2] ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον [t] εὐχαριστία. 5. τοῦτο [u] γὰρ ἴστε[3] γινώ-

s Col. iii. 18; Philem. 8 only; 1 Macc. xi. 35. t = Acts xxiv. 3; Phil. iv. 6; Col. ii. 7 al.; Luke and Paul only; exc. Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12. u Constr., here only; see Luke iv. 44 reff.; Gen. i. 6.

[1] και αισχροτης ℵBD[3]KLP, Syr.-P., Copt., Arm., Clem., Bas., etc.; η αισχροτης AD*FG 23, 31, 39, Vulg., Sah., Euth., etc.

[2] α ουκ ανηκεν ℵABP 31, 67[2], 73 (17 omg. ἅ), Clem.[1], Eph., Antioch., Cyr., (latt.); τα ουκ ανηκοντα DEFG[c]KL, most mss., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.

[3] εστε γιν. with D[3]EKL, etc., Syr., al., Thdrt., Dam., Thl.; ητε 73; ιστε ℵABD FG 23[1], 31-9, 44-7, 57, al., Vulg., Copt., Arm., Clem., Cyr., Chr., Oec., Suid., Cypr., Jer., Vig., Per., all.

tised at heathen festivals, concubinage, marriage within prohibited degrees, or the like. The moral life of the Graeco-Roman world had sunk so low that, while protests against the prevailing corruption were never entirely wanting, fornication had long come to be regarded as a matter of moral indifference, and was indulged in without shame or scruple not only by the mass, but by philosophers and men of distinction who in other respects led exemplary lives.—**ἢ πλεονεξία**: *or covetousness*. Here, as in iv. 19, **πλεονεξία** is named along with **ἀκαθαρσία**. In this passage, as in the former, most commentators take the two terms to designate two distinct forms of sin, *viz.*, the two vices to which the ancient heathen world was most enslaved, immorality and greed; while some understand **πλεονεξία** to be rather a further definition of **ἀκαθαρσία** and give it the sense of *insatiability*, *inordinate affection*, *sensual* greed. The noun is found ten times in the NT and the verb **πλεονεκτεῖν** five times. In some of these occurrences **πλεονεξία** can mean nothing else than *covetousness* (*e.g.*, Luke xii. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 5). But the question is whether it has that sense in all the passages, or has taken on the acquired sense of *sensual* greed or overreaching in some of them. That is not very easy to decide. The association of the word **πλεονέκτης** with sins of the flesh (*e.g.*, in 1 Cor. v. 10, 11) is urged in favour of the latter application (*cf.* Trench, *Syn. of the N. T.*, p. 79). But it is argued with reason that the use of the disjunctive **ἢ** between **πόρνοις** and **πλεονέκταις** there and the connecting of **πλεονέκταις** with **ἅρπαξιν** by **καί** point to a distinction between the former two and an identity between the latter. So, too, in Col. iii. 5 the noun **πλεονεξίαν** is differentiated from the **πορνείαν**, etc., by **τήν**. On the other hand, the passages in Rom. i. 29 and 2 Pet. ii. 14 seem to suggest something more than *covetousness*, and it is also to be noticed that the original idea of these terms was that of having or taking an *advantage* over others. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 the verb **πλεονεκτεῖν** is used along with **ὑπερβαίνειν** in this sense, with reference to the sin of adultery. The present passage is probably the one, so far as Pauline use is concerned, that most favours the second sense, and it must be added that even the argument from the force of the disjunctive **ἢ** must not be made too much of. For in chap. v. 5 we find **πόρνος** and **ἀκάθαρτος** connected by **ἤ**.—**μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν**: *let it not be even named among you*. Cranm., Gen., Bish. render it "be once named". The strong neg. **μηδέ** gives it this force —"Not to speak of doing such a thing, let it not be even so much as mentioned among you". The partial parallel in *Herod.*, i., 138, **ἅσσα δέ σφι ποιέειν οὐκ ἔξεστι, ταῦτα οὐδὲ λέγειν ἔξεστι**, is noticed here by most.—**καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις**: *as becometh saints*. The position of sainthood or separation to God, in which the Gospel places the Christian, is so far apart from the license of the world as to make it utterly incongruous even to speak of the inveterate sins of a corrupt heathenism.

Ver. 4. **καὶ αἰσχρότης**: *and filthiness*. This is taken by many (Eth., Theophyl., Oec., Rück., Harl., etc.) to refer to indecent *talk*, which, however, would be expressed by **αἰσχρολογία** (Col. iii. 8). The context shows it to refer to sins of the flesh, but there is nothing to limit it to sinful *speech*. It denotes shameless, immoral conduct in general.—**καὶ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία**: *and foolish talking or* [*and*] *jesting*. The readings here are somewhat uncertain as regards the particles. The TR has the support of such authorities as ℵ*P, Syr.-Harcl., Arm. for **καί . . . ἤ**; AD*G, Vulg., Sah., etc., give **ἢ . . . ἤ**; Bℵ[1]D[3]K, Boh., Eth.,

σκοντες, ὅτι πᾶς [v] πόρνος ἢ [w] ἀκάθαρτος ἢ [x] πλεονέκτης, ὅ[1] ἐστιν [y] εἰδωλολάτρης, οὐκ ἔχει [z] κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ[2] τοῦ [a] χριστοῦ

v 1 Cor. v. 11 al.; Paul only, exc. Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15. w In Gospels and Rev. only with πνεῦμα; legal, Acts x. 14, 28, xi. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 14; 2 Cor. vi. 17; = here only. x 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 10 only; Sir. xiv. 9. y 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 9, x. 7; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15. z Ch. i. 14 reff. a 1 Tim. v. 21; Rev. xx. 6.

[1] For ὅ ὅς ADEKL, most mss., Copt., Syr., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., all; ο ℵB 17, 67, lect. 40, al., Cyr., Jer.$_2$, also with ιδωλολατρια FG, It., Vulg., Cyp., Jer., Ambrst., al. For ο εστ., η or και Syr., Ar.-erp., Eth.

[2] εις την βας. τ. θ. κ. Χρ. FG, Ambrst., al.

etc., have καί . . . καί. The first is accepted by TRV; the second by L; the third by WH. The choice is between the first and third, and the balance of evidence is on the whole, although not very decidedly, on the side of καί . . . καί. The noun μωρολογία is of very rare occurrence. In common Greek it is found only a very few times (Arist., *Hist. An.*, i., 11; Plut., *Mor.*, 504 A); in the NT only this once. Its sense, however, is sufficiently clear.—**καὶ εὐτραπελία**: *and jesting*. This is the solitary occurrence of the noun in the NT. It is found, however, in Aristotle (who defines it as πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις, *Eth. Nic.*, iv., 14), Pindar (*Pyth.*, i., 178), etc. It appears to have meant originally *versatility*, *facetiousness*, and to have acquired the evil sense of *frivolity* or *scurrility*. Here it is taken by some (*e.g.*, Trench, Ell.) to be *distinguished* from μωρολογία and to denote, therefore, not the sin of the tongue merely, but the "evil 'urbanitas' (in manners or words) of the witty, godless man of the world" (Ell.). This depends so far on the acceptance of the disjunctive ἤ as the proper reading, but may be essentially correct. AV and other old English Versions give *jesting*, except Wicl., who has *harlotry*, and the Rhem. which gives *scurrility*.—**τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα**: *things which are not seemly*. The article has the pred. force = "*as* things which are not seemly" (Mey.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 610). The reading, however, varies. The TR is supported by the great mass of MSS—DGKL, etc.; but BℵAP, etc., give ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν, which is to be preferred. The clause is in apposition to the preceding; but probably only to the latter two nouns, μωρολογία and εὐτραπελία, as these form the direct contrast to the following εὐχαριστία. *Cf.* τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα of Rom. i. 28. —**ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία**: *but rather giving of thanks*. The brachylogy (*cf.* Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 705, 3) requires ἔστω or rather γίνεσθω to be supplied. The εὐχαριστία is understood by some to mean *gracious speech* (Clem. Al.; also Jer., with a *perhaps*), or *pious*, *edifying* discourse generally (Calv., on the analogy of Col. iv. 6; Prov. xi. 6). Others give it the sense of *courteous* speech (Mor.). But the idea of gracious speech would be expressed rather by εὔχαρι, and, as Meyer points out, the contrast which would thus result would be less in keeping with "the Christian character and the profoundly vivid piety of the Apostle". On nothing does he more insist than on the grace of thankfulness, and the expression of it, to God for the gifts of His love to sinful men.

Ver. 5. **τοῦτο γὰρ ἴστε γινώσκοντες**: *for this ye know, being aware that*. The TR reads ἐστε = *ye are* (with D³KL, Theod., Theophyl., etc.), taking it with the participle as = "ye are aware". But ἴστε (which is supported by BℵAD*GP, Vulg., Goth., Sah., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc.) must be preferred. The phrase ἴστε γινώσκοντες is explained by some as a Hebr. form, following the well-known use of the inf. with the fin. verb, or as having the force of the participle with the fin. verb in such expressions as γινώσκων γνώσῃ (Gen. xv. 13); and so the RV renders it—"ye know of a surety". But in such formulæ the *same* verb occurs in both cases, whereas here we have two distinct verbs. Hence it is best rendered—"ye know, being aware that". It is an appeal to their consciousness of the incompatibility of such sins with the inheritance of the Kingdom of God. It is not necessary, therefore (with von Hofmann), to put a full stop between the ἴστε and the γινώσκοντες, and make ἴστε refer to the *preceding* statement. Nor is there any reason for taking ἴστε as an imper. (so Vulg., Beng., etc.) instead of an indic. The τοῦτο refers to what *follows*, and the γάρ introduces a reason for the former injunctions. These injunctions are enforced by a reference to the reader's own knowledge, and that reference to their knowledge is made in direct appeal to

καὶ [a] θεοῦ.[1] 6. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [b] ἀπατάτω [c] κενοῖς λόγοις· διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς [d] υἱοὺς τῆς [d] ἀπειθείας.

b 1 Tim. ii. 14; James i. 26 only.
c 1 Cor. xv. 10, 14, 58 al.; Col. ii. 8; James ii. 20; Exod. v. 9; Job. vi. 6.
d Ch. ii. 2 reff.

[1] Χριστου 14, al.; θ. κ. Χ. Ar.-erp., Ambrst., al.; Χ. του θεου Eth., Ar.-pol., Thdrt.$_1$.

their consciousness.—**ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος**: *that no fornicator or unclean person*. On the Hebr. formula **πᾶς . . . οὐκ**, "every one . . . shall not," see on iv. 29 above and Win.-Moult., p. 209.—**ἢ πλεονέκτης**: *or covetous man*. The **πλεονέκτης** appears here again to have its proper sense, and not any secondary application. — **ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης**: *who is an idolater*. This reading of the TR has the support of ADKLP, Syr.-Harcl., Boh., Arm., Chrys., etc. But there are two interesting variants, *viz*., **ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολατρεία**, which is the reading of G, Vulg., Goth., Syr.-Pes. (probably), and **ὅ ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης**, which is given by Bℵ, 67², Jer., etc. The choice must be between this last and the TR. On the whole the former is to be preferred (with LTTrWHRV) on textual grounds, and that reading will then have the force of "which is the same as an idolater". Some (Harl., etc.) refer the relative (**ὅς**) to all three previous nouns; but the analogy of Col. iii. 5 is against that. It is true that *fornication* and *uncleanness* might also well be called forms of idolatry. But the point here seems to be that the *covetous*, *grasping* man in particular, who makes a god of Mammon, is much the same as the worshipper of an idol; and the **πλεονέκτης** is thus made synonymous with the **εἰδωλολάτρης** in order to stigmatise avarice as a specifically anti-Christian vice, essentially incompatible with the spirit of self-sacrifice which is of the very being of Christianity and was inculcated so strenuously by Paul himself.—**οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν**: *has inheritance*. The **ἔχει** is taken by Meyer as a case of *present* for *future*, marking a looked-for event as just as certain as if it were already with us. But it is rather a proper present, appropriate here as the expression of a principle or law; *cf*. Win.-Moult., p. 331.—**ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ**: *in the Kingdom of Christ and God*. The clause has been understood as an affirmation of Christ's Godhead, as if = "the Kingdom of Him who is at once Christ and God" (Beza, Beng., Rück., Harl.); and some, with this view of its import, have held it to be an example of the application of Sharp's rule. But that rule is inapplicable here by reason of the fact that **Θεός** is independent of the article and occurs indeed without it in the phrase **βασιλεία Θεοῦ** (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21). **Θεοῦ** has the same *climactic* force here as in 1 Cor. iii. 22, etc. The kingdom is *Christ's*, committed to Him now, but to be delivered up at last to God, who is to be sole and absolute Sovereign (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28).

Ver. 6. **μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς ἀπατάτω κενοῖς λόγοις**: *let no one deceive you with vain words*. A solemn warning, made the more pointed by being given without any connecting particle. **κενός** is "vain" in the sense of *empty*, without the substance of truth or reality, and so = *sophistical*; *cf*. **κενολογεῖν** in Isa. viii. 19. But what is the reference? Some think *heathen philosophers* and *Jews* are in view (Grot.), or *Judaisers* in particular (Neand.), or *antinomian Christians* (Olsh.), or *teachers of Gentile tendencies* (Meyer), or *false brethren in the Churches* (Abb.). But the expression is a general one, applying to all who sought by their sophistries to palliate the vices in question or make them appear to be no vices. These would be found mostly (though by no manner of necessity exclusively) among the heathen, especially among such Gentiles as heard the truth and remained unbelieving. This is most accordant with the descriptive terms which follow, *viz*.—**υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας**; **μὴ . . . συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν**; **ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος**. (So Mey., Ell., etc.)—**διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *for because of these things cometh the wrath of God*. The **διὰ ταῦτα**, which is placed emphatically first, refers of course to the *sins* in question; not to the "vain words," as Chrys., *e.g*., strangely thought. The certainty of the Divine retribution is added as an enforcement of the previous warnings. It is given in terms of a solemn present (**ἔρχεται**) and in the form of "the wrath of God"—an expression which occupies a very large place both in the OT and in the NT. This **ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ** is not to be limited (with Ritschl.) to the judgment of the last day, or taken as synonymous with the *vindicta Dei*, or resolved into a figure

7. μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε [e] συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν. 8. [f] ἦτε γάρ ποτε [g] σκότος, νῦν δὲ [g] φῶς ἐν κυρίῳ· ὡς [h] τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε 9. (ὁ γὰρ

e Ch. iii. 6 reff. f Rom. vi. 17. g Acts xxvi. 18; Rom. ii. 29, xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 6 al. h Ch. ii. 3 reff.

of speech with no reality behind it, or identified simply with certain *effects*—the workings of conscience, the shortness and the ills of life, the penalties of the present existence, etc. It is given in Scripture, just as the love, the righteousness, the holiness of God are given, as an *affectus* and not merely an *effectus*, a quality of the perfect moral nature of God, an attitude and sensibility of the Divine Mind toward evil. It is exhibited as operating now, but also as looking to fulfil itself completely in the final adjustment. Here its future operation in the ultimate awards may be specially in view, but not that alone. Meyer puts it too narrowly when he says it is "the wrath of God *in the day of judgment*, which future, as in ver. 5, is realised as present". —**ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας**: *upon the sons of disobedience*. For **ἀπειθείας** WH prefer **ἀπειθίας**. The phrase has been used already in ii. 2, and there with reference to the unregenerate. Here, again, it describes the persons in respect of their "essential and innate disobedience" (Ell.). The **ἀπειθεία** in view is the denial of faith, disobedience to the truth of the Gospel of God, and so to God Himself; see on ii. 2, and *cf.* Rom. xi. 30, 32, xv. 31; Heb. iv. 6, 11.

Ver. 7. **μὴ οὖν γίνεσθε συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν**: *become not ye then partakers with them*. **γίνεσθε** again = "do not become," "suffer not yourselves to be"; not **ἔστε**, "be not". What is meant is a possible falling back into ways by grace forsaken. The *participation* which is negatived is obviously taking part with the sons of disobedience (**αὐτῶν**) in their *vices*, not merely in their punishment or in the **ὀργή**. The term **συμμέτοχος** (or **συνμέτοχος**, TWH) occurs only here and in iii. 6 above. The **οὖν** has the force which it has in v. 1, giving the inference to be drawn from the statement of the *wrath of God*.

Ver. 8. **ἦτε γάρ ποτε σκότος**: *for ye were once darkness*. A consideration in support of the previous exhortation, *viz.*, the consideration that with them the condition in which such sins could be indulged was wholly past and gone. The **ἦτε** is put emphatically first to throw stress on the fact that all *that* is now *behind* them, and surely not a condition to which they could revert. No **μέν** requires to be supplied here. Its omission in this clause, while the next has **δέ**, is nothing strange or irregular, the **μέν** being inserted only "when the first clause is intended to stand in connection with and prepare the reader for the opposition to the second" (Ell.). See Ell. on Gal. ii. 15; Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, p 765; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, pp. 575-578. It has to be remembered also that the correlation of those two particles has by no means the position in NT Greek which it has in classical Greek. In point of fact it has little or no place in the Catholic Epistles except 1 Pet. (to some extent), or in 2 Thess., 1 Tim., Tit., Philem., and the Apoc., and is comparatively rare even in the Gospels; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 266, 267. The abstract **σκότος**, instead of **ἐσκοτισμένοι** or similar concrete form, adds greatly to the force of the representation. They were darkness itself,—persons "in whom darkness becomes visible and holds sway" (Thay.-Grimm), so utterly sunk in ignorance of Divine things, so wholly lost in the evils accompanying such ignorance —**νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *but now ye are light in the Lord*. Instead of what they once were they had become enlightened by the Gospel, discerners of Divine truth and subjects of the new life which it opens to men. The completeness of the change is indicated again by the use of the abstract term—so possessed and penetrated were they by that truth that they could be described not simply as *enlightened* but as themselves now *light*. And this "in the Lord," for it was in virtue of their fellowship with Christ that this new apprehension of things came to them, transforming their lives. —**ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε**: *walk as children of light*. The strong abstracts **σκότος, φῶς**, come in fitly before the exhortation and make it more pointed. The omission of **οὖν** or any similar particle adds further to the force of the exhortation. If these Ephesians were now "light in the Lord," it was not for themselves only but for others. They were called to live a life beseeming those to whom Christian enlightenment and purity had become their proper nature; *cf.* Luke xvi. 8; John xii. 36; 1 Thess. v. 5. Nothing is to be made of the absence of the article here in contrast

καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς[1] ἐν πάσῃ [i]ἀγαθωσύνῃ[2] καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ), 10. [k]δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστιν [l]εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ[3]· 11. καὶ

i Rom. xv. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11 only; Neh. ix. 35. k Constr., Rom. xii. 2; see Luke xiv. 19 reff. l Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20 al. Paul (and Heb.) only.

[1] πνευματος D[3]E[2]KL, etc., Syr., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al.; φωτος ℵABDEFGP 6, 10, 17, 47, 67[2], 179, 213, al., It., Vulg., Syr., Ar.-erp., Copt., Sah., Eth., Arm., Marcion., Lat. Fathers.

[2] αγαθοσυνη DEFGLP 37, al.

[3] For κυρ., θεῳ DFG, it., v., Lat. Fathers (exc. Aug.).

with τοῦ φωτὸς of ver. 2, the general practice being to insert or omit the article in the case of the governed noun according as the governing noun has it or wants it (Rose's Middleton, *On the Greek Article*, iii., 3, 7, p. 49).

Ver. 9. ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος [φωτός]: *for the fruit of the Spirit* [*the light*]. The reading of the TR, τοῦ πνεύματος, which is that of such uncials as D[3]KL, most cursives, Syr.-P., Chrys., etc., must give place to τοῦ φωτός, which is supported by BℵAD*GP, 67[2], Vulg., Goth., Boh., Arm., Orig., etc. The πνεύματος is probably a correction from Gal. v. 22. The whole verse is in effect a parenthesis, and is printed as such by the RV. But it is a parenthesis with a purpose, the γάρ being at once explanatory and confirmatory. It gives a reason for the previous injunction and an enforcement of it; the point being this—"Walk as I charge you; for anything else would be out of keeping with what is proper to the light and is produced by it". καρπός, *fruit*, a figurative term for the moral results of the light, its products as a whole; *cf.* Matt. iii. 8; Phil. i. 11, etc. In the corresponding statement in Gal. v. 22, where the καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος is contrasted with τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, the singular term may also suggest the idea of the unity of the life and character resulting from the Spirit.—ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ: *is in all goodness*. ἐστι, *is*, *consists*, is left unexpressed after καρπός. The πάσῃ here again has the force of "every form of,"—in goodness in all its forms. The noun ἀγαθωσύνη appears again in Rom. xvi. 14; Gal. v. 22; 2 Thess. i. 11. Thus it occurs only four times in the Pauline writings. It is used in the LXX, but appears not to belong to classical Greek. It varies somewhat in sense. In the OT it means sometimes *good* as opposed to evil (Ps. xxxviii. 20, lii. 3), sometimes *enjoyment* (Eccles. iv. 8), sometimes *benevolence*, the bountiful goodness of God (Neh. ix. 25). Here and in the other Pauline passages it is taken by some in the sense of *uprightness*, but appears rather to mean *active* goodness, *beneficence*; *cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 218.—καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ: *and righteousness*. δικαιοσύνη here has the sense of *rectitude*, *probity*, freedom from the morally wrong or imperfect, as in Matt. iii. 15, v. 6, 10, 20, etc., and as also in such Pauline passages as Rom. vi. 13, 16, 18-20, viii. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 7, 14, etc.—καὶ ἀληθείᾳ: *and truth*. ἀλήθεια here in the subjective sense of *moral* truth, sincerity and integrity as opposed to *falsehood*, *hypocrisy* and the like; *cf.* John iii. 21; 1 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 18, etc. Here, then, Christian morality is given in its three great forms of the *good*, the *just*, the *true*. Abbott compares the "justice, mercy, and truth" of the Gospels and Butler's "justice, truth, and regard to the common good".

Ver. 10. δοκιμάζοντες τί ἐστιν εὐάρεστον τῷ Κυρίῳ: *proving what is well-pleasing to the Lord*. The exhortation given in ver. 8, interrupted by the enforcement introduced in ver. 9, is now continued and explained. The participial sentence defines the *walk* which was enjoined in respect of the way in which it is to be made good. It is a *walk* which is to be taken up and carried out in the light of a constant trial of what pleases the Lord. The verb δοκιμάζειν here has its primary sense of *proving*, *testing* (*cf.* Rom. xii. 2), rather than its secondary sense of *approving* (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 3, etc.). Here, therefore, the δοκιμάζοντες expresses the idea of the careful trial, "the activity and experimental energy" (Ell.), necessary to the walk. The answer of the conscience (Rom. xiv. 23), or conformity to the Gospel (Rom. i. 16; Phil. i. 27), is given elsewhere as the test of the Christian walk. Here its correspondence with what is pleasing to God is given as its final proof and its most distinctive characteristic. εὐάρεστον is better rendered on

μὴ [m] συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς [n] ἔργοις τοῖς [o] ἀκάρποις [1] τοῦ [n] σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ [p] ἐλέγχετε. 12. τὰ γὰρ [q] κρυφῆ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν

m Phil. iv. 14; Rev. xviii. 4 only.
n Rom. xiii. 12 only; see 1 Cor. iv. 5; Isa. xxix. 15.
o Matt. xiii. 22 Mark; Tit. iii. 14; 2 Pet. i. 8; Jude 12; see 1 Cor. xiv. 14; Wisd. xv. 4.
p = John iii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 15; Xen., *Symp.*, viii., 43.
q Here only; Gen. xxxi. 26 al.

[1] For ακαρπ., ακαθαρτοις 61-2; ατακτοις 30[1], Slav.-ms.

the whole "well-pleasing" (RV), especially when Col. i. 10 is compared, than "acceptable" (AV).

Ver. 11. **καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους**: *and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.* TWH again prefer the form **συνκοινωνεῖτε.** The verb has its usual force here, and takes us back to the **συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν** of ver. 7. The only question is whether it governs the **ἔργοις** itself, or an **αὐτοῖς** or **αὐτῶν** understood. Looking to the **συμμέτοχοι αὐτῶν** above, the **συγκοινωνήσαντές μου τῇ θλίψει** of Phil. iv. 14, etc., some prefer the latter, = "have no fellowship with them in the works". But the *gen.* probably would then be the proper case for the *things* in which the participation took place; *cf.* the use of **συγκοινωνεῖν** with **τινί τινος** (*Dio Cass.*, xxxvii., 41, etc.), and **συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης,** etc. (Rom. xi. 17). Here, therefore, as in the case of the **ἁμαρτίαις** in Rev. xviii. 4 and even the **θλίψει** in Phil. iv. 14, the verb is best understood as governing the **ἔργοις** directly. Elsewhere we read of **ἔργα πονηρά** (Col. i. 21), and **νεκρὰ ἔργα** (Heb. vi. 1); here of **ἔργα ἄκαρπα,** works which result in no gain, yield nothing pleasant or profitable, bring no blessing or reward with them; *cf.* the contrast between the *works* of the flesh and the *fruit* of the Spirit in Gal. v. 19, 22.—**μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε**: *but rather even reprove them.* This rendering of the RV is on the whole the best. AV omits the *even.* The other old English Versions render similarly, except Wicl., who has "but more"; Gen., 2, which gives "but even reprove them rather"; and Bish., "but even rebuke". The formula **μᾶλλον δὲ καί,** combines the ideas of the corrective (**μᾶλλον**), the adversative (**δέ**) and the ascensive (**καί**), and means, therefore, "but rather even," not merely "yea, much more". Without the **καί** the phrase **μᾶλλον δέ** has the force of a corrective climax; *cf.* Mey. on Rom. viii. 34, Gal. iv. 9, and Fritz. on Rom. viii. 34. It was not enough, therefore, for them simply to *abstain* from such works; they must even *reprove* them. The question, however, is what is the proper sense of **ἐλέγχετε** here, and what is the force of the whole sentence? Some give the verb the sense of *reproving*, but understand the *reproof* in view to be both in *word* and in *deed* (Olsh.), or only in *deed*, *i.e.*, the reproof conveyed by the spectacle of a pure life and consistently moral walk. Others, looking to the following **τὰ γὰρ κρυφῆ γινόμενα,** etc., and thinking it incongruous to speak of an *oral* rebuke in connection with a statement of the shame it is even to *speak* of the sins in question, would give the verb the sense of *exposing* (Abb.). But both the context and the general idea connected with **ἐλέγχειν** in the Pauline writings (*cf.*, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 15) point to the notion of *oral* reproof. The idea, therefore, is that these Christians were not at liberty to deal lightly with such sins, or connive at them, or be silent about them, but had to speak out against them and hold them up to rebuke, with the view of bringing their heathen neighbours to apprehend their turpitude and forsake them.

Ver. 12. **τὰ γὰρ κρυφῆ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν αἰσχρόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν**: *for the things which are done by them in secret it is a shame even to speak of.* This rendering of the RV, which follows Ellicott's, does more justice to the *order* of the Greek than that of the AV. The term **κρυφῆ** occurs only this once in the NT; but it is found occasionally in the LXX. Lach., WH, Mey., etc., prefer the form **κρυφῇ**; most editors and grammarians (Treg., Tisch., Alf., Jelf, Win., etc.) adopt **κρυφῆ**; *cf.* Win.-Moult., pp. 52, 53. The **γάρ** introduces a reason for, or a confirmation of, the charge to *reprove* the sins. But what of the special point and connection? Some (*e.g.*, Harl.) would refer the **γάρ** to the **μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε,** as if = "do not take part in their sins, for they are too vile even to mention". But this does not do justice to the difference between the **κρυφῆ γινόμενα** and the **ἔργα τοῦ σκότους.** Others, putting more into the **λέγειν** than it can properly bear, understand it as = "rebuke these sins openly, for to speak of them in any other

αἰσχρόν ἐστιν καὶ λέγειν· 13. τὰ δὲ πάντα [p] ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς [r] φανεροῦται· πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστιν.

r Mark iv. 22; John iii. 21; Rom. i. 19 al. Paul.

terms than that of rebuke is shameful". Bengel finds in it a reason for the sins being only referred to and not specified by name. Stier, supposing the reproof *de facto* to be in view, makes it = "do not even name these sins, for if you did so you would yourselves be sinning, whereas your walk in the light will be their reproof". Others (Von Sod., Abb.), adopting the sense of "expose" for **ἐλέγχειν**, take the idea to be—"do not participate in these works, but expose them, for the things they do secretly it is a shame even to mention; but all these things when exposed by the light are made manifest in their true character". But the course of thought is simpler. The *secrecy* of the works in question is the reason why they require to be openly reproved; and the point is this—the heathen practise in secret vices too abominable even to mention; all the more is the need of open rebuke instead of silent overlooking or connivance (Mey., Ell., etc.). It is not *all* heathen sins, therefore, that are in view; for it would be an exaggeration to say that *all* such vices were of a kind too shameful even to speak of; but a certain class of sins, that worst class which are done in secret. This is in harmony with the emphatic position of the **κρυφῇ** and with the contrast in the **φανεροῦται**. But if the expression **κρυφῇ γινόμενα** covers less than the **ἔργα τοῦ σκότους**, there is nothing on the other hand to indicate that it refers specifically to the immoral licence of the Pagan *mysteries*, or any other single instance of dark and infamous excess. It includes all those shameless heathen indulgences which sought the cover of secrecy.

Ver. 13. **τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστί**: *but all, when they are reproved, are made manifest by the light: for everything that is made manifest is light.* Both the connection and the import of some of the words here are difficult to determine, and various interpretations have been proposed. The RV renders it "but all things when they are reproved are made manifest," treating it as a general statement. But the point and the harmony of the whole verse are best seen if the phrase **τὰ πάντα** is taken to refer to the secret practices which have been immediately in view, = "all of them," "all *these* things". The **ἐλεγχόμενα**, again, must have its proper sense of *reproved* or *rebuked*, and cannot be dealt with as synonymous with **πεφανεροῦται**. The anarthrous participle will express the *manner* or the *time* of the action in question, and is not = "all things *which* are reproved" (Vulg., AV, etc.), but is = "all *these* things when they are reproved". The **πᾶν** must be accepted as a neuter, there being no reason for taking it (with Bengel) as abstract for concrete and so = "every *man*". Further, the **φανερούμενον** and the **φανεροῦται** are naturally to be taken as of the same Voice. That the former cannot have the force of the Middle, "that which makes manifest," appears from the fact that there does not appear to be any instance of **φανεροῦσθαι** being anything else than a pure passive in the NT, although it occurs some fifty times there. Two particular difficulties remain, *viz.*, (*a*) the connection of **ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός**, and (*b*) the sense of **φῶς** in the two clauses. As to (*a*), some attach the words to the **ἐλεγχόμενα**, = "when they are reproved by the light" (Syr., Copt., etc.). But, as the **ἐλέγχετε** (ver. 11) was introduced without any specification of the agent, it is most natural to connect the **ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός** here not with the participle but with the fin. verb, and the best sense is got thereby. As to (*b*), it is held by some (*e.g.*, Ell.) that the term **φῶς** must have the same sense in both clauses, whether the primary sense or the metaphorical. But it is difficult to get a clear and consistent sense for the statement on that supposition, neither is it *necessary* that the **τοῦ φωτός** in the first clause should have identically the same sense as **φῶς** in the second. In point of fact in the former the idea of the *Christian* light, the light of the Christian truth previously referred to, seems to be in view; while in the latter clause, which gives a *general* statement in support of the preceding *particular* affirmation, **φῶς** has its primary sense. It should be added that, if **φανερούμενον** is part of the statement of a general truth, the objection taken by some (*e.g.*, Abb.) to the interpretation that deals with it as a true passive, *viz.*, that it should then be **πεφανερωμένον**, falls to the ground. These considerations, therefore, negative all such inter-

14. **διὸ** [s]**λέγει** [t]**Ἔγειρε**[1] **ὁ** [u]**καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν,** [v]**καὶ** [w]**ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ χριστός.**[2] 15. [x]**βλέπετε οὖν** [y]**πῶς** [z]**ἀκριβῶς**

s Ch. iv. 8 reff. t Isa. xxvi. 19; (Heb.) lx. 1. u 1 Thess. v. 6 reff. v = James iv. 7; Rev. ii. 10. w Here only; Job xxv. 5. x = Matt. xxiv. 4 al.; 1 Cor. iii. 10, viii. 9, x. 22, xvi. 10; Gal. v. 15; Col. ii. 8; Heb. iii. 12, xii. 25. y See note. z = here only; see Acts xxvi. 5.

[1] **εγειραι** with some mss.; **εγειρε** MSS., al.

[2] **επιψαυσεις του Χριστου** D[1] and mss. in Chr.-Jer., d, e, f, Thdrt. (who however cites text from **ἔνια τῶν ἀντιγρ.** with approval), Orig., Ambrst.; **επιφαυσει σοι ο Χριστος** Marc., Clem., Orig.$_2$, Ath., Chr., Dam., Archel. (om. **σοι**), Jer., Ambr., Aug., Vig., Pel., al.

pretations as these—(1) "he who does not refuse to be made manifest, becomes an enlightened one" (Beng.); (2) "for all that is enlightened by the light, is itself light" (Olsh.); (3) "all things which are tested by the light of the doctrine of Christ, one has no need to keep secret; all, however, which one can perform openly is itself light"; (4) all those constructions which give **φανερούμενον** the Middle sense, *e.g.*, *omne enim illud, quod manifesta facit alia, lux est* (Erasm.); *lux enim illud est quod omnia facit manifesta* (Beza; similarly Calv., Bleek, etc.); (5) and all that make the *light* the agent of the **ἐλέγχειν** (De Wette, etc.). The sense, therefore, is this—"all these shameful things which are done by them in secret, when they are subjected to the open rebuke which Christians ought to give them, are laid bare by the light of the Christian truth acting in their reproof, so that the doers of them are made to see them in the odiousness of their real nature; for everything that is disclosed in its real colours ceases to be secret and becomes of the nature of light". So substantially Mey., Ell., etc. The **δέ** also has its proper, adversative force, as if = "these things indeed are done in secret; *but* (or *yet*) they are made manifest and displayed in their true character, when you reprove them in the power of Christian truth". Thus, the whole sentence becomes a further reason, derived from the *effects* of the act, for practising the **ἐλέγχειν**; and the second clause confirms the particular power ascribed to the Christian **φῶς** by reference to the general statement of the connection between *manifestation* and *light*.

Ver. 14. **διὸ λέγει, Ἔγειραι ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός**: *Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee.* So the RV, better on the whole than the "shall give thee light" of the AV. The verse contains a quotation, but the great difficulty is in ascertaining its source and understanding its precise point. It is introduced by the subordinating, co-ordinating, and causal particle **διό** (on which see under ii. 11, and *cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 233; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 274) = **δι' ὅ**, "on which account," *i.e.*, "things being as I have stated them we have the Divine word, 'Arise,'" etc. The **λέγει** is taken by some (Haupt, Abb.) as = *it is said;* but in Paul's general use it is personal, **ὁ Θεός** or similar subject being understood; while **φησί** is the formula that may be used impersonally. (See on iv. 8, and *cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, xii., 4, p. 419.) For **ἔγειραι** of the TR, which is the reading of the cursives, **ἔγειρε**, which is supported by BℵADGKL and practically all uncials, must be accepted. It requires no **σεαυτόν** to be supplied; neither is it to be explained as an Active with a Middle sense; but is best understood as a formula like **ἄγε**, with the force of *up!* The imper. **ἀνάστα** for **ἀνάστηθι** occurs again in Acts xii. 7, as also in Theocr., 24, 36; Menander (Mein.), p. 48, etc.; *cf.* **ἀνάβα** (Rev. iv. 1), **κατάβα** (Mark xv. 30; but with a *v. l.*). The verb **ἐπιφαύσει** means properly to *dawn*, corresponding to the ordinary Greek **ἐπιφώσκω**, which is used also in the narratives of the Resurrection in Matt. xxviii. 1; Luke xxiii. 54. This is the only occurrence in the NT of the form **ἐπιφαύσκω**, which is found occasionally, however, in the LXX (Job xxv. 5, xxxi. 6, xli. 10, etc.). The noun **ὑπόφαυσις** also occurs in Herod., vii., 30. Instead of **ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός** D* and certain manuscripts mentioned by Chrys., Theod., Jer., etc., read **ἐπιψαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός** or **ἐπιψαύσεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ**. This reading was connected with the legend that our Lord's Cross was planted above Adam's burial-place, and that our first father was to be raised from the dead by the touch of the Saviour's body and blood. The clause as we have it means not merely "Christ will cause His face to shine graciously upon thee," but

"Christ will shine upon thee with the light of His truth and bring thee out of the pagan darkness of ignorance and immorality".

So much for the terms. But whence does the passage come? The answer which first suggests itself, and which is given by many (Calv., Est., Beng., Harl., Olsh., Hofm., Weiss, Alf., Ell., etc.), is that it is a quotation from the OT, as the formula **λέγει** indicates, and in fact a very free reproduction and application of Isa. lx. 1. The difficulty lies in the extreme freedom with which the original words are handled. There is but a very slender resemblance between what we have here and the LXX version of the prophetic verse, *viz.*, **φωτίζου, φωτίζου, Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἥκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ δόξα Κυρίου ἐπί σε ἀνατέταλκεν.** Nor should we have a different condition, if we supposed Paul in this case to have followed the Hebrew text. Hence some (Beza, etc.) imagine that Paul has combined with Isa. lx. 1 other Isaianic passages (*e.g.*, ix. 1, xxvi. 19, lii. 1). But while it is true that Paul does elsewhere use great liberty in modifying, combining, and applying OT passages, it cannot be said either that these words of Isaiah have much relation to the quotation, or that we have in Paul's writings (even Rom. x. 6, etc., not excepted) any case quite parallel to this. Others, therefore, conclude that the passage is from some apocryphal writing, the *Apocalypse of Elias* (Epiph.), a prophecy under the name of *Jeremiah* (Geor. Syncell.), one of the writings attributed to *Enoch* (Cod. G, margin). But though Paul *might* have quoted from an apocryphal book, and some think he has done it, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. ii. 9, it is certain that his habit is to quote only from the OT, and further this formula of citation appears always to introduce an OT passage. Meyer tries to solve the difficulty by the somewhat far-fetched supposition that Paul really quoted from some apocryphal writing, but by a lapse of memory took it for a part of canonical Scripture. Others suggest that he is quoting a saying of our Lord not recorded in the Gospels (*cf.* Resch., *Agrapha*, pp. 222, 289), or a *baptismal formula*, or some *hymn* (Mich., Storr, etc.). The choice must be between the first-mentioned explanation and the last. Notwithstanding the confessed difficulties of the case, there is not a little to incline us to the idea that, although in a very inexact and unusual form, we have a biblical quotation before us here. On the other hand it is urged (*e.g.*, by Haupt) with some force that the rhythmical character of the passage favours the supposition that we have here a snatch from some very ancient hymn or liturgical composition. The question must be confessed to be still open. But what in any case is the *point* of the quotation here? The passage is introduced in connection with the reference to the *effects* of a faithful **ἔλεγξις** and under the impression of the figure of the *light*. It takes the form of an appeal to wake out of the pagan condition of sin, described by the twofold figure of *sleep* and *death*, and of a promise that then Christ will shine upon the sinner with the saving light of His truth. The quotation comes in relevantly, therefore, as a further enforcement both of the need for the *reproof* which is enjoined, and of the good effects of such a *reproof* faithfully exercised.

Vv. 15-21. A paragraph closely connected with the former, and specifying various things belonging to the correctness and consistency of the Christian walk.

Ver. 15. **βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκριβῶς [ἀκριβῶς πῶς] περιπατεῖτε**: *take heed then how ye walk with strictness* [or, *take heed carefully how ye walk*]. The writer passes from the statement of the need of the **ἔλεγξις** and its profitable effects into which he had been led for a space, and returns to the exhortation of ver. 8. The **οὖν** has its *resumptive* force here; as indeed it is a particle not so much of *inference* as of "continuation and retrospection" (Donald.), and is better rendered "then," "accordingly," "to proceed," than "therefore" (see Win.-Moult., p. 553; Ell. on Gal. iii. 5; and especially Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 571). It is out of place to give **βλέπετε** any such sense as "make use of the light so as to see," as if it had regard to the **φῶς** previously mentioned. It has the simple force of "take heed," as in Matt. xiii. 23, 33; 1 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 2; Col. iv. 17. It is followed by **πῶς** again in Luke viii. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 10. The particular shade of meaning attributable to **ἀκριβῶς** here turns in some degree on the reading. The TR gives **πῶς ἀκριβῶς**, following ℵ[c]ADGKLP and most MSS., with the Vulg., Syr., Arm. Versions, and such Fathers as Theodor., Jerome, etc. If this order is adopted **ἀκριβῶς**, which = "exactly," "diligently" (Matt. ii. 8; Luke i. 3; Acts xviii. 25; 1 Thess. v. 2), will express the idea of strict conformity to a standard, carefulness against any departure from what is proper to a Christian walk. So the AV and other old

περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς [a] ἄσοφοι, ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοὶ, 16. [b] ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν [c] καιρὸν, ὅτι αἱ [d] ἡμέραι [e] πονηραί εἰσιν. 17. διὰ τοῦτο μὴ

a Here only.
b Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5; Col. iv. 5 only.
b c Col. iv. 5; Dan. ii. 8.
d = 2 Tim. iii. 1; Heb. x. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 10.
d e Ps. xl. 1.
e = Gal. i. 4; ch. vi. 13.

English Versions render it "circumspectly" or (Wicl., Rhem.) "warily"—a very good translation. In Bℵ*17, Origen, etc., the order is **ἀκριβῶς πῶς**, and this is adopted by TTr marg. WHRV. In that case the injunction loses its distinctive note, and instead of the charge to take heed how they walked "with strict carefulness," we have the plain exhortation to "take heed carefully" how they walked. The **πῶς** in either case should have its proper sense "how" (as in Cran., Cov., Rhem. and similarly Wicl.), not "that" (as in AV and the rest of the old English Versions). Further, the **περιπατεῖτε** is not an indic. with a *conjunctive* force, as if = "take heed how ye *should* walk," but a proper indic.; the point being the need of looking carefully at the way in which the Christian walk was being carried out there and then. See Win.-Moult., p. 376, and *cf.* **ἕκαστος βλεπέτω πῶς οἰκοδομεῖ** in 1 Cor. iii. 10.—**μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι, ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί**: *not as unwise, but as wise.* Some think that some such term as **περιπατοῦντες** must be supplied here. But it is unnecessary, the **μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι** being dependent on the **πῶς περιπατεῖτε** and explanatory of it, = "how ye walk, *to wit*, not as unwise, but as wise". The subjective negative **μή** is in point because the whole sentence is also dependent on the **βλέπετε.** The nature of the walk to be consistently pursued is placed in the stronger light by the antithetic parallelism; a form especially characteristic of the Johannine writings; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 762. They were to walk as those who had the character (**ὡς**) not of fools, but of wise men.

Ver. 16. **ἐξαγοραζόμενοι τὸν καιρόν**: *buying up for yourselves the opportunity.* Definition of the **ὡς σοφοί**, specifying the way in which they were to give token of the quality of wisdom. The expression occurs only once again in the NT (in Col. iv. 5); and there are but few proper parallels to it. The phrase as used in Dan. ii. 8 has rather the sense of *gaining time, delaying.* The classical phrase **καιρὸν πρίασθαι** (used, *e.g.*, by Demosthenes) has the plain meaning of purchasing for money. Even the **κερδαντέον τὸ παρόν** cited from Anton., vi., 26, and the **καιρὸν ἁρπάζειν** of Plut. (*Philop.*, 15) are but partial analogies. In the NT the verb **ἐξαγοράζειν** has at times the sense of *redeeming*, ransoming one from another by payment of a price, and so it is applied to Christ's vicarious death (Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5). It has the sense of *ransoming* occasionally in profane Greek (*e.g.*, Diodor., 36, 1, p. 530). Hence some take the idea here to be that of *redeeming*, as from the power of Satan (Calv.), or from the power of evil men (Beng.); the sacrifice of earthly things being taken by some (Chrys. Theophyl., Oec., etc.) to be the purchase-price. But it is doubtful whether any such technical or metaphorical sense can be attached to the word here, where the subject in view is the plain duty of a careful Christian walk. The simpler sense of *buying* is more appropriate to the context. The **ἐξ-** probably has its intensive force, although Ellicott takes it to refer merely to the "undefined time or circumstances, *out of* which, in each particular case, the **καιρός** is to be bought". Giving the Middle also its proper sense, we get the sense of "buying up for yourselves". The thing to be "bought up" is the **καιρός**, not "the time," but "the *fit* time," the "opportunity," and the purchase-money implied in the figure is left undefined, but may be the *careful heed* expended on their walk. Thus the sense comes to be this—the character of wisdom by which their walk was to be distinguished was to show itself in the prompt and discerning zeal with which they made every opportunity their own, and suffered no fitting season for the fulfilment of Christian duty to pass unused. Luther's "suit yourselves to the time" would require some such phrase as **δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ** (Rom. xii. 11), and is otherwise inappropriate. Other explanations, such as Harless's supposition that the matter in view is the fit time for letting the **ἔλεγξις** break in upon the darkness of sin, are remote from the immediate subject or impart ideas which are not in the text. The RV gives "redeeming the time" in the text, and "buying up the opportunity" in the margin.—**ὅτι αἱ ἡμέραι πονηραί εἰσι**: *because the days are evil.* Statement of motive for buying up the opportunity, *viz.*, the evil of the time. The context makes it clear that what is in view is the moral evil of the days, not merely as, *e.g.*, in Gen.

f Luke xi. 40, xii. 20; Rom. ii. 20 al.; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. ii. 15; Job v. 3.
g Acts xxi. 14 only; elsw. τοῦ θεοῦ.
h Luke xii. 45; 1 Thess. v. 7 only.
i Tit. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 4 only; Prov. xxviii. 7; 2 Macc. iv. 6.
k = Acts xiii. 52; Rom. i. 29, xv. 13 al.

γίνεσθε [f] ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιόντες[1] τί τὸ [g] θέλημα τοῦ [g] κυρίου.[2] 18. καὶ μὴ [h] μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν [i] ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ[3] [k] πλη-

[1] συνιεντες D[3]EKL, mss., nearly, Syr., Arm., Eth., al., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; συνιετε ℵABP 67[2], 73, 118, Chr.-ms., Jer.; συνιοντες DFG (It., Vulg., Goth., Syr., all, Lucif., all).

[2] After κυρ. insert ημων B; for κυρ., θεου A 14, 55, 66[2], 109-15-78, d, e, f, Syr., Thl., Jer., Aug.-Pel.

[3] αλλα μαλλον 10, 37, 71, 116, Arm.

xlvii. 9, their difficulties and troubles (Beza, etc.). The fact that the times in which they lived were morally so corrupt was a strong reason for making every opportunity for good, which such times might offer, their own.

Ver. 17. **διὰ τοῦτο μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες**: *for this cause become not ye foolish.* The **διὰ τοῦτο** *may* refer to the immediately preceding clause (Rück., De Wette, etc.), the evil of the days being a reason for avoiding folly. It is better, however, to refer it to the main idea, that of the *walk*, than to the subordinate. The manner of walk which they were called to pursue required the cultivation of wisdom, not of folly. The **γίνεσθε**, again, is not to be reduced to the sense of **ἐστε**. Contemplating them as in the Christian position Paul charges them not to suffer themselves to slip back again into folly—a thing inconsistent with the walk required of the Christian. **ἄφρονες** is a strong term = without reason, senseless, lacking moral intelligence.—**ἀλλὰ συνιέντες** [**συνίετε**] **τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Κυρίου**: *but understanding* [*understand*] *what the will of the Lord is.* The reading varies here between **συνιέντες**, as in TR, with D[3]EKL and the mass of MSS., Vulg., Syr.-P., etc.; **συνιόντες**, with D*G, etc.; and **συνίετε**, with BℵAP 17, etc., which is adopted by LTTr WHRV. For **Κυρίου** Lachmann gives **θεοῦ** in the margin, but on slight authority. The **Κύριος**, as in Acts xxi. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 19, is *Christ.* As distinguished from **γινώσκειν**, **συνιέναι** expresses *intelligent, comprehending* knowledge, more than acquaintance with a thing or mere matter of fact knowledge.

Ver. 18. **καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ**: *and be not made drunk with wine.* A particular case of the **ἀφροσύνη** to be avoided is now mentioned. The **καί** is used here, as, *e.g.*, also in Mark i. 5, to add a *special* designation to a *general, inclusive* statement; Win.-Moult., p. 546. The case is the abuse of wine. But there is nothing to suggest any reference to excess at the *Agapae* (1 Cor. xi. 21) in especial. **ἐν ᾧ ἐστιν ἀσωτία**: *wherein is dissoluteness.* Or, with the RV, "wherein is riot". The AV, Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., all give "excess"; Wicl. has *lechery*, and the Rhem. *riotousness.* **ἀσωτία** (*cf.* Prov. xxviii. 7) expresses the idea of an *abandoned, debauched* life; literally, the condition of one who is past salvation. The **ἐν ᾧ** refers not to the **οἶνος** alone (which might infer a Gnostic view of matter or Montanistic, ascetic ideas of life), but to the whole phrase **μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ**—the becoming *drunk* with wine.—**ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν Πνεύματι**: *but be filled with the Spirit.* The verb **πληροῦν** is construed with the *gen.* of the thing that fills (*e.g.*, Acts ii. 28, v. 28, xiii. 52, *pass.*, etc.); or with the Hebraistic *acc.* (Col. i. 9); or with the *dat.* (Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4, etc.). The construction with **ἐν** here is exceptional. Hence some prefer to understand **πνεύματι** of man's spirit, and render it (as RV margin) "be filled in spirit". The contrast would then be between being filled in one's physical or carnal nature and filled in one's spiritual nature (so Braune, and in effect Abb.). In NT Greek, however, verbs that are followed by the simple dat. sometimes vary it by a prepositional form, *e.g.*, **βαπτίζεσθαι ὕδατι** (Luke iii. 16) and **ἐν ὕδατι** (Matt. iii. 11), **παντὶ τρόπῳ** (Phil i. 18) and **ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ** (2 Thess. ii. 16), etc.; and the formula **πληροῦν** or **πληροῦσθαι ἐν** is not wholly without analogy; *cf.* **τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου**, i. 23 above; and Col. iv. 12, **πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ**, where indeed the **πεπληρωμένοι** of the TR must give place to another verb, yet one with the same idea, the sense being probably "filled *with* everything willed by God" (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 272; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 117). The **ἐν** may be taken, therefore, as the *instrum.* **ἐν**, and

ροῦσθε ἐν [l]πνεύματι,[1] 19. λαλοῦντες [m]ἑαυτοῖς [n]ψαλμοῖς[2] καὶ [o]ὕμνοις καὶ [p]ᾠδαῖς [[q]πνευματικαῖς[3]], [r]ᾄδοντες καὶ [s]ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ [t]καρδίᾳ[4]

l Const., Rom. x. 20. m = Ch. iv. 32 reff. n = Col. iii. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 26. o Col. iii. 16 only; Neh. xii. 46. p Col. iii. 16; Rev. v. 9 al. only; Exod. xv. 1 al. q Rom. i. 11 al. Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. ii. 5. r Col. iii. 16; Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3, xv. 3 only; Jer. xxxvii. 19. s Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; James v. 13 only; 1 Kings xvi. 16. t = Acts vii. 54; Rom. ii. 15, 29, x. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 37 al.

[1] **εν τω πνευματι** FG; add **αγιω** Eth., Arm.

[2] **εν ψαλ.** B, D.-lat., 17, 67[2], 73, 116-18, Vulg., Chr., Ambrst., Jer., Pel.

[3] After **ωδαις** om. **πνευματικαις** B, d, e, Ambrst.-ed.; add **εν χαριτι** A. **εν ταις καρδιαις** ℵ[3]ADEFGP 47, It., Vulg., Goth., Syr., Syr.-marg., al., Bas., Chr.[2], Lat. Fathers.

[4] **τη καρδια** ℵB, Orig.; **εν τη καρδια** KL and most MSS., Syr.-P., Arm., Eth., Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl.

the sense will be "filled *with* or *by* the Spirit". Some (*e.g.*, Ell., Alf.) would combine the ideas of *in* and *by*, supposing the unusual phrase to be chosen with a view to convey the fact that the Holy Spirit is not only the instrument *by* which the Christian man is filled, but that also *in* which he is so filled. But this is a needless refinement. The contrast, as most commentators recognise, is not merely between the **οἴνῳ** and the **πνεύματι**, but between the **μεθύσκεσθε** and the **πληροῦσθε**. Otherwise the order would have been **μὴ οἴνῳ μεθύσκεσθε, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι πληροῦσθε** (Mey.). The contrast is not between the *instruments* but between the *states*—between two elevated states, one due to the excitement of wine, the other to the inspiration and enlightenment of the Spirit.

Ver. 19. **λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς**: *speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs*. Lachm. inserts **ἐν** before **ψαλμοῖς**; Tr and WH place it in the margin, on the authority of BP 17, 67[2], Vulg., Jer. **πνευματικαῖς** is bracketed by Lach., but is to be retained, as being found in all authorities with the exception of a very few—B, *d*, *e*, etc. The AV and the other old English Versions render **ἑαυτοῖς** "yourselves," and the RV gives this a place in the margin. But in all probability **ἑαυτοῖς** has the reciprocal sense = **ἀλλήλοις**, as in iv. 32 (*cf.* Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 654, 2). The idea is not that of *meditation*, but that of *converse*. There is nothing, however, to suggest the thought of actual *worship*. The sentence specifies one of the ways in which the condition of being "filled with the Spirit" would express itself. In their intercourse one with another their language would not be that of ordinary convention, far less that of base intoxication, but that of spiritual devotion and thankfulness. Reference is made by many commentators to Pliny's well-known report of the practice of the Christians of Bithynia and Pontus—carmen Christo quasi Deo dicunt *secum invicem* (Ep., x., 97); but what is in view there is responsive praise in the Lord's Day worship. *Psalms, hymns*, and *spiritual songs* are mentioned again in Col. iii. 16. What the distinctions are, if any, between the three terms has been considerably disputed. **ψαλμός** is a religious song, especially one sung to a musical accompaniment, and *par excellence* an OT psalm; **ὕμνος** is properly speaking a song of *praise*; **ᾠδή** is the most general term, applicable to all kinds of songs, secular or sacred, accompanied or unaccompanied (*cf.* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 279; Light. on Col. iii. 16). The three words are brought together here with a view to rhetorical force, and it is precarious, therefore, to build much upon supposed differences between them. There is nothing to warrant Harless's idea that the **ψαλμός** is the spiritual song for *Jewish*-Christians and the **ὕμνος** for *Gentile*-Christians; or Olshausen's supposition that the term **ψαλμοῖς** is to be limited to the OT psalms which had passed over into the Christian Church. There were *Christian* psalms—psalms which the Holy Spirit moved the primitive Christians to utter when they came together in worship (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26), as He moved them to speak with tongues (Acts ii. 4, x. 46, xix. 6). It is probable, therefore, that these are intended here, especially in view of what has been said of being "filled by the Spirit". If the terms, therefore, are to be distinguished at all, the case will be simply this—that the **ψαλμοί** and the **ὕμνοι** are specific kinds of **ᾠδαὶ πνευματικαί**, and that the former are the Christian psalms which worshippers were inspired to sing, and which no doubt would be like the familiar psalms

u=Luke xvii. 16, xviii. 11; John xi. 41; Rom. i. 8 and freq. Paul; Rev. xi. 17.

ὑμῶν τῷ κυρίῳ, 20. [u] εὐχαριστοῦντες [v] πάντοτε ὑπὲρ [v] πάντων ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [w] τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί,[1]

u v 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3; Paul only. v 2 Cor. ix. 8; Phil. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; Paul only. w James i. 27.

[1] πα. κ. θ. DEFG, al.₂, It., Goth., Vig.

of Israel, while the latter were songs of praise to Christ or to God. On this view the adj. πνευματικαῖς is attached to the ᾠδαῖς not merely to differentiate these ᾠδαί as religious and not secular, but to describe them as inspired by the Holy Ghost.—ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ: *singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord.* The ἐν of the TR is supported by KL, most cursives, Syr.-Harcl., Arm., etc. It is omitted by Bℵ*, Orig., etc., and is deleted by LT[Tr]WHRV. For τῇ καρδίᾳ, Lachm. prefers ταῖς καρδίαις, which is given by ℵ³ADGP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. ψάλλοντες, properly = *playing* on a stringed instrument, and then = *singing*, especially to an instrument (Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; James v. 13). The τῷ Κυρίῳ will have its usual reference, *viz.*, to *Christ*. The question, however, is whether this clause is to be taken as *coordinate* or as *subordinate*. Does it *add* something to the previous λαλοῦντες clause, or simply explain and extend it? The latter view has been accepted by many from Theodoret downwards, who understand the point here to be that the speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs was not to be a formal thing or a matter of the lips only, but the utterance of the heart, "with the heart" (RV). But this would be expressed rather by ἐκ τῆς καρδίας or κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν. The rendering "heartily" also would be easier if there were no ὑμῶν. Besides the contrast in the context is not between lip-praise and heart-praise on the part of Christians, but between Christian converse expressing itself in praise, and the vain or profligate talk of the heathen. Hence (with Harl., Mey., Ell., Alf.), it is best to give ἐν its proper sense of *in*, and to understand the clause as referring to the melody that takes place in the stillness of the heart. It specifies a second kind of praise in addition to that of the λαλοῦντες—the unvoiced praise of meditation and inward worship.

Ver. 20. εὐχαριστοῦντες πάντοτε ὑπὲρ πάντων: *giving thanks always for all things.* Another *coordinate* clause giving a third and more particular way in which the being "filled with the Spirit" should express itself. The two preceding sentences referred to *praise*, both outwardly with the mouth and inwardly in the silence of the heart. This third sentence mentions a special form of praise, *viz.*, *thanksgiving*. This thanksgiving is described as a *constant* duty, the πάντοτε which would have been inappropriate with the λαλοῦντες and with the ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες being in place here where, as in the case of *joy* and *prayer* (1 Thess. v. 16, 17), the matter is one primarily of attitude or spirit. The ὑπὲρ πάντων, "for all things" (neut., not masc., as understood by Theodor.), is taken by many in its widest possible extent, as including things evil as well as good. The Epistle does not deal, however, particularly with the *sufferings* of the Christian, but with what he receives from God and what his consequent duty is. It is most accordant, therefore, with the context to understand the πάντων as referring to all the *blessings* of the Christian, the whole good that comes to him from God.—ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: *in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.* The phrase ἐν ὀνόματι . . . Χριστοῦ is different from ἐν Χριστῷ and of wider application. It has different shades of meaning, *authority*, *power*, *honour*, *dependence*, etc., in different connections. Here probably it expresses the idea of doing something *in dependence* upon Christ, or *in regardfulness* of what Christ is; *cf.* John xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 23; Col. iii. 7.—τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί: *to God and the Father.* The RV gives "to God, even the Father" in its text, and "to the God and Father" in the margin. But the most appropriate rendering of the title is the above. The title designates One who is *God and at the same time Father;* the Fatherhood here, as elsewhere, being no doubt primarily the relation to Christ, as is suggested by the ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, etc.

Ver. 21. ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις: *subjecting yourselves one to another.* The connection of this clause is by no means clear. It is taken by not a few (Calv., Matthies, etc.) as an independent clause, the participle being dealt with as an imperative. But there is nothing to suggest the ἐστε which would have to be supplied.

21. [x] ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ χριστοῦ[1]· 22. αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν[2] ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, 23. ὅτι ἀνήρ[3] ἐστιν [y] κεφαλὴ τῆς

x Ch. i. 22 reff.
y = 1 Cor. xi. 3; ch. i. 22, iv. 15; Col. i. 18; Paul only

[1] Χριστου ℵABLP, most others, f, Vulg., Syr., Copt., Arm., Eth., Goth., Orig., Bas., Chrys., Dam., Victorin., etc.; Χριστου Ιησου DE 35, d, e; Ιησου Χριστου Fgr.G, g; κυριου K; θεου most cursives, Clem., Euth., Thdrt., Dam.

[2] After ανδρ. insert υποτασσεσθε KL, al., Chr.; before ιδ. DF, Syr.; υποτασσεσθωσαν ℵAP 17, 57, fere al., Vulg., Copt., Clem.,₁, Bas., Thdrt., Dam., Lat. Fathers; without υποτασσεσθαι or υποτασσεσθωσαν B, MSS. in Jerome: (*Hoc quod in lat. exx. additum est, subditae sint, in gr. edd. non habetur. . . . Sed hoc magis in graeco intelligitur quam in latino*), Clem.

[3] ο ανηρ some cursives, Clem., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; ανηρ ℵADEFGKLP 44, 106 to 11-53-77-6-9, 219-38, all, Dam.

To relate the clause to the paragraph which *follows* means that it is the introductory, *general* statement, of which we have a particular application in what is said of the **γυναῖκες**. But in that case we should expect the duty of the **γυναῖκες** to be conveyed by a noun distinct from **ὑποτασσόμενοι**, but denoting a form of behaviour that would come easily under the comprehensive duty expressed by the participle. It is best to connect the clause, therefore, with what *precedes* it, and to take it as a *fourth coordinate* clause, giving yet another way in which the condition of being "filled with the Spirit" should express itself. The former three dealt with spiritual converse, praise, and thanksgiving; this one deals with what is due from ourselves to others. It is appended to the other three as a summary statement of duty in our relations one to another, of which particular applications are to be made. Thus it leads easily on to the special obligations which are next enforced. The same comprehensive statement of Christian duty in our earthly relations as summed up in the one idea of mutual **ὑπόταξις**, in contrast with pagan self-seeking and self-assertion, is given in 1 Pet. v. 5.—**ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ [Χριστοῦ]**: *in the fear of God* [*of Christ*]. The reading of the TR, **Θεοῦ**, is that mostly of the cursives and a few Fathers. It must give place to **Χριστοῦ**, which is given by BℵALP, Vulg., Syr., Boh., etc., and is accepted by LTTrWHRV. Other variations occur, *e.g.*, **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** in D and **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** in G. The phrase "in the fear of Christ" occurs only this once. Reverence for the Lord Himself was the spirit in which this great duty of mutual subjection was to be fulfilled.

Vv. 22-33. A paragraph which, in dealing with the duties of wives and husbands as seen in the new light of Christian truth, gives the Christian ideal of the marriage-relation. It is the loftiest conception of that relation that has ever come from human pen, and one than which no higher can be imagined.

Ver. 22. **Αἱ γυναῖκες, τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν [ὑποτάσσεσθε]**: *Wives, be in subjection to your own husbands.* The great Christian law of mutual subjection or submissive consideration is now to be unfolded in its bearing on three particular relations which lie at the foundation of man's social life—those of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and servants. The relation of husbands and wives, as the most fundamental, is taken up before the others, and the Christian duty of the wives is set forth first. The reading is somewhat uncertain. The TR inserts **ὑποτάσσεσθε**, with KL, most cursives, Syr., Chrys., etc. A few manuscripts (DG) place the **ὑποτάσσεσθε** after the **γυναῖκες**. In some important authorities (ℵAP 17, Boh., Goth., Vulg., Arm., etc.) we find **ὑποτασσέσθωσαν**; which is accepted by LTr and given a place in the margin by WH. The clause is given without any verb by B, Clem., and Jer., which last states that the verb was not found in his *Greek* codices. This shortest form is adopted by WH in their *text*. The verb is easily supplied from the preceding **ὑποτασσόμενοι**, and such constructions are quite in Paul's style. The **ἰδίοις** (which is omitted in the parallel passage in Col. iii. 18) is here, as often if not always in the NT, something more than a simple possessive. It conveys the idea of what is *special*, and gives a certain note of emphasis or intensity, = husbands who as such are peculiarly and exclusively *theirs*; see 1 Pet. iii. 1, and *cf.* Ell. *in loc.*; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 169.—**ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ**: *as to the Lord.* That is, *to Christ;* not to the *husband* as lord and

z Ch. i. 23 reff. a = Constr., 1 Tim. iv. 10; John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14.

γυναικὸς ὡς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς [z] ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς [1] [a] σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. 24. ἀλλ' ὡς [2] ἡ ἐκκλησία [x] ὑποτάσσεται τῷ χριστῷ,

[1] και αυτος εστιν ℵ[3]D[2,3]E[2]KLP, Syr., Arm., Goth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., etc.; αυτος alone ℵ*ABD*E*FG 72, 73, 112, 178, d, e, f, g, Vulg., Copt., Clem., Euth., Orig., Victorin., etc.

[2] ως ℵAD*FGP 17, 31, 47, 67[2], 73, Clem., Orig., Chr., Euth., etc.; ωσπερ D[3]EKL, al., pler., Bas., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

master. If the husband's supremacy had been in view, it would have been expressed by τοῖς κυρίοις. The ὡς denotes more than *similarly*, and more than "just as they are submissive to Christ so should they be to their husbands". The next sentence, and the whole statement of the relation between husband and wife in the following verse in terms of the relation between Christ and the Church, suggest that the point of the ὡς is that the wife is to regard the obedience she has to render to her husband as an obedience rendered to Christ, the Christian husband being head of the wife and representing to her Christ the Head of the whole Christian body.

Ver. 23. ὅτι ὁ ἀνήρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας: *because the husband is the head of the wife, as also Christ is the head of the Church.* Reason for a wifely subjection of the kind indicated. It is found in the relation of headship. In the marriage union the husband holds the same relation, *viz.*, that of headship, as Christ holds to the Church, and the headship of the one represents the headship of the other. For ἐστι κεφαλή, B, Vulg., etc., give κεφαλή ἐστιν, which WH place in the margin. The ὁ before ἀνήρ rests on the slenderest authority, and is omitted by LTTrWHRV on the testimony of BℵA DFKL, etc. The anarthrous ἀνήρ means "a husband" in the sense of any man belonging to the class of husbands. The article, again, is appropriate in τῆς γυναικός, as a definite relation is expressed there = "a husband is head of *his* wife". The ὡς καί indicates the point common to the two subjects—each is *head*, though in relation to different objects.—[καὶ] αὐτός [ἐστι] σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος: *and He is Himself the Saviour of the body.* The καί and the ἐστι of the TR have considerable authority (ℵ[3]D[2,3]KLP, most cursives, Syr., Arm., etc.); but they are not found in Bℵ*ADG, Vulg., etc., and are to be omitted (with LTTrWHRV). The clause then might be construed as in *apposition* to the previous ὁ Χριστός, = "as Christ is the Head of the Church—He, the Saviour of the body". But it is best taken as an *independent* clause, stating in a definite and emphatic way an important point in which Christ, who resembles the husband in respect of *headship*, at the same time *differs* from the husband. It is best rendered, therefore, "He, He Himself (*i.e.*, = He alone) is the Saviour of the body". The RV less happily makes it "being Himself the Saviour of the body". The αὐτός can only be *Christ*, and the σῶμα is the *Church*—the body to which He brings salvation. The husband is head of the wife, and in that he is like Christ; but Christ is also that which the husband is not, *viz.*, *Saviour* of that whereof He is Head.

Ver. 24. ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί: *nevertheless as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be subject to their husbands in everything.* For ἀλλ' the best editors give ἀλλά. For the ὥσπερ of the TR, supported by D[3]KL and most cursives, read (with LTTrWHRV) ὡς, which is found in ℵAD*GP, 17, 67[2], etc. But B omits it. The ἰδίοις inserted by TR (after AD[3]KLP and various Versions, etc.) before ἀνδράσιν is wanting in BℵD*G, 17, 67[2], etc., and should be deleted. It has crept in probably from ver. 22. The question here is as to the force of the ἀλλά. Some suppose a suppressed negation before it, *e.g.*, "be not disobedient," "do not disallow the marital headship, *but*," etc. (Eadie). Others give it a resumptive force (Harl., etc.). But the supposed digression, which can only be the brief clause αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος, requires no such resumption. Others give it a certain syllogistic force, understanding it to introduce a *proof* of the preceding statement, presenting the relation in a new light, or an inference from the statement (De Wette, Olsh.); but ἀλλά does not draw *conclusions* like οὖν, nor is it = ὥστε, although it may introduce a *minor proposition*; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 291; Hartung, *Partikl.*,

οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς[1] ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί. 25. οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας ἑαυτῶν,[2] καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ [b] ἑαυτὸν [b] παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, 26. ἵνα αὐτὴν

b Ver. 2 reff.

[1] Before ανδρ. insert ιδιοις AD[2]E[2]KLP, etc., Vss., Fathers; om. ℵBD*E*FG 17, 67[2], It.

[2] εαυτων om. ℵAB 5, 17, 23, 49, 57, 70, Clem.,$_1$, Orig., Cyr., Chr.,$_2$; insert DEKL, etc. (τας εαυ. Clem.,$_1$), Chr., Thdrt.,$_2$, al.; add υμων FG, Thdrt.,$_1$.

ii., p. 384. Others make it = "*but then*, which is the main thing," etc., supposing ver. 24 to give a second proof of the fact that wives should be obedient to their husbands *as to the Lord*—a proof drawn from the position held by Christ and by the husband, *viz.*, that of being *head* (Win.-Moult., p. 565). This, however, would be expressed rather by **δέ** than by **ἀλλά**, the former being the particle that in *opposing* also *continues* and *connects*, adding something distinct from what has preceded, while the latter has the full *opposing* significance, disannulling or discounting something mentioned before (Win.-Moult., p. 551). The **ἀλλά**, therefore, must have its full *adversative* force, and is best rendered "nevertheless," "for all that". The twenty-fourth verse thus looks to the peculiarity mentioned as belonging to Christ's headship in distinction from the husband's, *viz.*, the fact that He is not only Head, but Saviour. And the idea becomes this—"Christ indeed is Saviour of the body, and that the husband is not; nevertheless the question of *obedience* is not affected thereby; for all that, as the Church is subject to Christ, so too are wives to be subject to their husbands" (so subst. Calv., Beng., Mey., Ell., Alf., etc.). In the **οὕτως** clause **ὑποτασσέσθωσαν**, "*let* the wives be subject," as in RV text and according to most commentators, or better, **ὑποτάσσονται**, "so are the wives also" (as in RV marg.), is to be supplied from the preceding **ὑποτάσσεται**. The **ἐν παντί** naturally means in everything pertaining to the marriage-relation.

Ver. 25. **οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας [ἑαυτῶν], καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *husbands, love your wives, even as also Christ loved the Church*. The reflexive **ἑαυτῶν** introduced by the TR after **γυναῖκας**, as in DKL, Syr., etc., is not found in BℵA, 17, Clem., etc., and is properly omitted by LTTr WHRV. The reading **ὑμῶν** also occurs in G. We have now the statement of the corresponding duty of husbands. If the wife's duty is submission, the husband's is love—a love like Christ's—a love capable even of suffering and dying for the wife as Christ did for the Church.—**καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς**: *and gave Himself up for it*. **παρέδωκεν**, as in v. 2, Gal. ii. 20 (**παραδόντος ἑαυτόν**), Rom. iv. 25 (**παρεδόθη**), without explanation of that to which He gave Himself; that being understood to be *death*. This is the measure, therefore, of Christ's love, and this is the manner of love with which the husband is to meet the wife's obedience.

Ver. 26. **ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ**: *that He might sanctify it*. Statement of the great object with which Christ in His love for the Church gave Himself up to death for it. An object worthy of the self-sacrifice, described in definite terms and with a solemn significance—the sanctification and cleansing of the Church with a view to its final presentation in perfect holiness at the great day. The verb **ἁγιάζειν**, a later form of **ἁγίζειν** (used, *e.g.*, by Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 1495; Pindar, *O.*, iii., 34, etc.), frequent in biblical and patristic Greek, means to *set apart* to a sacred use, to *consecrate*, by external or ceremonial cleansing (Heb. ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5); by an *expiation* (1 Cor. vi. 11; Heb. x. 10, 14, 29); or by inward, *ethical* purification (1 Thess. v. 23). Most exegetes take **ἁγιάσῃ** in the third sense here, and this is favoured by the terms which follow in ver. 27. On the other hand, both in the Pauline writings and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (*cf.* Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, Engl. transl., vol. ii., 68, etc.) the dominant application of the verb is deliverance from the *guilt* of sin by means of an expiation.—**καθαρίσας**: *cleansing it*. The verb **καθαρίζειν**, Hellenistic for **καθαίρειν**, has certain occasional applications in the NT (*e.g.*, *literal* cleansing, Matt. xxiii. 26; Luke xi. 39; pronouncing *ceremonially* clean, Acts x. 15, xi. 9; *consecrating* by cleansing, Heb. ix. 22, 23); but apart from these it has two main senses—that of *ethical* purification (2 Cor. vii. 1; James iv. 8), and that of *forgiveness*, freeing from the *guilt* of sin (Tit. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 14; 1 John i. 7, 9). In the case of this verb,

again, the prevailing idea is that of the changed, rectified *relation* to God. The two ideas probably are not sharply divided in the writer's mind. They are brought together again, both as definite acts of the past, in 1 Cor. vi. 11, **ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε.** But the effect on *standing* appears to be the thing immediately in view here. In classical Greek, too, the term **καθαρμός** is used in the sense of a purification from *guilt* (*e.g.*, Soph., *O. T.*, 1228). The participle is taken by many as, in relation to **ἁγιάσῃ**, a proper past = "that he might sanctify it *after* cleansing it" (Mey., Alf., Ell.; RV "having cleansed it," etc.). The purification in view is thus made something *prior* to the sanctifying. But **καθαρίσας,** as is often the case with aor. participles connected with a fin. aorist (Bernh., *Synt.*, x. 9, p. 383), may also be of the *same* time as **ἁγιάσῃ** and express the *way* in which the sanctifying takes effect. The latter is the more probable view here (Syr., Vulg., Harl., Abb., etc.), especially as the aor. **ἁγιάσῃ** points to a single, definite act, and one predicated of the *Church* as a whole.—**τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος**: *by the bath of the water.* Designation of the *means* by which the purification takes place. The phrase is a difficult one. The word **λουτρόν** occurs only once again in the NT (Tit. iii. 5). It is used in both cases with reference to *baptism* (although some do not admit this), and it is so used in eccles. Greek. In classical Greek it has the occasional, secondary sense of a *libation* for the dead (Soph., *El.*, 84, 434; Eurip., *Phoen.*, 1667), but is used properly as = "*bath, bathing-place* (*e.g.*, Homer's **θερμὰ λοετρά**, *Il.*, xiv., 6; **λοετρὰ Ὠκεανοῖο**, *Il.*, xviii., 489, etc.); *bathing* (Herod., vi., 52; Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 5, 20); or the *water for bathing* or *washing* (Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 1599)". It is doubtful whether any clear instance can be found of its use as = *washing*. The **ὕδατος** is prob. the *gen. materiæ*, and the articles mark the **λουτρόν** as the well-known bath of the (baptismal) water. The Versions vary in their renderings. The Vulg. gives *lavacrum*, and similarly the Syr. and the Goth. The Rhem. follows the Vulg. and renders *laver*. But the other old English Versions have either "the *washing*" or "the *fountain*" of water. The RV gives "the washing of water" in the text, but "the laver" in the margin. But "laver," in the sense of the *vessel*, does not appear to be a legitimate translation. The only legitimate rendering is "the *bath* of water," *i.e.*, *the bath of the baptismal water.* Many interpreters find in the phrase an allusion to the bath taken by a bride before her wedding. The subsequent imagery, and especially the **παραστῆσαι,** may favour that; but the fact that the Subject here who cleanses by the bath of the water is Christ, while it was not the *bridegroom* who administered the pre-nuptial bath to the bride, makes that doubtful.—**ἐν ῥήματι**: *with* (or *through*) *the word.* In respect both of *sense* and of *connection* this is a peculiarly difficult phrase. With respect to the latter the **ἐν ῥήματι** is connected by some with the **ἁγιάσῃ** = "sanctify it by the word," **ἐν** being taken as the *instrum. dat.* (Winer, Rück., Bisp., Bleek, Mey., etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 172). The objection to this is the remoteness of the defining phrase from the verb. On the other hand it may be the case that the order is selected with a view to bringing things together, first the two verbs and then the two defining terms (so Meyer). The analogy of John xvii. 17, **ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ,** is also urged. Others connect it with the **λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος,** = "the bath of water *in* or *by* the word". But to this there is the serious objection that the **ἐν ῥήματι** is anarthrous. The Greek would require either **τῷ** or **τοῦ ἐν ῥήματι,** the phrase not being one of the kind (like **τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι,** chap. ii. 15 above) to make a single idea with the **λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος** and so dispense with the article; *cf.* on chap. i., 17 above. There remains the third course—to connect it with **καθαρίσας,** or with the idea expressed by the clause **καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος** as a whole. This on the whole is the connection freest from difficulty, and it gives a congruous idea, which may take more than one form, *e.g.*, that the purification is *effected by* the **ῥῆμα**; that it is *accompanied* by it; or that it takes place *in* it as its *element* or *condition.* But what of the *sense* of the **ῥήματι**? How difficult it is to obtain a satisfactory meaning appears at once from the variety and the peculiarity of the interpretations proposed. Some, *e.g.*, take it to refer to the baptismal *formula*, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or "in the name of Jesus" (Chrys.); in which case, however, we should expect either **καὶ ῥήματος** or **ἐν τῷ ῥήματι.** Others give the noun the simple sense of "an *utterance*" and take the phrase to mean "*attended* or *conditioned* by an utterance"; with the explanation that the particular *utterance* in view is "the revelation of salvation embodied in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy

ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ [d] λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος [e] ἐν ῥήματι, 27. ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς [1] ἑαυτῷ [f] ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μὴ ἔχουσαν

c = John xvii. 17, 19; Rom. xv. 16 al. Paul; Jude 1; Rev. xxii. 11. d Tit. iii. 5 only; Cant. iv. 2. e Ch. iv. 19, vi. 2; ῥ. (without art.), Rom. x. 17; Heb. vi. 5, xi. 3; ch. vi. 17; Paul only. f = 2 Cor. xi. 2; Luke ii. 22; Acts i. 3, ix. 41, xxiii. 33; Rom. vi. 13 al.; Luke and Paul only (see Matt. xxvi. 53). g Luke vii. 25, xiii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 10 only; 1 Kings ix. 6 al.

[1] **ιν. π. αυτην** D[3]EK, etc., Vss., Chr., Thdrt.[1], al.; **αυτος** ℵABD*FGLP 6, 10, 17, 23[1], 67[2], etc., It., Vulg., Copt., Goth., Greek-Lat. Fathers.

Ghost" (Moule). Haupt, again, makes it = "by means of a word," supposing the term to be added in order to bring out the wonderfulness of the purification as seen in the fact that it is effected simply by a *word*, that is to say the word spoken by the person who baptises. Hofmann also gives it the sense of "with a word," *i.e.* = cleansing it *by the utterance of His effective will*. Others make it = "by the bath resting on a word," *viz.*, the Divine *command* (Storr, Kl., etc.). If we look, however, at the use of the word **ῥῆμα** in the NT we find that it is applied to anything spoken—a *sound* produced by the voice (2 Cor. xii. 4; Heb. xii. 19); a *declaration* (Matt. xxvi. 75; Mark ix. 32, Luke ii. 50, etc.); *doctrine* or *instruction* (Rom. x. 17, if not = *command*); or a *saying*, whether in the form of a *message* (Rom. x. 8), a *command* (Luke v. 5), or a *promise* (Luke i. 38, ii. 29). In Paul's Epistles and in Hebrews, it appears to be used mostly, if not exclusively, of a word proceeding directly or indirectly from *God* (*cf.* Ell. *in loc.*). It has indeed another sense, that of "thing," corresponding to the Hebr. דָּבָר, "the thing spoken of," "the thing enjoined," etc. (*e.g.*, Matt. xviii. 16; Luke i. 37, ii. 15; Acts x. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 1). This sense is claimed for it by some in Rom. i. 8, 13-21. But it is scarcely applicable here. Hence here it may best be taken to refer either to the *word of promise*, that is the Divine promise of forgiveness (Mark xvi. 16), or to the *preached Gospel*. It has also the great advantage of being in harmony with the **ῥῆμα Θεοῦ** in chap. vi. 17. It is true that **ῥῆμα** is not quite the same as **λόγος**, but carries with it the definite sense of the *spoken* word; and that, consequently, it may not be taken to designate the *Gospel* here in the subjective sense of *divine truth*, the Word of God in respect of its spiritual contents, or as a revelation of grace. But it may have the sense of that truth as *proclaimed*, the *preached* Word or Gospel. With the former sense the clause will define the purification as being *in accordance with* or *dependent on* the Divine promise, or having that promise as its *ground*. The latter interpretation (which is preferred by Meyer, etc.) is thought to be most in harmony with Rom. x. 8, 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, and it gives a good sense however the **ἐν** is construed. The main objection urged against these two interpretations is the absence of the article, and the fact that where **ῥῆμα** has such a sense it is accompanied by some defining term, **Θεοῦ** (Eph. vi. 17), **Χριστοῦ** (Rom. x. 17) or the like. To this the only reply is that the omission of the article is due to the presence of the preposition (Middleton, *Gr. Artic.*, vi. 1; *cf.* Ell. *in loc.*), or that **ῥῆμα** may have become, like **νόμος, χάρις**, etc., so well-understood and constant a term in the sense of "the spoken word" *par excellence*, that it could dispense with the article (Mey.). Thus the import of the whole verse will be—"that he might set apart and consecrate the Church by cleansing it of guilt by baptism in accordance with the Divine promise" (or, "on the ground of the preached word of the Gospel"). The clause defines the **καθαρισμός** as one that does not take effect by means of the **λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος** in and by itself, but by that only as administered in the *power* or on the *ground* of the preached Word. It is to be observed also that the *sanctifying* and the *purifying* are referred to Christ's giving up of Himself, His death being that in virtue of which these things take place.

Ver. 27. **ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὴν [αὐτὸς] ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *that He might Himself present to Himself the Church, glorious*. Statement of the remote, ultimate object with which Christ "gave Himself up" to death; as the *immediate* object, which has that final purpose in view, is expressed by the **ἁγιάσῃ**. For **αὐτήν** of the TR, supported by D[3]K, most cursives, Syr.-P., etc., the reading **αὐτός** is to be substituted on the authority of BℵAD*GL, Syr.-Harc., Vulg., etc. It is Christ *Himself* who is to present the Church, and it is to *Himself* He is to present it. He is at once the Agent and the End or Object of the presentation. The

[h] σπίλον ἢ [i] ῥυτίδα ἤ τι [k] τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ [l] ἄμωμος. 28. οὕτως [m] ὀφείλουσιν οἱ ἄνδρες [1] ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώματα. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ·

h 2 Pet. ii. 13 only; Jos., *Antt.*, xiii., 11, 3.
i Here only; Aristoph., *Plut.*, 1051; Plat., *Symp.*, p. 191 A.
k Rom. i. 32 al. Paul; 3 John 8.
l Ch. i. 4 reff.
m = Luke xvii. 10; John xiii. 14 al.; 1 Cor. xi. 10 al.

[1] **και οι ανδρες οφειλουσιν** ABDEFG 17, 213, It., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Clem., Jer., Aug., Pel.; **κ. οφ. οι ανδρ.** Arm.; **ουτως οφειλουσιν οι ανδρες** ℵKL, etc., Syr., Method., Chr., Thdrt., al.

παραστήσῃ is not to be taken here to mean the presenting of the Church as an *offering*. It is true that the verb is so used in Rom. xii. 1; but the case is different here, in respect both of the ruling idea of the paragraph and of the introduction of **ἑαυτῷ**. It would be incongruous with Paul's teaching to speak of Christ as presenting an *offering* to Himself. The idea, as the context suggests, is that of the bridegroom *presenting* or *setting forth* the bride; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 2. The anarthrous **ἔνδοξον** is a case of tertiary predicate (*cf.* Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 473). The rendering, therefore, is not "present a glorious Church," but "present the Church, glorious," *i.e.*, in the aspect, or character of gloriousness. The presentation in view, which is given here as the *final* object of Christ's surrendering of Himself to death, and is exhibited (by use of the aor.) as a single def. act, cannot be anything done in the world that now is (as is supposed by Beng., Harl., Hofm., etc.), but must be referred (with Aug., Jer., Rück., De Wette, Bleek, Mey., Ell., Alf. and most) to the future consummation, the event of the *Parousia*.—**μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον**: *not having spot*. Explanation of what is implied on the negative side in the **ἔνδοξον**. The neg. **μή** is in place, as the clause refers to the purpose in the mind of Christ. The word **σπίλος** = *spot, moral blemish*, takes the place of the Attic **κηλίς** in later Greek writers (Dionys., Harl., Plut., Lucian, Joseph., etc.). It occurs only once again in the NT (2 Pet. ii. 13). The "ι" being short in composition (**ἄσπιλος**), WH, Ell., Alf., etc., accentuate it **σπίλος**; Lach., Tisch., Lipsius, Mey., etc., retain **σπῖλος**.—**ἢ ῥυτίδα**: *or wrinkle*. The word **ῥυτίς** occurs only this once in the NT, and is not found in the Apocrypha or in the LXX, but is not infrequent in profane Greek, whether classical (Aristoph., Plato, etc.), or late (Diod., Plut., Lucian, etc.). Attempts have been made (by Aug., Grot., etc.) to establish a distinction between **σπίλον** and **ῥυτίδα** here, but without success.—**ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων**: *or any such thing*. The article gives this the force of anything belonging to the *class* of such things as deform and defile.—**ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος**: *but that it should be holy and unblamable*. The regular construction would have taken some such form as **ἀλλ' οὖσαν**, etc. It is changed here, perhaps with a view to variety, as if the paragraph had begun with **ἵνα μὴ ἔχῃ**. Such *oratio variata* was common in Greek, and there are numerous examples of it in the NT generally (*e.g.*, Mark xii. 38; John viii. 53; Acts xx. 34, xxii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 7), and especially in the Pauline writings (Rom. i. 12, iv. 12, xii. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 13, xiv. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 23; Phil. ii. 22). See Jelf, *Greek Gram.*, § 909; Win.-Moult., p. 722; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 241. On **ἄμωμος** see under i. 4 above.

Ver. 28. **οὕτως ὀφείλουσιν [καὶ] οἱ ἄνδρες ἀγαπᾶν τὰς ἑαυτῶν γυναῖκας**: *even so [also] ought husbands to love their own wives*. The reading and the order vary somewhat. The **ὀφείλουσιν** *precedes* **οἱ ἄνδρες** in most manuscripts, ℵ[2]KL 17, etc.; in others (ADGP, etc.) it *follows* it. Lachm. prefers the latter; TrWHRV the former. The TR, supported by ℵKL, etc., omits **καί**; which is inserted, however, before **οἱ ἄνδρες** by BADFG 17, and most Versions, etc. It is accepted by TrRV, and is bracketed by WH. The **οὕτως** is taken by some (De Wette, etc.) to refer to the following **ὡς**, = "husbands ought to love their wives *just as* they love their own bodies". To this there is no serious grammatical objection; for **οὕτως** does not look always to what precedes, but may refer to what follows (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. iii. 15, **οὕτω δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός**; also 1 Cor. iv. 1). When this is the case, however, whether in classical Greek or in the NT, there appears to be a certain *emphasis* on the **οὕτως**, and its more familiar reference is to what precedes. Here, too, the **καί** favours the relation to the preceding **καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός**, etc. The idea, therefore, is that even as Christ loved the Church so too ought husbands to love their wives.—**ὡς τὰ ἑαυτῶν σώ-**

29. οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα [1] ἐμίσησεν, ἀλλὰ [n] ἐκτρέφει καὶ [o] θάλπει αὐτὴν,[2] καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς [3] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. 30. ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν

n Ch. vi. 4 only; 3 Kings xii. 8, 10 al.

o 1 Thess. ii. 7 only; Deut. xxii. 6.

[1] την εαυτου σαρκα ℵ[3], Method., Orig., Victorin., etc.; την σαρκα αυτου Vulg., Tert., Ambrst., Jer., etc.

[2] εκτρ. αυ. κ. θ. DEFG, d, e, f, g, Goth.; some Vss. repeat αυτην; Method. om. altog.

[3] ο κυριος D[3]EKL, etc., Ar.-pol., Slav., Oec.; ο Χριστος ℵABD*FGP 17, etc., It., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Sah., etc., Greek-Lat. Fathers.

ματα: *as their own bodies.* This is not to be reduced to "like themselves" (Rosenm., etc.); nor does ὡς here mean simply "like," as if all that is meant is that the husband's love for his wife is to be *similar* to his love for his own body. The ὡς has its *qualitative* force, = "as it were," "as being". *Christ* and *husband* are each *head*, as Paul has already put it, and as the Church is the body in relation to the former, so is the wife in relation to the latter. The husband, the head, therefore, is to love the wife as being his body, even as Christ loved the Church as forming His body. The idea of husband and wife as being *one flesh* is probably also in view. ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα, ἑαυτὸν ἀγαπᾷ: *he that loveth his own wife loveth himself.* The relation of *head* and *body* means that the wife is part of the husband's *self*. To love his wife, therefore, in this character as being his body, is to love *himself*. It is a love, consequently, not merely of *duty*, but of *nature*—κατὰ φύσιν as well as κατ' ὀφειλήν (Ell.).

Ver. 29. οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν: *for no one ever hated his own flesh.* The γάρ gives a reason for the preceding statement, looking to the *thought*, however, rather than to the *form* of the statement. The *thought* is the oneness of husband and wife, the position of the wife as part of the husband's self; and the connection is this—"he should love her even as Christ loved the Church, for the wife, I say, is as the body in that natural relationship in which the husband is the head, so that in loving her he loves *himself*; and this is the reason in *nature* why he should love her, for according to this to hate his wife is to hate his own flesh, which is contrary to nature and a thing never seen". σάρξ has here its non-ethical sense, practically = σῶμα (as in Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 16, etc.).—ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν: *but nourisheth and cherisheth it.* The form ἀλλά is preferred again by LTTr WHRV. The ἐκ- in the comp. ἐκτρέφει may point to the careful, continued nourishing from one stage to another, nourishing *up to maturity*. Ell. takes it to express "the evolution and development produced by the τρέφειν" (so, too, Mey., etc.). As θάλπειν means primarily to *warm*, some give it the literal sense here, supposing it to look to the *covering* and *protection* of the body as ἐκτρέφει looks to its *nourishment*—"fovet" spectat *amictum*, says Bengel, ut "nutrit" victum; and so Mey. But the secondary sense seems more appropriate here, especially in view of the following affirmation regarding Christ, and as it is in 1 Thess. ii. 7.—καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος [Χριστὸς] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν: *even as the Lord* [*Christ*] *also the Church.* For the Κύριος of the TR (with D[3]KL, etc.) read with the best critics Χριστός, which is given in BℵAD[1]F, 17, and most Versions and Fathers. That is, "even as Christ also *nourisheth and cherisheth* the Church"—a broad statement of Christ's loving care for His Church, into which no reference to the *Lord's Supper* (which is nowhere in view here) as the means by which the *nourishing* is effected can be dragged (as, *e.g.*, by Kahnis, etc.).

Ver. 30. ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ: *for we are members of His body.* The μέλη, which is the heart of the statement, has the emphatic position. We are not something apart from Christ, nor do we occupy only an accidental relation to Him. We are veritable parts of that body of which He is head, and this is the reason why He nourishes and cherishes the Church; *cf.* the detailed description in 1 Cor. xii. 12-27.—ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ: *being of His flesh and of His bones.* This sentence, which is added by the TR, has considerable documentary testimony—ℵ[3]D GLP, most cursives, such Versions as the Syr. and the Arm., and such Fathers as Iren., Jer., etc. If it is retained, as is

p Here only; see Luke xii. 3. **ὀστέων αὐτοῦ.**[1] 31. [p] **ἀντὶ** [p] **τούτου** [q] **καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος πατέρα καὶ μητέρα,**[2] **καὶ** [r] **προσκολληθήσεται**[3] **πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα**[4] **αὐτοῦ,**

q Matt. xix. 5 from Gen. ii. 24; 1 Thess. iii. 1 al. r Acts v. 36.

[1] **εκ τ. σ. αυτ. κ. εκ τ. οστ. αυτ.** om. ℵ*AB 17, 67², Copt., Eth., Euth.; insert ℵ³DEFGLP, also K, but with **του σωματος** for **των οστεων**, most others, Vulg., Syr., Arm., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., al., Jer., al.

[2] **τον πατερα** ℵAD³EKLP, etc., Marc., Orig., Euth., Meth., Chr., etc.; **πατερα** without **τον** BD*FG; **πατερα** without **αυτου** ℵ*BD*FG 17, 67², 73, 115, Vulg., Syr.-P., Arm., Orig., etc.; insert **αυτου** ℵ³AD³EKLP, etc., Syr.-Sch., Cop., Eth., Marc., Meth., etc.; **την μητερα,** with same authorities mostly as for **τον πατερα**; omit **την** BD*FG.

[3] **κολληθησεται** ℵ³D²FG, Marc., Epiph.

[4] **τη γυναικι** ℵ*AD*FG 17, 37, 116, It., Vulg., Lat. Fathers, Meth., Epiph.; **προς την γυναικα** ℵ³BD³EKL, most cursives, Orig.₂, Chr., Thdrt.₂, al.

done by Mey., Ell., Reiche, Alf., etc., it will be an explanation of the affirmation that we are **μέλη τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ,** drawn from the thought of our *origin* (**ἐκ**). We are *members* of Christ's body, as having the source of our spiritual being in Him. This statement of our *spiritual origin* is expressed in terms like those used of the origin of our physical life, the allusion being probably to the record of the formation of Eve in Gen. ii. 23. As the first woman derived her physical being from Adam in the way there recorded, so we Christians draw our spiritual being from Christ. The evidence, however, is decidedly adverse, the clause not appearing in Bℵ*A, 17, 67², Boh., Eth., Method., Euthal., Origen (prob.), etc. The internal evidence may be said to be against it, in so far, *e.g.*, as a new figure is suddenly introduced, the statement is carried beyond the idea of *relationship*, and no clear or congruous meaning can be readily attached to the new terms, *flesh* and *bones*. Nor is it easy in face of evidence so old and so various to suppose that the words were mistakenly omitted by homœoteleuton. The clause, therefore, is deleted from the *text* by LTTrWHRV; Tr., however, giving it a place on the margin.

Ver. 31. **ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος [τὸν] πατέρα [αὐτοῦ] καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα**: *for this cause shall a man leave [his] father and mother.* Lachm. and Tregelles omit **τόν** and **τήν**; which are bracketed by WH. The **αὐτοῦ** is omitted by LTTrWHRV, as not supported by Bℵ*D*G, 17, Vulg., Arm., etc. It is found in ℵ³AD³KLP, Syr.-P., Boh., etc. These words, whether Paul gives them professedly as a *quotation* in a free form, or uses them directly, making them his own (Mey.), are substantially those which in Gen. ii. 24 follow the statement regarding Eve as bone of Adam's bone and flesh of his flesh. **ἀντὶ τούτου** corresponds to the **ἕνεκεν τούτου** of Gen. ii. 24; **ἀντί,** the prep. of *exchange* and *succession*, being used also, like the Hebrew תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר, in the sense of "for that," and occasionally as = "wherefore"; *cf.* **ἀνθ' ὧν,** Luke xii. 3; *cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 125; Win.-Moult., p. 456. Thus **ἀντὶ τούτου** may refer either to the immediately preceding statement regarding our being *members of* Christ's body (so Mey.), or to the leading idea of the previous verses, *viz.*, the husband's duty to love, nourish, and cherish the wife even as Christ loves, nourishes, and cherishes the Church. The former connection leads, as in Meyer's case, to an allegorising interpretation. The latter is to be preferred as in harmony with a simpler and more natural view of what follows. Another turn is given to the phrase, *e.g.*, by Von Soden, who makes it = "instead of this," supposing the point to be that in place of *hating*, as mentioned in ver. 29, the husband ought to love and cleave to his wife. But this is far-fetched. The **καταλείψει,** especially in view of its application in the OT passage cited or used, must be taken here as the *ethical* future, the future expressing what *should*, *can*, or *must* be, as, *e.g.*, in Matt. vii. 26; Luke xxii. 49; John vi. 68; Rom. x. 14, etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 348; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 407. Meyer insists on its being a *pure* future, and refers it to what is to take place at the *Parousia*. The verse as used here has been strangely handled by many commentators, who have found secondary, mystical meanings in the words. Not a few of the Fathers (Chrys., Theod., Theophyl., Jerome, etc.) interpreted it of the Incarnation; and later

καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο [s] εἰς σάρκα μίαν. 32. τὸ [t] μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω [u] εἰς χριστὸν καὶ [u] εἰς [1] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

s Matt. xix. 5 reff. t = Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 51 al. Paul; Rev. i. 20 al. u = Acts ii. 25; Heb. vii. 14 only.

[1] omit εις BK 4, 51, 72, 73, etc., Iren. (Greek-Lat.), Tert., al.; insert אADEFGLP, al. pler., Vulg., Syr., Orig.$_2$, Meth., Tit., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., etc.

exegetes expounded it as referring in one way or other to Christ's *present* connection with the Church (Grot., Beng., etc.); some understanding Christ's separation from His *nation* (Mich.), or from the *synagogue*, to be indicated by the phrase "leave His Father," and others even explaining it of the *Lord's Supper* (Harl., Olsh.). Alford applies it mystically to "that past, present, and future which constitutes Christ's Union to His Bride, the Church—His leaving the Father's bosom, which is *past*—His gradual preparation of the Union, which is *present*—His full consummation of it, which is *future*". Even Meyer puts a forced, allegorical sense upon it, taking it to be used typically of the perfect union which takes place between Christ and the Church only at His Second Coming, before which time He is not Husband, but Bridegroom. So the **ἄνθρωπος** becomes *Christ*, at the Parousia; the leaving father and mother becomes mystically Christ's leaving His seat at the right hand of God; the two becoming *one flesh* is the descending, returning Christ making one ethical person with the Church, etc. But all this is in the highest degree unnatural. When Paul allegorises he gives intimation of the fact (**ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα**, Gal. iv. 24), and certainly there is no such allegory as this would be anywhere else in the Pauline writings. Its incongruities condemn it. What is to be made, *e.g.*, of the leaving of the *mother*, which Jerome, *e.g.*, is driven to say means the leaving of the heavenly Jerusalem? We take the verse, therefore, in its simple and obvious sense, as referring to the direct and ruling idea of the paragraph, *viz.*, the natural marriage relation and the duty of husbands to wives; and we read it as an enforcement of that duty based upon the natural identity of the wife with the husband, as stated in the narrative of Creation and illustrated in its highest ideal in the Church's relation to Christ.—**καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ δύο ἔσονται εἰς σάρκα μίαν**: *and shall cleave unto his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.* "Cleave to" represents very well the force of the verb **προσκολλάω**, the Sept. representative of דָּבַק, *to glue to, stick to.* For **πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα**, the reading of TR, with Bא[3]C[3]DKL, Orig., etc., **τῇ γυναικί** is given in א*AD*G, etc., and is preferred by LTTr, while WH place it in the margin. The **αὐτοῦ** is omitted by T with א[1], etc. For **προσκολληθήσεται** there is also the variant **κολληθήσεται** in א[3]D[1]F, etc.

Ver. 32. **τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν**: *this mystery is great.* Not "this is a great mystery," as it is rendered by the AV and Rhem.; nor "this is a great secret," Tynd., Cran., gen. The term **μυστήριον** (on which see under i. 9 above) cannot mean *allegory* or *dark-saying*, but must have its usual sense of something once hidden and now revealed, a secret disclosed. It cannot refer, therefore, as Mey. makes it do, to the quotation from Gen. ii. 24 as a passage with a hidden typical or mystical meaning, one *deep* (**μέγα**) and difficult to reach. Nor can it well refer to the spiritual union of Christ and the Church by itself (Beng.), or to the comparison between the union of husband and wife and that of Christ and the Church (Est.), as the **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω** would then lose its point. It is simplest to take it as referring to Christian truth touching the relation between husband and wife as set forth in these verses. That truth is described by **μέγα** as *great*, *i.e.*, in the sense of grandeur and importance. The Vulg. rendering *sacramentum* (followed by Wicl. and the Rhem.) has induced many Roman Catholic theologians to found on this as a passage presenting *marriage* in the character of a *sacrament*—a perverted interpretation which was disavowed indeed by distinguished scholars like Cajetan and Estius in the Roman Catholic Church itself. It may be added that Alford understands by the **μυστήριον** "the matter mystically alluded to in the Apostle's application of the text just quoted; the mystery of the spiritual union of Christ with our humanity, typified by the close conjunction of the marriage state". And Von Soden, taking the **τοῦτο**, as in 1 Cor. xv. 51, to refer to

33. [v] πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς [w] οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος [1] τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα [x] οὕτως ἀγαπάτω [x] ὡς ἑαυτόν,[2] ἡ δὲ γυνὴ [y] ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα.

v = always in Paul; 1 Cor. xi. 11 al. and in Matt. and Luke (Gosp.), (vi. 24 al.), in Mark (xii. 32), John (viii. 10, but ?), and Acts viii. 1 al. with gen. "except". w Acts xxi. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 31; = Mark xiv. 19; John viii. 9. x 1 Cor. iii. 15 reff. y Constr., Mark v. 23.

[1] εκαστον FG 13, D[1]E. [2] ως εαυ. αγαπ. DEFG (αγαπα D).

what *follows*, supposes the sense to be "this secret, that is, what I am about to say as the secret sense of this sentence, is great". Hatch, again, who regards **μυστήριον** as closely related in sense to **τύπος, σύμβολον** and **παραβολή** and interchangeable with them, gives **μυστήριον** the sense of "symbol" (which he thinks is its meaning also in Rev. i. 20, xvii. 7), and renders it "this symbol (*sc.* of the joining of husband and wife into one flesh) is a great one" (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 61).—**ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν, καὶ [εἰς] τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: *but I speak with reference to Christ and the Church*. The second **εἰς** is omitted by LWH, as not found in BK, Iren., Tert., etc.; it is inserted, however, in ℵADFL, Orig., Meth., Theodor., Cypr., Hil., etc. The formula **λέγω δέ** is used in various Pauline passages where an *explanation* of something previously said is in view (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 12; Gal. iii. 17, iv. 1, v. 16; *cf.* **τοῦτο δέ φημι**, 1 Cor. vii. 29, xv. 50). Here too, the sense is not "I *interpret* it," but simply "I *say* it," "I *mean* it". The **δέ** has here its *disjunctive* force, introducing an explanation and separating it from the thing explained (Thayer-Grimm, *Greek-Engl. Lex. of N. T.*, p. 125). The **εἰς** is the prep. of *ethical direction*, indicating that towards which the mind is looking (Thayer-Grimm, *ut sup.*, p. 184; and *cf.* Acts ii. 25), = "*with reference* to Christ," not "*of* Christ," far less "*in* Christ" as the Vulg. unhappily renders it. The emphatic position of the **ἐγώ** gives it to be understood that what immediately follows is the writer's own way of putting the matter just stated, or his own application of the words of Scripture. The sense, therefore, is this—"the truth of which I have spoken, the relation of husband and wife as one flesh, is a revelation of profound importance; but let me explain that, in speaking of it as I have done, *my* meaning is to direct your minds to that higher relation between Christ and His Church, in its likeness to which lies its deepest significance.

Ver. 33. **πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἕνα**: *nevertheless ye also severally*. **πλήν**, connected probably with **πλέον** and meaning primarily *further, besides*, is used both for *unfolding* (= moreover); and for *restricting* (= *howbeit, nevertheless*; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *ut sup.*, p. 517; Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, § 548). Here probably it has the latter application, = "nevertheless, not to say more of that higher union, see that ye, all of you, fulfil the obligation of love to your wives". The distributive phrase **οἱ καθ' ἕνα**, "ye one by one," individualises the **ὑμεῖς**, and excludes all exceptions. The **καί** conjoins the **ὑμεῖς** with Christ, = "in you also, as in Christ, *love* is to be fulfilled". **ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν**: *let each one of you love his own wife as himself*. The sentence, which has begun with the plural **ὑμεῖς**, when it reaches its verb follows the nearest **ἕκαστος**, and gives **ἀγαπάτω** instead of **ἀγαπᾶτε**. The **ἕκαστος** expresses still more emphatically the absoluteness and universality of the Christian duty of conjugal love—a duty from which no single husband is exempt. As in ver. 28 the **ὡς** means not merely that each husband is to love his wife as he loves himself, but that he is to love her as *being* himself, part and parcel of himself according to the Divine idea of the marriage union.—**ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα**: *and the wife—let her see that she fear her husband*. **ἡ γυνή** is a *nom. absol.* of a simple kind and emphatic; the **δέ** is metabatic and slightly adversative; = "so much has been said of the husband, and as to the wife now, reverence is her part". The change in the construction from the usual imperative to the form **ἵνα φοβῆται** is explained by some by supplying **βλεπέτω**, as **βλέπετε** stands in v. 15. But **ἵνα** with the conj. is used elsewhere in the NT (Mark v. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 7) as an imperative formula, originally no doubt an elliptical form for "I bid you that you do," or "see you that you do". It occurs also in later Greek prose (*e.g.*, Arrian, *Epict.*, iv., 1, 41), as the corresponding formula **ὅπως** is used in the same way in classical Greek with the fut. indic. (Aristoph., *Nubes*, 823), and more occasionally with the conj. (Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 3, 18). So in Latin, *ibi ut sint omnia*

VI. 1. τὰ τέκνα, [a] ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν ὑμῶν [b] ἐν κυρίῳ[1]· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν δίκαιον. 2. [c] Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα,[2]

a Matt. viii. 27 al.
b Ch. iv. 17 reff.
c Exod. xx. 12.

[1] Omit εν κυριω BD*FG, d, e, f, g, Clem., Tert., Cypr.; insert ℵAD²EKLP, all cursives (appy.), most Versions, Orig., Bas., Chr., Euth., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst., Jer.

[2] After την μ. insert σου FG 37, 47, 115, 219, 238, etc., Syr., Copt., Eth., Orig., etc.

parata, Cic., *Fam.*, xiv., 20 (*cf.* Donaldson, *Greek Gram.*, p. 602; Win.-Moult., p. 396). **φοβῆται**, *fear*, in the sense of *reverence*, spontaneous, obedient regard; *cf.* the frequent application of the verb to the fear of God (Luke i. 50, xviii. 2, 4; Acts x. 2, 22, 35, etc.); and its use in the case of Herod (Mark vi. 20).

CHAPTER VI. Vv. 1-4. Other relative duties—those of parents and children. With this the concise paragraph in Col. iii. 20, 21 is specially to be compared.

Ver. 1. **τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν [ἐν Κυρίῳ]**: *children obey your parents in the Lord.* The duty of the *wife* has been described by the terms *subjection* or *submission* (**ὑποτάσσεσθαι**) and *fear* (**φοβεῖσθαι**). The duty of the *child* is now described in terms of *obedience* (**ὑπακούειν**, = readiness to hearken to one) and *honour* (**τιμᾶν**, ver. 2). In these words the whole distinctive duty of the child is summed up, in the Old Testament as well as in the New. The "eye that mocketh at his father, and despiseth to obey his mother, the ravens of the valley shall pick it out, and the young eagles shall eat it" (Prov. xxx. 17). Disobedience to parents is named among the dark sins of the heathen of reprobate mind (Rom. i. 30), and the evils of the "grievous times" in "the last days" (2 Tim. iii. 2). The **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, = in *Christ*, is best connected with the **ὑπακούετε**, not with the **γονεῦσιν**. It defines the quality of the obedience by defining the *sphere* within which it is to move—a Christian obedience fulfilled in communion with Christ. This phrase **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, however, is of disputable authority. It is inserted by the TR, supported by ℵAD²·³KLP, Vulg., Syr., etc.; but is omitted by BD* FG, Cyr., Cypr., etc. It is deleted by Lachm., bracketed by TrWH, and retained by RV.—**τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι δίκαιον**: *for this is right.* **δίκαιον** = right, not in the sense of *befitting* (**πρέπον**) merely, but (*cf.* Col. iv. 1; Phil. i. 7, iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 6) in that of *righteous*, what is required by *law*—the law that is at once founded on the natural relation of **τέκνα** and **γονεῖς** and proclaimed in the Divine Commandment (ver. 2).

Ver. 2. **τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα**: *honour thy father and mother.* Obedience is the *duty*; *honour* is the *disposition* of which the obedience is born. The authoritative terms of the OT Law (Exod. xx. 12; Deut. v. 16), given in the exact words of the LXX, are adopted in order to enforce regard for that disposition.—**ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ**: *which is the first commandment in point of promise.* **ἥτις** may have here a simply *explanatory* force (so Ell., who renders it "the which"; Abb., "for such is") rather than the qualitative sense, or the casual, "seeing it is". But even its *explanatory* use suggests a *reason* for the fulfilment of the commandment. The prep. **ἐν** is understood by some (*e.g.*, Alf.) to be the local **ἐν**, expressing the *sphere* of the commandment, and so conveying the idea of being "accompanied by". But more probably it expresses the simple sense of *relation*, "in regard of," "in point of" (Mey., Ell.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 488). **πρώτη**, like other ordinals, being specific enough in itself, dispenses with the article. But what is meant by this definition of the fifth commandment as the *first* in point of promise? The *second* commandment also has a kind of promise. But if that commandment is discounted because its promise is general, not peculiar to itself, but applicable to all, and if the fifth alone has attached to it a promise relevant to itself, why is it called the "first" and not rather the "only" commandment in point of promise? Some meet the difficulty by supposing it to mean the *first* in the second table (Mich., etc.). But in the second table it would still be not only the *first* but the *only* one of the kind; and if the Jewish division of the Decalogue, which assigned *five* commandments to each of the two tables, reaches thus far back, it would not be even in the second table. Nor can **πρώτη** be taken in the sense of first in *importance*; for it is never described as such (*cf. per contra* Matt. xxii. 38; Rom. xiii. 9, 10; Gal. v. 14). The most probable explanation is that Paul has not the Decalogue alone in view, but the whole series of Divine Command-

ἥτις ἐστὶν[1] ἐντολὴ πρώτη [d] ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ,[2] 3. ἵνα [e] εὖ σοι [e] γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ [f] μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 4. καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ [g] παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' [h] ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν [i] παιδείᾳ καὶ [k] νουθεσίᾳ κυρίου.[3]

d = ch. v. 26 reff. e f Here only. g Rom. x. 19 only, from Deut. xxxii. 21; see Col. iii. 21; ch. iv. 26. h Ch. v. 29 reff.; Prov. xxiii. 24. i 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11 only; Prov. i. 2, 7 (Ps. vi. 1; Isa. liii. 5). k 1 Cor. x. 11; Tit. iii. 10 only; Wisd., xvi. 6.

[1] Omit εστιν B 46, Eth.

[2] Before επαγγ. insert τη DEFG 2, 73, 115, many Fathers.

[3] For κυρ., Χριστου 17.

ments, Mosaic and later (Mey., etc.). Westcott and Hort notice another possible pointing, *viz.*, πρώτη, ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ, = "the which is the first commandment, with the promise that," etc. But this still leaves it unexplained why this commandment is called the *first*. The whole sentence is dealt with as a parenthesis by the RV. But this is to miss the real point of the statement, which is to advance from the duty of *obedience* (ὑπακούετε) enforced by its relation to the requirement of law (the δίκαιον), to the higher idea of filial *honour* as inculcated in the highest summary of Divine Law, the Decalogue. The ἥτις clause, therefore, is an integral part of the statement, and instead of being a remark by the way conveys an advance in the thought.

Ver. 3. ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἔσῃ μακροχρόνιος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: *that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the land*. The quotation of the commandment is continued according to the LXX, but with some variations, *viz.*, ἔσῃ for γένῃ, and the omission of τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἧς (Exod. xx. 12, or ἧς alone as in Deut. v. 16) Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου δίδωσί σοι. This clause is omitted perhaps as less suitable to those addressed (Abb.); or it may be with a view to generalise the statement and relieve it of all restrictions but those which necessarily condition the promises of temporal blessings (Ell.). Meyer strangely supposes that the quotation is left unfinished simply because the readers could easily complete it for themselves. In that case it might have been even shorter. The first clause promises temporal good generally; the second the particular blessing, so associated in the OT with the idea of the Divine favour, of length of days. The ἔσῃ is explained by not a few (Erasm., De Wette, Win., etc.; *cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 361) as a case of *oratio variata*, a transition from the ἵνα construction to direct narrative, = "and thou shalt be," as the RV *margin* puts it. But there is no necessity for supposing such a change in the construction, as ἵνα with the fut. indic., though strange to Attic Greek (which yet uses ὅπως with that tense and mood), is found in the NT (1 Cor. ix. 18; Rev. xxii. 14). In Attic Greek the idea would have been expressed not by εὖ γενέσθαι, but by εὖ πάσχειν, εὖ πράττειν or similar form (Mey.). In the OT original, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς refers of course to the land of *Canaan*. Meyer thinks it must retain its historical sense here. But that, in its literal completeness, would be something inapplicable to Paul's Christian readers. The fact that the quotation is broken off at this point, and that the more restricted, national terms of the OT promise are omitted, might warrant us in giving the phrase the larger sense of "on the earth" (with RV text). But it is best to take the phrase as far as possible in its historical sense, and translate it "on the land" (RV marg.), *i.e.*, the land on which your Christian lot is cast.

Ver. 4. καὶ οἱ πατέρες, μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν: *and, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath*. The καί continues the statement of this second of the relative or domestic duties, presenting now the other side. The duty is one not only of children to parents, but also of parents to children. The parental duty is set forth in terms of the *father's* obligation without particular mention of the mother's, not because children of maturer age are in view (Olsh.), but simply because the father is the ruler in the house, as the husband is the head of the wife; the mother's rule and responsibility being subordinate to his and represented by his. The parental duty is given first *negatively*, as avoidance of all calculated to *irritate* or *exasperate* the children—injustice, severity and the like, so as to make them indisposed to filial obedience and honour. παροργίζειν, a strong verb, found again in Rom. x. 19, with which

5. Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις[1] [l] κατὰ σάρκα [m] μετὰ [n] φόβου καὶ [n] τρόμου, ἐν [o] ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας[2] ὑμῶν, ὡς τῷ

l (Acts ii. 30); Rom. i. 3, iv. 1, ix. 3 al.; Paul only; = σαρκί or ἐν σ., 1 Pet. iii. 18 al. m = ch. iv. 2 reff. n 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Phil. ii. 12 only. o Col. iii. 22 al. Paul only; 1 Chron. xxix. 17.

[1] τοις κυριοις κατα σαρκα DEFGKL, al. pler., Chr., Thdrt., Oec., etc.; τοις κατ. σαρ. κυρ. ℵABP 17, 31, 37, 39, 47, 57, 73, al.$_8$, Clem., Chr.$_1$, Dam., Thl.

[2] της καρδιας ABDEFGKL, etc., Clem., Chr., Thdrt., Dam.; omit της ℵ 3, 48, 67*, 72, 114, 115, 122, Orig., Bas., etc.

cf. μὴ ἐρεθίζετε in Col. iii. 21.—**ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου**: *but nurture them in the discipline and admonition of the Lord.* For ἀλλ' TTrWHRV prefer ἀλλά as before. We have now the statement of parental duty on the positive side. **ἐκτρέφειν** has here obviously the sense of *bringing up* (*cf.* Prov. xxiii. 24), not that of *nourishing* as in v. 29 above. **ἐν** is not *instrumental* here but *local*, denoting the ethical *sphere* or *element* in which the **παιδεία** and the **νουθεσία** take place. **παιδεία** in classical Greek means *education*, the whole *instruction* and *training* of youth, including the training of the *body*. In the NT as also in the OT and the Apocrypha **παιδεία** and its verb **παιδεύειν** mean education *per molestias* (Aug., *Enarr.*, in Ps. cxix. 66), *discipline*, instruction by *correction* or *chastening* (Luke xxiii. 16; Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8; Rev. iii. 9; *cf.* Lev. xxvi. 18; Ps. vi. 1; Isa. liii. 5; Ecclus. iv. 17, xxii. 6; 2 Macc. vi. 12). Of the general Greek sense there is but one instance in the case of the *verb* in the NT (Acts vii. 22); and as regards the *noun* the passage in 2 Tim. iii. 16 suits the idea of *disciplinary* instruction. There is no reason, therefore, for departing from the usual biblical sense of the word here, or for giving it the wide sense of *all* that makes the education of children. The term **νουθεσία**, not entirely strange to classical Greek (*e.g.*, Aristoph., *Ranae*, 1009), but current rather in later Greek (Philo, Joseph., etc.) in place of the earlier form **νουθέτησις** (**νουθετία** also appearing to occur occasionally), means *admonition*, training by *word*, and in actual use, mostly, though not necessarily, by word of reproof, remonstrance or blame (*cf.* Trench, *NT Syn.*, pp. 104-108). The Vulg. translates very well, "in disciplina et correptione". The distinction, therefore, between the two terms is not that between the *general* and the *special* (Mey.), but rather that between training by *act and discipline* and training by *word* (Ell.). The **Κυρίου** is taken by some as the *gen. obj.*, = "about Christ" (so the Greek commentators generally); by others as = "according to the doctrine of Christ" (Erasm., Est., etc.), or as = "worthy of the Lord" (Matthies). But it is best understood either as the *possess. gen.* or as the *gen.* of *origin*, = "the Lord's discipline and admonition," *i.e.*, *Christian* training, the training that is of Christ, proceeding from Him and prescribed by Him.

Vv. 5-9. Other relative duties—those of masters and servants. With this compare the paragraph in the sister Epistle, Col. iii. 22-iv. 1, and the statement in 1 Peter ii. 18-25.

Ver. 5. **οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα**: *servants obey them who according to the flesh are your masters.* As in the case of the two relations already dealt with, so here the statement begins with the dependent member, the *servant*, who in these times was a *bond-servant.* Many questions would inevitably arise with regard to the duties of masters and servants in a state of society in which slavery prevailed and had the sanction of ancient and undisputed use. Especially would this be the case when Christian slaves (of whom there were many) had a heathen master, and when the Christian master had heathen slaves. Hence the considerable place given in the NT to this relation and the application of Christian principles to it (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Tit. ii. 9, 10; and Philemon, in addition to Col. iii. 22, iv. 1 and 1 Pet. ii. 18-25). Here, as elsewhere in the NT, slavery is accepted as an existing institution, which is neither formally condemned nor formally approved. There is nothing to prompt revolutionary action, or to encourage repudiation of the position. Onesimus, the Christian convert, is sent back by Paul to his master, and the institution is left to be undermined and removed by the gradual operation of the great Christian principles of the equality of men in the sight of God, a common Christian brotherhood, the spiritual freedom of the Christian man, and the Lordship of Christ to which every

p Col. iii. 22 only.
q Col. iii. 22 only; Ps. lii. 5.
r Col. iii. 23 only.

χριστῷ,[1] 6. μὴ κατʼ ᵖὀφθαλμοδουλείαν[2] ὡς ᵠἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλʼ ὡς δοῦλοι χριστοῦ,[3] ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, 7. ἐκ ʳψυχῆς

[1] For Χριστω, κυριω AL 17, 39, 47, Vulg.-ms., Copt., Chr.₁.

[2] οφθαλμοδουλιαν ℵDEFGLP 37, 120, 121, etc.; ὀφθαλμοδουλειαν ABK and most.

[3] του Χρ. D³EKL, etc., Chr., Thdrt.; om. του ℵABDFGP, al. plu., Bas., Euth., etc.

other lordship is subordinate. See especially Goldwin Smith's *Does the Bible Sanction American Slavery?*; Köstlin's *Christliche Ethik*, pp. 318, 480, etc.; Mangold's *Humanitat und Christenthum*; Lightfoot's *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 319-329. ὑπακούετε, as in the case of children so in that of slaves *obedience* is the comprehensive name for duty, and this as a duty lying within the larger principle of the recognition and honour due to constituted authority (Rom. xiii. 1-7; 1 Pet. ii. 13-17). For τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα (TR, with DFKL, etc.), the better order is τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις (LTTr WHRV, with BℵAP, etc.), = "those who according to the flesh are your masters" (RV), not "your masters according to the flesh" (AV). In the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Peter the slave's master is called δεσπότης. The word κύριος, limited by the κατὰ σάρκα to the designation of a lordship which holds only for material interests and earthly relations, may perhaps have been selected here with a view to the contrast with the Κύριος whose lordship is absolute, inclusive alike of master and of slave, of earthly and of heavenly relations.—μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου: *with fear and trembling*. The use of the same phrase with regard to Paul himself (1 Cor. ii. 3), the Corinthians (2 Cor. vii. 15), and the Philippians (Phil. ii. 12), is enough to show that nothing more is in view here than *solicitous zeal* in the discharge of duty, anxious care not to come short.—ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν: *in singleness of your heart*. A clause qualifying the *obedience* itself; not the "fear and trembling," in which case we should have expected τοῦ ἐν ἁπλότητι, etc. It states the spirit in which the obedience was to be rendered,—not in formality, pretence, or hypocrisy, but in inward reality and sincerity, and with an undivided heart. The noun ἁπλότης = the condition of being *without folds, simplicity*, as contrasted with *pretence, dissimulation, insincerity*, in the NT is found only in the Pauline writings, and there seven times, with slightly different shades of meaning (Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11, 13, xi. 3; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii, 22; in 2 Cor. i. 12 the preferable reading is ἐν ἁγιότητι). The phrase ἐν ἁπλότητι occurs again in the first and the last of these passages.—ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ: *as to Christ*. That is, with an obedience regarded as rendered to Christ Himself; *cf.* ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ in v. 22, and see also Rom. xiv. 7-9.

Ver. 6. μὴ κατʼ ὀφθαλμοδουλείαν: *not in the way of eye-service*. TWH prefer the form ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν. Negative explanation of what ἁπλότης τῆς καρδίας means. κατά points to the *principle* or *rule* of action. The noun occurs only here and in Col. iii. 22; but ὀφθαλμόδουλος is found also in the *Constit. Apost.*, iv. 12. It is the service that is done only when one is under the master's eye—an obedience to save appearances and gain undeserved favour, which is not rendered when the master is absent as it is when his scrutiny is on us.—ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι: *as men-pleasers*. ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is another non-classical word, occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and in the NT limited to this passage and Col. iii. 22; *cf.* Ps. liii. 6, ὀστᾶ ἀνθρωπαρέσκων in LXX, and *Ps. Salom.*, iv., 8, 10.—ἀλλʼ ὡς δοῦλοι [τοῦ] Χριστοῦ: *but as bond-servants of Christ*. τοῦ is found in D³KL, etc., but not in BℵAD*F, etc., and is omitted by LTTrWH. The contrast is with ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, servants of *Christ*, not pleasers of *men*. The δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ, therefore, is a clause by itself, only *explained* by what follows. Some, mistaking this, make it one sentence with ποιοῦντες, etc.; in which case it loses its force, and the emphasis is on the ποιοῦντες.—ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς: *doing the will of God from the heart*. Statement of what is appropriate to the "bond-servants of Christ". It belongs to the *character* (ὡς) of the bond-servant of Christ to do the will of God, the God and Father of Christ, in his condition in life, and to do that not grudgingly or formally, but *ex animo*, with hearty readiness—ἐκ ψυχῆς, lit.

μετ' [s]εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ[1] καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις[2]· 8. εἰδότες ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος[3] ποιήσῃ ἀγαθὸν, τοῦτο [t]κομίσεται[4]

s 1 Cor. vii. 3 only; 1 Macc. xi. 53.
t = 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25 al.

[1] Omit ως before τω κυριω D[3]EKL, al. plu., Thdrt., Dam., etc.; insert ως ℵAB D*FGP, d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Syr., Bas., Chr., etc.

[2] ανθρωπω B, Eth., Dam.

[3] εκαστος *after* οτι ABDEFGP, etc., d, e, f, g, m, Vulg., Copt., Arm., Petr., Bas., Euth., Dam., etc.; εκαστος *before* ποιηση KL, al. longe plu., Syr., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., Theophyl., Oec.; εκαστος *after* ποιηση ℵ*,3, Syr.-P.; εαν τι ποιηση BL, d, e, 46, 62, 115, 129, Petr., etc.; ειδοτες οτι (prob. ο τι) εαν ποιηση ℵ*; ο εαν ποιηση ℵ[3]ADEFGP 3, 17, 31, etc.; ο εαν τι εκαστος ποιηση L**, al. plu., Chr.[180], Thdrt., Dam.

[4] κομισεται ℵ*ABD*FGP (-ισηται), Petr.; κομιειται ℵ[3]D[3]EKL, Bas., Euth., Thdrt., Dam.

"from the soul," *cf.* ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου "with all thy soul," Mark xii. 30. The ἐκ ψυχῆς is attached by not a few (Syr., Chrys., Jer., Beng., Harl., De Wette, Alf., Abb., WH) to the following clause. Tregelles, again, would attach both ἐκ ψυχῆς and μετ' εὐνοίας to the ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. But on the whole the simplest and most congruous connection is as it is given both in the AV and the RV. The addition of ἐκ ψυχῆς to the ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ is not superfluous; for to be true to the character of the bond-servant of Christ requires not merely the doing of God's will, but the doing of that will *ex animo*. But such definition is enough, and there is no need of the further description μετ' εὐνοίας. On the other hand the μετ' εὐνοίας is as pertinent as an explanation of the δουλεύοντες as ἐκ ψυχῆς is as an explanation of the ποιοῦντες.

Ver. 7. **μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες [ὡς] τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις**: *with good will doing service* [*as*] *to the Lord and not to men.* Further explanation of what is meant by the bond-service of Christ, *viz.*, a service rendered with *good will* and as a service to the Lord Himself, not to men. μετ' εὐνοίας means not simply *with readiness*, but with the disposition that wishes one well. In the NT the noun occurs only here; in 1 Cor. vii. 3 the accredited reading is not εὔνοιαν but ὀφειλήν. The TR omits ὡς before τῷ Κυρίῳ (with D[3]KL, etc.). It is given, however, by BℵAD* GP, Vulg., Syr., etc., and is rightly inserted by LTTrWHRV. It got a place in Beza's edition of 1598.

Ver. 8. **εἰδότες ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ ἀγαθόν**: *knowing that whatsoever good thing each shall have done.* Or, according to the text of T and WH = "knowing that each, if he shall have done any good thing". Participal clause subjoining a reason or encouragement for a service rendered in sincerity, with hearty good-will, and as to the Lord Himself. The encouragement lies in their Christian knowledge of the Lord's reward. εἰδότες, not = "who know" as if οἱ εἰδότες, but "seeing ye know," "knowing as ye do". The ποιήσῃ, as followed by the κομίσεται, is best rendered "shall have done". The readings vary greatly. Passing over minor diversities, *e.g.*, εἰδόντες for εἰδότες, ἐάν τις ἕκαστος, ὃ ἕκαστος ποιήσῃ with omission of ἐάν τι, etc., we find exceptional uncertainty in the text of the ἐὰν clause. The TR reads ὅτι ὃ ἐάν τι ἕκαστος, which is given in L[2] and most cursives. In that case ἐὰν is the *potential* ἄν, the ὃ and the τι being separated by *tmesis* (*cf.* ἣν ἄν τινα καταβλάψῃ, Plato, *Laws*, ix., 864 E), and the sense being = "whatsoever each," etc. But in a considerable number of Manuscripts and Versions (ADGP, 17, 37, Vulg., Arm., etc.) we find ὅτι ἕκαστος ὃ ἂν (or ἐὰν) ποιήσῃ,; in ℵ*, ὅτι (probably ὅ τι) ἐὰν ποιήσῃ, while ℵ[3] inserts ὃ before ἐάν; in L*, and one or two cursives (46, 62, 115, 129), ὅτι ἐάν τι ἕκαστος; and in B d, e, Petr. [alex. can. 6], ὅτι ἕκαστος ἐάν τι ποιήσῃ. This last reading is preferred by Tisch., ed. viii.[th], Alf., WH, and is placed in the margin by Lach. In this ἐὰν is the *conditional* particle and the sense is = "knowing as ye do that each, if he shall have done any good thing". The Manuscripts constantly vary between ἄν and ἐάν. In classical Greek the conditional ἐάν, *if*, took also the contracted form ἄν, especially in Thucydides and Plato, and this possibly is the explanation of the biblical use of ἐὰν as = the *potential* ἄν. In any case the use of ἐὰν, attached to relative pronouns and adverbs, ὁ ἐάν,

u Acts xvi. 26, xxvii. 40; Heb. xiii. 5 only; Deut. xxxi. 6. v Acts iv. 17, 29, ix. 1 only; Job xxiii. 6

παρὰ κυρίου,[1] εἴτε δοῦλος εἴτε ἐλεύθερος. 9. καὶ οἱ κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς, u ἀνιέντες τὴν v ἀπειλήν, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν

[1] του κυρ., with KL, etc., Fathers; κυριου ℵABDEFGP, Petr., Euth., Dam., etc.

ὅπου ἐάν, οὗ ἐάν, ὁσάκις ἐάν, etc., with the *potential* force, appears to occur (making all due allowance for uncertainties in the texts) with some frequency both in the LXX and in the NT, and it is found in the papyri; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 168; Buttm., *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 72; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 60, 61, 216.—**τοῦτο κομιεῖται [κομίσεται] παρὰ [τοῦ] Κυρίου**: *this shall he receive again from the Lord.* The κομιεῖται of the TR is supported by ℵ³D³ KL, Bas., Chr., Theodor., etc.; P gives κομίσηται. The best reading is κομίσεται, which is that of Bℵ*AD*G, etc. In the NT the verb κομίζειν is used once in the simple sense of *carrying* or *bringing to* one (Luke vii. 37, of the woman's ἀλάβαστρον); oftener in the sense of *obtaining* (1 Pet. i. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 13; Heb. x. 36; xi. 39), or in that of *receiving back*, *recovering one's own* (Matt. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Col. iii. 25). The word has this last sense also in classical Greek (*e.g.*, τὴν ἀδελφήν, Eurip., *Iph. T.*, 1362; Thuc., i., 113, etc.). So here the idea is that of receiving *back*. The "good thing" done is represented as being itself given back to the doer; the certainty, equity and adequacy of the reward being thus signified (*cf.* especially 2 Cor. v. 10). Whether the Middle is to be taken as the *appropriative* Middle, expressing as it were the receiving back of a *deposit* (Ell.) is doubtful in view of the fact that in every NT occurrence but one (Luke vii. 37) Middle forms are used. The best uncials omit τοῦ before Κυρίου, and so LTTrWHRV.—**εἴτε δοῦλος, εἴτε ἐλεύθερος**: *whether bond or free.* The reward in view is that of the Great Day, the Parousia, which will have regard not to *social* distinctions or external circumstances, but only to *spiritual* conditions.

Ver. 9. **καὶ οἱ Κύριοι, τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖτε πρὸς αὐτούς**: *and ye masters* [or *lords*, RV marg.], *do the same things unto them.* The καί has the same force as in vi. 4 above. The duty of the masters is a corresponding duty, essentially the same as that of the servants (τὰ αὐτά), and it is stated first in respect of what is to be done and then in respect of what is to be left undone. It is to put a forced sense, however, on the phrase ποιεῖτε τὰ αὐτά if it is made to refer only to the preceding δουλεύοντες (Chrys.), as if the point were that the masters had a *service* to render to the δοῦλοι as these had a service to render to them. Nor does it seem to look back simply to the more general idea in ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Probably the μετ' εὐνοίας is more immediately in view, and the meaning is that the masters were to act to their servants in the same Christian way as the servants were called to act to them—in the same spirit of consideration and goodwill.—**ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλήν**: *giving up your threatening.* The τήν, pointing to the too well-known habit of the masters, may be best rendered by "your". ἀνίημι is used in the NT in the sense of *loosening* (Acts xvi. 26, xxvii. 40), and of *leaving* (Heb. xiii. 5, from LXX). In classical Greek it is used metaphorically both of *slackening*, *releasing* (Aristoph., *Vesp.*, 574), and *giving up* (Thuc., iii., 10, of ἔχθρα). The latter sense is most in point here. As Ell. rightly observes: "St. Paul singles out the prevailing vice and most customary exhibition of bad feeling on the part of the master, and in forbidding this, naturally includes every similar form of harshness". This negative side of the master's duty is not noticed in the parallel passage in Col. iv. 1.—**εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν [αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν] ὁ Κύριός ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς**: *knowing as ye do that also your Master* [*that both their Master and yours*] *is in heaven.* εἰδότες, as in ver. 8, expresses the reason or encouragement for such conduct on the part of masters, *viz.*, the fact that masters themselves have a Master or Lord, whose seat is in *heaven*, not merely on earth, and who is Lord equally of master and of slave. The reading of the TR, καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, has the support of most cursives and such uncials as K. Some few MSS. give καὶ αὐτῶν ὑμῶν (D³G). But the best accredited reading is καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν, "both theirs and yours," given by B¹AD*, also by ℵ* (except that αὐτῶν becomes ἑαυτῶν), Syr., Boh., Vulg., Arm., etc., and accepted by LTTrWHRV.—**καὶ προσωποληψία οὐκ ἔστι παρ' αὐτῷ**: *and respect of persons is not with Him.* The form προσωποληψία is preferred by the best critics (LTTrWH). The noun and

καὶ ὑμῶν[1] **ὁ κύριός**[2] **ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς**[3] **καὶ** [w] **προσωπολημψία**[4] **οὐκ ἐστιν** [x] **παρ' αὐτῷ.**[5]

10. **Τὸ** [y] **λοιπὸν,**[6] [z] **ἐνδυναμοῦσθε**[7] **ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ** [a] **κράτει τῆς**

w x Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1 only.
y 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 1; = Paul only.
z Rom. iv. 20 al.; Paul only, exc. Acts ix. 22.
a Ch. i. 19 reff.

[1] **και αυτων και υμων** ℵ* (**εαυτων**) ABDP 17, 31, 37, 38, 116, Vulg., Goth., Arm., Copt., Clem., Euth., Dam., Jer.; **και υμων και αυτων** ℵ³L 5, 23, 47, 67, 73, 115, 213, Syr.-P., Petr., Bas., Cypr., Ambrst.; **και αυτων υμων** DEFG, g, etc.; **και υμων αυτων** K, al. plu., d, e, Syr.-Sch., Eth., Bas., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

[2] Omit **ο** before **κυριος** 17, 74, 115, 238, Bas., Dam.

[3] **ουρανοις** Clem., Petr., Bas., etc.; **τοις ουρανοις** P; **ουρανω** ℵ 31, 47, 73, Bas., Dam., etc.

[4] **προσωποληψια** D³EKLP, etc.; **προσωπολημψια** ℵAB*D*FG.

[5] **παρ αυτω** Petr., Bas., etc.; **εν αυτω** 31, 37, Syr.-P., Cypr., etc.; **παρα θεω** D*FG, d, e, f, g, m, Pelag., etc. (FG add **τω**.)

[6] **του λοιπου** ℵ*AB 17, 73, 118, Euth., Cyr., Procop., Dam.: **το λοιπον** ℵ*DEFG KLP, etc., Chr., Thdrt., Theophyl., Oec., etc.; add **αδελφοι μου** ℵ³KLP, etc., Syr., Copt., Goth., Chr., Theophyl., etc.; omit **ἀδελφοι μου** ℵ*BDE 17, d, e, m, Arm., Eth., Dam., etc.

[7] **δυναμουσθε** B 17, Orig.

its cognates **προσωπολημπτής** (Acts x. 34), **προσωπολημπτέω** (Jas. ii. 9), **ἀπροσωπολήμπτως** (1 Pet. i. 17), are Hellenistic forms, occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. **προσωπολημψία** itself is found only four times in the NT (Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; James ii. 1). *Cf.* also the phrases **βλέπειν εἰς πρόσωπον** (Matt. xxvi. 16; Mark xii. 14), **λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον** (Luke xx. 21; Gal. ii. 6), which in the NT have always a bad meaning,—to judge partially, to have regard to the person in judging or treating one. In the LXX the phrase **λαμβάνειν** or **θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον** is also used in the sense of having respect to one's person, *being partial* (*e.g.*, Job xxxii. 21, where it is conjoined with *giving flattering titles*), but admits at the same time of the better sense of *showing favour* to one (Gen. xix. 21).

Vv. 10-20. General concluding exhortation, following up the injunctions bearing on the particular, domestic duties. This comprehensive charge, which is expressed in terms of the Christian's spiritual warfare, the powers of evil with which he has to contend, and the weapons with which he is to arm himself, brings the Epistle worthily to its close.

Ver. 10. **τὸ λοιπόν** [**ἀδελφοί**] **μου, ἐνδυναμοῦσθε** [**δυναμοῦσθε**] **ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *finally* (or, *henceforth*) [*my brethren*], *be strengthened in the Lord*. For **τὸ λοιπόν**, the reading of TR with DFKLℵ³, etc., **τοῦ λοιποῦ**, is to be preferred (with LTTr WHRV) as sustained by Bℵ*A, 17, etc. The form **τὸ λοιπόν** (also the simple **λοιπόν**) is used in classical Greek both as = "as for the rest," *quod superest*, "finally" and with the temporal sense of *henceforth*. In the NT it has both these applications (*e.g.*, Phil. iii. 2, iv. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1, etc., for the former, and Matt. xiv. 41, xxvi. 45; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Heb. x. 13 for the latter). It occurs also once in the sense of "at last," or "already" (Acts xxvii. 20). The form **τοῦ λοιποῦ**, properly a temporal gen., both in classical Greek (Herod., ii., 2; Xen., *Cyr.*, iv., 4, 10, etc.) and in the NT (Gal. vi. 17), has the sense of "henceforth". **τὸ λοιπόν** can be used for **τοῦ λοιποῦ**, but it does not appear that **τοῦ λοιποῦ** is equally interchangeable with **τὸ λοιπόν**. Here **τὸ λοιπόν** might mean either "as for what you have still to do in addition to what has been said" (Mey.), or "henceforth". **τοῦ λοιποῦ** is = "*in* the future," "henceforth" (*cf.* Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, pp. 94, 109; Ell. on Gal. vi. 17; Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 382). The TR inserts **ἀδελφοί μου**, with ℵ³KLP, most cursives, and Syr., Boh., etc. **ἀδελφοί**, without **μου**, is read by AFG, Vulg., Theodor., etc. But the best accredited text (Bℵ*D, 17, Eth., Arm., Cyr., Luc., Jer., etc.) omits the phrase (so LTTrWHRV). The **ἐνδυναμοῦσθε** of the TR is supported by the mass of authorities, but is displaced by the simple **δυναμοῦσθε** (which occurs in Col. i. 11) in B 17; which latter is given a place in the margin by WH. **ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι** is a proper passive = "to

[a]ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. 11. [b]ἐνδύσασθε[1] τὴν [c]πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, [d]πρὸς τὸ[2] δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι[3] πρὸς τὰς [e]μεθοδείας[4] τοῦ διαβόλου.

b Ch. iv. 24 reff.
c Luke xi. 22 only; 2 Kings ii. 21.
d = Matt. v. 28 al.
e Ch. iv. 14 reff.

[1] ενδυσ. υμας FG. [2] εις το DEFG. [3] στ. υμ. DE; αντιστ. K.
[4] μεθοδειας B^3D^3P, etc.; μεθοδιας ℵAB*FGKL 37, etc.

be strengthened," as in Acts ix. 22; Rom. iv. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Heb. xi. 34. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** (**ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ** in ℵ*) defines the strengthening as *Christian* strengthening, such as can take effect only in union with Christ.—**καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ**: *and in the power of his might*. On the distinction between the various words for *strength*, etc., *cf.* on chap. i. 19 above. The phrase is not to be reduced to "in his mighty power," but has the full force of "in the active efficacy of the might that is inherent in him". Meyer takes the **ἐν** as instrumental = "by means of the might of his strength". But it has its proper force of "in," the efficient, energetic power of the Lord's inherent might being the principle or element *in* which the increase of strength which is possible only where there is union with Christ is to realise itself. By the **καί**, therefore, this clause *adds* something to the preceding and does more than merely *explain* it. In 2 Cor. xii. 9, **ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, the idea is that of the strength of Christ descending to *rest* on one.

Ver. 11. **ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *put on the whole armour of God*. Further explanation of what has to be done in order to become strong enough to meet all enemies, even the devil. **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is the gen. of *origin* or *source*, = the panoply which comes from God or is provided by Him. To put the emphasis on the **Θεοῦ** (Harl.) is to miss the point and to suppose a contrast which there is nothing here to suggest, *viz.*, with some *other* kind of panoply. The emphatic thing, as most exegetes notice, is the **πανοπλίαν**, the idea being that we need not only a Divine equipment, but that equipment in its *completeness*, without the lack of any single part. The fact that, in order to meet our spiritual foe, we need to take to ourselves all that God provides for living and for overcoming, is expressed in a telling figure drawn from the world of soldiery. The figure of the Christian as a *warrior* with his *arms*, *wages*, etc. (**ὅπλα, ὀψώνια**, etc.), occurs repeatedly in the Pauline writings (Rom. vi. 13, 23, xiii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). In briefer form the figure of the *armour* appears in 1 Thess. v 8, and in its rudiments also in Isa. lix. 17; *cf.* also Wisd. v. 17, etc. **πανοπλία** is not *armour* simply (Vulg. *armatura*, Harl., etc.), but *whole armour*, the complete equipment of the Roman **ὁπλίτης** or "man of arms," consisting of shield, helmet, breastplate, greaves, sword and lance; *cf.* Thuc., iii., 14; Isocr., 352 D; Herod., i., 60; Plato, *Laws*, vii., p. 796 B; and especially Polybius, vi., 23, 2, etc. The word occurs only once again in the NT (Luke xi. 22). No doubt the *Roman* soldier is particularly in view. Paul, the Roman citizen, would think of him, and it was the Roman military power that filled the eye where Paul laboured and wrote.—**πρὸς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς στῆναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου**: *that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil*. Statement of the *object* of the putting on of this panoply. The general sense of *direction* conveyed by the flexible prep. **πρός** when followed by the acc. takes a wide variety of applications. In this short sentence it expresses *mental* direction, *aim* or *object*, and *local* direction, *against*. The phrase **στῆναι πρός** belongs to the soldier's language, being used for *standing one's ground*, in opposition to taking to flight (Thuc., v., 104, and *cf.* Raphel., *Annot.*, ii., p. 493). In Jas. iv. 7 we have **ἀντιστῆναι** with the dat. For **μεθοδείας** TWH prefer **μεθοδίας**. On this rare term, found neither in profane Greek nor in the OT, and in the NT only in the two occurrences in this Epistle, see on chap. iv. 14 above. The plural denotes the various forms which the **μεθοδεία**, the *craftiness*, takes, and is fitly rendered either *stratagems* (which brings out the fundamental idea of *method* or *plan* in the deceit) or *wiles*. The Rhem. gives *deceits*; Tynd., Cov., Cran., Gen., Bish., *assaults* or *crafty assaults*. The *Devil*, **διάβολος**, is mentioned here as the author and practiser of all subtle, malicious scheming. The malign powers of which he is the prince are noticed next.

Ver. 12. **ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν [ὑμῖν] ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα**: *for our [your] wrestling is not against flesh and blood*. Reason for speaking of the **μεθοδείαι τοῦ**

12. ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν[1] ἡ [f] πάλη πρὸς [g] αἷμα καὶ [g] σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς [h] ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς [h] ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς [i] κοσμοκράτορας

f Here only. g Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Heb. ii. 14; Sir. xiv. 18. h Ch. i. 21 reff. i Here only.

[1] For ημ., υμιν BDFG 52, 115-20, al., It., Syr., Ar.-pol., Slav. al., Lucif., Ambrst.; ημιν ℵAD³EKLP, etc., most mss., Vulg., Copt., Syr., al., Thdrt., Clem., Orig., Meth., all Cyp., Hil., Jer., Aug., Ambrst.

διαβόλου as dangers against which the Christian must stand his ground. The **ὅτι** is explanatory, = "the wiles of the Devil, I say, for it is not mere *men* we have to face". The term **πάλη**, which occurs only this once in the NT, is used in classical Greek occasionally in the general sense of a *battle* or combat (in the poets, *e.g.*, Aesch., *Cho.*, 866; Eurip., *Heracl.*, 159), but usually in the specific sense of a contest in the form of *wrestling*. If it has its proper sense here, as is most probable, there is a departure for the time being from the figure of the panoply, and a transition to one which brings up different ideas. Has Paul, then, who elsewhere uses the more general figures of the **μάχη**, the **ἀγών**, etc., any special object in view in selecting **πάλη** here? There is nothing to indicate any such special object, unless it be to bring out the *hand to hand* nature of the conflict, "the *personal, individualising* nature of the encounter" (Ell.). The **ἡ** defines the **πάλη** in view, *viz.*, the physical struggle, as not the *kind* of **πάλη** with which we are concerned—which is "for us" (**ἡμῖν**). The **ἡμῖν** of the TR has the support of ℵAD³KLP, most cursives, and most Versions; **ὑμῖν** is read by BD*G, Eth., Goth., etc. The case is somewhat evenly balanced. TrWH place **ὑμῖν** in the margin; Lach., Tisch., etc., keep **ἡμῖν**. The form **αἷμα καὶ σάρξ** occurs only here and (acc. to the best critics) in Heb. ii. 14. Elsewhere it is **σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα**; but the sense is the same, = *feeble humanity*. The phrase occurs four times in the NT, always with the same general sense of man in the character of his *weakness* and *dependence*, but with slightly varying references; *e.g.*, with regard to our *corporeal* being in 1 Cor. xv. 50; Heb. ii. 14; our *intellectual* power in Matt. xvi. 17; our *spiritual* capacity as contrasted with invisible, diabolic agents (*cf.* Ell. on Gal. i. 16). The idea of *carnal desires* or *passions* which is ascribed to the phrase here by some (Jer., Matthies, etc.) would be expressed by **σάρξ** without **αἷμα**.—**ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς**: *but against the principalities*. The formula **οὐκ—ἀλλά** indicates not a *comparative* negation, as if = "not so much against flesh and blood as against the **ἀρχαί**," but an absolute. Meyer regards the clause as a case of brachylogy, some term of more *general* sense than **πάλη**, *e.g.*, **μάχη** or **μαχετέον** having to be understood, = "for us there is not a *wrestling* with flesh and blood, but a *fight* with the principalities". This on the ground that the idea of *wrestling* is inconsistent with that of the *panoply*. But while it is true that there is a change in the figure for the time being, there is nothing strange in that, neither is there any incongruity in representing the Christian's *conflict* as a *wrestling*—an *individual* encounter and one *at close quarters*. On the sense of **ἀρχαί**, *principalities* or *rulers* applied here to the powers of *evil*, see on i. 21 above.—**πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας**: *against the authorities*. On **ἐξουσίαι**, here designating *demonic* authorities, see on i. 21 above.—**πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους [τοῦ αἰῶνος] τούτου**: *against the world-rulers of the darkness of this world* (or, *of this darkness*). **τοῦ αἰῶνος** is inserted after **σκότους** by the TR, and is found in most cursives, and in such uncials as ℵ³D³EKLP. It is omitted in Bℵ*D*FG, 17, 67², etc., and is rejected by LTTrWHRV. In the NT we have such designations as **ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου** (John xiv. 30), **ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου** (2 Cor. iv. 4), applied to Satan. The phrase **κοσμοκράτωρ τοῦ σκότους τούτου** occurs only here. The noun **κοσμοκράτωρ** is found in the Orphic Hymns (iii., 3, of Satan), in inscriptions (C. I., 5892, with ref. to the emperor), in Gnostic writings (of the devil), and in the Rabbinical literature in transliterated Hebrew form (of the angel of death, and of kings like the four pursued by Abraham, and Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach, Belshazzar; *cf.* Wetstein, *in loc.*; Fischer's *Buxtorf*, *Lex.*, p. 996, etc.). According to usage as well as formation, therefore, it means not merely *rulers* (Eth., Goth.), but *world-rulers*, powers dominating the world as such and working everywhere. **τοῦ σκότους** limits their dominion, however, to the world as it now is in the darkness of its ignorance

k = Col. i. 13; Luke xxii. 53.
l Constr., here only.
m Matt. xxii. 18 al.; Rom. i. 20 al.
n Ch. i. 3 reff.; Ps. xli. 1, xlviii. 5.
o Acts vii. 43, xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Deut. i. 41; Jer. xxvi. 3.

τοῦ ᵏ σκότους τούτου,[1] πρὸς τὰ ˡ πνευματικὰ τῆς ᵐ πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ⁿ ἐπουρανίοις. 13. διὰ τοῦτο ᵒ ἀναλάβετε τὴν ᵉ πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ,

[1] Add του αιωνος, with ℵ³D³EKLP, etc., Syr.*, al., Mac., Ath.-ms., Chr., Thdrt., al.; om. ℵ*ABD*FG 17, 67², 80, most vss., Clem., Orig.-oft., Ath., Eus., Bas., Nyss., Cyr., Cypr., Lucif., Hil., Ambrst., Jer., Tert., etc.

and evil, and suggests the destined termination of their operation.—**πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας**: *against the spirit-forces of wickedness*. The repetition of the **πρὸς** before each of the four powers named in the clause has rhetorical force. Such renderings as "spiritual wickedness" (Tynd., Bish., AV), "spiritual craftiness" (Cran.), *spirituales nequitiae* (Erasm., Beza, Wolf., etc.), are inadequate. The phrase **τὰ πνευματικά** is not the same as **τὰ πνεύματα**, but means properly speaking the *spiritual things* (so Wicl., "the spiritual things of wickedness"). It is possible that the neut. adj. has the *collective* force here; in support of which Meyer and others adduce such phrases as **τὸ πολιτικόν, τὸ ἱππικόν, τὰ λῃστρικά**, etc. But **τὸ πολιτικόν** seems to mean the whole of that section of the community which consists of **πολῖται**; **τὸ ἱππικόν**, also **τὰ ἱππικά** (Polyb., iii., 114, 5) means *cavalry*; and **τὰ λῃστρικά** is used for pirate-vessels. The form **τὸ λῃστικόν**, however, has both the sense of *piracy* (Thucyd., i., 4, 13), and that of a *band of robbers* (Thucyd., ii., 69). This may perhaps justify the sense of *spirit-bands* or *spiritual hosts* here. But it seems most consonant with usage to give the term **τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας** the simple sense of "the spiritual things," *i.e.*, "*elements* or *forces* of wickedness," without connecting with it the doubtful connotation of *armies, hosts*, or *hordes* (*cf.* Abb., *in loc.*). The **πονηρίας** is the gen. of *quality*, = the spirit-forces whose essential character is wickedness.—**ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**: *in the heavenly regions*. On **τὰ ἐπουράνια** see under i. 3 above. The phrase, of which this is the fifth occurrence in the Epistle, is most naturally understood in the *local* sense which it has in the previous instances. Some depart from this sense and make it = *the heavenly blessings*, giving at the same time the meaning of "for," "in behalf" to **ἐν**, = "for the heavenly possessions". So even Chrys., Theod., and Oec., followed by Witsius, Wolf., etc. But **ἐν** cannot = **ὑπέρ** or **περί**, not even in Matt. vi. 7; John xvi. 30; Acts vii. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 4. Others, retaining the local sense, take the phrase as a designation of the scene of the *combat*, *e.g.* = "in the kingdom of heaven," that being the region in which Christians contend with the enemies of God (Matthies), or "in the air" as contrasted with the *solid ground* (Rück.). But the term qualifies **τὰ πνευματικά**. Forming one idea with that, it dispenses with the article; *cf.* **τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ ἀέρος**, Matt. vi. 26; **τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι**, 1 Tim. vi. 17, etc. It defines the domain of these spirit-forces. Their haunts are those superterrestrial regions, not the highest heavens which are the abode of God, Christ, and angels, but those lower heavens which are at once subcelestial and superterrestrial. The phrase and the idea may be suggested by the Jewish notion of a series of seven heavens, each distinguished from the other, the third or (later) the fourth, *e.g.*, being identified with Paradise. *Cf.* Morfill and Charles, *Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. xl. The phrase expresses, therefore, much the same idea as the phrase **τοῦ ἀέρος** in ii. 2. The reason why Paul uses **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** and not **ἐν τῷ ἀέρι** here may be, as Meyer suggests, his wish to "bring out *as strongly as possible* the superhuman and superterrestrial nature of these hostile spirits".

Ver. 13. **διὰ τοῦτο ἀναλάβετε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *wherefore take up the whole armour of God*. **διὰ τοῦτο**, *i.e.*, because your enemies are such as these. **ἀναλαβεῖν** is the accepted term for taking up arms, as **κατατίθεσθαι** is for laying them down (Deut. i. 41; Jer. xxvi. 3).—**ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ**: *that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day*. The object of the **ἀντιστῆναι**, *viz.*, the powers of evil, is left to be understood. The **ἡμέρα πονηρά** is inadequately interpreted as the *day of death* (E. Schmid); the *day of judgment* (Jer.); the *present life* (Chrys., Oec., etc.)—which would rather have been **αἰὼν πονηρός**; or the whole period of conflict prepared for us by Satan (Rück., Harl., De Wette, Bleek, etc.). Regard

ἵνα δυνηθῆτε [p] ἀντιστῆναι ἐν τῇ [q] ἡμέρᾳ τῇ [q] πονηρᾷ καὶ ἅπαντα [r] κατεργασάμενοι [1] στῆναι.[2] 14. στῆτε οὖν [s] περιζωσάμενοι τὴν

p Matt. v. 39 al.; abs., here only.
q Ch. v. 16 reff. r = Rom. vii. 15, 17, etc., xv. 18 al.[17]; Paul only, exc. 1 Pet. iv. 3; James i. 3, 20.
s Luke xii. 35 al.; Paul, here only; Dan. x. 5; Ps. lxiv. 6.

[1] **κατεργασμενοι** A.

[2] **στηναι, στητε ουν** Orig., Euseb., Dam., Jer., etc.; **στητε** DFG, d, e, Cypr.; *stare* without **στητε ουν** Victorin.

must be had to the definiteness given to the **ἡμέρα** by the article, which marks it out as in some sense or other a single day, a critical day, a time of peculiar peril and trial. Hence the choice must be between the *time immediately preceding the Parousia*, the searching day of the future in which the powers of evil will make their last and greatest effort (Meyer, etc.), and the *day of violent temptation and assault*, whenever that may come to us during the present time (Ell., etc.), "any day of which it may be said, 'this is your hour, and the power of darkness'" (Barry; so also Abb.). The latter view is on the whole to be preferred.—**καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στῆναι**: *and having done all, to stand*. In A we have the variant **κατεργασμένοι**, a misspelling for **κατεργασάμενοι** or for **κατειργασμένοι**. The Vulg. renders *in omnibus perfecti* (following perhaps the reading **κατειργασμένοι**). Some make it = "having *prepared* all things for the conflict" (Erasm., Beza, etc.); but that would be expressed by some such form as **παρασκευασάμενοι** (1 Cor. xiv. 8). Others give it the sense of *overpowering* (Oec., Chrys., Harl., etc.; *cf.* "overcome" in AV margin)—a sense which it has, but not in the NT, as far as appears, and which will not suit the *neut.* (**ἅπαντα**) here. There is no reason to depart from the ordinary sense of the verb, *viz.*, that of *perficere* (*cf.* Plato, *Laws*, iii., p. 686 E; Herod., v., 24, etc.), *doing thoroughly*, *working out*, especially (the **κατά** being intensive) accomplishing a *difficult* task. Applied to things evil or dishonourable this becomes *perpetrare*. These are the senses which it has in the NT generally and in the Pauline writings in particular (Rom. vii. 15, 17; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Phil. ii. 12, etc.; and in the sense of *perpetrating*, Rom. i. 27, ii. 9; 1 Cor. v. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 3). The **ἅπαντα** refers obviously to the *conflict* in view, and means "all things pertaining to your struggle". The **στῆναι**, in contrast with the **ἀντιστῆναι** or *withstanding*, denotes the final result; the ability to withstand when the fight is on is to be sought with a view to holding one's position when the conflict is at an end,—neither dislodged nor felled, but *standing* victorious at one's post.

Ver. 14. **στῆτε οὖν περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**: *stand, therefore, having girded your loins with truth*. In some few authorities **στῆτε οὖν** is omitted (Victor., Ambrstr.); in others the **οὖν** is omitted and **στῆτε** is retained (D*FG, Cyp., etc.). **ὀσφυς** is accentuated **ὀσφῦς** by TR and Treg.; but **ὀσφύς** by LTWH. The aor. **στῆτε** may perhaps be best rendered, "take your stand," the definite act being in view. The spiritual warrior who has kept his position victorious and stood above his conquered foe in one "evil day," is to take his stand again ready to face another such critical day, should it come. The following sentences explain what has to be done if he is thus to stand. The aorists can scarcely be the *contemporary* aorists or definitions of the *way* in which they were to stand; for it would not be the mark of the good soldier that he left his equipment to be attended to till the very time when he had to take up his position. They are proper pasts, stating what has to be done *before* one takes up his stand. First in the list of these articles of equipment is mentioned the girdle. Appropriately so; for the soldier might be furnished with every other part of his equipment, and yet, wanting the girdle, would be neither fully accoutred nor securely armed. His *belt* or *baldric* (**ζωστήρ** or (later) **ζωνή**) was no mere adornment of the soldier, but an essential part of his equipment. Passing round the loins and by the end of the breastplate (in later times supporting the sword), it was of especial use in keeping other parts in place, and in securing the proper soldierly attitude and freedom of movement. The **περιζωσάμενοι** is better rendered (with RV) "having girded your loins," than "having your loins girt" (with AV); for the *girding* is the soldier's *own* act by help of God's grace (*cf.* Luke xii. 35 and the **ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας** of 1 Pet. i. 13). The sing. **ὀσφύς** is used now and again in

[t] ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν [u] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν [v] θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 15. καὶ [w] ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας [u] ἐν [x] ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ

t Luke l.c., reff.; Matt. iii. 4; 1 Pet. i. 13; Isa. xi. 5. u See 1 Cor. iv. 21 reff. v 1 Thess. v. 8; Rev. ix. 9, 17 only; Isa. lix. 17. w Mark vi. 9; Acts xii. 8 only; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15. x Here only; = Ps. ix. 37; see Ezra ii. 68.

the LXX as the rendering of הֲלָצַיִם = the two loins, and so it is used here and in Acts ii. 30; Heb. vii. 5, 10. The ἐν in ἐν ἀληθείᾳ is the *instrum.* ἐν, perhaps with some reference to the other parts being *within* the girdle (Ell.; *cf.* περιεζωσμένος ἐν δυναστείᾳ, Ps. lxiv. 7). But what is this ἀλήθεια which is to make our spiritual cincture? It has been taken in the *objective* sense, the truth of the Gospel (Oec.). But that is afterwards identified with the *sword* (ver. 17). It is *subjective* truth (*cf.* v. 9 above). But in what sense again? In that, says Meyer, of "harmony of knowledge with the objective truth given in the Gospel"; in that, as Ell. puts it, "of the inward practical acknowledgment of the truth as it is in Him" (Christ). But in its subjective applications ἀλήθεια means most obviously the personal grace of *candour*, *sincerity*, *truthfulness* (John viii. 44; 1 Cor. v. 8, xiii. 6; 2 John 1; 3 John 1), as it is used also of the *veracity* of God (Rom. xv. 8). It seems simplest, therefore, and most accordant with usage to take it so here (with Calv., etc.). And this plain grace of *openness*, *truthfulness*, *reality*, the mind that will practise no deceits and attempt no disguises in our intercourse with God, is indeed vital to Christian safety and essential to the due operation of all the other qualities of character. In Isa. xi. 5 *righteousness* is combined with truth in this matter of *girding*—ἔσται δικαιοσύνῃ ἐζωσμένος τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀληθείᾳ εἰλημένος τὰς πλευράς—in the case of the Messianic Branch out of the roots of Jesse.—**καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης**: *and having put on the breastplate of righteousness.* As the soldier covers his breast with the θώραξ to make it secure against the disabling wound, so the Christian is to endue himself with *righteousness* so as to make his heart and will proof against the fatal thrust of his spiritual assailants. This δικαιοσύνη is taken by some (Harl., etc.) as the righteousness of justification, the righteousness of faith. But *faith* is mentioned by itself, and as the ἀλήθεια was the quality of truthfulness, so the δικαιοσύνη is the quality of moral rectitude (*cf.* Rom. vi. 13), as seen in the regenerate. The gen. is to be understood as that of *apposition* or *identity*, = "the breastplate which *is* righteousness". In the analogous passage in 1 Thess. v. 8 the breastplate is *faith and love*, and with it is named the helmet, which is introduced later in this paragraph. In the fundamental passage in Isa. lix. 17 we have the breastplate and the helmet again mentioned together, and the former identified as here with *righteousness*—ἐνεδύσατο δικαιοσύνην ὡς θώρακα.

Ver. 15. **καὶ ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας**: *and having shod your feet.* So the RV; better than "and your feet shod" of AV. The reference comes in naturally in connection with the στῆτε. The soldier, who will make this *stand*, must have his feet protected. The Heb. נַעַל, *sandal*, is represented in the LXX by ὑπόδημα, which also occurs repeatedly in the Gospels and Acts, σανδάλιον being also used both in the NT (Mark vi. 9; Acts xii. 8), and in the LXX, as well as in Josephus, with the same sense. Here, however, the *military* sandal (Hebr. סְאוֹן, Isa. ix. 4; Lat. *caliga*; *cf.* Joseph., *Jew. Wars*, vi. 1, 8, and Xen., *Anab.*, iv., 5) is in view, which protected the soldier's feet and made it possible for him to move with quick and certain step.—**ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ**: *with the preparedness.* The form ἑτοιμασία occurs in later Greek (*e.g.*, Hippocr., p. 24; Joseph., *Antiq.*, x., 1, 2) and in the LXX (*cf.* Ps. x. 17), for the classical ἑτοιμότης. It means (*a*) *preparation* in the active sense of *making ready* (Wisdom, xiii., 12); (*b*) a *state of preparedness*, whether *external* (*e.g.*, ἵππους εἰς ἑτοιμασίαν παρέχειν, Joseph., *Antiq.*, x., 1, 2), or *internal* (Ps. x. 17); perhaps also (*c*) something fixed, a *foundation* (=Heb. מָכוֹן; Dan. xi. 7). Some have given it this last sense here, either as = *stedfastness* in keeping the faith, or as = on the *foundation*, the strong and certain *ground*, of the Christian religion (Beng., Bleek, etc.). But in harmony with the general idea of the ethical equipment of the Christian, it means *readiness*, *preparedness of mind*. The ἐν is again the *instrum.* prep.—**τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης**: *of the Gospel of peace.* The first gen. is that of *origin*, the second that of *con-*

[y] εὐαγγελίου τῆς [y] εἰρήνης, 16. [z] ἐπὶ[1] πᾶσιν [a] ἀναλαβόντες τὸν [b] θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως, [c] ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεσθε[2] πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ [d] πονηροῦ

y Here only; see Mark i. 14; Acts xx. 24; Isa. lii. 7; Rom. x. 15. z Luke iii. 20, xvi. 26; 2 Cor. vii. 4; Col. iii. 14; 1 Thess. iii. 7, 9. a Ver. 13 reff. b Here only; 2 Kings i. 21. c Simply local, see note. d = (Matt. v. 37, 39)? xiii. 19 al.; (2 Thess. iii. 3)? 1 John ii. 13, v. 18.

[1] επι ADEFGKL, etc., Syr.-scr., Arm., Goth., Chr., Euth., etc.; for επι, εν ℵBP 17, 26, 31-7, 80, 118, 213, It., Vulg., Method., Naz., Cyr.-jer., Cypr., etc.

[2] δυνασθαι DFG, d, e, f, g, m, Victor., Jer.

tents, = "the preparedness which comes from the Gospel whose message is peace". The εἰρήνη here is doubtless *peace with God* (Rom. v. 1), that peace which alone imparts the sense of freedom, relieves us of what burdens us, and gives the spirit of courageous readiness for the battle with evil. The phrase "the Gospel of peace" is elsewhere associated with the idea of the message preached (Isa. lii. 7; Nahum i. 15; *cf.* Rom. x. 15). Here, however, the readiness is not zeal in *proclaiming* the Gospel, but promptitude with reference to the *conflict*. The *preparedness*, the mental alacrity with which we are inspired by the Gospel with its message of peace with God, is to be to us the protection and equipment which the sandals that cover his feet are to the soldier. With this we shall be helped to face the foe with courage and with promptitude.

Ver. 16. **ἐπὶ [ἐν] πᾶσιν ἀναλαβόντες τὸν θυρεὸν τῆς πίστεως**: *in addition to all* (or, *withal*) *taking up the shield of faith*. The readings vary between ἐπί and ἐν. The former, that of the TR, is supported by ADGKL, most cursives, and such Versions as the Syr.-P, and the Arm.; the latter, by BℵP, 17, Syr.-H., Boh., Vulg., etc. The latter is accepted by L (*non-marg.*) TTrWHRV; and with it the sense is "*in* or *among all*," aptly rendered *withal* by the RV. With ἐπί the sense will be neither "*above* all" (AV) as if = *most especially*, nor "*over* all," with reference to *position*; but, in accordance with the general idea of "accession," "superaddition" expressed by ἐπί (*cf.* Ell.), *in addition to all* (*cf.* Luke iii. 20). **θυρεός**, in Homer = a stone put against a door (θύρα) to block or shut it (*Od.*, ix., 240, etc.), but later = a *shield*, is the large, oblong shield, Lat. *scutum*, as distinguished from the smaller, circular ἀσπίς, the Lat. *clipeus*. It is described by Polybius (vi., 23, 2) as the first portion of the πανοπλία, and is appropriate here where the Christian is presented under the figure of a heavy-armed soldier. **τῆς πίστεως**, the gen. of *appos.* or *identity*, = "the shield which *is*, or *consists of*, faith"; πίστις having here also its distinctive NT sense of *saving* faith—the faith by which come the Divine forgiveness and the power of a new life.—**ἐν ᾧ δυνήσεσθε πάντα τὰ βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ [τὰ] πεπυρωμένα σβέσαι**: *wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one*. ἐν ᾧ = "by means of which," as the shield is placed before us to cover us from the stroke. There is no necessity for putting on δυνήσεσθε the sense of the remote future, as if the last conflict preceding the Judgment (Mey.) alone were in view. It refers to the future generally—to any time in our Christian course when we shall need special power for special assault. The art. τά is omitted before πεπυρωμένα by BD*G, etc., but inserted by the mass of authorities. Lach. deletes it; Treg. and WH bracket it. The anarthrous participle might have the qualitative sense, = "fire-tipped as they are" (so Abb.). If the article is retained, it would be implied, as Meyer remarks, that the wicked one has also other arrows to discharge besides these fearsome and pre-eminently destructive ones, which are mentioned here in order to express in its utmost force the terror of the attack. The βέλη in view are not *poisoned* arrows (referred to, as is supposed, in Job vi. 4; Ps. xxxviii. 2), which were not *flaming* missiles; but arrows tipped with tow, pitch or such like material, and set on fire before they were discharged, the πυρφόροι διστοί (Thucyd., ii., 75, 4), or βέλη πυρφόρα (Diod., xx. 96), the *malleoli* used by the Romans (Cic., *Pro Mil.*, 24), the Greeks (Herod., viii., 52), and, as it would seem, the Hebrews (Ps. vii. 13). The σβέσαι has its own appropriateness here, the θυρεός being constructed of material (wood and leather, Polyb., *Hist.*, ii., 23, 3), which not only prevented the missile from penetrating, but was proof against its fire and let it burn itself out. **τοῦ πονηροῦ**, in harmony with the general idea of a personal stand against spiritual foes, must be masc., "the Evil One," the Devil.

τὰ[1] [e]πεπυρωμένα [f]σβέσαι. 17. καὶ τὴν [g]περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ [h]σωτηρίου [i]δέξασθε,[2] καὶ τὴν [k]μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν [l]ῥῆμα θεοῦ, 18. [m]διὰ πάσης [n]προσευχῆς καὶ [n]δεήσεως προσευχό-

e 1 Cor. vii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 29; 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. i. 15, iii. 18; Prov. x. 20. f Matt. xii. 20 al.; 1 Thess. v. 19; Heb. xi. 34. g 1 Thess. v. 8 only; Isa. lix. 17. h Luke ii. 30 reff.; Acts xxviii. 28. i = Luke ii. 28, xvi. 6, xxii. 17 only. k Heb. iv. 12 al. fr. l Ch. v. 26 reff.; Acts xv. 27, 32. m 2 Cor. ix. 12 al. fr. n Acts. i. 14; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5; 2 Chron. vi. 19 al.

[1] insert τα ℵAD[3]EKLP, etc., Clem., Orig., etc.; om. τα BD*FG.

[2] Om. δεξασθε DFG, d, e, g, m, Cypr., Luc., Victorin.; δεξασθαι AD[3]EKLP, 17, etc.

Ver. 17. **καὶ τὴν περικεφαλαίαν τοῦ σωτηρίου δέξασθε**: *and receive the helmet of salvation*. The construction changes here, as is often the case with Paul, and passes from the participial form to the direct imperative. There is no necessity, however, for marking this by a full stop at the close of the preceding sentence (with Lach., Tisch., and RV). **δέξασθε** is omitted by D*FG, Cyp., etc., and becomes **δέξασθαι** in AD[3]EKLP, 17, etc. The verb has its proper sense here, not merely "take," but "receive," *i.e.*, as a gift from the Lord, a thing provided and offered by Him. The *helmet* required for the defence of the head is introduced both in Isa. lix. 17 and 1 Thess. v. 8. It is noticed before the *sword;* for, the left hand holding the shield, when the sword is grasped by the right, there remains no hand free to put on any other part (Mey.). **τοῦ σωτηρίου** is again an *appos.* gen, = "the helmet which *is* salvation". In 1 Thess. v. 8 the helmet is not the salvation itself, as here and in Isa. lix. 17, but the *hope* of it. Paul's usual term is **σωτηρία.** In Tit. ii. 11 he uses the adj. **σωτήριος** in the sense of "bringing salvation". This is the only instance of his use of the abstr. neuter for **σωτηρία.** It occurs, however, in Luke's writings (Luke ii. 30, iii. 6; Acts xxviii. 28, and in the LXX).—**καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος**: *and the sword of the Spirit*. The gen. here cannot be that of *appos.* (although it is so taken by Harl., Olsh., etc.), for the following explanation renders that inept. It must be the gen. of *origin*, = "the sword supplied by the Spirit".—**ὅ ἐστι ῥῆμα Θεοῦ**: *which is the word of God*. Some strangely make the **ὅ** refer to the **πνεύματος**, = "the Spirit who is the Word of God" (Olsh., Von Sod., etc.); but nowhere else is the Spirit identified with the Word. The **ὅ** is explanatory of the **μάχαιρα,** the neut. form being due to the usual attraction. In Heb. iv. 2 we have the **λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ** compared in respect of superior sharpness or penetrating power to a *two-edged sword*. Here we have the phrase **ῥῆμα Θεοῦ,** which is to be understood, in accordance with the proper sense of **ῥῆμα,** as the *spoken* Word, the *preached* Gospel, and this in its length and breadth—not in the *commandments* of God only (Flatt), nor in His *threatenings* alone (Koppe), nor even yet in the sense of the *written* Word, the Scriptures (Moule). The sword is the only *offensive* weapon in the panoply. But it is indispensable. For, while the Christian soldier is exhibited here mainly in the attitude of defence, as one who *stands*, in order to take his position and keep his ground, thrust and cut will be required. The preached Gospel, "the power of God" (Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18), is the weapon provided by the Spirit for meeting the lunge of the assailant and beating him back. With this the description of the panoply comes to an end. It has not followed the usual way, but has left out certain parts (*spear* or *lance*, and *greaves*, to wit), and has introduced others (the *girdle* and the *sandals*) which are not enumerated in Polybius's list of the accoutrements of the man-at-arms. It has kept only in part by the Isaianic description (Isa. lix. 17), including the breastplate and the helmet, but passing over the "garments" and the "cloke". Nor has it much more in common with the fuller description in Wisd. v. 18, 20, which may also have been more or less in the writer's mind—**λήψεται πανοπλίαν τὸν ζῆλον αὐτοῦ . . . ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνης, καὶ περιθήσεται κόρυθα κρίσιν ἀνυπόκριτον. λήψεται ἀσπίδα ἀκαταμάχητον ὁσιότητα, ὀξυνεῖ δὲ ἀπότομον ὀργὴν εἰς ῥομφαίαν.** It differs also in the *application* of the figures of the breastplate and the helmet from the briefer Pauline description in 1 Thess. v. 8. But the capacity of bearing a variety of applications, each as just in its place as the other, is the quality of all figurative language that is apt and true to nature.

Ver. 18. **διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ**

μενοι [o] ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ [p] ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ [q] εἰς αὐτὸ [1] [r] ἀγρυπνοῦντες [2] ἐν πάσῃ [s] προσκαρτερήσει καὶ [3] [u] δεήσει περὶ [4] πάντων τῶν [t] ἁγίων

o Luke xxi. 36 only. p Ch. ii. 22 reff.
q 1 Pet. iv. 7; Jude 20; (Rom. ix. 17, xiii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 5, but all w. τοῦτο). r Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36; Heb. xiii. 17 only; Cant. v. 2. s Here only. t Ch. i. 1 reff.

[1] After αυτο insert τουτο D[3]EKLP, etc., Chrys.-text., Thdrt., Dam.-text., al.; om. ℵABD*FG (αυτον D*FG) It., Vulg., Lat. Fathers, Copt., etc.

[2] After αγρ. insert παντοτε DEFG, It., Syr., Ar.-erp., Bas.

[3] προσκ. και om. D* (εν π. τη δ.) FG, It., Victorin., etc.

[4] For περι, υπερ D*E*FG 37, 47, 73, 80, Syr. (with περι in marg.), Thdrt.

δεήσεως προσευχόμενοι: *with all prayer and supplication praying*. This clause is a further explanation of the manner in which the injunction **στῆτε οὖν** is to be carried. It is connected by some with the preceding **δέξασθε**; but it is not appropriate to the **δέξασθε**, which represents a single, definite act, while it is entirely suitable to the continuous attitude expressed by **στῆτε**. This great requirement of standing ready for the combat can be made good only when prayer, constant, earnest, spiritual prayer, is added to the careful equipment with all the parts of the panoply. Meyer would separate **προσευχόμενοι** from the **διὰ πάσης**, etc., and make it the beginning of a new, independent clause. His reason is that it is impossible to pray with *every* kind of prayer on *every occasion*. But the absoluteness of the statement is only of the kind that is often seen in Paul, as, *e.g.*, when he charges us to pray **ἀδιαλείπτως** (1 Thess. v. 17). **διά** has the familiar sense of "by means of," in the particular aspect of *formal cause*, the *manner* in which a thing is done (*cf.* **εἶπε διὰ παραβολῆς**, Luke viii. 4; **εἶπε διὰ ὁράματος**, Acts xviii. 9; **τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν**, 2 Cor. v. 11, etc.; Grimm-Thayer, *Lex.*, p. 133). The **πάσης** has the force of "*every kind* of". The distinction attempted to be drawn between **προσευχή** (= תְּפִלָּה) and **δέησις** (= תְּחִנָּה), as between prayer for *blessing* and prayer for the withholding or removing of *evil*, cannot be made good. The only difference between the two terms appears to be that **προσευχή** means prayer in general, *precatio*, and **δέησις**, a special form of prayer, *petition*, *rogatio*.—**ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ**: *in every season*. Not merely in the crisis of the conflict or on special occasions, but habitually, in all kinds of times.—**ἐν πνεύματι**: *in the Spirit*. The reference is not to *our* spirit, as if = with *inward devoutness* or with *heart-felt* pleading (Erasm., Grot., etc.), nor as opposed to **βαττολογεῖν** (Chrys.), but "in the Holy Spirit," the Holy Spirit being the sphere or element in which alone true prayer of all different kinds can proceed and from which it draws its inspiration; *cf.* the great statement on the *intercession* of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 26, 27); also Gal. iv. 6, and especially Jude 20, **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι**. Thus the praying is defined in respect of its *variety* and *earnestness* (**διὰ πάσης**, etc.), its *constancy* (**ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ**), and its *spiritual reality* or its "holy sphere" (*cf.* Ell.).—**καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ [τοῦτο] ἀγρυπνοῦντες**: *and thereunto watching*. The **τοῦτο** of the TR inserted after **αὐτό** has the support only of such MSS. as D[3]JK, etc.; it is omitted in BAℵ, etc., while **αὐτόν** alone occurs in D*G. **τοῦτο**, therefore, is to be deleted, as is done by LTTrWHRV. The **εἰς τοῦτο** refers not to what is to follow, as, *e.g.*, to the **ἵνα μοι δοθῇ** (Holzh.), but to what immediately precedes. The clause, therefore, attaches (by the **καί**) a more particular requirement to the general statement just made, specifying something that is to be done *with a view* (**εἰς τοῦτο**) to the fulfilment of the large injunction as to praying. That is *watchfulness*, *readiness*, and, as the next words state, watchfulness in *intercession*, **ἀγρυπνεῖν** = to *keep awake* or to *keep watch*, and then to be *attentive*, *vigilant* (Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36), is much the same as **γρηγορεῖν** and **νήφειν**. So far as any distinction is made between them it may be that **ἀγρυπνεῖν** expresses *alertness* as opposed to *listlessness*, **γρηγορεῖν** watchfulness as the result of *effort*, and **νήφειν** *wariness*, the wakefulness that is safe against drowsiness (Sheldon Green, *Crit. Notes on the N. T.*, *sub* Mark xiii. 33).—**ἐν πάσῃ προσκαρτερήσει καὶ δεήσει**: *in all perseverance and supplication*. The only occurrence of the noun **προσκαρτέρησις**. The verb, however, is found a number of times, both in profane Greek and in the NT, especially in Acts (Mark iii.

u = 1 Cor. xii. 8.
v See note.
w Matt. v. 2 reff.; Acts viii. 35, x. 34 al.

19. καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα μοι δοθῇ [1] ᵘλόγος ᵛἐν ʷἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου ˣἐν ˣπαῤῥησίᾳ ʸγνωρίσαι τὸ ᶻμυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,[2]

x Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 15; = Paul only. y z Ch. i. 9 reff.

[1] δοθειη, with some mss.; δοθη most MSS., mss., Vss., Ff.

[2] Insert του ευαγγελιου ℵADEFKLP, etc., d, e, f, Vulg., Syr., Copt., etc.; om. BFG, g, Victorin., Tert. (citing freely), Ambrst.

9; Acts i. 14, ii. 42, 46, vi. 4, viii. 13, x. 7; Rom. xii. 12, xiii. 6; Col. iv. 2) in the sense of *giving heed to* (*e.g.*, τῇ προσευχῇ, Acts i. 14, etc.), *continuing in*, etc. The *perseverance* or *stedfastness* in view is in the matter of prayer, so that the "in every kind of perseverance and supplication" is much the same as "in every kind of persevering supplication," although in the case of a hendiadys proper the order would rather have been ἐν δεήσει καὶ προσκαρτερήσει.—περὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων: *for all the saints*. Thus in order to prayer of the kind described—prayer comprehensive, continuous, and moving in the domain of the Spirit of God, there must be *intercession* for all and *watchfulness* and *perseverance* in it. Only when we constantly pray in this way for *others* can we pray for *ourselves* "with all prayer and supplication in every season in the Spirit".

Ver. 19. καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ: *and for me*. καί has here its *adjunctive* force, in the special form of appending the particular to the general (Win.-Moult., p. 544), = "and for me in particular". Paul passes from the requirement of intercession for all to that of intercession for himself, and that with a view to a special gift from God, to wit, freedom of utterance in preaching. The περί of the former clause becomes ὑπέρ in the present. This suggests the existence of some distinction between the two preps., and some have attempted to show that ὑπέρ alone expresses the idea of *care for* one, while περί denotes a more distant relation (Harl., etc.). But it is impracticable to establish either that or any other tangible distinction. ὑπέρ may be, generally speaking, more applicable to *persons*, and περί to *things*. But here both are used of persons. Even in classical Greek they were often used as if interchangeable (*e.g.*, Demosth., *Phil.*, ii., p. 74, 35), and in later Greek, both biblical and non-biblical, they seem to have lost any distinction they once may have had.—ἵνα μοι δοθείῃ [δοθῇ] λόγος: *that to me may be given utterance*. The δοθείῃ of the TR rests on very slender cursive evidence; δοθῇ is read by BℵAD EFGKLP, etc., and must be substituted. A few authorities place μοι *after* δοθῇ (ℵ*, d, e, f, vg, Victor., etc.); but in most it is inserted *before* it. δοθῇ has the position of emphasis—the utterance for which they were to pray in Paul's behalf is regarded as a *gift* from God. For this use of λόγος *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 2.—ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου: *in opening my mouth*. Not "*that* I may open my mouth" (AV), but "*when* I open my mouth". The ἐν marks the *occasion* of the action, and the action itself is that in which the *gift* (δοθῇ) of Divine help is sought. The phrase ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα does not of itself denote any special *kind* of utterance, whether *unreserved* (Calv., De Wette, etc.), *unpremeditated* (Oec.), or other. If it conveys in any case the idea of a certain *quality* of speech, that is due to the context; as in 2 Cor. vi. 11, where it is conjoined with the phrase ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν πεπλάτυνται. It means simply the opening of the mouth to speak, or the act of speaking; but both in the OT and in the NT it appears to have a certain *pathetic* (Mey.), or rather *solemn* force (Ell.), being used of grave and important utterances on which much depended (Job iii. 1; Dan. x. 16; Matt. v. 2; Acts viii. 33, xviii. 14).—ἐν παρρησίᾳ: *with boldness*. Statement of the thing specially sought, and recognised as to be obtained only by the gift of God, to wit, *fearless, confident freedom* whenever occasion came to preach the Gospel. παρρησία primarily = *freedom in speaking* (Acts iv. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 12); then *frankness, unreserve*, or *plainness* in speaking (Mark viii. 32; John x. 24, xi. 14, xvi. 25, etc.); and *boldness, assurance*, as opposed, *e.g.*, to αἰσχύνεσθαι (Phil. i. 20; 1 John iii. 21, v. 14); and with the fundamental idea of freedom or confidence in *speaking* again suggesting itself (1 John ii. 28, iv. 17; see also under iii. 12 above).—γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον [τοῦ εὐαγγελίου]: *to make known the mystery* [*of the Gospel*]. The τοῦ εὐαγγελίου of the TR has large support (ℵADEKLP, Vulg., Syr., Copt., etc.). It is omitted by BFgrG, Victor., etc., and is deleted by LWH. The *gen.* is probably that of *contents*, or one of the various forms of the *gen. possess.*, = the

20. ὑπὲρ οὗ [a] πρεσβεύω ἐν [b] ἁλύσει, ἵνα [c] ἐν αὐτῷ [d] παῤῥησιάσωμαι [e] ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι.

a 2 Cor. v. 20 only.
b Acts xxviii. 20 (Paul); 2 Tim. i. 16.
c See note.
d Acts ix. 26 al.; 1 Thess. ii. 2 only; Prov. xx. 9 al.
e Col. iv. 4.

mystery *contained in* the Gospel or *belonging to* it. On **μυστήριον** see under i. 9 above.—The connection of the several clauses in this verse is variously understood. Some connect **ἐν ἀνοίξει τοῦ στόματός μου** with the following **ἐν παρρησίᾳ**. So Grotius, who explains it thus—"ut ab hac custodia militari liber per omnem urbem perferre possem sermonem"; but **παρρησία** does not apply to freedom of *movement*, and here it has a sense in harmony with the following **παῤῥησιάσωμαι**. Others attach the **ἐν ἀνοίξει** closely with the **λόγος** as a definition of it, = "that utterance may be given me by the opening of my mouth" (Cornel. à Lap., Harl., Olsh., Von Soden, Abb., etc.). This makes the "opening of the mouth" the act of *God;* in support of which interpretation appeal is made to the terms in Ezek. iii. 27, xxix. 31, xxxii. 22; Ps. li. 15. The absence of the article, and the analogous passage in Col. iv. 3 are also thought to favour this. But the terms in Col. iv. 3 are different—**ἵνα Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου,** and the construction makes the **δοθῇ** and the **ἄνοιξις τοῦ στόματος** practically one and the same thing. The simplest constructions are these two—(1) to connect **ἐν παρρησίᾳ** with what *precedes*, and with the **λόγος** not the **ἄνοιξις,** = "that utterance, and that with boldness, may be given to me when I undertake to open my mouth with a view to make known the mystery of the Gospel"; and (2) to connect **ἐν παρρησίᾳ** with what follows, to wit, the **γνωρίσαι,** = "that to me utterance may be given when I open my mouth, that with boldness I may make known the mystery of the Gospel". The latter is preferred by Meyer, Ell., WH, etc. It is followed by the RV text, "in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness," etc.; while the RV margin gives "in opening my mouth with boldness, to make known the mystery," etc. The former construction gives a good sense for each particular term and a simple connection, if the **ἐν παρρησίᾳ** is taken to define not the *opening of the mouth*, but the *utterance*, the **λόγος,** which is the main thought. On the whole the latter is perhaps to be preferred, the need of *utterance*, power of speech, when occasion offers itself to preach, being first mentioned, and this gift of utterance being next defined in respect of its object, *viz.*, to give fearless confidence in making the Gospel known.

Ver. 20. **ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἁλύσει**: *in behalf of which I am an ambassador in a chain.* The **οὗ** is best referred, not to **τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,** but to **τὸ μυστήριον,** the mystery contained in the Gospel being the thing that Paul desired to make known (**γνωρίσαι**). So in Col. iv. 3 it is this **μυστήριον** that the writer is to utter (**λαλῆσαι**) and on account of which he is bound (**δέδεμαι**). **πρεσβεύω** = "I act as ambassador," only here and in 2 Cor. v. 20. The **ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ** of the latter passage is left to be understood here. The legation or embassage in Christ's cause, which Paul here ascribes to himself, is not to be limited to the *Roman Court* (Mich.), but is to be understood as to the whole Gentile world, in the wide sense of the *commission* given (Acts ix. 15, xvii. 15); the *debt* professed (Rom. i. 14); the *office* claimed (Rom. xi. 13), and recognised (Gal. ii. 9). The noun **ἅλυσις,** which is not of frequent occurrence in classical Greek, means there a *chain* (Herod., ix., 74; Eurip., *Or.*, 984); also a woman's ornament, a bracelet (Aristoph., *Frag.*, Mem., ii., p. 1079). It is taken by some to be a word of general application, denoting a chain or bond by which any part of the body may be bound, and it is questioned (*e.g.*, by Mey.), whether it is distinguished from **πέδη** as *hand*-fetter from *foot*-fetter. But, while in such passages as Rev. xx. 1 the specific sense may not be required, it seems clear that the distinction between *manacle* and *fetter* does obtain (*cf.* Polyb., iii., 82, 8); that this distinction is made in Mark v. 4; and that **ἅλυσις** is used of the "handcuff" by which a prisoner was attached to his guard (Joseph., *Antiq.*, xviii., 6, 7, 10; Acts xii. 6, xxi. 33, etc.; *cf.* Light., *Phil.*, p. 8). This may be its meaning here, and there will be no necessity for taking it to be a *collective* sing. = bonds; of which use indeed, though possible (*cf.* Bernh., *Synt.*, ii., 1, p. 58), there does not appear to be any clear example in the NT itself. And such phrases as **εἰς τὴν ἅλυσιν ἐμπίπτειν** (Polyb., iv., 76, 5, xxi., 3, 3) are inconclusive, the article giving the word the generic sense. It has been thought that the expression points to the *custodia militaris* endured by Paul in Rome (Acts xxviii. 16, 20; *cf.* 2 Tim. i.

f Col. iv. 7; ch. i. 15. g Here only. h (Ch. v. 1 reff.); see 1 Cor. xv. 58 reff. i Col. iv. 7 only.

21. Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς[1] f τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, g τί πράσσω, πάντα[2] ὑμῖν γνωρίσει[3] Τυχικὸς ὁ h ἀγαπητὸς h ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς i διά-

[1] και υμ. ειδ. (ιδ. AD*FG, al.) ℵADEFG, 108-14-18-20, al., It., Vulg., al., Thdrt., some Lat. Fathers; ειδητε και υμεις BKL, etc., Syr. Arm., Eth., Chr., Dam., Jer., Ambrst., etc.

[2] παντα om. D*FG, it., Syr., Jer.

[3] γν. υμ. ℵBDEFGP 37, 116-20, It., al., Ambrst.; υμιν γνωρισει AKL, etc., Vulg., Syr.-P., Chr., Thdrt., Dam., etc.

16; Beza, Grot., Paley, Steyer, etc.). That is possible, and indeed even probable, so far as the *custodia* is concerned. But the description might apply to the imprisonment in Cæsarea as well as to that in Rome. The real point of the clause is in the view it gives of the need of the **παρρησία** and of the *intercessions* that should bring that gift.—**ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ παρρησιάσωμαι ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι**: *in order that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak*. How is this purpose-clause to be connected? Some attach it to the **πρεσβεύω** (Beng., Meyer, Von Soden), as if = "I act as ambassador in a chain with the object of speaking boldly," etc. Others connect it with the whole foregoing clause, making it *subordinate* to that, and an explanation of the object of the *gift of utterance*, = "that utterance may be given to me to make known the mystery, with the view that I should speak boldly" (Harl.). But **ἵνα** is repeatedly used to introduce something that is not *subordinate* to, but *coordinate* with, what is stated in a former **ἵνα** clause (Rom. viii. 13; Gal. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 3). It is best, therefore, to take it so here, and to understand the clause as giving a *second* object contemplated in the **προσευχόμενοι** and **ἀγρυπνοῦντες**, etc. First the gift of *utterance*, and now secondly the gift more particularly of a *boldness* or *freedom* (**παρρησιάσωμαι**) in preaching such as *became* the Apostle's office and responsibility (**ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι**). The **αὐτῷ** refers to the **μυστήριον** which was to be preached. The **ἐν** is taken by some (*e.g.*, Harl.) to denote the *source* or *ground* of the *boldness* in speaking (**παρρησιάσωμαι**). But it is *God* who is named as the source of such boldness (**ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ**, 1 Thess. ii. 2). It might be an instance of **ἐν** expressing that *on* which a certain power operates or *in* which it shows itself (as in **ἵνα οὕτω γένηται ἐν ἐμοί**, 1 Cor. ix. 15; **ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε**, 1 Cor. iv. 6; *cf.* Thayer-Grimm, *Lex.*, p. 210). But it is best understood as the note of that *in* which one is *busied* (*cf.* Acts xxii. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Col. iv. 2, etc.), and so = "that, occupied with that mystery, *i.e.*, in *proclaiming* it, I may speak boldly" (Mey.).

Vv. 21-22. Statement regarding Tychicus and his mission.

Ver. 21. **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς [καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε] τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω**: *but that ye also may know my affairs, how I do*. The metabatic **δέ**, passing on to a different subject. The order **καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰδῆτε** is given in ℵADF, etc.; **εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς** in BKL, Syr., etc. The evidence is almost equally balanced. LTTr prefer the former order; WH give it in the margin. The **καί** has its proper force of "also," and points, therefore, to others as well as the Ephesians as possessing or being interested in the knowledge of Paul's affairs. Those who take the Epistle to the Colossians to be prior to this one, naturally think of the Colossians as in view. But in the Epistle itself there is nothing to indicate who these others were. For **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ** = "my circumstances," *cf.* Phil. i. 22; Col. iv. 7; also Tob. x. 8; 1 Esdr. i. 22. **τί πράσσω**, not = "what I do," but "how I fare," in the reflexive sense (Lat., *me habeo*) common from Æschylus downwards. Here it is explanatory of **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ**.—**πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσει [γνωρίσει ὑμῖν] Τυχικός**: *Tychicus shall make known to you*. **πάντα** is omitted in D¹F, Syr., etc. **ὑμῖν** is placed by the TR *before* **γνωρίσει** (as in AKL, Syr.-P., Chr., Theod., etc.; *after* it by LTTr WHRV (as in BℵDEFGP, 17, 37, 116, 120, Syr.-Sch., Copt., etc.). **Τυχικός**, usually so accented, but **Τύχικος** in WH, is mentioned again in Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. iii. 12. We gather from these passages that he was a native of proconsular Asia (Acts xx. 4), possibly of Ephesus itself (see Light., *Philip.*, p. 11); that he was with Paul towards the close of his third missionary

κονος [k] ἐν κυρίῳ, 22. ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν καὶ [l] παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν.

23. Εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ [m] ἀγάπη [1] μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ

k Acts xxiv. 15 reff.
l = 2 Cor. i. 4 al. fr.
m 2 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 6; Jude 2.

[1] For αγαπη, ελεος A.

journey (Acts xx. 4); and again at the time when the Epistle to the Colossians was written; and yet again at the end of the Apostle's career (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12). It is probable that he went to Jerusalem, as Trophimus did (Acts xxi. 29), in all likelihood as a delegate of his Church, the words ἄχρις τῆς Ἀσίας not belonging to the true text of Acts xx. 4. We find him here charged with the delivery of the circular letter known as the Epistle to the Ephesians, probably at the chief centres, Laodicea, Colossæ, etc., where Christian communities had been formed in Asia. He is mentioned also in connection with missions to Crete and to Ephesus (Tit. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12).—**ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν Κυρίῳ**: *the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord.* In the sister Epistle he is described in the same terms, but with the addition of **καὶ σύνδουλος. πιστός** = *faithful*, in the sense of *trusty*, as in Matt. xxiv. 45 and often elsewhere. The **ἐν Κυρίῳ** defines the **διάκονος**, and does not refer to the whole clause. The service to Paul was service rendered *in the Lord*, in Christ's fellowship and Spirit. The term **διάκονος** does not carry here the idea of ecclesiastical office, such as the *deaconship* proper, but refers to ministrations rendered to Paul himself, and so is "servant" or "minister" in the general sense. So in Col. iv. 7 he is called not only **πιστὸς διάκονος**, but Paul's *fellow-servant* (**σύνδουλος**) in the Lord. This is Paul's commendation of him to the Churches which he was to visit.

Ver. 22. **ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο**: *whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose.* **ἔπεμψα**, in idiomatic English = "I have written," but literally = "I did write". If it were certain that the Epistle to the Colossians preceded that to the Ephesians, that the special mission on which Tychicus was sent with Onesimus to Colossæ took place before Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians, and that he found some opportunity of forwarding the latter Epistle also in the course of Tychicus's journey, the **ἔπεμψα** would have its usual aorist sense, referring to a past act. Failing this, it must be taken as an instance of the *epistolary* aor., the mission being *coincident* with the writing of the letter, but contemplated from the view-point of the *recipients* of the letter, to whom it was a thing of the past. The epistolary aor. certainly occurs in Latin, in the use of *scripsi*, etc. (*cf.* Madvig, *Gr.*, § 345). How far its use extends in the NT is still a moot question, some finding many cases, *e.g.*, **ἔγραψα** in Gal. vi. 11; Philem. 19, 21; 1 Pet. v. 12; 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26, v. 13; **ἐπέστειλα**, Heb. xiii. 22; **ἔπεμψα, συνέπεμψα** in 2 Cor. viii. 18, 22; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8; Phil. ii. 28; Philem. 11, etc.; while others (*e.g.*, Blass) restrict it to **ἔπεμψα** in Acts xxiii. 30; Phil. ii. 28; Col. iv. 8; Philem. 11, etc. (*cf.* Win.-Moult., p. 347; Blass, *Gram. of N. T. Greek*, p. 194; Lightf. on Gal. iv. 11; Col. iv. 8; Ell. on Gal. iv. 11. —**ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν**: *that ye may know our state.* **τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν** will naturally have the same sense as the **τὰ κατ' ἐμέ**, the **ἡμῶν** including Paul's companions with himself. It is well rendered "our state" by the RV; "our affairs" by the AV. The information regarding Paul and his friends would not be confined to the letter, but would be given no doubt also by Tychicus by word of mouth.—**καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν**: *and that he may comfort your hearts.* **παρακαλεῖν** means most frequently either to *exhort* or (in later Greek as well as in the NT) to *beseech.* Rarely in non-biblical Greek has it the sense of *comforting* or *encouraging*; but in the LXX it represents נִחַם, and in the NT it has these senses, and also once that of *instructing* (Tit. i. 9). Here it means to *comfort*, or to *encourage*; probably the former, with respect both to Paul's troubles already mentioned (iii. 13 above) and their own.

Vv. 23-24. Closing Benediction.

Ver. 23. **εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως**: *peace be to the brethren and love with faith.* Paul's benedictions are usually addressed *directly* to the reader, **μεθ' ὑμῶν** or some similar form being employed. This one is addressed to the *brethren* in the third person, as is perhaps more appropriate in a circular letter. There is nothing to favour Wiese-

n Rom. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54; 2 Tim. i. 16; (Tit. ii. 7 var. read.).

πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. 24. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν [n] ἀφθαρσίᾳ.[1]

[1] Add αμην ℵ[c]DEKLP, etc., Vulg., Syr., Copt., Goth., Eth., Thdrt., Victorin., Ambrst.; om. αμην ℵ*ABFG 17, 73, f, g, Arm., Euth., Orig.

ler's notion that in the ἀδελφοῖς *Jewish* Christians are saluted, while the πάντων in ver. 24 refers to *Gentile* Christians. εἰρήνη, not = *concord* one with another, but = the OT שָׁלוֹם in salutations or farewells, = "may it be well with the brethren"; with the Christian connotation, however, of well-being as mental peace and good due to reconciliation with God. In his expression of what he would have them enjoy he couples with the blessing of a new mental peace that also of *love*—the Christian grace of love, that is to say, and such love as is *associated* with faith (μετὰ πίστεως). μετά, as distinguished from σύν, expresses the simple idea of *accompanying*. So here it is not "love *and* faith," but, faith being presupposed as making the Christian, it is love which *goes with* faith, not the *Divine* love (Beng., etc.), but the *brotherly* love which shows itself where *faith* is and by which faith works (Gal. v. 6).—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: *from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ*. The two-fold source of the blessings desired for the reader—God as *Father*, the Father of Christ Himself, the *causa principalis* and *fons primarius*; Christ as *Lord*, Head over all with a sovereignty which is founded in God (1 Cor. xi. 3; Phil. ii. 9; Eph. i. 17), as *causa medians* and *fons secundarius*. The phrase occurs again (though with some variations in the readings) in 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4. In the opening salutation it is "God *our* Father". Here the relation of God to *Christ* is more in view, in respect of their joint-bestowal of spiritual blessings.

Ver. 24. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγαπώντων τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. [ἀμήν]: *Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in uncorruptness*. As in Colossians, the three Pastoral Epistles, and also in Hebrews, we have here ἡ χάρις, "*the* grace," the grace beside which there is none other, the grace of God in Christ of which Christians have experience. In the closing benedictions of Cor., Gal., Philip., Thess., Philem. (as also in Rev.), we have the fuller form ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; also in Romans according to the TR, the verse, however, being deleted by the best critics. The former benediction was for the *brethren*, probably those in the Asiatic Churches. This second benediction is of widest scope—for *all* those who love Christ. The difficulty is with the unusual expression ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, both as to its sense and its connection. The noun ἀφθαρσία is used in Plutarch of τὸ θεῖον (*Arist.*, c. 6), in Philo of the κόσμος (*De incorr. Mundi*, § 11), in the LXX and the Apocr. of *immortality* (Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 19; 4 Macc. xvii. 12). In the NT it is found, in addition to the present passage, in Rom. ii. 7 of the "incorruption" which goes with the *glory* and *honour* of the future; in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, of the "incorruption" of the resurrection-body; in 2 Tim. i. 10, of the life and "incorruption" brought to light by Christ. The occurrence in Tit. ii. 10 must be discounted in view of the adverse diplomatic evidence. The Pauline use, therefore, is in favour of the idea of "incorruption," "imperishableness," the quality of the *changeless* and *undecaying*; and that as belonging to the future in contrast with the present condition of things. There is nothing, therefore, to bear out the sense of *sincerity* adopted by Chrys., the AV, the Bish.; *cf.* Tynd., "in pureness"; Cov. Test., "sincerely"; Cov. Cran., "unfeignedly". This would be expressed by ἀφθορία or some similar term (*cf.* Tit. ii. 7). Nor can it be simply identified with all *imperishable being* in this life or in the other (Bleek, Olsh., Matthies, etc.); nor yet again with ἐν ἀφθάρτοις on the analogy of ἐν ἐπουρανίοις, as if it described the *sphere* of the ἀγάπη. There remains the *qualitative* sense of "imperishableness" (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb., and most), which best suits linguistic use, the sense of the adj. ἄφθαρτος (*cf.* Rom. i. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 25, xv. 52; 1 Tim. i. 17; 1 Pet. i. 4, 23, iii. 4), and the application here in connection with the grace of love. The ἐν, therefore, is not to be loosely dealt with, as if = εἰς (Beza, as if it meant the same as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), or διά (Theophy.), or ὑπέρ (Chrys.), or even μετά (Theodor.); but has its proper force of the *element* or

manner in which the love is cherished. Further, the simplest and most obvious connection is with the **ἀγαπώντων**, as it is taken by most, including Chrys., Theod., and the other Greek commentators. Some, however, connect the phrase with **ἡ χάρις**, as = "grace be with all *in eternity*" (Bez., Beng., Matthies), or, "*in all imperishable being*" (Harl.), or as a short way of saying "grace be with all that they may have eternal life" (Olsh.). This construction, though strongly advocated recently by Von Soden, fails to give a clear and satisfactory sense, or one wholly accordant with the use of **ἀφθαρσία**; while there is against it also the fact that the defined noun and the defining phrase would be further apart than is usual in benedictions. Still less reason is there to connect the phrase immediately with **τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν** as if it described Christ as *immortal* (Wetst., etc.)—a construction both linguistically and grammatically (in the absence of **τὸν** before **ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ**) questionable. The phrase, therefore, defines the *way* in which they love, or the element in which their love has its being. It is a love that "knows neither change, diminution, nor decay" (Ell.). The closing **ἀμήν** added by the TR is found in ℵ[3]D KPL, most cursives, Syr., Boh., etc.; but not in Bℵ*AG, 17, Arm., etc. It is omitted by LTTrWHRV.

The subscription **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης διὰ Τυχικοῦ** is omitted by LTWH; while Treg. gives simply **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους**. Like the subscriptions appended to Rom., Phil., and 2 Tim., it chronicles a view of the Epistle that is easier to reconcile with fact than is the case with others (1 and 2 Thess., Tit., and espec. 1 Cor., Gal., 1 Tim.). In the oldest MSS. it is simply **πρὸς Ἐφεσίους**. In the Versions, later MSS., and some of the Fathers it takes various longer forms. The form represented in the TR and the AV is not older than Euthalius, Deacon of Alexandria and Bishop of Sulca, who flourished perhaps in the middle of the fifth century.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

PHILIPPIANS

INTRODUCTION.

THE CHURCH ADDRESSED. The town of Philippi occupied a commanding situation on the rocky slopes of a steep hill which overlooked, on the one side, the spacious plain of Drama watered by the Gangites (or Angites, Herodot., vii., 113), and, on the other, the pass between Mount Pangæum (south-west of Philippi) and the spurs of Hæmus. Through this pass ran the famous Roman road, the *Via Egnatia* (see Tafel, *De Via Militari Romanorum Egnatia*, Tübing., 1842), connecting Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic with the Hellespont. Its importance as a strategic position was manifest. Its value as a commercial centre was no less evident, standing as it did on the busy Roman thoroughfare which joined East and West, and being itself the emporium of a large industry which circled about the rich gold mines dotted over the surrounding region. Originally it had borne the name of Κρηνίδες (or αἱ Κρηνίδες), derived, perhaps, from the copious streams which flowed through the plain (Strabo, vii., *Frag*. 34, ταῖς Κρηνίσιν ὅπου νῦν οἱ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἵδρυται; Appian, *B. C.*, iv., 105, οἱ δὲ Φίλιπποι πόλις ἐστὶν ἣ Δάτος ὠνομάζετο πάλαι καὶ Κρηνίδες ἔτι πρὸ Δάτου). Philip of Macedon, in his victorious career, quickly discerned the value of the country bordering on Mount Pangæum. He recognised a source of vast profit in the gold and silver mines, which, up till now, had only been partially exploited. But a local centre of influence was necessary to command this coveted territory. Accordingly, by enlarging the former Krenides, he founded a new city, to which he gave his own name, Philippi (see Diod. Sic., xvi., 8, 6, ταύτην μὲν ἐπαυξήσας οἰκητόρων πλήθει μετωνόμασε Φιλίππους ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ προσαγορεύσας· τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν χώραν χρυσεῖα μέταλλα παντελῶς ὄντα λιτὰ καὶ ἄδοξα ταῖς κατασκευαῖς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ηὔξησεν ὥστε δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτῷ πρόσοδον πλεῖον ἢ ταλάντων χιλίων).

This Greek city attracted the notice of Augustus after his defeat of Brutus and Cassius in its immediate neighbourhood in 42 B.C. Having to find places of settlement for Italian soldiers who had served their time and could not be maintained in Italy, he established at Philippi, among other towns, a Roman colony, to which he granted

the *jus Italicum* as an attraction to settlers. This privilege included (*a*) exemption from the oversight of the provincial governor, (*b*) immunity from the poll and property taxes, (*c*) rights to property in the soil regulated by Roman law (see Marquardt-Mommsen, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Bd. I., pp. 363-364; Mommsen, *Provinces of Roman Empire*, i., pp. 299-302).

But, in addition to its industrial and military importance, Philippi could boast of the religious zeal of its inhabitants. MM. Heuzey and Daumet, in their exhaustive and invaluable *Mission Archéologique de Macédoine* (Paris, 1876), have pointed out that the rocks near the ancient site of Philippi are "a veritable museum of mythology" (p. 86). Traces have been found of a temple dedicated to Silvanus, one of the most popular deities of the Imperial epoch, who was worshipped as the sacred guardian of the Emperor (pp. iii, 75). The Oriental god Mên seems also to have had his votaries there, and in the neighbouring mountains Dionysus, the favourite divinity of the Thracians, had "the most revered of his sanctuaries" (p. v). This was the spiritual soil upon which the Gospel of Christ had to work, a picture in miniature of the strangely cosmopolitan character of religion in the Roman Empire at that stage in its history. We can easily conceive how, amidst these surroundings, the maiden "possessing a spirit of divination" was sure to drive a flourishing trade.

The account of Paul's work at Philippi is given in Acts xvi., a chapter belonging, in part, to the "we-sections," which are regarded as extremely valuable even by the most negative critics. (For attacks upon the authenticity of this account see Knowling on A. xvi., *ad fin.*, in vol. ii. of this work.) It was thoroughly in accordance with the Apostle's well-weighed plan of operations to choose as the starting-point of his labours in Europe a typical city of the Roman Empire, lying on one of the main trade-routes, where he might count upon protection against violence, and from which any strong influence he might exert must extend itself towards East and West (see Ramsay, *Church in Rom. Emp.*, pp. 56, 70, 148 *et al.*). Paul seems to have attached himself to a little company of Jews and proselytes (A. xvi. 13 ff.). Mention is only made of some women who assembled for prayer by the river side on the Sabbath day. From this it may probably be gathered that Judaism had no firm hold at Philippi. It is worthy of note that the charge of being Jews is set in the forefront by the enraged Philippians who drag Paul and Silas before the Praetors.[1] (For the ancient hatred of

[1] See Henle, *Tüb. Theol. Quartal-Schr.*, 1893, Hft. 1, p. 82.

Jews in the Roman world, see esp. Reinach, *Textes . . . relatifs au Judaïsme*, Paris, 1895.) Lydia, a seller of purple dyed garments, a native of Thyatira, famous for its dyeing trade, became the nucleus of a Christian congregation. She was already a God-fearer (σεβομένη τὸν Θεόν, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, ii., 2, p. 314). As the result of Paul's preaching she and her household were baptised, and the Apostle, with his companions, accepted her hospitality (see esp. A. xvi. 15). This spirit of generosity was to become characteristic of the Church at Philippi and of early Christian life as a whole.

It is needless to dwell on the sharp crisis through which Paul and Silas had to pass. The arrest, the illegal flogging (*cf.* Cic., *in Verr.*, v., 66: *facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari, prope parricidium necari*), the extraordinary deliverance, the repentance, conversion and baptism of the jailor, the release in presence of the panic-stricken magistrates,—all these experiences must have made a deep impression on the minds of the Philippians. Already there were brethren there (A. xvi. 40), whom they exhorted as they were on the point of leaving Philippi for Thessalonica. Strangely enough, the "*we*" introduced at A. xvi. 10 ceases with ch. xvi., only to be resumed at ch. xx. 6, when Paul leaves Philippi after another visit. Perhaps it is not unreasonable to believe with Ramsay (*St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 219) that Luke was left behind at Philippi to extend and consolidate the good work which had been done. In any case the Church must have made rapid progress. For Paul had scarcely left Macedonia when the Philippian Christians began to minister to his needs. From that time onwards they occupy a chief place in his affections.

It is difficult to point to anything like fixed data as regards the *component parts* of the Church at Philippi. Schinz in his important dissertation, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi* (Zürich, 1837), brings forward many arguments to prove that it was essentially a heathen-Christian community (see esp. p. 57 ff.). Certainly much, both in the Epistle and in the narrative of its founding, goes to confirm this opinion. As we have seen, it was a proselyte, a woman of Asiatic birth, who took the leading place in the early fortunes of this Church. Jews seem to have been a negligeable quantity at Philippi, for, apparently, there was no synagogue in the town. From the evidence of the Epistle, devoted women of heathen extraction (as their names show, see ch. iv. 2) stood in the forefront of Christian work. This was not peculiar to Philippi. Nothing is more remarkable than the place taken by women in the Apostolic Church as a whole. The Christian faith was their true emancipation. It gave scope for their most characteristic activities (see an interesting sum-

mary in Rilliet, *Commentaire sur l'Épître . . . aux Phil.*, pp. 312-313; also Renan, *St. Paul*, pp. 147-150; Lft., *Philippians*, pp. 55-56, who hints with good reason, on the evidence of Inscrr., that women occupied a specially favourable position in Macedonia; H. Achelis, *Zeitsch. f. N. T. Wissensch.*, i., 2, pp. 93, 97-98, and *cf.* notes on ch. iv. 2). It is worthy of notice that the only *definite* information we have as to any friction in the Philippian Church attaches itself to two of these Christian matrons, Euodia and Syntyche. In all likelihood the friction was slight. The Apostle does not deal with it in strong terms. Evidently it was some personal variance connected with Church life and work, or, perhaps, associated with the possession of particular spiritual gifts. We know how this latter endangered unity at Corinth (see 1 C. xii.). It is possible that we have a hint of its character in the warnings given against a false self-satisfaction in ch. iii. 12-16. Here and there, throughout the Epistle, there are echoes of it (see ch. i. 27, ii. 2-4, 14, iv. 5), and these point to a certain danger of selfish assumptions of superiority. But there are no traces of doctrinal controversies like those which rent some of the other Pauline Churches. On the whole, Paul feels unmingled satisfaction and joy in their condition. It is evident, therefore, that if there were any Jewish-Christians in the Church, they had not made themselves obnoxious by laying special emphasis on the characteristic tenets of their party. Indirect evidence on this point is afforded by incidental statements in the Epistle. Paul was accustomed to accept gifts from the Philippians. This was a course which he took care to avoid in Churches where a minority of Jewish-Christians could bring it up as a reproach against him. (Contrast his attitude, *e.g.*, towards the Church at Corinth.) Further, when he does burst forth in words of solemn warning against his adversaries (ch. iii. 2), it may be clearly seen that he is dealing with persons entirely outside the Philippian Church, but persons who may at any moment intrude into their midst and work serious havoc (see notes *ad loc.*). It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that this Church was composed mainly (if not exclusively) of heathen-Christians, at one in their loyalty to the Faith and to him who had first proclaimed it in their hearing; exposed, at the same time, to hurtful influences which might invade them from outside, and liable to those mutual differences of feeling which make themselves manifest in every Christian community.

The Occasion of the Letter. In ancient times letters were written to correspondents at a distance when a favourable opportunity presented itself of forwarding them to their destination (*cf.* Cic., *ad Attic.*, i., 9, 1). In the present instance this was afforded by the

return of Epaphroditus to Philippi (ch. ii. 28). From ch. iv. 15-16 it may be inferred that Paul had frequent communications with the Philippians.[1] The letter before us is evidently the reply to one which Paul had received. The recognition of this gives the proper clue to its interpretation. Dr. Rendel Harris, in a suggestive paper in the *Expositor* (v., 8, p. 403), advances the hypothesis that "when Paul replied to a letter he held the letter that he was replying to in his hand, and followed closely the points in it that needed attention" (see also Lock, *ibid.*, v., 6, p. 65 ff.). We believe this to be, in large measure, true of *Philippians*. Traces of a definite reply seem to emerge at i. 12 (where he answers their eager inquiries as to his health and prospects), i. 26 (they had probably spoken of him as their καύχημα, *cf.* Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 178), ii. 19 (where he reminds them that he is as much concerned to hear good news as they are), ii. 26 (their reference to the illness of Epaphroditus), iii. 2 (the abruptness with which the warning is introduced is best explained by some disconcerting tidings from Philippi), iv. 10 (they had apologised for their remissness in attending to his wants), and perhaps iv. 14-15 (they may have felt a little doubtful whether Paul would be willing to accept their gift, for here and there in the Epistle we have the *slightest* hints that he has to disabuse them of a notion that he had not been entirely pleased with them. See notes on i. 3).

It is manifest that the Apostle had received a gift from the Philippian Church through Epaphroditus, who spent some time, at least, in his company at Rome (ch. ii. 30). We cannot tell whether a letter had accompanied this gift, or, if so, whether Paul had acknowledged it in any way before. At all events, our Epistle is written considerably later, and presupposes a communication which came to Rome from Philippi while Epaphroditus was still at Paul's service. This is necessary from ch. ii. 26, ἀδημονῶν διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησεν. Perhaps even the order of subjects in the Letter is regulated by the arrangement of topics in that from Philippi. The chief matter involved, the acknowledgment of their gift, is introduced at the beginning (ch. i. 3-5, this is at least a likely interpretation) and end (ch. iv. 10-19) with a graciousness and delicacy of feeling unsurpassed in the annals of letter-writing.

Place and Date of Writing. (*a*) It is all but universally agreed that this Epistle was written from Rome. That is the early

[1] No argument, however, can be based on the fact that Polycarp, *Ep. ad Philipp.*, iii., says of Paul: ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, as the plural is frequently used to describe a single letter. See Lft. *ad loc.*

tradition, and no contrary evidence has been forthcoming strong enough to refute it. Of course the matter must be determined by comparing what we gather concerning Paul's circumstances from the Epistle itself with our information from other sources. The Apostle is a prisoner. He is residing in some centre of activity where the preaching of Christ has extended with amazing rapidity. His trial is about to reach a critical point. There is still the possibility that he may have to suffer as a martyr. But, on the whole, his outlook is very hopeful, and he can speak with joyful confidence of the speedy prospect of seeing his friends at Philippi again. Incidentally he mentions that the real character of his offence is now known in the "Prætorium," and he concludes his letter by sending greetings from the Christians of Cæsar's household. It seems to us that this situation can only correspond to one particular epoch in the Apostle's history, that the beginning of which is outlined in A. xxviii. 16, 30-31. The only alternative hypothesis which has ever been seriously put forward is that of *Cæsarea*. This was first done by H. G. Paulus (in a *Programm*, Jena, 1799), and later, more acutely, by Böttger (*Beiträge*, ii., p. 47 ff., Gött., 1837). Böttger lays stress on the point that prisoners at Rome could not have experienced the delay which is presupposed in this Epistle in the case of Paul. This argument is invalidated by the fact that processes of appeal were peculiarly subject to protracted delays. These were caused in particular by the necessity of having all the declarations of witnesses, informations, etc., handed in writing to the appellant before the higher court heard the appeal (see Geib, *Geschichte d. röm. Criminalprocesses*, esp. pp. 688-690). Böttger also tries to show that πραιτώριον (ch. i. 13) and οἰκία Καίσαρος (ch. iv. 22), almost the only local references in the Epistle, apply equally well to Cæsarea. This argument is emphasised by O. Holtzmann (*Th. LZ.*, 1890, col. 177), who adds these others, (*a*) that we know nothing of a sojourn of Timothy at Rome, (*b*) that the bitterness against the Judaisers is far more intelligible on the supposition that Paul's experiences of the Jews at Jerusalem were fresh in his remembrance. No one would deny that πραιτώριον is used of an Imperial residence outside Rome. And possibly οἰκία Καίσαρος might be equivalent to πραιτώριον, *i.e.*, in this case, according to Holtzmann, τὸ πραιτώριον τοῦ Ἡρώδου (A. xxiii. 35). This supposition Holtzmann believes to be the best explanation of μάλιστα (ch. iv. 22), for he considers the use of that word to point to those in Paul's immediate neighbourhood. But the assumption is quite gratuitous. He has already sent greetings from οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί, and in adding those of the ἅγιοι he singles out οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας. This was

most natural, since we know from other sources (see notes *ad loc.*) that there was a large body of Christians in the Imperial household, some of them perhaps connected with Philippi, and, in all probability, this movement had assumed greater proportions during Paul's sojourn at Rome. His converts there, in their new-born enthusiasm, would be likely to show a peculiarly lively interest in that far-distant Church which had manifested so remarkable an appreciation of their father in the Faith. An unbiased reader must feel that there is something far-fetched in the reference of οἰκία Καίσαρος to Cæsarea. The context of πραιτώριον indicates that Paul writes from a centre of eager Christian activity, a place of much higher importance than Cæsarea, which had long since heard the Gospel (A. x.), and could scarcely, in any case, be supposed to exert a pre-eminent influence. As to the other arguments of Holtzmann, there is nothing to oppose the hypothesis that Timothy visited Rome; in fact, it would be surprising if he had never seen his beloved master during so long a period of suspense. And certainly it did not require any *recent* experiences of Paul to call forth stern denunciations of those Judaisers who had dogged his steps from the beginning to the close of his career.

But the decisive argument for Rome, in our judgment, is Paul's *situation*. He expects a speedy termination of his case. How could this be possible at Cæsarea? There, on the first favourable opportunity that presents itself, he appeals to Cæsar. Only when that appeal has been heard can any decision be come to. And many hints in the Epistle suggest that the all-important moment was close at hand (see ch. i. 12, 13, 19, 20, 26, ii. 24, probably i. 7; also a discussion by the author in *Expository Times*, x., 1, pp. 22-24, and an excellent dissertation, *The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial*, by R. R. Smith, Camb., 1899). It is perhaps needless to deal with Spitta's argument in favour of Cæsarea (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 281) that the expectation of Felix that he should be offered a bribe by Paul was roused by the gift of money which the Apostle had lately received from Philippi.

(*b*) We believe that the arguments adduced above are sufficient to fix Rome as the *place* from which the Epistle was written. They also suggest a *late date* in Paul's sojourn at Rome, for he is awaiting the final decision in his trial. Lightfoot has attempted to show that *Philippians* stands first in order among the Imprisonment-Epistles. His main argument is greater similarity (especially in thought) to *Romans* than to *Colossians* and *Ephesians*. But this method of reasoning is precarious. Are we at liberty to break up the thinking of a man like the Apostle Paul, as it is

expressed in a small group of occasional letters, into a series of well-marked stages? These letters were, after all, the products of special circumstances, of special situations. Paul did not write as one who gradually, in successive works, presents a system of thought to the world. We may readily admit that more parallels may be found, on careful search, between *Philippians* and *Romans* than between it and the other Imprisonment-Epistles (although this statement must be made with caution, see Von Soden, *Hand-Comm.*, iii., 1, p. 16, on the marked resemblances between *Phil.* and *Coloss.*). But that does not touch the question of date. Paul's letters must be interpreted from the historical background of each of them. To use as an argument for the ante-dating of *Philippians* the fact that the other two letters of the Captivity "exhibit an advanced stage in the development of the Church" (Lft., *Phil.*, p. 45) seems, to say the least, hazardous, when, on Lightfoot's own showing, no more than a year can have elapsed between the earlier and the later writings. The "advanced stage in the development of the Church" emerges suddenly in view of the dangerous situation in which the Christians of Asia were placed at the time.

It is more difficult to speak with any confidence as to the actual date. The chronology of Paul's life has recently been the subject of keen discussion. For our purpose the crucial date is that of the arrival of Festus as Procurator of Judæa. Everything depends on determining the year in which the Procurator Felix was recalled and replaced by Festus (see Harnack, *Chronologie d. altchristl. Litt.*, p. 233). It is impossible here even to give a sketch of the various lines of argument used to fix approximately the all-important date. O. Holtzmann, who depends upon the authority of Tacitus and Josephus, and is followed, among others, by Harnack (who emphasises, in addition, the testimony of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius), argues for the end of the year 55 or the early part of 56. This would make 57 the year of Paul's arrival in Rome, and thus, if our former arguments are valid, *Philippians* would have to be assigned to the year 59, as he approached the close of his two years' captivity at Rome. This dating is much earlier than the received chronology, which would refer the recall of Felix to 60 and the Apostle's arrival in Rome to 61. In that case our Epistle would fall somewhere within the year 63. We are inclined, however, to accept the view of Mr. C. H. Turner in his masterly article on the *Chronology of N. T.* in Hastings' *Bible Dict.* After a fair-minded and cautious survey of all the arguments, he is led to adopt 58 as the year of the recall of Felix and the arrival of Festus in the province of Judæa. Paul would thus have reached

Rome early in 59. Hence, in all likelihood, *Philippians* was written towards the close of the year 61, when matters had taken so favourable a turn that the Apostle could reasonably expect a speedy release (see Turner's article, *op. cit.*). For the new chronology see O. Holtzmann, *N. T. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 125 ff., Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 233 ff.; for the received view, Schürer, *Jewish People*, i., 2, pp. 182-184, and note 38 with exhaustive list of literature, and in *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Th.*, Bd. xli., Hft. 1, pp. 21-42. On the whole question of place and date consult Steinmetz, *Die zweite röm. Gefangenschaft d. Ap. Paulus*, Leipz., 1897, pp. 4-9, and especially Th. Zahn, *Einleit. in d. N. T.*, Bd. I., pp. 380-392, whose arguments appear quite conclusive for placing *Phil.* after *Eph.*, *Col.* and *Philem.*

Genuineness. (*a*) There is no lack of *external* evidence for this Epistle. References are found to it in Church writers from the earliest times. These begin with Polycarp (πρὸς Φιλ., iii., 10 [Παῦλος] . . . ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς), and include the ancient letter from the Christians of Vienne and Lyons (Eusebius, *H. E.*, v., 2), as well as the *Fragment* of Muratori on the Canon.

(*b*) The *internal* testimony is equally convincing. Perhaps no Pauline epistle bears more conclusively the stamp of authenticity. There is an artlessness, a delicacy of feeling, a frank outpouring of the heart which could not be simulated. Like 2 Corinthians, this letter is a mirror of the Apostle's personal life. It reflects his varying moods at a great crisis in his history. It throbs from first to last with eager emotion. It gives a most vivid picture of Paul's intimate relations with the Churches which he has founded. The whole composition of the letter is devoid of any artificial plan. The Apostle moves from subject to subject by rapid transitions and unexpected turns of thought. If this Epistle betrays the compiler's hand, no internal proof of authenticity may be held valid at all, and literary criticism becomes irrelevant. For, in the case before us, every circumstance can be understood from the conditions existing in the life and times of Paul. This is the problem with which criticism has always and alone to deal.

None the less has the genuineness of *Philippians* been stoutly challenged. Baur was the first to enter the field in his *Paulus*, Bd. II., p. 50 ff. The objections he raised were: (1) the echo of Gnostic ideas in ch. ii. 6-9, (2) the lack of a genuine Pauline content, (3) the extraordinary nature of some of the historical details. To a sober judgment these difficulties do not exist. The Gnosticism of ch. ii. is the phantasy of a biased imagination. If the content in this Epistle be not Pauline, we may be said to know nothing of the Apostle's

thoughts or feelings. The historical details, so far from being extraordinary or unaccountable, afford us some of the most valuable side-lights we possess on a particular epoch of Paul's history, otherwise obscure. Since Baur's time comparatively few critics have been bold enough to renew the attack on our Epistle. A complete history of its criticism will be found in Holsten's articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* (1876), pp. 328-372. No more searching scrutiny of the Epistle with a view to proving its spuriousness has ever been carried out than that of Holsten himself (*op. cit.*, 1875, p. 425 ff.; 1876, p. 58 ff.). In these discussions he brings all his well-known acuteness and subtlety of reasoning to bear upon the minutest points of the letter. He willingly admits that it belongs to the Pauline school, but decides from such indications as the method of dealing with the Judaisers in ch. i., the conception of Christ in ch. ii. 6-9, etc., etc., that it cannot be the work of Paul. But any fair-minded reader of Holsten's articles will feel bound to agree with the verdict of an unbiased scholar like Schürer that his "arguments are so foolish that one is sometimes tempted to put them down as slips of the pen" (*Th. LZ.*, 1880, col. 555). Probably Pfleiderer's statement may be taken as representative of present-day opinion: "The genuineness of this letter is not to be doubted. The accounts of *Philippians* tally thoroughly with the presuppositions of *Romans*" (*Urchristenthum*, p. 153). Among many elaborate defences of the authenticity of *Phil.* we may mention as especially worthy of note those of Hilgenfeld in *Zeitsch. f. wiss. Theol.*, xvi., 2, p. 178 ff.; xviii., 4, p. 566 ff.; xx., 2, p. 145 ff.; xxvii., 4, p. 498 ff.

The *unity* of the Epistle has also been questioned. This was done as early as the beginning of last century by Heinrichs (*N. T.*, ed. J. Koppe, vol. vii., pars 2, proll., p. 31 ff.), who supposed it to consist of two letters, one (ch. i. 1-iii. 1; iv. 21-23) being addressed to the Church in general, the other (ch. iii. 2-iv. 20) to the more prominent authorities in it. (For a full account of such attempts see Clemen, *Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe*, 1894, p. 133 ff.) Völter (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1892, pp. 10-44, 117-146) put forward the theory that we have here a genuine Epistle consisting of ch. i. 1-7, 12-14, 18^b-26; ii. 17-29; iv. 10-21, 23, and also a spurious one made up of ch. i. 8-10, 27-30; ii. 1-16; iii. 1^b-iv. 9, 22, the remaining verses being added by the redactor whose compilation is before us. It is difficult to take so arbitrary a scheme as this seriously, and Völter entirely fails to show what aim or motive his hypothetical redactor had in his work. This would require to be stated with some appearance of reason before we could consider the likelihood of finding in a simple,

apparently spontaneous letter, a document so complicated as that which Völter discovers. C. Clemen, in the work above cited and also in his *Chronologie d. paulin. Briefe,* 1893, attempts to prove that two genuine letters have been combined in one Epistle. The first, composed of ch. ii. 19-24; iii.; iv. 8-9, he holds to be the earliest of the Captivity Epistles, the second, embracing ch. i. 1-ii. 18, 25-30; iv. 1-7, 10-23, to be the latest (see Table in *Chronol.*, p. 292). While laying stress upon the presence of numerous repetitions and paragraphs which have no connexion with their context, he bases his position mainly on what he conceives to be inexplicable contradictions between ch. ii. 20 and ch. i. 14, 16, and also between ch. iii. 2, 18 and ch. i. 18, 28. The theory, at first sight, is certainly plausible. There is no *a priori* reason (*cf.* the case of Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians) why two letters or fragments of letters to the Philippians should not, by some accidental circumstances of which we know nothing, have been combined. Only there must be some strong basis for such an hypothesis, derivable from the Epistle itself. We cannot feel that such a basis is presented by the arguments briefly alluded to above. In the groups of passages brought forward the contradiction appears to us imaginary. An exegesis which takes careful account of the historical background of the Epistle and recognises that the Apostle, like other men, had his moods of strong feeling, leaves no ground for maintaining that his statements in the one group are irreconcilable with those in the other[1] (see, for the details, the notes on these passages, and a most interesting parallel drawn from the criticism of Cicero's *Letters* in Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 220-222, 250).

Special Characteristics. The perusal of the Epistle cannot fail to produce the impression of *artlessness*. That is another way of saying that it precisely fulfils the conditions of a letter. Had this most prominent characteristic been always kept in view, much futile theorising both in the exegesis and in the criticism of the Epistle would have been avoided. The only plausible objections that have been brought against its genuineness or integrity would have been recognised as the natural consequences of its epistolary character (*Brieflichkeit*, a more convenient expression than English affords). For here, as in all his letters, the Apostle speaks for the occasion. He pictures his Christian brethren at Philippi as listening to his conversation. All is spontaneous and free. He draws up no fixed scheme which has to be followed, although, perhaps, the letter (or

[1] Clemen has recently withdrawn his objections to the unity of *Philippians* (see *Th. LZ.*, 1901, col. 293).

letters) from the Philippian Church may in some degree have suggested the course which his thought pursues. He feels thoroughly at home with his readers. Thoughts crowd in upon him as he writes. His reminiscences of Philippi supply secret links of connexion between paragraphs which might seem isolated from one another, links of connexion which we can no longer trace. Many of his ideas he does not require to elaborate. A brief hint will bring his readers into touch with the Apostle's mind.

It is quite plain, from a comparison of this with his other letters, that no Church held a deeper place in Paul's *affection*. This may be accounted for in various ways. Evidently the Judaising section of the Church had not, as yet, been able to gain a footing at Philippi, although there is little doubt that attempts must have been made. The Christians there refused to lend their ears to insinuations against their well-tried teacher and friend. They believed in the Gospel as Paul had presented it to them. This unflinching loyalty of theirs would be a genuine consolation to the Apostle amidst so many disheartening experiences endured through the fickleness of once promising converts. No wonder that he calls them his joy and crown.[1]

But, besides, there was, in all likelihood, a certain frank openheartedness, an affectionate simplicity of nature, which appealed directly to the mind of Paul. The Macedonians, as a people, had preserved the manners of a more artless time. They had suffered comparatively little from the corruption of an enervating age. They had maintained, perhaps, above all other parts of Greece, a healthy tone of life, a sturdy morality (*cf.* Renan, *St. Paul*, pp. 136-139). When the Gospel came to them they received it with a child-like responsiveness. And their appreciation of its worth remained no mere empty feeling. It took practical shape. No sooner had Paul left Philippi than they began to consider his needs and, with unhesitating generosity, to minister to them (see ch. iv. 15-16). And when the Apostle made his great collection for the poorer Christians at Jerusalem, the Churches of Macedonia amazed him by their liberality. It was natural that Paul should be drawn into a specially cordial intimacy with such a people. He had proved their loyalty; he had received numerous tokens of their affection. A man of his open and enthusiastic temperament would rejoice to find a Church to which he could unveil his heart without any doubts or misgivings.

The undertone of the Epistle is a deep, restrained joy. This springs partly from his unalloyed satisfaction in the Christians

[1] On *fidelity* as characteristic of the Macedonian people see an interesting note in Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 248, note 5.

at Philippi. All that he has experienced at their hands, all that he has heard of them by report, calls forth from him nothing but thankfulness. Even any word of warning which he may feel to be needful is uttered with the most delicate courtesy and tact. But further, his *mood* at the time of writing is cheerful and bright. He is a prisoner, but, none the less, the work of Christ has richly prospered. He has discovered that it is altogether independent of the human agents employed. Hence, although enmity or opposition may silence the preacher, the Gospel has free course. It remains the power of God unto salvation. But the progress of events, also, has led him to believe that his work is not done. Things seem to be shaping towards his release. The clouds, indeed, have not wholly vanished. Therefore a dark shadow flits, for a moment, across the page. But hope returns, a hope not baseless, but resting on what he feels to be the mind of God. So his farewell greeting can utter itself in exulting strains: "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice".

LITERATURE. (1) Earlier Commentaries. The most valuable are those of Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia (ed. H. B. Swete, Camb., 1880) and Theodoret; in the Reformation period, Calvin.

(2) Modern Works. Out of a large number which have been consulted we may mention Commentaries by Hoelemann (1839), Rilliet (1841), De Wette (ed. 2, 1847), Meyer (Engl. Tr.), Wiesinger (in Olshausen's *Com.*, Engl. Tr.), B. Weiss (1859, most exhaustive), J. C. von Hofmann, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Eadie, Beet, Moule (*Cambr. Bible; Cambr. Gr. Test.*), A. H. Franke (ed. 5 of Meyer, 1886), R. A. Lipsius (in Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar*, 1892, admirable for terse exposition), A. Klöpper (1893, thorough), Gwynn (in *Speaker's Com.*, 1893), Wohlenberg (in Strack-Zoeckler's *Komm.*, 1895), B. Weiss (*Die paulin. Briefe im berichtigten Text*, 1896, brief notes), Vincent (*International Crit. Comm.*, 1897), E. Haupt (ed. 6 of Meyer, 1897, very suggestive), and K. J. Müller (Freib. i. Br., 1899).

Of a more homiletic or practical character are the works of Braune (in Lange's *Bibelwerk*), Vaughan (1882) and Von Soden (1889, a model of its kind). To the same category belong Rainy's exposition of the Epistle (*Expositor's Bible*, specially valuable on the theology), and Moule's *Philippian Studies* (1897, devotional). Bengel's *Gnomon* is always worth consulting.

Most valuable *articles* dealing with the Epistle are those of Holsten (*Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.*, 1875, 1876, see section on "Genuineness" in the Introduction *supr.*), Zahn (Luthardt's *Zeitsch. f. kirchliche Wissensch. u. kirchl. Leben*, 1885) and Henle (*Tübingen*

Quartal-Schrift, 1893). See also the articles quoted in the Introduction.

Useful dissertations are those of Schinz, *Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi* (Zürich, 1833), Mynster, *Kleine theolog. Schriften*, p. 169 ff., Rettig, *Quaestiones Philippenses* (Giessen, 1831), Laurent, *Neutestamentliche Studien*, and R. R. Smith, *The Epistle of St. Paul's First Trial* (Cambr. 1899). For the literature on Phil. ii. 6-11 see the notes *ad loc.* A good list of discussions against and in favour of the genuineness of the Epistle will be found in the *Com.* of Lipsius, pp. 211-212. A very full and interesting examination of all matters of Introduction is presented in Zahn's *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, Bd. I., pp. 368-398.

On points of grammar and language, in addition to the ordinary grammatical works, frequent use has been made of Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in d. Neugriechische Grammatik* (Leipz., 1892), Viteau, *Études sur le Grec du N. T.* (I. *Le Verbe;* II. *Sujet, Complément et Attribut*), 2 vols. (Paris, 1893, 1896), W. Schmid, *Atticismus*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1887-1897), and especially G. A. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (Marb., 1897).

Quotations from LXX follow Swete's ed. For the critical notes, besides the great editions of the text, Weiss, *Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe* (Leipz., 1896), has been largely used.

The abbreviations used in the notes which may require explanation are :—

al. = other passages.
Alf. = Alford's *Greek Testament.*
Chr. = Chrysostom.
Comm. = Commentators.
CT. = *Cambridge Greek Testament.*
Dsm. = Deissmann (*BS.* = *Bibelstudien*, *NBS.* = *Neue Bibelstudien*).
Edd. = Editors.
Ell. = Ellicott.
esp. = especially.
Gw. = Gwynn.
Hatz., *Einl.* = Hatzidakis, *Einleitung in die Neugriech. Grammatik.*
Hfm. = Hofmann.
Hltzm. = Holtzmann.
Hpt. = Haupt.
Inscrr. = Inscriptions.
Kl. = Klöpper.
Lft. = Lightfoot.
Lips. = Lipsius.
MT. = *Moods and Tenses* (Burton, Goodwin).
Myr. = Meyer.
Pfl. = Pfleiderer.

Phil. = Epistle to the Philippians.
SH. = Sanday and Headlam (*Romans*).
SK. = *Studien und Kritiken.*
Thdrt. = Theodoret.
Th. LZ. = *Theologische Literaturzeitung.*
Th. Mps. = Theodore of Mopsuestia.
TK. = *Textkritik d. paulin. Briefe* (Weiss).
W-M. = Moulton's Ed. of Winer's *Grammar.*
W-Sch. = Schmiedel's Ed. of Winer.
Wohl. = Wohlenberg.
Ws. = Weiss.
Zw. Th. = *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.*

The recognised contractions have, as a rule, been used in the critical notes.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΦΙΛΙΠΠΗΣΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.[1]

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Τιμόθεος, [a] δοῦλοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[2] πᾶσι τοῖς [b] ἁγίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, σὺν[3] [c] ἐπισκόποις[4]

a Ps. cxvi. 16 and num. exx. Rom. i. 1; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 4. b Cf. 1 Cor. i. 2. c Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. ii. 25; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; 2 Kings xi. 18; Neh. xi. 9.

[1] προς Φιλιππησιους: so ℵABK 1, 37 (-πισιους), 113. αρχεται προς Φ. DEFG (DE -πηνσιους). The title in T.R. comes from the ed. of Elzevir, without MS. authority.

[2] So FGKLP, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Tisch., W.H., Ws. Χ. Ι. with ℵBDE, d, e, cop. Χ. Ι. more prob., as copyists were more likely to write the common expression Ι. Χ. for the other, which is characteristic of Paul (*cf.* Ws., *TK.*, pp. 131-134).

[3] Brückner (*Chronologische Reihenfolge d. paulin. Brr.*, Haarlem, 1890, p. 222) would omit the whole clause as interpolated.

[4] B²DᶜEK with Thphl., Cassiod. συνεπισκοποις; *coepiscopis* in Freising Fragg. of O.L. (ed. Ziegler). Th. Mps. apparently knows this reading, but rejects it (see Swete's ed., vol. i., p. 198).

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-2. SALUTATION.—Ver. 1. The only significance belonging to the mention of Timothy is that he was a well-known figure at Philippi (Acts xvi. 1-12, xix. 22, xx. 3-6), that they owed much to him, and that he was about to visit them again. The Epistle claims, of course, to be exclusively Paul's own.—**δοῦλοι.** Already in O.T. **δ.** is used in a distinctly religious sense; see esp. Psalms (LXX). As used by Paul, while expressing intense fervour of devotion, it includes the idea of a special calling and function in Christ's kingdom, parallel to its application in O.T. to the prophets; see Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 10, also Tit. i. 1. There is genuine humility in the contrast between **δοῦλοι** and **ἁγίοις.** He only calls himself **ἀπόστολος** when he assumes a commanding mood (Chr. *ad loc.*).—**Χρ. Ἰ.** The order strikes the keynote of Paul's attitude towards his Master. He delights to think of Him in royal dignity, the Messiah who was once Jesus being now **Κύριος.** For a good discussion of the respective designations **Χ. Ἰ.** and **Ἰ. Χ.**, see Von Soden in *Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet*, p. 118.—**πᾶσιν τ. ἁγίοις.** It is difficult to say whether **πᾶσιν** is emphatic or not. It is, at least, remarkable how often **πᾶς** appears in the opening paragraphs of this Epistle, as if to show Paul's strict impartiality, perhaps in the face of some pretensions to superiority which appeared in the Philippian Church. But, on the other hand, see 2 Cor. i. 1, Rom. i. 7, where the same phrase seems to have no special emphasis. —**τ. ἁγίοις.** Really a *terminus technicus* of the early Church. Having as its basis that idea of consecration to God, and consequent participation in His Divine majesty which bulks so largely in O.T. religion (*e.g.*, Lev. xi. 44-45, Jud. xiii. 7), and continues to have full prominence in the N.T. (Acts, almost all Epistles, Rev.), it suggests also in every N.T. instance that side of Christian life which stands in

[d] Almost confined to Esther in LXX. Technical use only here and 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.

καὶ [d] διακόνοις· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

most glaring contrast with the impurity and sensuality of the Gentiles, holiness of heart and conduct. This would naturally come into view as the result of the working of the Holy Spirit; see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 509 ff.; Hltzm., *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 152. The best commentary on the expression is John xvii. 11, 14, 15-23. In his salutations Paul uses the word as practically = **ἐκκλησία** (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. i. 1, with 1 Thess. i. 1). For the Christian Church is the spiritual successor of the sacred community of Israel. Ideally, all Christians are "saints," *cf.* **ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** (1 Cor. i. 2). The Spirit is, of course, the Sanctifier, but He only deals with those who are in Christ Jesus.—**ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** These words sum up Paul's Christianity. They denote the most intimate living union that can be conceived between the soul of the believer and the Risen Lord. He, as Spirit, is the atmosphere in which the new life is lived. *Cf.* the Rabbinic use of מָקוֹם (place or space) as a name of God; see Taylor, *Sayings of Jewish Fathers*, 2nd ed., p. 39. The phrase occurs eight times in Phil. The same idea is expressed by **Χριστὸς ἐν ἐμοί**; see esp. Gal. ii. 20. "The gist of this formula **ἐν Χριστῷ** is nothing else than Paul's mystic faith, in which the believer gives up himself, his own life, to Christ, and possesses the life of Christ in himself: he in Christ, and Christ in him; he dead with Christ, and Christ become his life" (Pfl., *Paulinism*, E. Tr., i., p. 198). For the extraordinarily central place of the idea in Paul's teaching, see Deissmann, *Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"* (Marburg, 1892).—**σὺν ἐπισκόποις κ. διακόνοις.** These keenly-discussed terms can only be most briefly examined. Who were the **ἐπίσκ.**? In LXX almost always = an official in charge of work being done (*e.g.*, repairs in Temple; rebuilding of Jerusalem) or an officer in the army (much less frequently). In N.T., besides this passage, (*a*) Acts xx. 28, applied by Paul to the **πρεσβύτεροι** of Ephesus, whom the Holy Ghost has made **ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ**; (*b*) 1 Pet. ii. 25, of Christ, who is called **τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν**; (*c*) 1 Tim. iii. 2 and Tit. i. 7, where it is almost universally admitted to be synonymous with **πρεσβύτερος**. Two points are clear from N.T. evidence: 1. The **ἐπίσκοπος** is, at least, often the same person as the **πρεσβύτερος**. 2. The **ἐπίσκ.** is concerned with shepherding the flock of God. Have we any information to corroborate these facts? As to the first there is the strong tradition of the early Church, *e.g.*, Jerome, *Ep.*, 69, 3: *apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri*; there is the admitted fact that in 1 Clem. the name **πρεσβύτεροι** is given to the **ἐπίσκοποι**; and Tertullian (*Apologet.*, 39) designates the officials who preside over the congregation *probati quique seniores*; see esp. F. Loofs, *SK.*, 1890, pp. 639-641. The second fact mentioned above conflicts with the celebrated theory of Hatch and Harnack (who has, however, greatly modified his standpoint; see his important review of Loening's *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums* in *Th. LZ.*, 1889, coll. 418-429), that the **ἐπίσκοποι** were distinct finance and cultus officials, who only gradually came into possession of more spiritual functions. But it seems hazardous to narrow down the duties of the **ἐπίσκ.** No doubt the name may, in certain cases, have been suggested by that of the **ἐπίσκοπος** or (more commonly) **ἐπιμελητής**, who exercised administrative control over the property of private associations and guilds existing at that time in the Hellenic world and enforced the rules of such associations (see J. Réville, *Les Origines de l'Épiscopat*, Paris, 1894, pp. 160-163). But just as the functions of these persons were left comparatively vague and undefined, so we might expect to find the beginnings of local administration in the Christian Church still less clearly marked. An additional reason for this would lie in the pre-eminent authority of the Apostles and the high place assigned to the possessors of "gifts". Accordingly it appears wise to use great caution in making any distinction between **πρεσβυτ.** and **ἐπίσκ.** Probably the truth lies in the direction of regarding **πρεσβ.** as a title of *status*, while **ἐπίσκ.** is one of *function*. Probably all **ἐπίσκοποι** were **πρεσβύτεροι**, while the converse may not be true. The difference of name may point to some early (and unknown) difference of administration. The **ἐπίσκ.** may have had some special connexion with the celebra-

3. [e]Εὐχαριστῶ[1] τῷ Θεῷ μου ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ [f]μνείᾳ ὑμῶν, 4. πάντοτε ἐν πάσῃ [g]δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν δέησιν

e Very freq. in Paul in this phrase Judith viii. 25; Inscrr. f Confined to Paul, *e.g.*, Rom. i. 9. g Rom. x. 1; 2 Tim. i. 3; Eph. vi. 18; num. exx. in LXX.

[1] So edd. with ℵABDcE**KLP, vg. syrr. cop. εγω μεν ευχαριστω τω Κυριω ημων D*E*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst., Cassiod. In Aug. *de corrept. et gratia*, § 10, "ego quidem" already omitted. Zahn (*Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 184) would read εγω μεν, believing that these words were lost through such parallels as 1 Cor. i. 4, Col. i. 3, Philm. 4; so also Hpt. in Myr.[6]

tion of the Eucharist as the central rite of Christian worship (see Sohm's strong insistence on this point, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 84 ff., 121 ff.) and with the management of Church property, which would originally consist of voluntary gifts offered to God in Christian worship. Gradually, as those endowed with extraordinary "charisms" (*e.g.*, prophets, teachers, evangelists) passed away, their functions would tend to be assumed by the leading office-bearers in each congregation. So the sphere, *e.g.*, of the ἐπίσκ., would be greatly enlarged. But we must be content, for lack of evidence, to do without precise definitions, only concluding as to the general equivalence in the earliest times of πρεσβ. and ἐπίσκ., and granting that their oversight and guidance were concerned with the spiritual as well as the material well-being of the organisation. *Deacons* are first mentioned here in the N.T. It is often tacitly assumed that they hold the office or function whose institution is described in Acts vi. This was an early tradition; *e.g.*, Iren., iii., 12, 10: *Stephanus . . . qui electus est ab apostolis primus diaconus.* But there are considerable arguments against this view. These are admirably summarised by Gwatkin (Hastings' *B.D.*, i., 574). (1) The seven are nowhere in N.T. called διάκονοι. (2) The qualifications laid down (Acts vi. 3) for the seven are much higher than those of 1 Tim. iii. 8. (3) Stephen was largely a preacher and Philip an evangelist. (4) The seven evidently rank next to the Apostles at Jerusalem. Hpt. (Myr.[6] *ad loc.*) holds that ἐπίσκ. and διάκ. denote here the same persons, the ἐπισκοπή being a διακονία towards the Church, and compares 1 Thess. v. 12, τοὺς κοπιῶντας καὶ προϊσταμένους. And the vague use of the word to denote any kind of Christian service (in earlier parts of N.T.) might seem to justify the idea. But considering the late date of Phil., it appears more reasonable to connect the office with that of 1 Tim. iii., where a clear distinction is drawn between the διάκ. and the ἐπίσκ. In the early Church the most necessary Christian *service* would be the care of the sick and poor. So the deacon must neither be double-tongued (δίλογος) nor a "lover of dirty gain" (so Gwatk. tr. αἰσχροκερδής), for in his work of visiting he would have temptations to "gossip and slander" on the one hand, and to "picking and stealing from the alms" on the other (Gwatk. *loc. cit.*). Many reasons are assigned for the mention of these officers here. But it seems quite natural that Paul should specify those who stood in the forefront of the Church's work and life, more especially as the letter is one of thanks for the gift which has been sent to him, a gift the management of which would be in the hands of the controlling authorities in the Church.

Ver. 2. Paul feels that the ordinary Greek salutation χαίρειν or the Eastern εἰρήνη σοι is too meagre for Christian intercourse. But closely connected with χαίρειν is his own great watchword χάρις, a word which, perhaps, above all others, shows the powerful remoulding of terms by Christian thought and feeling. χάρις for Paul is the central revelation of the fatherly heart of God in the redemption which Christ has accomplished for unworthy sinners. And its direct result is εἰρήνη, the harmony and health of that life which is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ; see an interesting discussion of the Apostolic greeting by F. Zimmer, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1886, p. 443 ff. Of course ἀπό governs Κυρίου. The Socinian exegesis which makes Κ. depend on πατρός is impossible in view of Tit. i. 4 (so Gw. *ad loc.*).—Κυρίου. The favourite designation of Jesus Christ in the early Church. See on chap. ii. 11 *infr.* *Cf.* the extraordinary frequency of the term δεσπότης as applied to God in Apostolic Fathers, etc. On the whole subject see Harnack, *Dogmen-Geschichte*, i., pp. 153-158.

ποιούμενος, 5. ἐπὶ τῇ [h] κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν [i] εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἀπὸ[1] πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· 6. [k] πεποιθὼς [l] αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ὅτι ὁ [m] ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν [n] ἔργον ἀγαθὸν [o] ἐπιτελέσει ἄχρις[2] [p] ἡμέρας

h Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16. i Acts xxiv. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 1. k Constrn. ver. 25; chap. ii. 18. l Rom. xiii. 6; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Gal. ii. 10 *et al.* m Gal. iii. 3. n Rom. xiv. 20. o 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11. Freq. in later books of LXX. p 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; 1 Thess. v. 2. For thought, *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 11.

[1] So Hpt. with DEFGKL, Chr., Thdrt. απο της πρωτης W.H., Ws., Lft. (brackets) with ℵABP 37, Euthal.cod. Possibly της is a later addition.

[2] So Trg., Lft. (αχρι[ς]) with DEFGKLP, Chr., Thdrt. W.H., Ws., Alf. αχρι with ℵB, Euthal.cod. (A αχρι ης).

Vv. 3-8. His thankfulness, love and confidence for the Philippians.—Ver. 3. Much may be said in favour of the reading ἐγὼ μὲν εὐχαριστῶ (see crit. note) from the point of view of sense. The antithesis would then show that the letter is a direct reply to one received from Philippi, and the emphasis on Paul's own thanksgiving would be accounted for (with Zahn) by the supposition that the Philippians imagined a slight lack of cordiality on his part. This supposition is favoured by the prominence given in the Epistle to Paul's delight in them.—εὐχ. τ. Θ. ἐπί. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 4, εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ . . . ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι . . . τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν; *Papyr. Lond.*, xlii., κομισαμένη τὴν παρά σου ἐπιστολὴν παρ' Ὥρου . . . ἐπὶ μὲν τῷ ἐρρῶσθα[ί] σε εὐθέως τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχαρίστουν (quoted by Dsm., *BS.*, p. 210). A word condemned by the grammarians, but in common use from the time of Polyb., and found in modern Greek as ὑκαριστῶ (Hatz., *Einleit.*, p. 285).—ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν. These words have been the subject of much discussion. No doubt ἐπί could be used here in what Ell. calls its "ethico-local" sense of a circumstance or experience regarded as the basis of an action, and thus the meaning would be: "I give thanks to my God at my whole remembrance of you" ("every remembrance" is, it seems to us, in spite of Kl., Lips. and Weizs., linguistically impossible). Or, what is more natural after εὐχαριστῶ (see exx. *supr.*), ἐπί may be "on account of". This would make good sense. The total impression left upon him by his intercourse with them is one which calls forth thankfulness. There is another possible meaning supported by Hfm., Zahn, Wohl., Harnack (*Th. LZ.*, 1889, col. 419) and Sohm (*Kirchenrecht*, p. 81). ὑμῶν may be gen. of subject, and so we should translate: "on account of your whole remembrance of me". This would accord admirably with the context, preparing the way for κοινωνία (ver. 5), and pointing delicately to the practical expression of their thoughtfulness. The only serious objection to it is that the other interpretation fits in more suitably with the parallels Rom. i. 8, 9, 1 Cor. i. 4, Eph. i. 16, Col. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2 and those in LXX.

Ver. 4. Various divisions of these words have been proposed, some referring πάντοτε . . . ὑμῶν to the preceding verse, others taking πάντοτε . . . μου together, and regarding the remainder of the sentence as a connected whole. It seems least arbitrary to find in ver. 4 a complete thought. The prominence of πᾶς shows the exuberance of his joy in them.—δεήσει. A special aspect of προσευχή, that of entreaty for the satisfaction of some known want; *cf.* Ell. on 1 Tim. ii. 1.—μετὰ χαρᾶς. The undertone of the whole letter.—δ. ποιούμενος. An interesting parallel in *Papyr.* of Faijûm, 172 A.D., δικαίαν δέ[ησ]ιν ποιούμενος (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 78), in the general sense of "asking" (*cf.* δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι, Luke v. 33, 1 Tim. ii. 1).

Ver. 5. On what does ἐπί depend? Surely it follows χαρᾶς of preceding clause (so Chr., Th. Mps.) rather than εὐχαριστῶ of ver. 3. It is, at least, awkward to take ἐπί twice with the same verb. μ. χαρᾶς has an emphatic position. Now he gives the reason for his joy.—τῇ κοινωνίᾳ. At the first glance κ. seems to refer to their mutual fellowship and harmony as Christians. A closer examination reveals that this whole passage is concerned with Paul's personal relation to them. And so κ. anticipates συγκοινωνούς (ver. 7), and will mean their common participation with Paul in spreading the Gospel. This really includes the idea of united action on the one hand, and the concrete expression of their helpfulness, their gift to the Apostle,

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1]· 7. καθώς ἐστι[2] δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο [q] φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ [r] καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς, ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ τῇ[3] [s] ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ [t] βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, [u] συγκοινω-

q Characteristic of this Ep., cf. Rom. xii. 16 al.
r Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. vii. 3.
s 2 Tim. iv. 16 al.
t In N.T. only here and Heb. vi. 16; Wisd. vi. 18.
u 1 Cor. ix. 23; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 10.

[1] So Lft., Hpt., W.H. (r l) with ℵAFGKP, syrr. cop. arm., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ti., Ws., Alf. Χ. Ι. with BDEL 1, 72, al., d, e, f, g, vg., Aug., Ambrst. Ws. (TK., p. 134) holds that Ι. Χ. was suggested by ver. 2.

[2] All edd. εστιν with MSS.

[3] εν before τη απολ. inserted by all edd. (Lachm. brackets) with ℵBDb et cEKLP, Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt., d, e, f, g. See Ws. (TK., p. 105), who thinks that εν was passed over because wanting before βεβαι., the copyists overlooking the fact that βεβ. was included with απολ. under one article.

on the other. Hort (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 44) points out that there is something concrete in the **κοινωνία** of Acts ii. 42. The same is true of Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 13, Heb. xiii. 16. This concrete notion in **κ.** (almost equiv. to "contribution") is supported by the use of **εἰς**, which is employed technically in contexts like this to denote the *destination* of money-payments, collections, etc. So 1 Cor. xvi. 1, **τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους**; Acts xxiv. 17, **ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου.** Important exx. from Papyri in Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 113-114, *NBS.*, p. 23. *Cf.* on the whole idea the most apt comment of Chr. *ad loc.*: **ὅταν γὰρ ἐκεῖνος μὲν κηρύττῃ, σὺ δὲ θεραπεύῃς τὸν κηρύττοντα, κοινωνεῖς αὐτῷ τῶν στεφάνων. ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἔξωθεν ἀγῶσιν οὐ τοῦ ἀγωνιζομένου μόνον ἐστὶν ὁ στέφανος ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ παιδοτρίβου καὶ τοῦ θεραπεύοντος καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν ἀσκούντων τὸν ἀθλητήν.—τὸ εὐαγγ.** It is unnecessary to narrow this down to the preaching of the Gospel. Used comprehensively. — **ἀπὸ πρώτης.** *Cf.* the account of their generosity in chap. iv. 10 ff.—**ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν.** The same phrase in Rom. viii. 22. *Cf. Papyr.* of Faijûm **μέχρ[ι] τ[οῦ] νῦν** in Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 81.

Ver. 6. **αὐτὸ τοῦτο.** Accus. of the "inner object," where the neuter pronoun takes the place of a cognate substantive; *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 1, **τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι** (see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 89). **αὐτὸ τοῦτο** is characteristic of Paul, "the firm touch of an intent mind" (Moule, *CT. ad loc.*). "Having this firm persuasion." Curiously enough, the same confident assurance, although based on very different grounds, is characteristic also of the later Jewish theology, *e.g.*, *Apocal. of Baruch* (ed. Charles), xiii., 3. "Thou shalt be assuredly preserved to the consummation of the times." Also xxv., 1; lxxvi., 2. "Christianity, by its completely rounded view of the world, guarantees to believers that they shall be preserved unto eternal life in the kingdom of God, which is God's revealed end in the world" (Ritschl, *Justification*, E. Tr., p. 200).—**ἐναρξάμενος.** This verb, although a word of ritual in classical Greek, is found in LXX (Pentat.) apparently in the simple sense "begin". In its only other occurrence in N.T., Gal. iii. 3, it is combined with **ἐπιτελέω** as here.—**ἔργον ἀγαθόν.** De W., Lft. and others refer this to **κοινωνία** of ver. 5. Is it not far more natural to regard it as "the work of God" *par excellence*, the production of spiritual life, the imparting of the **χάρις** of ver. 7? *Cf.* chap. ii. 13 and esp. Rom. xiv. 20, **μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ.—ἡμέρας Ἰ. Χ.** On the order **Ἰ. Χ.**, see ver. 1 *supr.* **ἡμ.** lacks the article on the analogy of **ἡμέρα Κυρίου** (LXX). This favourite conception of O.T. prophecy refers to "the time when the Lord reveals Himself in His fulness to the world, when He judges evil and fulfils His great purposes of redemption among men. . . . But the judgment has not its end in itself, it is but the means of making Jehovah known to the world, and this knowledge of Him is salvation" (Davidson, *Nahum*, etc., p. 105). It is easy to see how the N.T. idea grows out of this. Paul probably assumes that the day is not far off, but indulges in no dogmatising. This name is given to the day because Christ as **Κύριος** is to be judge. Belief in the Parousia of Christ has a most prominent place in Paul's religious thought. He never attempts to specify the time. But it cheers him, esp. in crises of his history (as

v Rom. i. 9; Gal. i. 20. νούς [1] μου [2] τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας. 8. [v] μάρτυς γάρ μού
w Chap. ii. 26; 2 Cor. ix. 14; cf. Ps. cxix. 131. ἐστιν [3] ὁ Θεός, ὡς [w] ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐν [x] σπλάγχνοις Ἰησοῦ [4]
x 2 Cor. vii. 15; Philm. 12.

[1] So also Trg. with BcKsil.LP. Other edd. συνκ. with ℵAB*DEFG, Euth.cod. See Ws., *TK.*, pp. 138-139.

[2] So all edd. τ. χαρ. μου, DEFG, d, e, f, g, vg. μοι τ. χαρ. 39, 43, 52, Euth.cod., Thphyl. O.L. (Freising Fragg., Ambrst.) *gaudii*, which presupposes χαρας.

[3] Om. Ti., W.H., Lft., Ws., Trg. with ℵ*BFgr.G 17, d, e, g, æth., Th. Mps. (*Cat.*, 236). Text in ℵcADgr.Egr.KLP, f, vg. syrp. cop., Thdrt., Ambrst. Myr. supposes it to be a reminiscence of Rom. i. 9.

[4] So also Hpt. with FKL, f, vg.cle. cop., Thdrt., Ambrst. X. I. Ti., W.H., Ws., Lft., Alf., Trg. with ℵABD*EGP 17, 37, d, e, g, am. sah., Bas.

in this Epistle), to believe that the Lord is near. (See Teichmann, *Die paulin. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht*, p. 11 ff.). There is perhaps no part of Paul's thought in which it is so difficult to trace a fixed outline of ideas as the eschatological. And yet there is no part more regulative for him than this.

Ver. 7. **δίκαιον.** = our "right" or "natural".—**τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπ. ὑμ.** Not "think this concerning you," but "have this care on your behalf"; *cf.* chap. iv. 10, **τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν. τοῦτο** of course refers to the finishing in them of God's "good work". **φρ.** seems always to keep in view the *direction* which thought (of a practical kind) takes. **ὑπέρ** usually has the sense of "interest in" (so Lft.).—**διὰ τὸ κ.τ.λ.** Paul's only use of **διά** with infin.—**ἐν τ. καρδίᾳ.** Perhaps it is best (with Zahn) to take **κ.** here not so much as the seat of the softer feelings, but rather as the abode of the stronger thoughts, resolutions, etc. A regular Greek usage. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 9, 2 Cor. iii. 15, iv. 6 *et al.* Thus the whole expression would almost be equiv. to "I know that you," etc.; *cf.* **ἄσβεστον ὑμῶν περιφέρω τὴν μνήμην** (Thdrt.). His love is expressed in the next verse.—Evidently **ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμ. κ.τ.λ.** goes with the following clause, for it is much more natural to suppose a break at the first **ὑμᾶς**, which is resumed by the second. On **ἐν** before **τ. ἀπολ.** see crit. note. Paul separates here (so also Wohl.) between his **δεσμοί** and his **ἀπολογία**, which makes up one idea with **βεβαίωσις**. It seems to us clear that this **ἀπολ.** marks a crisis in his circumstances of which the influence is seen all through the Epistle; *cf.*, *e.g.*, vv. 19, 25, chap. ii. 23, 24. Ought it not to be taken in its ordinary judicial sense of a defence against a regular charge? (as against Lft. and Moule, *CT.*, who refer **ἀπ.** and **βεβ.** to Paul's missionary work at Rome, and Hpt., who thinks of Paul's whole activity in refuting opponents, both public and private). The correctness of this view receives strong confirmation from Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 100 ff.), who shows that Paul, like the Translators of the LXX, was well acquainted with the technical sense of **βεβαίωσις** (Lat. *evictio*), the obligation under which the seller came to the buyer to guarantee against all claims his right to what he had bought. So Paul's defence before the emperor is a guarantee of the Gospel, a warrant of its value and claims. For **ἀπολ.** see 2 Tim. iv. 16. "My defence and confirmation of the Gospel."—**συνκ. μ. τ. χάρ. χάρις** here must be the great central gift of God's grace, which Paul always keeps in the foreground. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 10, **χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη.** There is no need to limit it to the grace of apostleship or to that granted to him in his trials and sufferings. Their love and kindness towards him and his great work, even at the darkest moments in his career, are proof enough that they share along with him in the grace of God. It is probably better to separate **μου** from **χάριτος.** [J. Weiss (*Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 263) would read **χρείας**, comparing chap. ii. 25, iv. 16, Rom. xii. 13. Certainly this would give good sense and be more pointed.]

Ver. 8. An exact parallel is Rom. i. 9-11, **μάρτυς γάρ μού ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι . . . ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς.** Such adjuration of God he uses only in solemn personal appeals; *cf.* Gal. i. 20. Perhaps this goes to justify Zahn in supposing

Χριστοῦ. 9. καὶ [y] τοῦτο προσεύχομαι, [z] ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον [a] περισσεύῃ[1] ἐν [b] ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ [c] αἰσθήσει,

y 2 Cor. xiii. 9.
z Mark xiv. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 13.

a Rom. xv. 13 *al.* Several times in P. in this sense and construction. b Four times in Col.; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12. c Only here in N.T., sev. exx. in Prov.

So Ti., W.H. (⌈⌉), Lft., Myr., Hpt., Alf., Trg. with ℵAK**L, Clem., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. **περισσευσῃ.** Lachm., Ws., W.H. (mg.), Trg. (mg.) with BDE 37, k^scr. Myr. accounts for **-σῃ** by similarity of sounds in terminations of **επιγνωσει, αισθησει, πασῃ.** Ws. thinks, conversely, that **-σῃ** was transformed into **-ῃ** under the influence of present **προσευχομαι** (*TK.*, p. 42).

that the Philippians had imagined some lack of cordiality in Paul's reception of their gift. Comm. have noted the intensity of language manifested in the compound **ἐπιποθῶ.** But it is needful to remember the fondness of later Greek for compounds which had lost their strong sense. Calvin, with practical insight: *neque enim parum hoc valet ad fidem doctrinæ faciendam cum persuasus est populus a doctore se amari.*—**ἐν σπλάγχνοις.** "With the heart of Jesus Christ" (with which his own has become identified). This amounts to the same thing as love. *Cf.* Gal. ii. 20, which is the best comment. Possibly Paret (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, iii., 1, p. 25) is not too fanciful in finding here a definite recollection of Jesus' nature, of which **σπλαγχνίζεσθαι** (in the Gospels) is a common expression. Every genuine pastor has some experience of this feeling.

Vv. 9-11. Prayer for their increase in Christian discernment.—Ver. 9. Zahn would put this clause under the government of **ὡς** in the preceding sentence. No strong argument can be used against this, but it is doubtful whether the explanation is necessary. In the use of **ἵνα** here, "purport" (to adopt Ellicott's expression) seems to be blended with "purpose". There are certainly passages in which the full "*telic*" force of **ἵνα** cannot be fairly asserted. This accords with the development of the later language. See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 214 ff. Possibly **ἵνα** in this passage is rhetorically parallel to **ἵνα** in ver. 10. (See J. Weiss, *Beiträge zur Paulin. Rhetorik*, p. 9.)—**ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμ.** can scarcely mean anything else than "your love towards one another". This has been already exemplified in their **κοινωνία** with Paul.—**περισσεύῃ.** In LXX, chiefly in Sirach. It is mainly in Paul's writings that it reaches this derivative sense of "abound". In the Synoptics it still means (usually), as in ordinary Greek, "to remain over". *Sola charitas non admittit excessum* (Bacon, *de Augm. Scient.*, vii., 3, quoted by Gwynn).—**ἐπιγν. κ. π. αἰσθ.** Apparently an eager and enthusiastic spirit prevailed in this Church. As so commonly, it might be accompanied by a slight want of discernment. That would lead, on the one hand, to misunderstandings over trifling matters (*cf.* chap. iv. 2?), on the other, to giving heed to plausible teachers. As the Galatians combined enthusiasm and fickleness, perhaps, at Philippi, enthusiasm was apt to prevail over spiritual common sense. Is not Lft. mistaken in annotating "Love imparts a sensitiveness of touch," etc.? This is not before Paul's mind. His prayer is that the sensitiveness of touch may be added to love.—**ἐπιγν.** A favourite word in the Epistles of the imprisonment. A good example of its intensive force is 1 Cor. xiii. 12, **ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην.** Very frequent in Justin M., *e.g.*, a definition of **ἐπιστήμη** (*Dial.*, 221 A), **ἐπιστήμη τίς ἐστιν ἡ παρέχουσα αὐτῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν θείων γνῶσιν, ἔπειτα τῆς τούτων θειότητος καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐπίγνωσιν.** *Cf. Dial.*, 220 D; *Apol.*, ii. 10, 19. Here = a firm conception of those spiritual principles which would guide them in their relations with one another and the world.—**αἰσθήσει.** Moral sensibility, quickness of ethical tact. Originally of sense-perception, but applicable to the inner world of sensibilities. Kl. quotes aptly from Hippocrates, *de Off. Med.*, 3, **ἃ καὶ τῇ ὄψι καὶ τῇ ἁφῇ καὶ τῇ ἀκοῇ καὶ τῇ ῥινὶ καὶ τῇ γλώσσῃ καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ ἔστιν αἰσθέσθαι.** A complete parallel is Heb. v. 14, where the writer defines the **τέλειοι** (*cf.* Phil. iii. 12, 15-16) as **τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.**—**πάσῃ.** Probably "all kinds of".

Ver. 10. **δοκ. τὰ διαφ.** *Cf.* Rom. ii. 18, **δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφ.** Two possible renderings. (1) "Approve things that are excellent." (2) "Test things that

10. [d] εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τὰ διαφέροντα, ἵνα ἦτε [e] εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ [f] ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, 11. πεπληρωμένοι [g] καρπῶν[1] δικαιοσύνης τῶν[1] διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[2] εἰς δόξαν καὶ [h] ἔπαινον Θεοῦ. 12. Γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς [i] βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι [k] τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ

d Rom. i. 11, xii. 2 *al.* e 2 Pet. iii. 1 Wisd. vii. 25. *Noun*, 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 17. f Acts xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. x. 32. Scarcely found in secular writers. g Heb. xii. 11; Jas. iii. 18; Prov. xi. 30 *al.* h Chap. ii. 11; Rom. xv. 7; Eph. i. 6, 14. i Jude 5. k Acts xxiv. 22, xxv. 14; Eph. vi. 21.

[1] So P, syrr. cop., Chr., Thphyl. **καρπον . . . τον.** All edd. with ℵABDEFGKL O.L. sah., Thdrt., Ambrst. B (with 116, 122) om. **τον.** See Ws., *TK.*, p. 78 *fin.*, who assigns the omission to carelessness.

[2] The important cursive 37 reads **Χ. Ι.** with amiat.

differ," *i.e.*, good and bad. Lft. opposes (2) on the ground that "it requires no keen moral sense to discriminate between good and bad". But was not this precisely the great difficulty for heathen-Christians? Theophyl. defines **τὰ διαφ.** by **τί δεῖ πρᾶξαι καὶ τί δεῖ μὴ πρᾶξαι.** The idea seems to be borne out by the following **εἰλικρ.** and **ἀπρόσκ.** We are therefore compelled to decide for (2). "The fundamental choice arrived at in believing has to be reiterated continually in a just application of it to a world of varying and sometimes perplexing cases" (Rainy, *Expos. Bib.*, p. 37). There are exx. of **τὰ διαφ.** in chap. iii. *passim.* Of course this **δοκιμάζειν** is made possible by the guidance of the indwelling Spirit. It shows us "the highest point which Paul reaches in his treatment of moral questions" (Hltzm., *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 149, who points out as instances of his delicate moral tact the precepts given in 1 Cor. viii.-x., Rom. xiv.).—**εἰλικρ. κ. ἀπρόσκ.** There is no warrant for adhering to the common derivation of **εἰλικρ.** from **κρίνω** compounded with either **εἵλη** ("heat of sun") and so = "tested by sunbeam," or **εἴλη** (= **ἴλη** "troops") and so "separated into ranks". The word is the equiv. of Lat. *sincerus*, "pure," "unmixed". A favourite term in Plato for pure intellect and also for the soul purged from sense. *Cf. Phaedo*, 66 A, 67 A, 81 B. Naturally transferred to the moral sphere. T. H. Green (*Two Sermons*, p. 41) describes **εἰλικρίνεια** as "perfect openness towards God". **ἀπρόσκ.** will then mean, in all probability, "not giving offence" to others, the obverse side of **εἰλικρ.** This sense seems to us to be proved by 1 Cor. x. 32 with the context, which is simply an expansion of Paul's thought here. *Cf.* also 1 John ii. 10.—**εἰς ἡμέραν Χρ. εἰς** has the meanings "with a view to" and "until," which here shade off into each other. The conception of **ἡμ. Χ.** "grew in Paul's hands to a whole æon, lasting from the **παρουσία** to the **τέλος**" (Beysch., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 273).

Ver. 11. Critical evidence (see above) fixes **καρπὸν . . . τόν** as the correct reading. We should, of course, expect the gen. (see the *v.l.*), but one of the most marked features in later Greek is the enlarging of the sphere of the accus. It is quite common to find it with verbs like **κληρονομεῖν** and **κρατεῖν κ.τ.λ.** *Cf.* in modern Greek **γέμω χρήματα,** "I am full of possessions" (see Hatz., *Einl.*, pp. 220-223; F. Krebs, *Rection d. Casus in d. späteren histor. Gräcität*, Heft i., pp. 3-4, ii., p. 3 ff.).—**καρπ. δικ.** A frequent phrase in Prov. (LXX). A showing forth of the results of righteousness. There is nothing here about justification, as Moule supposes. It is right conduct the Apostle has in view. But it is hardly needful to note that with Paul there can be no dissociation of the two ideas. **δικαιοσύνη** is always with him the right relation between God and man, made possible through Christ, which asserts itself, under the Holy Spirit's influence, in righteous conduct.—**διὰ Ἰ. Χ.** The **καρπός** as well as the **δικ.** is due to Christ (*cf.* chap. iv. 13).—**εἰς δ. κ. ἔπ. Θ.** *Cf.* the refrain in Eph. i. 6, 12, 14, and Christ's words in John xvii. 4, **ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** The disciple must be as the Master.

Vv. 12-14. His present situation.—Ver. 12. **γινώσκ. δὲ ὑ. β.** A common epistolary phrase. *Cf.* **ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι βουλόμεθα** in a Letter to the magistrates of Oropus from the Roman Consuls, 73 B.C. (Viereck, *Sermo Graecus*, etc., Gött., 1888, p. 36). **δέ,** as so frequently, is transitional.—**τὰ κατ' ἐμέ** = my circumstances. In later Greek **κατά** came to be a regular periphrasis for the gen. W. Schmidt (*de elocut. Josephi*, pp. 21-22) gives striking exx. from Josephus, *e.g.*, *Antt.*, i., 296, **τοῦ κατ' ἐκείνους συγγενοῦς,** where **κατ' ἐκ.**

μᾶλλον εἰς [l] προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν· 13. ὥστε τοὺς δεσμούς μου [m] φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ [n] πραιτωρίῳ

l Ver. 25; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Sirach li. 17; 2 Macc. viii. 8. m Constrn. chap. iii. 21; 1 Thess. iii. 13. n πρ. four times in Gospp. = governor's palace. So Acts xxiii. 35.

= ἐκείνων. See also Kaelker, *Quaestiones de elocut. Polybiana*, p. 282. This is Paul's first reference to his own affairs, which were of the deepest concern to the Philippians. Their gift had been prompted by their apprehensions of his sore need. Perhaps, as Calvin suggests, his opponents were using his calamities as a proof of the worthlessness of his Gospel.—**μᾶλλον εἰς προκ. . . . ἐλήλ.** The use of **μᾶλλον** seems to imply that they were looking out for bad news of the Apostle. And that would justify the supposition that, shortly before this, a change had occurred in Paul's circumstances. May not the change be connected with the **ἀπολογία** of ver. 7? Is it not probable that Paul had been transferred from his hired lodging (Acts xxviii. 30) into the prison where those on trial were kept in custody? O. Hirschfeld (*Sitz. Bericht.* of Berlin Academy, 1891, pp. 857-858) holds that imprisonment at Rome was of a military character, and that the barracks of various city troops served as prisons. Mommsen (*op. cit.*, 1895, p. 500) agrees with Hirschf. in believing that the *castra peregrinorum* may have been used esp. for this purpose. The Philippians would naturally expect that this stricter custody must mean severer hardships for the Apostle. As a matter of fact it has been in his favour. **προκοπή** is a technical term in Stoic philosophy for "progress towards wisdom" (see Zeller, *Stoics*, etc., p. 294). It is condemned by Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck, p. 85) as unclassical. Frequent in later Greek, esp. in Plutarch and Polyb.—**ἐλήλυθεν.** *Cf.* Mark v. 26, **εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα** (why should Ell. object to this parallel?), Acts xix. 27.

Ver. 13. For the skilful rhetorical structure of vv. 13-17 see J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, p. 17, who compares Rom. ii. 6-12.—**τὰ δεσμά** is, on the whole, more common; see Luke viii. 29, Acts xvi. 26, xx. 23. According to Cobet, *Mnemosyne*, 1858, p. 74 ff. (quoted in W-Sch., p. 85, *n.* 8), the neuter form refers to actual bonds, the masc. to the imprisonment. But there seems to be no distinction, *e.g.*, in Attic Inscrr. (see Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attisch. Inschr.*, p. 112, *n.* 1025). And Sch. states that the distinction will not apply to LXX.—**φαν. ἐν Χ. γεν.** It has become plain that he is a prisoner wholly for Christ's sake, and not on account of any breach of law. **γεν.** must be translated by the English perfect, for, as Moule (*CT.*) well points out, "our English thought separates present from past less rapidly than Greek". Of course we must supply **δεσμ.** as predicate with **φαν. γεν.**—**ἐν ὅλῳ τ. πραιτ.** is one of the most keenly contested expressions in the Epistle. Four leading interpretations are found. (1) *Those forming the praetorian guard.* So Lft., Hfm., Abbott, Hpt., Vinc. This explanation has much in its favour. Those coming up on appeal from the Provinces were handed over for surveillance to the *praefecti praetorio* (see Marquardt-Momms., ii. 2[3], p. 972 and *n.* 2). And Lft. (*Com.*, pp. 99-104) has shown conclusively that the word admits of this meaning. (2) *The barracks or camp of the praetorian guard.* So Lips., Kl., Alf., De W., Myr., Ws., Von Soden. But none of these Comm. bring direct evidence to show that the name *praetorium* was ever definitely applied to the *castra praetoriana*, built under Tiberius at the Porta Viminalis (Tac., *Ann.*, iv., 2). (3) *The emperor's palace.* So Chr., Th. Mps., Thdrt., Beng., Mynster (*Kleine theol. Schriften*, p. 184, some strong arguments), Gwynn, Duchesne. In all other passages of N.T. **πραιτ.** = residence of the ruler. It is said that it would be impossible for anyone writing from Rome to call the palace **πραιτ.** But, as Gw. observes, this is a provincial writing to provincials, and using the word in a familiar sense. Further, the change for the better in Paul's circumstances is connected with the knowledge that his bonds are in Christ. Is it because the *authorities* (emperor, etc.) have already begun to take a favourable view of his case that the preaching is allowed to prosper without hindrance and that his associates take courage? This interpretation cannot be dismissed altogether lightly. (4) *The judicial authorities.* So Mommsen (*op. cit.*, p. 498) and Ramsay (*St. Paul*, etc., p. 357 ff.). These would be the *praefecti praetorio* (either one or two) with their assessors and other officials of the imperial court. Momms. quotes from a letter of Trajan to Pliny (*Ep. Plin.*, 57 [65]), in which he decides that a criminal condemned to exile, but, in spite of this,

καὶ [o] τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι, 14. καὶ τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ [p] πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου [q] περισσοτέρως τολμᾷν[1] ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον[2] λαλεῖν. 15. Τινὲς μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν, τινὲς

o Cf. Luke xxiv. 9.
p Philm. 21; 2 Kings xviii. 20 al.
q In Paul and Hebrews.

[1] So Alf., W.H. Ti., Trg., Ws. τολμᾶν.

[2] So DcE**K, Chr.(occas.), Thdrt., Ell. (who calls του Θεου "a nearly certain gloss"), Hpt. Other edd. add του Θεου with ℵABD*E*P, d, e, f, vg. sah. cop. arm., Clem., Chr.(some places).

lingering in the province, should be sent in chains *ad praefectos praetorii mei*, who are not the prison officials but those concerned with the hearing of cases. This explanation also would agree well with what Paul says about his bonds and the progress of the Gospel. We would hesitate to decide between (1) and (4), the context seeming to support the latter, while, perhaps, ὅλῳ favours the former.—**καὶ τ. λοιποῖς π.** *Cf. CIG.*, i., 1770, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν φανερὰν πεποήκαμεν τήν τε ἰδίαν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων προαίρεσιν. Apparently a vague phrase = everywhere else.

Ver. 14. **τοὺς πλείονας.** Vaughan holds that "from the universal practice of deciding matters by the vote of a majority the term comes to mean *the main body*, the society *as a whole*," but this scarcely seems needful.—**τῶν ἀδ. ἐν Κ.** These words surely make up one phrase (so Alf., Weizs., Ws., etc., as against Lft., Lips., Myr., etc.). *Cf.* Col. i. 2. It is difficult to see where the tautology, which is said to be involved in this interpretation, comes in. Probably it is an almost technical combination. Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 82) notes from Papyri a precisely similar technical use of **ἀδελφός** in the language of the Serapeum at Memphis.—**πεποιθ. τ. δεσμ. μου.** "Having confidence in my bonds," *i.e.*, being encouraged by the favourable light in which his imprisonment was beginning to be regarded when seen in its true character. [This tells in favour of (4) in ver. 13.] *Cf.* Philm. 21, **πεποιθὼς τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου.—λαλεῖν.** Hpt. believes that **λαλ.** is used here expressly instead of **λέγειν** as emphasising the physiological process rather than the word spoken. In the later language these refinements were apt to be overlooked. Still it is interesting to find that in LXX דִּבֵּר is almost invariably transl. by **λαλεῖν** and אָמַר by **λέγειν.**

Vv. 15-18. THE RESULT OF HIS MORE FAVOURABLE CIRCUMSTANCES: CHRIST PREACHED, WHETHER OF SPITE OR GOOD-WILL.—Ver. 15. **τινές.** Are these included in the **πλείονες** of ver. 14 or not? We prefer to believe (so also Weizs., *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1876, p. 294 ff.) that the Apostle has changed his point of view. For is it conceivable that those who "had confidence" in his bonds should, on the other hand, "raise affliction" (ver. 17) for those bonds? He thinks now not so much of the emboldening of his Christian brethren as of the fact that the Gospel is being preached with great vigour over a wide area. Accordingly **τινές** may be taken by itself.—Probably **καί** goes with **φθόνον.** "Some preach . . . *actually* from envy and rivalry."—**ἔριν** = "rivalry" (not "strife"), as often. *Cf.* Thuc., vi., 31, 4; Æsch., *Eumen.* (ed. Paley), 933 (where used in a good sense). To whom does Paul refer? It has usually been taken for granted that it must be to his unwearying opponents, the Judaisers. So Myr., Alf., Lft., Franke (esp. *SK.*, 1895, p. 772), Duchesne and others. But, as Hpt. clearly shows, we have no grounds for assuming the existence of a definitely anti-Pauline Jewish-Christian party at Rome (so also Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 112-113). At the same time this jealousy of the Apostle, a matter of personal feeling, may well have arisen in the Jewish wing of the Roman Church. They would naturally be roused to some bitterness by Paul's emphasis on the universality of the Gospel and his neglect of its specially Jewish setting. But it is unreasonable to divide all the Christians of the Apostolic Age into Gentile-Christians and Judaisers. There would be many Jewish-Christians who never favoured the extreme methods or even doctrines of the latter. (*Cf.* M'Giffert's instructive discussion, *Apost. Age*, pp. 393-395, and Pfl., *Urchrist.*, pp. 147, 151.) It is indeed quite possible that those re-

δὲ καὶ δι' [r]εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουσιν· 16. οἱ μὲν[1] ἐξ [s]ἐριθείας[2] τὸν[3] Χριστὸν [t]καταγγέλλουσιν, οὐχ [u]ἁγνῶς, [v]οἰόμενοι θλῖψιν ἐπιφέρειν[4] τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου· 17. οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀγάπης, εἰδότες

r Chap. ii. 13; Eph. i. 5, 9. Several exx. in Sirach.
s See note *infra*.
t Acts xvii. 3; Col. i. 28. Often in Acts. Only twice in LXX.
u Only here in N.T.
v In N.T. only found besides in John xxi. 25; Jas. i. 7.

[1] **εξ εριθειας** . . . to end of ver. 16 and **εξ αγαπης** . . . to end of ver. 17 change places. So all edd. with ℵABD*EFGP 17, 23, 37, d, e, f, g, go. sah. cop. arm. æth., Bas., Euth.cod., Tert., Victorin. Non-transposition only found in D[b et c] KL (which om. **οι μεν εξ εριθ. . . . δεσμ. μ.**), Chr., Thdrt.

[2] So ℵAB³KP. **εριθιας** DEFG 114. (See Ws., *TK*., p. 141.)

[3] So Ti., W.H. (⌈ ⌉) with ℵ*ADEKP, Bas., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ws. om. **τον** with ℵca.BFG, Chr.cod. Trg., Alf., Lach. bracket **τον**.

[4] So DcEKL, Chr., Thdrt. All edd. **εγειρειν** with ℵABD*FG 17, 31, O.L. vg. sah. cop. arm. æth., Aug., Ambrst. (DbP, Euth.cod. **επεγειρειν**). Thphyl. (mg.) **προσφερειν**.

ferred to here are Pauline Christians who for some reason have a personal pique at the Apostle. (*Cf.* Ws., *Amer. J. of Theol.*, i., 2, pp. 388-389, who throws out the interesting suggestion that they may have been old teachers of the Church who had become jealous of Paul's high position, and so wished to outstrip him and destroy his popularity.) "Paul says nothing here which I have not experienced" (Calv.).—**τινὲς δὲ καί.** Although not explicitly, these, of course, belong to the **πλείονες** of ver. 14. **καί** marks the contrast with the preceding clause. — **δι' εὐδοκίαν.** The word can mean nothing else here than "goodwill". For it is placed in antithesis to **φθόνος** and **ἔρις**, and resumed by **ἀγάπη** below. *Cf.* Sirach, ix., 12, **μὴ εὐδοκήσῃς ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ ἀσεβῶν.**

Vv. 16-17. An overwhelming mass of authority is in favour of transposing these verses as above (see crit. note). *TR.* is simply an emendation based on the order in ver. 15.—Ver. 16. **οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης.** Is this a complete phrase or does **ἐξ ἀγ.** qualify the predicate **τ. Χρ. κηρύσσ.** supplied from ver. 15? The latter seems most natural, as it preserves the complete parallelism of the clauses, which would otherwise be disturbed by **οὐχ ἁγνῶς.**—**κεῖμαι** has practically become perf. passive of **τίθημι. τέθειμαι** is seldom used. (See Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 11, 6.) Exactly parallel are Luke ii. 34, **οὗτος κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν**; 1 Thess. iii. 3, **αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα.** "Am appointed."

Ver. 17. **ἐξ ἐριθείας.** Here virtually = "selfishness" (rather than "factiousness"). Originally, the character of a worker for pay. Now that which degraded the hired worker, in the estimation of antiquity, was his labouring wholly for his own interests, while it was a sign of the noble to devote himself to the common weal. This sense suits all N.T. passages (Rom. ii. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Gal. v. 20, Jas. iii. 14, 16). See Hpt.'s valuable note from which the above is condensed.—**τὸν Χ.** It is hard to say whether **τόν** ought to be retained. It would easily be accounted for as an assimilation to **τὸν Χ.** in ver. 15.—**καταγγ.** A distinction has been drawn between **καταγγ.** as confined to those sent by Christ and **κηρύσσ.** as applying to all preachers, including our Lord Himself. Probably they are quite synonymous here. *Cf.* an excellent note in Westcott (on 1 John i. 5) on the special signification of **καταγγ.** among compounds of **ἀγγέλλω** = "proclaim with authority, as commissioned to spread the tidings throughout those who hear them".—**οὐχ ἁγν.** "With mixed motives." *Cf.* Pind., *Ol.*, iii., 37, **μεγάλων ἀέθλων ἁγνὰν κρίσιν** (quoted by Alf.).—**οἰόμενοι.** "Purposing." So frequently in later Greek. Schmid (*Atticismus*, i., 128) quotes from Dio Chrys., Aristides and Philostratus. *Cf.* Phryn. (ed. Lobeck), 190, **βιβλίον . . . ὅπερ οἴεται δηλοῦν.** There is a sharp contrast between **εἰδότες** in ver. 16 and **οἰόμενοι** here.—**θλῖψιν ἐγείρειν τ. δεσμ. μ.** The balance of authority is in favour of **ἐγείρειν. ἐπιφέρειν** is probably an ancient gloss, which may have crept into some text from the margin. The phrase apparently means "to stir up vexation for me in my imprisonment". They attributed their own jealous feelings to the Apostle, and could

ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι. 18. [w] τί γάρ; [x] πλὴν[1] παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε [y] προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται· καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι. 19. οἶδα γὰρ[2] ὅτι τοῦτό μοι [z] ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως, καὶ [a] ἐπιχορη-

w Rom. iii. 3.
x Acts xx. 23 parall. to correct text here.
y Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47.
z Luke xxi. 13.
a Eph. iv. 16 is the only parall. The verb five times in N.T.

[1] So also Myr. with DEKL, d, e, f, vg. syrr. arm. æth. go., Chr., Thdrt. Ti., W.H., Trg. πλην οτι with ℵAFGP 17, sah., Ath.[528], Euth.[cod.], Thphl.[mg.] Ws. om. πλην with B, Ath.[cod.] See Ws., *TK.*, p. 103. There is much difference of opinion as to the *punctuation*. Ti. has comma after καταγγ., stop at χαιρω, and colon after χαρησ. Ws. has colon aft. χαιρω, stop aft. χαρησ. W.H. colon aft. χαιρω, comma aft. χαρησ. Lft. colon aft. both χ. and χαρησ. Hpt. and Vaughan would place interrogation aft. καταγγ.

[2] So Ti., Alf., Trg. with ℵADEFGKLP, d, e, f, g, vg. syrr. cop. arm. W.H., γαρ (δε in mg.). Ws. δε with B 37, 61, 116, sah. See his *TK.*, p. 68, where he suggests that it was natural to supplant δε by γαρ as confirming χαρησομαι.

not conceive a greater worry to him than that he should hear of their success in preaching.

Vv. 18-20. His joy in the preaching of Christ and expectation of success in his cause.—Ver. 18. There seems little doubt that we should read πλὴν ὅτι, as there would be a tendency to omit either word to simplify the sense. Ws. holds that πλήν was inserted because copyists did not notice that ὅτι is causal, introducing a protasis. But it is difficult to imagine this misunderstanding if ὅτι stood alone. τί γάρ probably goes closely with οἰόμενοι preceding. "Supposing they purpose, etc., what then? Only that . . . Christ is preached." τί γάρ has its usual classical sense. For πλ. ὅτι in this usage, *cf.* Acts xx. 22-23, τὰ . . . συναντήσοντα ἐμοὶ μὴ εἰδώς, πλὴν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα . . . διαμαρτύρεται.—προφάσει ε. ἀληθ. A common antithesis. The one party preached the Gospel, ostensibly for Christ's sake, really to gain their own ends.—The best punctuation of the next clause is that of W.H., who place a colon after χαίρω and a comma after χαρησ.—ἐν τούτῳ. Must not τ. mean "the fact that, in spite of my imprisonment, Christ is preached"? It seems far-fetched to refer it to his imprisonment.—χαίρω. Assuming that Paul's opponents here were Judaisers, Comm. have been driven to desperate shifts to explain his joy in their preaching. This verse was quoted in the early Church in favour of heretics, so that Chr., Th. Mps. and Thdrt. have to protest against the abuse of it (see Swete, *Th. Mps.*, i., p. 209). When reasonably interpreted it presents no serious difficulties. — ἀλλὰ κ. χαρήσ. Closely connected with the following verse, but not necessarily introducing a new subject (as Hfm.). It has almost the same force as if οὐ μόνον had preceded. The κοινή form for χαιρήσω, like ζήσομαι for ζήσω in N.T. *Cf. CIA.*, ii., 593, *b*, 18 (2 cent. B.C.). Found in LXX, where χαροῦμαι also occurs (W-Sch., p. 108, *n.* 8). This is a progressive future. *Cf.* Rom. vi. 2 (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 32). Perhaps we can detect, as some have suggested, a note of loneliness and resignation in this verse (*cf.* chap. ii. 21).

Ver. 19. The only apparent ground for reading δέ is its difficulty. γάρ (which has greatly preponderating authority) gives the reason for the continuance of his joy.—τοῦτο. There is no need to limit this to his captivity (so Kl.), or his worries and trial (De W., Lft.). It is used generally of his present circumstances. τοῦτο . . . σωτ. is quoted from Job xiii. 16 (LXX).—σωτ. We fail to see why this should be interpreted as the final eschatological salvation (so Ws., Lft., Kl., etc.). There is nothing in the context to justify such a thought. He has every reason to hope, he tells them, that he will see them again in peace (vv. 25-27). Surely he is thinking chiefly of his probable release, an expectation which admirably accords with the favourable view of his case which was evidently being taken at Rome. This interpretation (Chr., τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν λέγει) is strongly supported by the sense of the word in Job. xiii. 16, from which it is here quoted, where יְשׁוּעָה has not the usual deeper meaning which belongs to it in the Prophh. and Pss., but signifies

γίας τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 20. κατὰ τὴν [b] ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου, ὅτι ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, ἀλλʼ ἐν πάσῃ [c] παρρησίᾳ, ὡς πάντοτε, καὶ νῦν [d] μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστὸς ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου. 21. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν,[1] Χριστός[2]· [e] καὶ

b Only parall. in Rom. viii. 19. See Fritzsche, *Opuscc.*, p. 150 ff.

c Acts iv. 13, xxviii 31 *et passim.*

d Luke i. 46; Acts xix. 17.

e *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 6.

[1] Prob. to be spelt thus in N.T. See W-Sch., i., § 5, 11, d.

[2] F, Gʳʳ., d, e, f, vg. go. add **ἐστιν**.

victory in a contest for the right. *Cf.* also 2 Cor. i. 10 ff., a passage precisely akin to this, which favours the above idea of **σωτηρία**. [We find that Zahn uses almost the same arguments, Luthardt's *Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 300.] This verse is linked to ver. 12 by ver. 18. He desires their prayers for deliverance, and the promised Spirit of Christ (Luke xii. 12) to give him wisdom that he may know how to act. In any case (the thought crosses his mind that he may still be condemned) he hopes to glorify Christ whether in life or death.—**ἐπιχορ.** The absence of the article is no reason for joining **ἐπιχ.** closely with **δεήσ.** under the government of **ὑμῶν.** The gen. **τοῦ πν. Ἰ. Χ.** is quite sufficient to isolate **ἐπιχ.** "The supply given by the Spirit of Jesus Christ." This is the Spirit possessed by Christ Himself and communicated to all who abide in Him as members of His body. Of course Paul, at times, really identifies Christ with the Spirit, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xv. 45, 2 Cor. iii. 17. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 17. This identification springs directly from his own spiritual history. "The first 'pneumatic' experience Paul had was an experience of Christ" (Gunkel, *Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes*[2], p. 91). *Cf.* for the word **ἐπιχορ.** *Ep. ad Diogn.*, i., 10, **τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγοῦντος.** "A suitable and common word for the Giver God. . . . The generosity of its origin survives in the transfer" (Gildersleeve *ad loc.*).

Ver. 20. **ἀποκαραδ.** The concentrated intense hope which ignores other interests (**ἀπό**), and strains forward as with outstretched head (**κάρα, δοκεῖν**). *Cf.* Rom. viii. 19, **ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται.** The verb **ἀποκαραδοκεῖν** is found in Polyb., Plut., Joseph., Aquila.—**αἰσχυνθ.** very probably refers, in the main, to his own conduct, the danger of denying his Lord under stress of hardships, but there is also involved the thought of Christ's treatment of him. This gives the true antithesis to **μεγαλυνθ.**—**παρρησίᾳ.** We are inclined to believe that **π.** has its literal meaning, boldness of speech, for he has before him the danger of denying Christ. Of course there is implied the idea of courage in his whole bearing. The word is typical of the attitude of the early Christians.—**καὶ νῦν.** His trial is in process.—**μεγαλ. . . . θανάτου.** There is some force in Meyer's suggestion that passive verbs are used here because Paul feels himself the organ of Divine working. **ἐν τῷ σώμ.** "In my person." **σ.** in Paul is always a colourless word, the organ of the **ψυχή** or the **πνεῦμα,** and taking its character from its constituting principle. If he lives, it will be for the service of Christ, which is the highest honour he can pay his Lord. If he has to die, then his readiness to endure death and his calm courage in enduring will be the most eloquent testimony to the worth of his Lord.

Vv. 21-23. Death or life means Christ for him.—Ver. 21. **ἐμοί.** Why this emphasis? He knew that, after the expression of his joyful confidence and hope, the word **θάνατος** would come as a shock to their minds. There could be no question as to how men in general felt concerning life and death. But *he*, the Apostle, occupies a different standpoint. This standpoint he must explain. In spite of Haupt's strong arguments for taking **τὸ ζῆν,** not as bodily life, but as life in its general conception (including the future existence), we cannot help feeling that the antithesis of **ζωῆς** and **θανάτου** (ver. 20) necessitates the same contrast between **τὸ ζῆν** and **τὸ ἀποθανεῖν.** [Kabisch, *Eschatologie d. Paulus*, p. 134, goes the length of saying that Paul does not know the conception of life as an ethical quality; that it always means for him simply *existence*. Probably there may be more truth in this than we are at first sight, from our different modes

τὸ ἀποθανεῖν, κέρδος. 22. εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν [f] σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς [g] ἔργου [1] · καὶ τί αἱρήσομαι [2] οὐ [h] γνωρίζω. 23. [i] συνέχομαι γὰρ [3] ἐκ τῶν δύο, τὴν [k] ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς [4] τὸ [l] ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι,

f Gal. ii. 20; contrast Rom. viii. 12.
g See note *infr.*
h 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1; Gal. i. 11 *al.*
i Luke xii. 50; *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 14.
k Appar. the only N.T. ex. of this constrn.
l Also in Luke xii. 36 = return. Noun in 2 Tim. iv. 6.

[1] FG, O.L. vg., Iren^int., Victorin., Ambrst., *al.* add **εστιν**. W.H. read **εργου,—**.

[2] B **αιρησωμαι**. Blass **τι αιρησομαι;** so W.H. mg.

[3] So some minn., Thdrt. Edd. **δε** with ℵABDEFGKLP, O.L. vg. go. syr^p. æth. sah., Chr., Euth.^cod., Victorin., Ambrst. Trg. **γαρ** in mg.

[4] DEFG om. **εις**.

of thought, inclined to admit. To the Jewish mind non-existence was certainly one of the most terrible ideas conceivable.] If life meant for Paul wealth, power, self-gratification and the like, then death would loom in front of him with terror. But life for *him* means Christ. He is one with his Lord. And he knows that death itself cannot break that union, it can only make it more complete (because death is **σὺν Χ. εἶναι**, ver. 23). Thus it must be actual gain, a definite addition to his joy. Contrast the thought of *Apoc. of Bar.*, xiv., 12, in some degree similar: "the righteous justly hope for the end, and without fear depart from this habitation, because they have with thee a store of works preserved in treasuries".—**κέρδος.** *Cf.* Wisd. iii. 2, **ἔδοξαν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀφρόνων τεθνάναι, καὶ ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἀφ' ἡμῶν πορεία σύντριμμα· οἱ δέ εἰσιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.** In sharp contrast to Paul's statement, *cf.* Libanius, *Orat.*, xxvi., p. 595 A (quoted by Wetstein): **πάντως οἷς βαρὺ τὸ ζῆν κέρδος ὁ θάνατος.** See numerous apt illustrations in Wetstein.

Ver. 22. To show the diversities of interpretation to which this verse has given rise, it is enough to note that in the first clause Hpt. would supply **ζῆν ἐστιν,** while Ws. suggests **κέρδος.** Others regard the first two clauses as protasis (**τοῦτο** summing up the words preceding), making the apodosis begin with **καί.** The context suggests an explanation more simple and more natural. Paul has sought to convince them that death has no terror for him; that, on the contrary, it is pure gain. Yet he will not have them suppose that therefore life on earth (**ἐν σαρκί,** life with the encumbrance of sinful flesh) is a burden and a trouble. In the circumstances, as he points out immediately, it is probably best for him and them. And he will give a preliminary hint of this. Must we not supply **μοί ἐστι,** in thought, in the first clause? This is suggested both by **ἐμοί** preceding and by the **μοι** which follows. **ἐστί** has to be supplied, admittedly, in both clauses of ver. 21. There is no greater difficulty in doing so here. "But if life in the flesh be my portion, this means (so we must also translate the **ἐστί** supplied in first clause of ver. 21) for me fruit of (*i.e.*, springing from) labour." **τὸ ζῆν** is qualified by **ἐν σ.,** because the Apostle felt that he could not regard physical death as quenching his life. Death only meant fuller life, therefore he must define when he wishes to speak of life on this earth.—**καρπὸς ἔργου.** For the phrase see Ps. ciii. (civ.) 13, **ἀπὸ καρποῦ τῶν ἔργων σου χορτασθήσεται ἡ γῆ;** Wisd. iii. 15, **ἀγαθῶν γὰρ πόνων ὁ καρπὸς εὐκλεής.** Aptly Thphyl., **καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκὶ οὐκ ἄκαρπόν μοί ἐστιν· καρποφορῶ γὰρ διδάσκων καὶ φωτίζων πάντας.** — **τί αἱρήσ. τί** has practically ousted **πότερον** from N.T. It is quite natural to have the fut. indicat. in a deliberative sentence.—**γνωρίζω.** Its invariable meaning in N.T. = "make known". This sense suits almost every instance in LXX. So here, "I do not make known," "I cannot tell".

Ver. 23. **συνέχομαι δέ** (with most authorr.). **δέ** = "rather". *Cf.* Rom. iv. 20.—**συνέχ. ἐκ.** Apparently the idea is that of a strong pressure bearing upon him from (**ἐκ** the source) two sides and keeping him motionless. — **ἐπιθυμ. εἰς.** *Cf.* Thuc., iv., 81, **ἐπιθυμίαν ἐνεποίει τοῖς Ἀθην. συμμάχοις ἐς τοὺς Λακεδ.**—**ἀναλῦσαι.** Aor. of momentary action (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 50). Only here in N.T. in this sense. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 6, **ἀνάλυσιν;** Philo, Flacc. *ad fin.*, **τὴν ἐκ τοῦ βίου τελευταίαν ἀνάλυσιν.** Frequent in LXX and late Greek = depart. In Polyb. it usually means *castra movere.* — **σὺν Χ. εἶναι.**

πολλῷ[1] μᾶλλον [m] κρεῖσσον· 24. τὸ δὲ [n] ἐπιμένειν ἐν[2] τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαιότερον δι' ὑμᾶς. 25. καὶ τοῦτο πεποιθὼς οἶδα ὅτι μενῶ καὶ [o] συμπαραμενῶ[3] πᾶσιν ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν ὑμῶν [p] προκοπὴν καὶ χαρὰν τῆς πίστεως, 26. ἵνα τὸ [q] καύχημα ὑμῶν περισσεύῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐν ἐμοί,[4] διὰ

m Cf. Mark vii. 36; 2 Cor. vii. 13.
n Used by P. literally and metaphor., e.g., 1 Cor. xvi. 7 and Rom. xi. 23.
o With true text παραμενῶ, cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 6.
p See ver. 12 supr.
q Characteristic of P., e.g., Rom. iv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 15, also 2 Cor. v. 12 in different sense.

[1] So ℵ*DEFGKLP, f, vg. go. syrr. arm. æth., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. add **γαρ** with ℵ[a]ABC 6, 10, 17, 31, Clem.[541], Euth.[cod.], Ambrst., Aug. Ws., *TK.*, p. 120, assigns the omission to carelessness. D*FG, d, e, Victorin. **ποσω**.

[2] So Alf., Trg., Myr., Ws. with BDEFGKL, Thdrt., Thphl., O.L. vg. Ti., W.H. om. **εν** with ℵACP, c, k, o, Clem., Or., Chr. Myr. thinks **εν** might easily have been absorbed by the final syllable of **επιμενειν**. Ws. supposes it was omitted on the analogy of pass. like Rom. vi. 1, Col. i. 23, where **επιμ.** has a different meaning.

[3] So Myr. with D[c]EKLP, Chr., Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. **παραμενω** with ℵABCD*FG 17, 20, 31, 67**, arm., Euth.[cod.]

[4] FG, f, g place **εν Χ. Ι.** after **εν εμοι**.

From this passage and 2 Cor. v. 8 (but see also 1 Thess. v. 10) as compared with others, *e.g.*, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Cor. xv. 51, Beyschl. (*N.T. Theol.*, ii., 269 ff.), Teichmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 57-59), Grafe (*Abhandl. C. v. Weizsäcker gewidm.*, p. 276) and others conclude that the Apostle changed his views on eschatology in his later years, and esp. when death stared him in the face. Instead of supposing a sleep (**κοιμᾶσθαι**) until the Parousia, or else the direct experience of that event, he now believes that after death the soul is immediately united to Christ. It is, however, hazardous to build up eschatological theories on these isolated utterances of the Apostle. He has, apparently, no fixed scheme of thought on the subject. The Resurrection is not before his mind at all in this passage. His eschatology, as Dsm. (*Th. LZ.*, 1898, col. 14) well observes, must rather be conceived as **ἐλπίς**. Death cannot interrupt the life **ἐν Χριστῷ**. This is the preparation for being **σὺν Χ.** Even contemporary Jewish thought was familiar with a similar idea. So, *e.g.*, *Tanchuma*, *Wajjikra*, 8: "When the righteous leave the world they ascend at once and stand on high" (Weber, *Lehren d. Talmud*, p. 323). See also Charles, *Eschatology*, p. 399 ff.—**πολλῷ κ.τ.λ.** It seems necessary for the sense to insert **γάρ** with the best authorities. The double comparat. is fairly common.

Vv. 24-26. HIS PRESENTIMENT THAT HE WILL VISIT THEM AGAIN.—Ver. 24. **ἐπιμ.** seems common with Paul in a colourless sense.—**ἐν.** It is hard to decide whether it should be retained or not. No difference is made in the sense.—**ἀναγκ.** It is characteristic of the Apostle that the first thing which strikes him is the need of others. Wetstein quotes aptly from Seneca, *Epp. ad Lucil.*, p. 104, *ingentis animi est aliena causa ad vitam reverti quod magni viri saepe fecerunt.*

Ver. 25. **καὶ τ. π. οἶδα.** "With this conviction (*sc.*, that his life is needful for them) I know," etc. Paul does not claim to be infallible, but he is so confident of the Philippians' need of him that he cannot doubt that this will be God's purpose too. There is every reason to believe that his hope was justified (see *Introduction*).—**παραμενῶ** (which is best attested) has in later Greek the special sense of "remaining alive". See Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 132, who quotes Dio., i., 62, 8; 333, 29; Herod., i., 30, and compares Plat., *Phaed.*, 62 E, 86 C.—**εἰς τ. ὑ. προκ. κ.τ.λ.** Probably **προκ.** should be taken apart from **πίστεως**, which goes closely with **χαράν**. "With a view to your progress and the joy of your faith." **ὥστε στηριχθῆναι μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς καθάπερ νεοττοὺς δεομένους τῆς μητρὸς ἕως ἂν αὐτοῖς παγῇ τὰ πτερά** (Chr.).

Ver. 26. "In order that your ground of glorying may increase in Christ Jesus through me, by reason of my," etc. Their **καύχημα** is their knowledge and possession of the Gospel. Christ Jesus is the sphere in which this blessing is enjoyed. *Cf.* Sirach ix. 16, **ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου ἔστω τὸ καύχημά σου.**—**ἐν ἐμοί** is defined by the following clause. Paul looks on his presence with them as an occasion of advance in their Christian

τῆς ἐμῆς [r] παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 27. Μόνον ἀξίως τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ [s] πολιτεύεσθε, ἵνα εἴτε ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ὑμᾶς, εἴτε ἀπών, ἀκούσω[1] τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι [t] στήκετε ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ

r Usually in N.T. of Second Advent. Seldom as here.
s Acts xxiii. 1; 2 Macc. vi. 1.
t Chiefly in P., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 8.

[1] So Alf., Myr. (Lft. mg.) with ℵ^{a}ACD^{c}EFGKL, Chr., Euth.$^{cod.}$, Thdrt. Lach., Ti., W.H., Ws. **ακουω** with ℵ*BD*P 47, 57.

calling. **ἐν**, which here denotes strictly the *basis*, may be translated "through". This passage bears out the favourable turn which Paul's affairs have taken. He looks forward to rejoining them.

Vv. 27-30. Entreaty to live worthily of the Gospel in the face of conflicts.—Ver. 27. **μόνον** "gives the aim for which he wishes to remain alive" (Hfm.).—**ἀξίως . . . πολιτ.** For the whole phrase *cf. Inscrr. of Pergamon* (after 133 B.C.), Bd. ii., 496$_{8}$, **[ἀ]ναστρεφομένην καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἀξίως τῆς πόλεως** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 22). For **ἀξίως τ. εὐαγγ.** *cf. Inscrr. Perg.*, 521, of a priestess, **ἱερασαμένην ἀξίως τῆς Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος** (*op. cit.*, p. 75).—**πολιτεύεσθε.** In addition to reff. in marg., *cf.* Joseph., *Vit.*, 2; Paris *Papyr.*, 63, coll. 8, 9 (164 B.C.), in which a letter-writer claims for himself that he has **ὁσίως καὶ . . . δικαίως [πολι]τευσάμενος** before the gods (Dsm., *BS.*, p. 211); 1 Clem. *ad Cor.*, vi., 1. The word seems gradually to have lost its original sense of life in a community, and came to mean simply "live" or "behave". But probably a shade of its original significance often survives as here, to live as directed by certain regulations, certain laws. [Hort, *Christian Eccl.*, p. 137, would retain the strict sense, "live a community-life . . . one directed not by submission to statutes but by the inward power of the Spirit of fellowship".]—**ἀκούσω.** We should, of course, expect **ἀπὼν καὶ ἀκούσας** with some finite verb of knowing, but the Apostle, as so frequently, changes the expression of his thought in the process of its formation.—**στήκ. ἐν ἑ. πν.** Curiously enough, the second reference to citizenship (iii. 20) is followed by the same two verbs **στήκειν** and **συναθλεῖν** (so Gw.). This is the first direct exhortation to unity in the Epistle. Apparently there was a danger of friction. We have no reason to suppose that there had been serious divisions in the Philippian Church, but the case of Euodia and Syntyche (iv. 2) discloses perilous tendencies. This was not unnatural, for "the very energy of the Christian faith tended to produce energetic personalities" (Rainy, *Exp. B.*, p. 82). And so, apart from doctrinal differences altogether, divergences might arise on questions of method, organisation, etc., with serious consequences. The following words, **ἑνὶ πνεύματι,** viewed in the light of 1 Cor. xii. 9, 11, 13, suggest that the differences may have been due to a supposed superiority in spiritual endowments.—**ἑ. πνεύμ.** It is difficult to define precisely the Pauline idea of **πνεῦμα.** At times (*e.g.*, Rom. viii. 16) Paul speaks as if the Divine **πν.** and the human were two forces existing side by side, the Divine working upon the human. At others, the **πν.** in man seems to refer to the direct indwelling of the Spirit of God as the principle of new life imparted to man, *e.g.*, Rom. viii. 10. On the whole, we believe it is true to affirm that **πν.** in Paul is not a psychological but a religious term (so also Hpt. Kl. holds that Paul recognised a distinct **πν. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.** Hltzm. would identify this with the **νοῦς.** *Cf.* Cone., *Paul*, pp. 326-327). Here we are safe in holding that **ἑνὶ πν.** refers to the common, spiritual life implanted in them by the direct working of the Holy Spirit. Certainly this is its most usual significance in Paul. See an instructive discussion in Holsten, *Paulin. Theol.*, p. 11, who shows that when Paul uses **πν.** to denote the *human* spirit, apart from Divine working, it is when he is obliged to emphasise it as the inner power which moves in the hidden life, or when he draws a sharp contrast between the inner and outer side of human nature, laying stress upon the former as the essential, in opposition to the senses which cannot truly know.—**μιᾷ ψυχῇ.** Apparently Chr. and Th. Mps., with the best ancient versions, join **μ. ψ.** with **στήκ.** The words denote the common feeling, the agreement of heart and mind which was the result of possession of the same Spirit. *Cf.* Acts iv. 32. Kl. well compares the sense

[u] συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 28. καὶ μὴ [v] πτυρόμενοι ἐν μηδενὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντικειμένων· ἥτις αὐτοῖς μέν ἐστιν[1] [w] ἔνδειξις ἀπωλείας, ὑμῖν δὲ[2] σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· 29. ὅτι ὑμῖν[3] [x] ἐχαρίσθη τὸ[4] ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν· 30. τὸν αὐτὸν [y] ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες οἷον[5] εἴδετε[6] ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ νῦν ἀκούετε ἐν ἐμοί.

u Chap. iv. 3 (only other ex. in N.T.).
v Only here in N.T.
w Rom. iii. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 5.
x Acts iii. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 12; *cf.* Buttmann, *N.T. Gramm.*, p. 52.
y 1 Tim. vi. 12 *al.*; *cf.* Wisd. iv. 2 (with Grimm's note).

[1] So KL, syr^p., Thdrt., Dam. Ti., W.H., Ws., Alf. **εστιν αυτοις** with ℵABCD*FG 17, 61, d, e, f, g, go. arm.

[2] So DcEKL, f, vg. cop. go. æth., Chr., Thdrt., Ambrst. All edd. **υμων δε** with ℵABP 17, 31, 47, d, e, arm. syr^p., Aug. **ημιν δε** C*Dgr.*Fgr.G 73, g, Victorin.

[3] A 35, 71 **ημιν**.

[4] Om. **το** FG, 3, 68**, 73, 120, arm.

[5] **και** added by D*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst. C* inserts **και** after **ειδετε**.

[6] So edd. with ℵAB*CD*E* 17, Chr., Thdrt. **ιδετε** BcDcE**FGKLP, Clem., Euth.cod., Thphl.

of *camaraderie* which binds the soldiers of a country together. For an exhaustive discussion of **ψυχή** see Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, pp. 101-109.—**συναθλ. τ. π.** A comparison with iv. 3 would suggest "striving along with the faith" (so Lft., Vau.). This is certainly harsh. The parallel in Jude 3, **ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει**, favours the sense, "striving together (**συν**) *for* the faith". *Conjungat vos evangelii fides, praesertim cum illa vobis sit communis armatura adversus eundem hostem* (Calvin).—**τῇ πίστ.** Christianity regarded in its most characteristic aspect as the acceptance of God's revelation of mercy in Christ, and the resting upon that for salvation. **ἡ πίστις** gradually becomes a technical term. See Hatch, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 314; Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, i., p. 129 ff.

Ver. 28. **πτυρόμ.** is apparently used esp. of scared horses. So Diod. Sic., xvii., 34, 6, **διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ αὐτοὺς σωρευομένων νεκρῶν πτυρόμενοι.** It is found in Plut., *Reipub. Ger. Praec.*, p. 800, of a multitude. See Kypke *ad loc.*—**τ. ἀντικειμ.** Who are their adversaries? In ver. 30 he speaks of them as having the same conflict as *he* had when at Philippi and now has at Rome. In both these instances, most probably, his opponents were heathen. Further, when warning his readers against Jewish malice, what he usually fears is not that they will be terrified into compliance, but that they will be seduced from the right path. And, as Franke (Myr.[5] *ad loc.*) points out, the conflict here is for the **πίστις**, not for the **ἀλήθεια** of the Gospel. It is no argument against this that some of his reasoning would only have force for Jews, *e.g.*, suffering as a gift of God (so Holst., *Jahrb. f. prot. Th.*, 1875, p. 444). For he is speaking of the impression made upon them (the Philippians), and he uses Christian modes of expression. Probably therefore he thinks chiefly of their heathen antagonists, as, in any case, Jews seem to have formed a very small minority of the population. The pagans of Philippi, on the other hand, would struggle hard against a faith which condemned all idol-worship, for the extant remains at Philippi and in its neighbourhood show that they were an extraordinarily devout community. See esp. Heuzey et Daumet, *Mission Archéologique de Macédoine*, pp. iii., 84-86. At the same time we cannot exclude the possibility that he had non-Christian Jews in his mind as well.—**ἥτις.** "Inasmuch as this" (*sc.*, the fact of their not being terrified). The relative is, as frequently, attracted to its predicate. So **ἥτις**, agreeing with **ἐνδ.**, for **τοῦτο.** In the following words the true reading is **ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς.** That of *TR.* has arisen for the sake of symmetry with the succeeding clause.—**ἔνδειξις.** An Attic law-term. In N.T. only in Paul. Not found in LXX. It denotes proof obtained by an appeal to facts. See SH. on Rom. ii. 15.—**ἀπώλεια** has its usual Pauline antithesis **σωτηρία.** Paul has never defined **ἀπώλεια.**—All edd. read **ὑμῶν δέ.** Not only is it better attested (see crit. note), but it also deserves preference as being the harder reading and sufficient to explain

a 2 Cor. viii. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 13; Heb. xii. 5.

II. 1. Εἴ τις[1] οὖν [a]παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ, εἴ τι[2] [b]παραμύθιον ἀγάπης, εἴ τις [c]κοινωνία Πνεύματος, εἴ τινα[3] [d]σπλάγχνα καὶ [e]οἰκτιρ-

b See note *infr.* c 1 Cor. x. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Philm. 6 *al.* d See on chap. i. 8 *supr.* e *Cf.* esp. Col. iii. 12.

[1] τι Euth.cod. [2] τις D*L 17, 137.

[3] So Ws., Myr. with very few minn., Clem., Thdrt., Thphyl., O.L. (d, e, f, g, m), Victorin., Ambrst. τις Ti., Alf., W.H. with ℵABCDEFGKLP, *al.*, Chr.moscc, Euth.cod. τι 4, 18, 37, 46, 72, 74.

the other. It really includes ὑμῖν. The emphasis in Paul's mind changes from the persons to their destinies. It was quite natural to assimilate ὑμῖν to αὐτοῖς preceding. But there is also the thought that *they* (the adversaries) will be affected not only by the proof of their own destruction, but also by that of the Philippians' salvation.—τοῦτο seems to refer to ἔνδειξις. "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Ver. 29. ὅτι . . . ἐχαρίσθη. We are inclined to join this clause immediately to μὴ πτυρόμενοι (so also Hpt.). The prospect of suffering was apt to terrify them. But when they view suffering in its true light, they will discover that it is a gift of God's grace (ἐχαρ.) instead of an evil.—τὸ ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ. The Apostle intended to insert πάσχειν after Χρ., but for a moment he pauses. To emphasise the real value of suffering for Christ's sake, he compares it with that which they all acknowledge as the crowning blessing of their lives, faith in Him. As to the form of the sentence, this is a favourite rhetorical device of Paul's. See J. Weiss, *Beiträge*, p. 11 *n.*—οὐ μόνον. μή might have been expected. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative οὐ is used instead of μή. This principle applies esp. in the case of the adverb μόνον" (Burton, *MT.*, p. 183).—εἰς αὐτόν. The deepest aspect of faith, the intimate union into which the soul is brought.

Ver. 30. ἀγῶνα. For the fact, see Acts xvi. 19 ff. and *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 2. The metaphor has been prepared for by στήκετε and συναθλοῦντες. *Cf.* Epictet., iv., 4, 32 (quoted by Hatch, *Hibb. Lects.*, p. 156), "Life is in reality an Olympic festival: we are God's athletes to whom He has given an opportunity of showing of what stuff we are made". ἀγών was constantly used in later Greek of an inward struggle. See some striking exx. from Plutarch in Holden's note on *Timoleon*, xxvii., § 5.—ἔχοντες. A broken construction. It ought strictly to be dative agreeing with ὑμῖν. It can scarcely be taken as parallel with συναθλ. and πτυρ.—εἴδετε. See reff. above.—ἀκούετε. His Roman trial.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-4. Exhortation to unity of spirit and lowliness.—Ver. 1. εἴ τις κ.τ.λ. "If exhortation in Christ, if the appeal of love, if fellowship in the spirit, if compassion and pity have any effect."—οὖν probably refers back to i. 27.—παράκλησις has the two senses of "exhortation" and "consolation". But the whole context, supported by such passages as Eph. iv. 1, 1 Cor. i. 10, is in favour of the former. No doubt the idea of encouragement and stimulus is implied. This is an exhortation in Christ. That itself must gain for it a favourable reception.—παραμ. Only here in N.T. Once in LXX, Wisd. iii. 18. Almost equiv. to παράκλ., but having a suggestion of tenderness involved. It springs from his love towards them.—κοιν. πνεύματος. The community of believers is the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Christ, is the unifying Principle of life. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 13, ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. As Gunkel well observes (*Wirkungen d. heil. Geistes bei Paulus*[2], p. 69 ff.), Paul rendered an unspeakable service to the Church by emphasising this conception. By so doing he saved the exuberant spiritual gifts of the Apostolic Age from degenerating into mere unnatural excitement. All these came to be estimated according to their value for the community of believers as a whole.—τινα σπλάγχνα. There can be no doubt that an overwhelming weight of authority lies on the side of the reading τις. τινα is simply an emendation. How can τις be accounted for? We had hit upon the conjecture that originally τι may have stood in all the clauses. (So Euth. reads before παράκλησις.) It would be quite natural that from a slight misunderstanding of its meaning it should be changed into τις before παράκλ. and κοινωνία. The τι before σπλάγχνα (found in several

μοί, 2. [f] πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν, ἵνα [g] τὸ αὐτὸ [g] φρονῆτε, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, [h] σύμψυχοι,[1] τὸ ἓν[2] φρονοῦντες· 3. μηδὲν κατὰ [i] ἐριθείαν ἢ[3 4] [k] κενοδοξίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ [l] ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγού-

f John iii. 29. For constrn. *cf.* John xv. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3.
g Chap. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
h Only here in N.T.
i See note on i. 16.
k Only here in N.T.; 4 Macc. ii. 15, viii. 19.
l Not earlier than N.T.; Eph. iv. 2; Col. iii. 12 *al.* Jos., *BJ.*, 4, 9, 2, *αἰτιαθεὶς ἐπὶ ταπ.* = craven-heartedness.

[1] So Alf., Trg., Lach. with ℵB^cD^cEKLP. **συνψ.** Ti., W.H., Ws. with AB*CD*FG.

[2] So most edd. with ℵ^cBDFGKLP, d, e, g, syrr. arm. æth., Clem., Bas., Hil., Ambrst., Victorin. **το αυτο** W.H. (mg.) with ℵ*AC 17, 73, vg. go., Euth.^cod.

[3] So Myr. with D^gr.E^gr.FGKLP, f, g, syrr. go., Chr., Thdrt., Hil. Edd. **μηδε** with ℵABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. arm. æth., Euth.^cod., Victorin., Aug., Ambrst.

[4] Om. **κατα** TR., Myr. with ℵ^cDEFGKLP, f, g, go., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. **κατα** with ℵ*ABC 17, 31, 37, 116, d, e, m, vg. cop. syrr. arm., Euth.^cod., Vict., Hil., Aug., Ambrst.

minn., including 37) might easily assimilate the following **σ**. At this stage the type of text found in the leading uncials happened to arise. And so the error was stereotyped, although corrected later by Greek Fathers. Curiously enough this same conjecture has been made by Hpt. We do not overlook the difficulties involved, but allow it to stand for want of anything better.—**σπλάγχνα.** See on i. 8. He appeals to their pity.

Ver. 2. *Semper in discordiis aperta est janua Satanae ad spargendas impias doctrinas, ad quas repellendas optima munitio est consensus* (Calv.).—**πληρ. . . . ἵνα.** The **ἵνα** clause seems exactly = Latin *gerund*. *Cf.* an infinitive used in the same way in Acts xv. 10, **τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι κ.τ.λ.,** also Polyc., *Martyr.*, x., 1 (quoted by Burton, *MT.*, p. 92). **ἵνα** is probably "hypotelic" as Ell. (on Eph. i. 17) terms it, *i.e.*, "the subject of the wish is blended with and even (at times) obscures the purpose".—**τὸ α. φρον.** The general description of agreement which is analysed and defined in the succeeding clauses. Perhaps a common phrase in popular language. See *Sepulchr. Inscr.* (Rhodes, 2nd cent. B.C.), of a married couple, **ταὐτὰ λέγοντες ταὐτὰ φρονοῦντες ἤλθομεν τὰν ἀμέτρητον ὁδὸν εἰς Ἀΐδαν** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 84).—**τ. αὐτ. ἀγ.** The same feelings.—**σύμψ.** The same point of view in their common interests.—**τὸ ἓν** expresses the one concrete aim of their views, perhaps with special reference to the unity of the Church (so Lips.). Minute distinctions, however, must not be forced, as there is doubtless here much of what Vaughan terms "the tautology of earnestness".

Ver. 3. **μηδέν.** Probably, *sc.*, **φρονοῦντες,** although no addition is necessary. This is the prevalent thought in the Apostle's mind.—**ἐριθείαν.** It is no wonder that Paul should warn against this danger, seeing it was one of his most grievous vexations at Rome.—**ἤ.** Read with best authorities **μηδὲ κατά** (see crit. note).—**κενοδ.** Only here in N.T. Three times in LXX. Combined with **ἀλαζονεία** and **μεγαλαυχία.** The boastful expression of pride. Egotism and boastfulness were apparently the perils besetting the Philippian Church. These were natural excrescences of the zealous spirit which pervaded this community. It is a strange phenomenon in religious history that intense earnestness so frequently breeds a spirit mingled of censoriousness and conceit.—**τῇ ταπεινοφρ.** The construction seems exactly parallel to Rom. xi. 20, **τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν** = "on account of," "by reason of". Perhaps the article emphasises the generic idea (so Myr.). **ταπεινός** with derivatives, used in classical writers to denote a mean condition of self-debasement, had been already exalted by Plato and his school to describe that state of mind which submits to the Divine order of the universe and does not impiously exalt itself. It underwent a further stage of development in Christian literature, when it came to signify the spirit which most resembles that of Christ Himself. See an instructive note in Moule (*CT. ad loc.*).

Ver. 4. The authorities are pretty evenly balanced in the case of the alternative readings **ἕκαστος** and **ἕκαστοι** (see crit. note). Probably edd. are right in

m Chap. iii. 8, iv. 7.

μενοι [m] ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν· 4. μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστος[1] σκοπεῖτε,[2] ἀλλὰ καὶ[3] τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστος.[4] 5. τοῦτο γὰρ[5] φρονείσθω[6] ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ

[1] So ℵCDEKLP, d, e, go. syrr., Bas., Ephr., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. (Trg., W.H. mg.) εκαστοι with ABFG 17, 116, f, g, m, vg., Bas., Euth.cod., Amb.

[2] So L, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. σκοπουντες with ℵABCDEFGP, d, e, f, g, m, vg. go. arm. Bas., Euth.cod., Hil., Ambrst.

[3] Om. και D*FGK 61, d, e, f, g, m, vg., Victorin., Ambrst., *al.*

[4] So KL, d, go. syrr. arm., Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. εκαστοι with ℵABCvi.Dgr. Egr.P 17, 31, 47, cop. Bas., Euth.cod., Victorin., Aug. Om. FG, f, g, m, vg. æth., Ambrst. ℵ*AC 17, Cyr. join εκαστοι to following words. So W.H. mg.

[5] So Myr. with ℵcDEFGKLP, d, e, f, g, m, go. syrp., Chr., Thdrt., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst. Om. γαρ edd. with ℵ*ABC 17, 37, 73, kscr., cop. arm. æth., Euth.cod. Myr. holds that γαρ came to be omitted because the preceding εκαστοι (ver. 4) with the reading φρονειτε (ver. 5) was supposed to begin a new sentence.

[6] So Myr. with C3KLP, cop. arm. go., Or., Eus., Ath., Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. φρονειτε with ℵABC*DEFG 17, 67**, d, e, f, g, m, vg. syrr., Euth.cod., Cyr., Victorin., Ambrst. Myr. retains φρονεισθω as the harder reading.

preferring the latter, both on account of the variety of its witnesses and its aptness in the context. Besides, as the more difficult, it would be very liable to correction. σκοποῦντες has overwhelming authority in its favour. "No party having an eye for its own interests alone but also for those of the rest." ἕκαστοι (frequent in this sense in classical Greek) = each group, each combination.—ἑτέρων. Used with strict correctness as opposed to ἑαυτῶν. It often has a less strict usage in N.T. From the gentle way in which he deals with them, we cannot suppose that there was as yet any serious rent in the Philippian Church. Probably he has already in mind the party feeling roused by the disagreement between Euodia and Syntyche. The opinion of the Christian community was divided. This might, of course, lead to serious issues. He has already implored them to be of the same mind (ver. 2). The way of reaching this harmony is unselfishness. "Paul's ethic is at least as much a social as an individual ethic" (Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., 162. Instructive discussion).

Vv. 5-11. The condescension and exaltation of Christ. As to form, vv. 5-10 appear to be constructed in carefully chosen groups of parallel clauses, having an impressive rhythm (see J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, pp. 28-29).—Ver. 5. γάρ ought probably to be rejected with the best group of MSS. φρονείσθω, as the harder reading, has much in its favour, but φρονεῖτε is far better attested. τοῦτο φρονεῖτε κ.τ.λ. The ordinary translation runs, "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus". This means the supplying either of ἐφρονεῖτο (ἐφρονήθη) or ἦν in the latter half of the verse after ὃ. Certainly any past tense (passive) of φρονέω is not only very harsh, but, when analysed, yields no appropiate sense. ἦν is scarcely less harsh, for it would presuppose τοῦτο φρονεῖν (not τοῦτο alone) as the antecedent of ὃ. Deissmann (following Hfm.) supplies φρονεῖτε (*cf.* parallel construction in 2 Tim. i. 5), and translates, "Have this mind within your community (so also Hoelemann) which ye have also in Christ Jesus". This keeps the local meaning with both occurrences of ἐν (for we have here the common Pauline phrase ἐν Χ. Ἰ. as the sphere of the Christian life). It gives a vivid force to καί. It gets rid of the apparently superfluous use of ἐν ὑμῖν after φρονεῖτε. And φρονεῖτε is, of course, the easiest word to supply. The sense is thoroughly apt. Christians then, as now, were often different in their ordinary dealings and relations from what they were in their strictly Christian life. The two spheres were at times kept distinct. Those who professed to have made great sacrifices for the sake of Christ might never dream of making even the slightest for a brother. The keenest zeal may be displayed in religious work, accompanied by singular laxity of principle in the common concerns of daily business and social intercourse. At first sight the interpretation, perhaps, repels by its unfamiliarity. But it appears less difficult than the other possible expositions.

[n] καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 6. ὃς ἐν [o] μορφῇ Θεοῦ [p] ὑπάρχων, οὐχ [q] ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι [r] ἶσα [1] Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν [s] ἐκένωσε, 7. μορφὴν

n Cf. 2 Tim. i. 5 *ad fin.*
o See note *infr.*
p 1 Cor. xi. 7; Gal. ii. 14 (appar. same force). Extraord. common in Acts, often in seemingly colourless sense.
q See note *infr.* r Job xi. 12, xxx. 19. s Rom. iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3 (= make of no effect). Jer. xiv. 2, xv. 9 (transl. Heb. word = languish).

[1] So Trg. ἴσα Ti., Alf., W.H., Ws. Prob. the latter is more correct. The circumflex is, in all likelihood, an assimilation to the Epic language. See W-Sch., i., 68-69.

For Lft. and Vinc. practically ignore the difficulty, the former taking ἐφρονεῖτο = ὃ καὶ Χ. Ἰ. ἐφρόνει ἐν ἑαυτῷ. But that begs the question. Kl. thinks it impossible to separate the two spheres. (See Dsm., *Das N.T. Formel*, etc., p. 113 ff.; also Zahn, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 243, who quotes with approbation Victorinus *ad loc.*, *Hoc sentite in vobis quod sentitis in Christo.*) [O. Hain, *SK.*, 1893, pp. 169-171, following the same lines, takes the second φρονεῖτε = imperat. "As indeed ye must have in Christ Jesus." This is difficult to arrive at.]—ἐν ὑμῖν. Correct N.T. writers would usually employ ἑαυτοῖς. Classical authors use ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς.

Vv. 6-11. In the discussion of this *crux interpretum* it is impossible, within our limits, to do more than give a brief outline of the chief legitimate interpretations, laying special emphasis on that which we prefer and giving our reasons. As regards literature, a good account of the older exegesis is given by Tholuck, *Disputatio Christologica*, pp. 2-10. Franke (in Meyer[5]) gives a very full list of modern discussions. In addition to commentaries and the various works on Biblical Theology, the following discussions are specially important: Räbiger, *De Christologia Paulina*, pp. 76-85; R. Schmidt, *Paulinische Christologie*, p. 163 ff.; W. Grimm, *Zw. Th.*, xvi., 1, p. 33 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *ibid.*, xxvii., 4, p. 498 ff.; W. Weiffenbach, *Zur Auslegung d. Stelle Phil.*, ii. 5-11 (Karlsruhe, 1884); E. H. Gifford, *Expositor*, v., vol. 4, p. 161 ff., 241 ff. [since published separately]; Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 188 ff. It may be useful to note certain cautions which must be observed if the Apostle's thought is to be truly grasped. (*a*) This is not a discussion in technical theology. Paul does not speculate on the great problems of the nature of Christ. The elaborate theories reared on this passage and designated "kenotic" would probably have surprised the Apostle. Paul is dealing with a question of practical ethics, the marvellous condescension and unselfishness of Christ, and he brings into view the several stages in this process as facts of history either presented to men's experience or else inferred from it. [At the same time, as J. Weiss notes (*Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 263), the careful rhetorical structure of the passage (two strophes of four lines) shows that the thought has been patiently elaborated.] (*b*) It is beside the mark to apply the canons of philosophic terminology to the Apostle's language. Much trouble would be saved if interpreters instead of minutely investigating the refinements of Greek metaphysics, on the assumption that they are present here, were to ask themselves, "What other terms could the Apostle have used to express his conceptions?" (*c*) It is futile to attempt to make Paul's thought in this passage fit in with any definite and systematic scheme of Christology such as the "Heavenly Man," etc. This only hampers interpretation.

Ver. 6. ὅς. The discussions as to whether this refers to the pre-existing or historical Christ seem scarcely relevant to Paul's thought. For him his Lord's career was one and undivided. To suggest that he did not conceive a pre-existence in heaven is to ignore the very foundations of his thinking. Probably he never speculated minutely on the nature of Christ's pre-existent state, just as he refrains from doing so on the nature of the future life. He contents himself with general lines. The interpretation of the passage depends on the meaning assigned to (1) μορφή, (2) ἁρπαγμός, (3) τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.—In LXX μορφή denotes the form, appearance, look or likeness of some one, that by which those beholding him would judge him. See Job iv. 16, Dan. v. 6 and three other places, Wisd. xviii. 1, 4 Macc. xv. 4. Plainly, from the context of these passages, the word had come, in later Greek, to receive a vague, general meaning, far removed from the accurate, metaphysical content which belonged to it in writers like Plato and Aristotle. It seems, therefore, to us of little value, with Lft. and Gifford (*op.*

δούλου λαβών, ἐν [t] ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· 8. καὶ [u] σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, [v] ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν, γενόμενος [w] ὑπήκοος

t Rom. i. 23, viii. 3. LXX.
u 1 Cor. vii. 31.
v Matt. xviii. 4, xxiii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 7 *al.*
w Acts vii. 39; 2 Cor. ii. 9.

cit.), to discuss the relation of μορφή to terms such as οὐσία, φύσις and εἶδος in their philosophical refinements. It is far more probable that Paul uses μορφ. here "in a loose, popular sense, as we use 'nature'" (*Guardian*, Jan. 1, 1896). He means, of course, in the strictest sense that the pre-existing Christ was Divine. For μ. always signifies a form which truly and fully expresses the being which underlies it. But in trying to reach a conception of the pre-existing nature of his Lord, he is content to think of Him as the εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ (Col. i. 15), as sharing in that δόξα (on the close relation of μ. and δόξα see Nestle, *SK.*, 1893, pp. 173, 174) which is the manifestation of the Divine nature (*cf.* John xvii. 5, Heb. i. 3), as possessing, that is to say, the same kind of existence as God possesses, without indulging in speculations on the metaphysical relationship of the Son to the Father. So in 2 Cor. viii. 9 (the closest parallel in thought to this) he describes the same condition by the words πλούσιος ὤν. And this reminds us of the point of emphasis, the unspeakable contrast between the heavenly and earthly states, the μ. Θεοῦ and the μ. δούλου. The Apostle's mind is overpowered by the profound ethical meaning and value of the Humiliation.—ὑπάρχων. Probably = "being constitutionally" (Evans on 1 Cor. xi. 7), "being by nature". *Cf. Liturgy of S. James* (Hammond, *Litt.*, p. 45, quoted by Giff.), παιδίον γέγονεν ὁ πρὸ αἰώνων ὑπάρχων Θεὸς ἡμῶν. At the same time, in later Greek, it is often a mere copula. *Cf.* Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 2. This participle represents the imperfect as well as the present tense. So probably here.—ἁρπαγμόν. In the absence of relevant evidence for this word, its precise significance must largely be determined by the context. Accordingly it must be discussed in close connection with τὸ εἶν. ἴσα Θ. "Did not consider τὸ ε. ἴ. Θ. as an ἁρπαγμός." What is the relation of τὸ ε. ἴ. Θ. to μορφή? The words mean "the being on an equality with God" (R.V.). It is surely needless to make any fine distinctions here, as Giff. does (*op. cit.*, p. 242), between εἶναι ἴσος as = equality of nature and εἶναι ἴσα as pointing to "the state and circumstances which are separable from the essence and therefore variable or accidental," or, with Lft., to say that ἴσος would refer to the person, while ἴσα has in view the attributes. As a matter of fact the adverb ἴσα (neuter plural) is used in the most general sense, without any metaphysical subtleties, *e.g.*, Job. xi. 12, ἄνθρωπος δὲ ἄλλως νήχεται λόγοις· βροτὸς δὲ γεννητὸς γυναικὸς ἴσα ὄνῳ ἐρημίτῃ; xxx. 19, ἥγησαι δέ με ἴσα πηλῷ, ἐν γῇ καὶ σποδῷ μου ἡ μερίς. *Cf.* Thuc., iii., 14, ἴσα καὶ ἱκέται ἐσμέν; Soph., *Oed. R.*, 1188, ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ζώσας ἐναριθμῶ, and elsewhere. Thus no theological speculations can be based upon the word. Is τὸ ε. ἴ. Θ. equivalent to ἐν μ. Θ.? In spite of some Comm. there is absolutely nothing in the text to justify the supposition. Plainly μορφή has reference to *nature*; τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ to a relation. In fact it is only a particular rendering of ἁρπαγμός which suggested their equivalence. A more important question is whether τὸ ε. ἴ. Θ. was possessed by Christ in virtue of His being ἐν μορ. Θεοῦ. This will depend on the sense of ἁρπαγμός. It is generally admitted now that ἁρπαγμός may be regarded as = ἅρπαγμα. (See esp. Zahn, *Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, pp. 244-249.) *Cf.* θεσμός, lit. = "the laying down," "ordaining" of a thing, which comes to mean "the thing laid down," the ordinance or statute; ἱλασμός, lit. = a propitiating, appeasing, but usually the propitiatory offering, that by which propitiation is made (see Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 180). Myr., Hfm., Beet and others wish to keep the active meaning, and translate, "Did not consider the being on an equality with God as a means of robbing". But it seems impossible to accept this sense when we have no hint of what is to be robbed. Lft., Hpt., Vinc. and others, regarding ἁρπαγμός as = ἅρπαγμα, translate, "Did not look upon His equality with God as a prize to be clutched". That is to say, τὸ ε. ἴ. Θ. is something which He already possessed and resolved not to cling to. But will ἁρπαγμός admit of this meaning? We cannot find any passage where ἁρπάζω or any of its derivatives has the sense of "holding in possession," "retaining". It seems invariably to mean "*seize*," "*snatch violently*". Thus it is not permissible to glide from the true sense "grasp at" into one which is totally dif-

ferent, "hold fast". Are we not obliged, then, to think of the ἁρπαγμός (= ἅρπαγμα) as something still future, a *res rapienda?* *Cf. Catena* on Mark x. 41 ff. (quoted by Zahn), Jesus' answer to the sons of Zebedee, οὐκ ἔστιν ἁρπαγμὸς ἡ τιμή, "the honour is not one to be snatched". Observe how aptly this view fits the context. In ver. 10, which is the climax of the whole passage, we read that God gave Jesus Christ *as a gift* (ἐχαρίσατο) the name above every name, *i.e.*, the name (including position, dignity and authority) of Κύριος, Lord, the name which represents the O.T. Jehovah. But this is the highest place Christ has reached. He has always (in Paul's view) shared in the Divine nature (μ. Θεοῦ). But it is only as the result of His Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection and Exaltation that He *appears to men* as on an equality with God, that He is *worshipped by them* in the way in which Jehovah is worshipped. This position of Κύριος is the reward and crowning-point of the whole process of His voluntary Humiliation. It is the equivalent of that τελείωσις of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks. This perfection "He acquired as He successively seized the occasions which His vocation as author of salvation presented to Him, a process moving on the lines of His relations to mortal, sinful men" (Davidson, *Hebrews*, p. 208). Along the same lines He was raised to the dignity of Κύριος, which is a relation to mankind. (See on the relation of Christ as Κύριος to God, Somerville, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-142.) This equality with God, therefore, consists in the κυριότης, the Lordship to which He has been exalted. "*He did not regard the being on an equality with God as a thing to be seized, violently snatched.*" *Cf.* Heliodor., *Ethiop.*, vii., 20, οὐχ ἅρπαγμα οὐδὲ ἕρμαιον ἡγεῖται τὸ πρᾶγμα. He might have used the miraculous powers inherent in His Divine nature in such a way as to compel men, without further ado, to worship Him as God. Instead of that He was willing to attain this high dignity by the path of humiliation, suffering and death. Is not this interpretation strongly corroborated by the narrative of the Temptation? In that mysterious experience our Lord was tempted to reach τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ in the way of ἁρπάζειν, forcing men out of sheer amazement to accept His claim and exalt Him as Lord. [Perhaps the curious negative expression οὐχ ἁρπαγμ. κ.τ.λ. has been suggested by a comparison with the first Adam who sought to reach "equality with God" by means of ἁρπάζειν.] It is to be noted that the increased glory which Paul and all the N.T. writers regard as pertaining to Christ after His Resurrection has only to do with His dignity, His "theocratic position," not with His essential personality. (*Cf.* Ménégoz, *Le Péché et la Rédemption*, p. 164.) He has simply become ἐν δυνάμει, that which He already was substantially. *Cf.* Rom. i. 4, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Also Luke xxiv. 26.—ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε. Instead of appearing among men in the Divine μορφή and thus compelling them to render Him the homage which was His due, He "emptied Himself" of that Divine μορφή and took the μ. of a bond-servant. The Apostle does not specify that of which He emptied Himself, as the stress is laid upon the "emptying," but with μορ. δούλου λαβών added to explain what ἐκένωσε means, we are bound to conclude that he has in view its antithesis, μ. Θεοῦ. (So also Myr., Hfm., Alf., Weiffenb., Hpt., Bruce, Gore, etc. Fairbairn, *Christ in Mod. Theol.*, pp. 476-477, tries to show that Christ emptied Himself of the "physical attributes" of Deity while retaining the "ethical". But does this lead us any nearer a solution of the mystery in the depths of the Son's personality?)

Ver. 7. A question arises as to punctuation. W.H. punctuate as in the text. Calvin, Weiffenb. and Hpt. would place a comma after γενόμ. and a colon after ἄνθρωπος of ver. 8. This would co-ordinate these three clauses and make a new sentence begin with ἐταπείνωσεν. The division does not seem natural or necessary.—μ. δούλου λ. The clause defines ἐκένωσε. Christ's assumption of the "form" of a δοῦλος does not imply that the innermost basis of His personality, His "ego," was changed, although, indeed, "there was more in this emptying of Himself than we can think or say" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 119). δ. simply describes the humility to which He condescended. It is needless to ask whose δοῦλος He became. The question is not before the Apostle.—ἐν ὁμοιώ. ἀνθ. γεν. γεν. as opposed to ὑπάρχων, "becoming" as opposed to "being by nature". This clause, in turn, defines μ. δ. λ. "Being made in the likeness of men." ὁμοι. expresses with great accuracy the Apostle's idea. Christ walked this earth in the *real* likeness of

x Heb. xii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 9; 2 Macc. xiii. 14 (ἀγωνίσασθαι μέχρι θανάτου). y Only here in N.T.; Ps. xcvi. 9.

[x] μέχρι[1] θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.[2] 9. διὸ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν [y] ὑπερύψωσε, καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα[3] τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα·

[1] αχρι D*FG. [2] του σταυρου ℵ.

[3] So DEFGKLP, arm., Thdrt., Or., Eus., Ath., Epiph., Chr., Euth.cod. Edd. add το with ℵABC 17, Hipp., Dion.alex., Eus.bis (Alf. brackets το).

men. This was no mere phantom, no mere incomplete copy of humanity. And yet Paul feels that it did not express the whole of Christ's nature. It was not "an hereditary likeness of being" (Hltzm. See *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 70-72). It was, in a sense, borrowed.—ἀνθρ. Almost = "mankind," "humanity".

Ver. 8. καί seems to introduce a break. The Apostle goes on to describe the depth of the self-renunciation. No doubt there is here especially before Paul's mind the contrast between what Christ "*is* in Himself and what He *appeared* in the eyes of men" (Lft.).—σχήμ. = Lat. *habitus*, the external bearing or fashion, "the transitory quality of our materiality" (Gore).—εὑρεθείς. Each word in the description emphasises the outward semblance. "Being found, discovered to be." The verdict of his fellow-creatures upon Him. They classed Him as an ἄνθρωπος. His outward guise was altogether human.—ἐταπ. Even as man He endured great humiliation, for He suffered the shameful death of the Cross. For surely ἐταπ. is more than a vivid, lively way of expressing ἐκέν. (as Weiffenb., *op. cit.*, p. 42). The rest of the verse depicts His humiliation. That consists in His obedience and the terrible issue to which it led. As obedient, He gave Himself wholly up to His Father's will. And the course of following that will led as far as (μέχρι) death itself, no ordinary death (δέ bringing into prominence the special nature of it, *cf.* Rom. iii. 22, ix. 30), but a death of shame and suffering. *Cf.* Cic., *pro Rabir.*, v., 10 (quoted by Moule): *Mors si proponitur, in libertate moriamur . . . nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus.* This would come home with force to the minds of the Philippians who enjoyed the *jus Italicum*.

Ver. 9. διὸ . . . καί. On account of His great renunciation and obedience. An exemplification of His own maxim: "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted". καί marks the correspondence between His lowliness and God's exaltation of Him.—ὑπερύψ. This goes back beyond the ἐταπείν. to the ἐκέν. (So Kl.) It reminds them that Christ has reached a position, in a certain sense, higher than that which He occupied ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ. This has nothing to do with His nature. The Divine glory which he always possessed can never be enhanced. But now, in the eyes of men and as claiming their homage, He is on an equality with God. *Cf.* the realistic description of the exaltation in *Sheph. of Hermas* (quoted by Taylor, *Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, p. 167), *Sim.*, ix., 6, 1, ἀνήρ τις ὑψηλὸς τῷ μεγέθει ὥστε τὸν πύργον ὑπερέχειν. Also *Gospel of Peter*, 10, with Robinson's notes.—ἐχαρίσατο. "Gave as a gift." This is the Father's prerogative, for undoubtedly the N.T. teaches a certain subordination of the Son. *Cf.* John xiv. 28, Rom. i. 3-4, 1 Cor. viii. 6, and, most memorable of all, 1 Cor. xv. 28, where the Son, having accomplished His work, seems, according to the Apostle's view, to recede, as it were, into the depths of the Divine Unity.—ὄνομα. τὸ ὄν. should be read with the best MSS. It is quite possible that the last syllable of ἐχαρίσατο occasioned the omission of the article. To what does ὄνομα refer? It is only necessary to read on, and the answer presents itself. The universal outburst of worship proclaims that Jesus Christ is Κύριος, Lord, the equiv. of O.T. Jehovah, the highest title that can be uttered. The full significance of the name will only be realised when all the world acknowledges the sovereignty of Christ. As J. Weiss notes (*Nachfolge Christi*, pp. 63-64), this is not a specially Pauline conception, but belongs to the general faith of the Church. [It is amazing how Alf., De W. and Ead. can refer it to "Jesus," Myr. and Vinc. to "Jesus Christ," while Lft. and Hpt. regard it as = "dignity," "title," without specifying.] On the whole conception *cf.* Heb. i., esp. vv. 3-4. Perhaps the Apostle has in his mind the Jewish use of הַשֵּׁם, "the Name," as a reverent substitute for יהוה (LXX Κύριος), Jehovah. *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers* (ed. Taylor), iv., 7, and *Additional Notes*, pp. 165-167,

10. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ[1] πᾶν γόνυ [z]κάμψῃ[2] [a]ἐπουρανίων καὶ [a]ἐπιγείων καὶ [b]καταχθονίων, 11. καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα [c]ἐξομολογήσηται[3] ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,[4] εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πατρός.

z Eph. iii. 14; Isa. xlv. 23.
a E.g., 1 Cor. xv. 40.
b Only here in N.T.
c Perhaps closest parallels are Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; Ps. liii. 8

[1] Χριστου added by ℵ* 47, 73, 114, 115, Or., Chr., Cyr., Marc. [2] καμψει P.

[3] So Lach., Trg. (§), Ws., W.H. with ℵB, Ir., Clem., Thdrt., Eus., Ath., Cyr. Ti., Alf., Myr. -γησεται with ACDEFGKLP, Or., Chr., Euth.cod. Ws., *TK.*, 46, speaks doubtfully. The subjunct. may be an assimilation to καμψη, but, on the other hand, the indic. comes from Isa. xlv. 23. It is unsafe to decide, as ε and η in the post-classical period were often interchanged. See W-Sch., p. 48.

[4] Om. X. Fgr.G, g, m, Eus., Novat., Hil.

where Taylor compares with vv. 7-8 of our chap., Isa. liii. 12 and with ver. 9, Isa. lii. 13. Most appropriate to our passage is his quotation from Jeremy Taylor (*Works*, vol. ii., p. 72): "He hath changed the ineffable name into a name utterable by man, and desirable by all the world; the majesty is all arrayed in robes of mercy, the tetragrammaton or adorable mystery of the patriarchs is made fit for pronunciation and expression when it becometh the name of the Lord's Christ".—τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα. *Cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 22, "Angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him"; Eph. i. 21.

Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. Ἰ. Perhaps the best explanation is that of Weiffenb. (*op. cit.*, p. 51), "On the ground of this name (Κύριος)," *i.e.*, because of what it means for every worshipper. Of course, the worship is rendered to Him as Lord. Abbott (*Notes on St. Paul's Epistles*, p. 93) compares Ps. lxiii. 4, "Thus will I bless Thee while I live: I will lift up my hands in Thy name". *Cf.* also Ps. xx. 5, liv. 1. This *name*, which declares the true character and dignity of Jesus Christ, is both the basis and the object of worship. See the somewhat parallel use of εἰς τὸ ὄν. in Inscrr. (Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 144-145). For the history of the phrase and its Semitic basis consult *Die biblische "im Namen,"* by J. Böhmer (Giessen, 1898).—ἐπουρ. κ. ἐπιγ. κ. καταχθ. Aptly Thdrt., ἐπουρανίους καλεῖ τὰς ἀοράτους δυνάμεις, ἐπιγείους δὲ τοὺς ἔτι ζῶντας ἀνθρώπους καὶ καταχθονίους τοὺς τεθνεῶτας.—ἐπουρ. The heavenly spirits. "Paul regards the higher world as divided into a series of ascending spheres" (Beysch., *N.T. Th.* [E.Tr.], ii., 100).—καταχθ. It is needless to think of these in connexion with the Descent into Hades, although this subject had an extraordinary place in the minds of the early Christians (*cf.* Bruston, *La Descente du Christ aux Enfers*, Paris, 1897). Here simply = a general term for the dead. Often in sepulchral Inscrr. For the division of all beings into three regions Everling compares Ignat. *ad Trall.*, 9, ἀληθῶς ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἀπέθανεν, βλεπόντων τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ ὑποχθονίων (see his *Paulinische Angelologie u. Dämonologie*, Gött., 1888, pp. 83-84).

Ver. 11. Κύριος. See on ver. 6 *supr.* This is the characteristic confession of the Apostolic Church. It is most significant that Κύριος has no article, which shows that it has become virtually one of Christ's proper names. See Simcox, *Lang. of N.T.*, p. 49, and *cf.* Acts ii. 36, "Know assuredly that God made Him Lord as well as Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (so Hort); 1 Cor. xii. 3, Rom. x. 9, 1 Cor. viii. 6, where "One Lord" is parallel to "One God". Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 3) compares our verse with vv. 2-5. The invocation of one Lord is a bond of unity. The term "Lord" has become one of the most lifeless words in the Christian vocabulary. To enter into its meaning and give it practical effect would be to recreate, in great measure, the atmosphere of the Apostolic Age. [See, on the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Apostolic Age, an interesting essay by T. Zahn in *Skizzen aus d. Leben d. alten Kirche*, Leipz., 1894, pp. 1-38).—εἰς δ. Θ. The whole purpose of the working out of salvation is the glory of God the Father. This end is attained when men yield to His operations and acknowledge Christ as Lord. *Cf.* esp. Eph. i. 9-12.

Vv. 12-16. THE CHRISTIAN LIFE TO BE LED IN A SPIRIT OF AWE AND WATCHFULNESS, AS IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD'S WORKING. On vv. 12-13 see two important discussions, Schaeder, *Greifs-*

12. Ὥστε, ἀγαπητοί μου, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε, μὴ ὡς [1] ἐν τῇ [d] παρουσίᾳ μου μόνον, ἀλλὰ νῦν πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τῇ [d] ἀπουσίᾳ μου, μετὰ φόβου καὶ [e] τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν [f] κατεργάζεσθε· 13. ὁ [2] Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ [g] ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν [3] καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ

d See chap. i. 27.
e 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. vi. 5; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. xix. 16.
f Rom. v. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 10; *cf.* Heb. xii. 1, 2.
g 1 Cor. xii. 6; Gal. iii. 5.

[1] Om. B 3, 17, 38, 48, 72, cop. arm. æth., Chr., Ambrst. W.H. bracket. But, as Ws. shows (*TK.*, p. 122), ὡς was very liable to omission from carelessness. Prob. the -ως of καθώς might be the occasion.

[2] So D b et c EL, Chr., Thdrt. Edd. om. ὁ with ℵABCD*FGKP 17, Eus., Euth.cod.

[3] A adds δυναμεις.

walder Studien, pp. 231-260, and Kühl, *SK.*, 1898, pp. 557-580. Ver. 12. ὥστε. With what does it link the following verses? Paul has returned to practical exhortation. So we should naturally expect him to take up the thread which he dropped at ver. 6 on turning to the example of Jesus Christ. At that point he had been urging them to be of one mind. But with what aim? Especially in order that they might present an unbroken front in their conflict for the faith. But that brings us back to i. 27 ff. And that the connexion of our passage with the earlier paragraph is not arbitrary we may gather from the occurrence of the same idea in both, *viz.*, that of his own presence and absence. *Cf.* i. 27 *b* with ii. 12 *b*. At the same time there is also a link between vv. 12-13 and the passage immediately preceding. He introduces his admonition with obedience (ὑπηκούσατε). But Christ's lowliness consisted precisely in His ὑπακοή (ver. 8, ὑπήκοος). Christ has been exalted as the result (διό, ver. 9) of humble obedience. Corresponding to His exaltation will be their σωτηρία.—ὑπηκούσατε. We believe that this means obedience to God. See on ὥστε *supr.*—κατεργάζ. *Cf.* Gal. iv. 18.—μετὰ φ. κ. τρ. *Cf.* Eph. vi. 5, οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου. In both passages the phrase expresses the solemn responsibility to God which is always felt by those conscious of the Divine Presence, whether they are occupied with common tasks or the concerns of their spiritual life. *Nihil enim est quod magis ad modestiam et timorem erudire nos debeat quam dum audimus nos sola Dei gratia stare* (Calvin). Gunkel (*Wirkungen* [2], etc., p. 70) well contrasts the fear with which the Jew looked upon the Divine Presence with the calm joy which the Christian feels in such an experience.—τὴν ἑαυτ. σωτ. Such a use of ἑαυτῶν for ὑμῶν αὐτῶν is much more common in N.T. than in classical Greek. But *cf.* Demos., *Olynth.*, i., § 2, εἴπερ σωτηρίας αὐτῶν φροντίζετε. The emphasis is on ἑαυτῶν. Each of them is responsible for his own salvation before God. They must not lean on the Apostle. His absence must make no difference. "For the race is run by one and one and never by two and two" (R. Kipling).—σωτ. This is the end and aim of their faith. See 1 Pet. i. 9, τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.—κατεργ. The best comment on the distinctive force of κατεργ. is 2 Cor. vii. 10, ἡ γὰρ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται, where ἐργ. refers to a process in its mediate workings, while κατεργ. looks solely at the final result. So here almost = "make sure of your salvation," "carry it into effect". *Cf.* 2 Pet. i. 10. As Kühl (*op. cit.*, p. 560 ff.) points out, the Apostle does not think here so much of the moral effort, their deliberate conduct as such (so Schaeder). This, as the presupposition of salvation, would be alien to the Pauline point of view. Lowliness and obedience (the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως) are needful, that they may look away from themselves to Jesus Christ, who is the "author and finisher of their faith".

Ver. 13. ὁ must certainly be omitted with all the best authorities. "For *God* is He that works," etc. The emphasis lies on Θεός for two reasons. First, in the matter of attaining salvation they have to do *not* with Paul, but with God. Second, they must enter upon this momentous course not lightly, but "with fear and trembling," for if they miss the goal it means that they have deliberately

ἐνεργεῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς [h] εὐδοκίας.[1] 14. πάντα ποιεῖτε χωρὶς [i] γογγυσμῶν καὶ [k] διαλογισμῶν, 15. ἵνα γένησθε [l] ἄμεμπτοι καὶ [m] ἀκέραιοι, τέκνα Θεοῦ [n] ἀμώμητα [2] ἐν [3] [o] μέσῳ [3] γενεᾶς [p] σκολιᾶς καὶ [q] διεστραμμένης,

h See on chap. i. 15 *supr.* i Acts vi. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 9; *cf.* Exod. xvi. 7 *al.* k Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Tim. ii. 8. See note *infr.* l Chap. iii. 6; Luke i. 6; 1 Thess. iii. 13. Freq. in LXX., *e.g.*, Job i. 1. m Matt. x. 16; Rom. xvi. 19. n 2 Pet. iii. 14. For *v.l.* ἄμωμα, Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Col. i. 22. o See note *infr.* p Acts ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 18; Deut. xxxii. 5. Freq. in LXX., esp. Prov. q Matt. xvii. 17; Luke ix. 41; Acts xx. 30. Often in LXX.

[1] C, æth. add **αυτου.**

[2] So Myr. with DEFGKLP, Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Edd. **αμωμα** with ℵABC 17, 23, Clem., Vict.graec.

[3] So Db et cEKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. **μεσον** with ℵABCD*FGP 17, 23, 31, 67**, Euth.cod.

rejected the purpose of God. This explains the connecting **γάρ.—ὁ ἐνεργῶν.** It seems always to have the idea of *effective* working. In N.T. the active is invariably used of God. The middle is always intransitive. The verb has become transitive only in later Greek (*cf.* Krebs, *Rection d. Casus*, ii., 21). Many exx. occur in Justin M.—**τὸ θέλειν.** The first resolution in the direction of salvation takes its origin from God. So also does the **ἐνεργεῖν,** the carrying of this inward resolve into practical effect, the acting on the assurance that God's promise is genuine. *Cf.* Eph. ii. 8, **τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον.** To Paul the Divine working and the human self-determination are compatible. But "all efforts to divide the ground between God and man go astray" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 136).—**ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας.** "To carry out His own gracious will." So Thdrt. (see also Gennrich, *SK.*, 1898, p. 383, *n.* 1). His great purpose of mercy is the salvation of men. To realise this He surrounds them with the influences of His gracious Spirit. For the word *cf.* Ps. Sol. viii. 39, **ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν ἡ εὐδοκία εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.** Conyb.-Hows. and Hfm. would join **ὑπὲρ τ. εὐδ.** with the words following, but this would be unintelligible without **αὐτοῦ.** Blass boldly reads **ὑπὲρ (οὐ) τ. εὐδοκίας πάντα ποι.** (*N.T. Gramm.*, p. 132). Such procedure is arbitrary. Zahn and Wohl. (with Pesh. and O.L. versions) connect the words with **τὸ ἐνεργ.** preceding, and, comparing Rom. vii. 15-21, make **εὐδ.** = human inclination to goodness, *i.e.*, practically equiv. to **θέλειν.** But this is the interpretation of a subtle exegete, which would scarcely appeal to a plain reader. The interpretation given above, connecting **ὑπ. τ. εὐδ.** with **ὁ ἐνεργ.,** is thoroughly natural and has many parallels in Paul, *e.g.*, Eph. i. 5, 9, etc. See esp. SH. on Rom. x. 1. These verses are a rebuke to all egotism and empty boasting (see ii. 3).

Ver. 14. **γογγ.** Many Comm. understand **γογγ.** and **διαλογ.** as referring to God. This interpretation appears far-fetched and unnecessary. The whole discussion preceding has turned on the danger to their faith in being disunited. Is it not natural that when he speaks of "grumblings" and "discussions" he should point to their mutual disagreements? Would not these be the common expressions, *e.g.*, of the variance between Euodia and Syntyche? May they not be connected with the **ἑτέρως τι φρονεῖν** of chap. iii. 15? There has never been a hint of murmuring against God up till now. *Cf.* 1 Peter iv. 9, Wisd. i. 11, **φυλάξασθε . . . γογγυσμὸν ἀνωφελῆ καὶ ἀπὸ καταλαλιᾶς φείσασθε γλώσσης.** On **γογγ.** see esp. H. Anz, *Dissertationes Halenses*, vol. xii., pars 2, pp. 368-369.—**διαλογ.** Probably = disputes. Common in this sense in later Greek. *Cf.* Luke ix. 46. Originally = thoughts, with the idea of doubt or hesitation gradually implied. See Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 8.

Ver. 15. **γένησθε.** "That ye may become." A high ideal before Paul's mind to be reached by a gradual process.—**ἄμεμπτοι. οὐ μικρὰν γὰρ προσάγει κηλῖδα ὁ γογγυσμός** (Chr.). Perhaps **ἄμεμ.** refers to the judgment of others, while **ἀκέραιοι** denotes their intrinsic character (so Lft.). *Cf.* Matt. x. 16, where Christ exhorts the disciples to be **ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.—τέκνα Θεοῦ.** This whole clause is a reminiscence, not a quotation, of Deut. xxxii. 5, **ἡμάρτοσαν, οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα, μωμητά· γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη.** It is impossible to say whether Paul uses **τ. Θ.**

ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς [r]φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, 16. [s]λόγον ζωῆς [t]ἐπέχοντες,[1] εἰς [u]καύχημα ἐμοὶ εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς [v]κενὸν ἔδραμον, οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν [w]ἐκοπίασα. 17. Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ[2] [x]σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ [y]λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ [z]συγχαίρω[3]

r Rev. xxi. 11; Gen. i. 14, 16; Wisd. xiii. 2. s For the thought, *cf.* John vi. 68; Acts v. 20. Phrase only here. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. v. 19 *al.* t No parallel in N.T. or LXX. See note *infr.* u See on chap. i. 26. v Gal. ii. 2; *cf.* Rom. ix. 16; Gal. v. 7. w *Cf.* Isa. xlix. 4. x 2 Tim. iv. 6. y Ritual sense in Luke i. 23; Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21. More general use in 2 Cor. ix. 12, and prob. ver. 30 of this chap. Often in LXX. z Luke i. 58, xv. 6, 9; 1 Cor. xii. 26 = rejoice with.

[1] ℵ* εχοντες. [2] και ει FG, f, g, vg.

[3] So Trg., Alf. with ABcDcEKsil.L. Ti., W.H., Ws. συνχαιρω with ℵaB*CD*FGP. ℵ* om. και συνχαιρω.

in the strict sense common in N.T., or whether he employs the term more loosely as in Eph. v. 8.—The best authorities read **ἄμωμα,** the more usual N.T. word. **ἀμώμητά** may be due to **μωμητά** of LXX. —**μέσον** is certainly to be read instead of **ἐν μέσῳ,** with all leading authorities. It is one of those adverbial expressions which, in the later language, perhaps under the influence of Semitic usage, took the place of prepositions. *Cf.* Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 214, where several exx. are quoted from Porphyrogenitus, *de Caer.*—**σκολ. κ. διεστραμ.** The latter epithet is precisely = the Scotch expression "thrawn," "having a twist" in the inner nature.—**ἐν οἷς.** Sense-construction.—**φαίν.** Comm. differ as to whether **φ.** means here "appear" or "shine". Surely the appearing of a **φωστήρ,** a luminary, must be, at the same time, a shining. Both interpretations really converge in this context. [Calv. takes **φαίν.** as imperative, and compares Isa. lx. 2. This is by no means unlikely.] Probably **κόσμος** (= the whole universe of things) goes closely with **φωστῆρες,** emphasising the contrast, while nothing is said as to their influence on others. Christ Himself is **τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου** (John viii. 12). His followers are **φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ.** For **κόσμος** see Evans' excellent note on 1 Cor. ii. 12.

Ver. 16. **λ. ζωῆς.** For the connexion between this expression and **φωστῆρες** see John i. 4, **ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.** When Paul speaks of "life" as belonging to the Christian he means not merely the new power of holy living imparted to him, but the real presence of a truly Divine life which, although largely concealed for the present by the fleshly nature, is the pledge and actual beginning of life eternal. This is, in the Apostle's view, the supreme goal of the Christian calling. The Christian gospel, therefore, is a **λόγος ζωῆς.**—**ἐπέχοντες.** Its common meaning (as in Homer, etc.) is "holding forth". But the Apostle is not thinking of the influence exercised by his readers upon others. It is their own steadfastness in the faith that is before his mind in this passage. That tells against the interpretation of Field (*Otium Norvicense*, iii., pp. 118-119, following Pesh. with Michaelis, Wetstein, etc.), who translates, "being in the stead of life" (to it, *sc.*, the world), "holding the analogy of life". No doubt there are good exx. of the phrase in later Greek, but we are safe in saying that the ordinary N.T. reader would not understand **λόγ. ζ.** in this sense. Chr. and Thphl. take it as = "having in them" (a strengthened **ἔχειν**). Th. Mps. has "holding fast," which is also the gloss of Hesychius on the word (**κρατοῦντες**). There is practically no difference between the two last explanations. Either suits the context well. It was quite customary in late Greek to use intensified forms like **ἐπέχειν** as stronger equivalents for the simpler words.—**εἰς καύχ.** "For a ground of boasting." *Cf.* Zeph. iii. 20, **δώσω ὑμᾶς ὀνομαστοὺς καὶ εἰς καύχημα.** —**ἡμέρα Χ.** A combination only found in this Epistle. As the Apostle advanced in years the final result of his labours would have increasing prominence in his thoughts.—**ὅτι.** Does this introduce the ground of his boasting, or is it used in an "anticipative" sense = because? The latter seems necessary, as the reason of his boasting has already been given, their blamelessness and steadfastness.—**ἔδραμον . . . ἐκοπίασα.** These aorists look back from the day of Christ over the whole course of Paul's life and work. It is now finished, and it has not failed. We must translate by English perfects, "I have not run," etc. Lft. thinks that **ἐκοπ.** is a metaphor from "training" in athletic contests. See his important note

πᾶσιν ὑμῖν· 18. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετέ μοι.

19. Ἐλπίζω δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ[1] Ἰησοῦ, Τιμόθεον ταχέως πέμψαι ὑμῖν,[2] ἵνα

[1] Lach. Χριστω with CD*FG 38, 71, 74, d, e, g, cop.

[2] D*, O.L. vg., προς υμας.

on Ignat. *ad Polyc.*, vi., συγκοπιᾶτε ἀλλήλοις, συναθλεῖτε, συντρέχετε. But its occurrence in Isa. xlix. 4 (κενῶς ἐκοπίασα, εἰς μάταιον καὶ εἰς οὐδὲν ἔδωκα τὴν ἰσχύν μου) shows that it may be taken without any metaphorical significance.

Vv. 17-18. MUTUAL REJOICING IN CHRISTIAN SERVICE.—Ver. 17. "Nay, although I should even be offered (lit. 'poured out as a libation') upon the sacrifice and sacred service," etc. εἰ καί leaves abundant room for the possibility, as distinct from καὶ εἰ, which barely allows the supposition. See esp. Hermann on *Viger*, no. 307. The metaphor of this verse has given rise to much discussion. It is admitted that σπένδ. = to be poured out as a drink offering. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 6, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι. But what is the meaning of ἐπί? Is it "upon," "over," or "in addition to," "concurrently with"? Ell. and others, holding that the Apostle refers to *Jewish* sacrificial usages in which, it is said, the drink-offering was poured, not over the sacrifice but round the altar, decide for the latter sense. Paul's life would be a sacrifice additional to that of their faith. But, in writing to the Philippians, it is far more likely that he should illustrate from heathen ritual in which the libation took so prominent a place. In that case we have an apt parallel in Hom., *Il.*, xi., 775, σπένδων αἴθοπα οἶνον ἐπ' αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσι, where ἐπί can scarcely mean anything but "upon". After all, the decision between the two does not affect the sense. The offering of Paul in either case, instead of being a cause of sadness and despair, is really the climax of their sacrifice, the libation which crowns it. Zahn (*op. cit.*, p. 296-297), followed by Hpt., joins ἐπί with χαίρω in the sense of "I rejoice on account of the sacrifice," etc. This is certainly attractive, but seems too bold in view of the order of the words. —τῇ θυσίᾳ κ. λειτ. τ. πίστ. Here, again, unnecessary difficulties have been raised over the question whether Paul or the Philippians are to be regarded as offering the sacrifice. There is no evidence that the Apostle wishes to strain the metaphor to the breaking point. He has been urging them to preserve their Christian faith pure and unfaltering. That will be a joy to him in the day of Christ. But now another thought crosses his mind. What if in his Christian labours he should fall a victim? The idea gives a sacrificial cast to his thinking, and he regards their faith (*i.e.*, virtually, their Christian profession and life), on the one hand, as a θυσία, an offering presented to God (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1), and, on the other, as a λειτουργία, a sacred service, the presenting of that offering. (For the ritual use of λειτ. in Egyptian Papyri see Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 137-138). "Even although I should fall a victim to my labours in the cause of Christ, I rejoice because your faith is an accomplished fact. I rejoice on my own account (χαίρω) because I have been the instrument of your salvation. I also share in the joy (συγχαίρω) which you experience in the new life you have received." This paraphrase, perhaps, expresses the real force of the words in their close connexion with the context. We can see no ground for translating συγχαίρω (with Lft. and others) as "congratulate," a translation which surely misses the point of the language. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 26.

Ver. 18. τὸ δ' αὐτό. Adverbial use = ὡσαύτως. *Cf.* Matt. xxvii. 44.—συγχαίρ. This is, of course, a different joy from that which he shares with them. It is their joy in his obtaining the martyr's crown.

Vv. 19-24. HIS PURPOSE TO SEND TO THEM TIMOTHY, A GENUINE FRIEND OF THEIR COMMUNITY.—Ver. 19. Clemen (*Einheitlichkeit d. paulin. Briefe*, p. 138) seeks to prove that vv. 19-24 do not belong to this context. This is to forget the flexibility and rapid transitions natural to a friendly letter. The last paragraph, in spite of its joyful tone, ended with a note of anxious foreboding for the Philippians. He will dispel the dark shadow.—ἐν Κ. Ἰησ. *Cf.* ver. 24 *infr.*, and the repeated occurrence of this and cognate phrases all through Paul's Epistles. See the note on chap. i. 1 *supr.* His intention depends on the will and power of Christ, just as its

κἀγὼ [a] εὐψυχῶ, γνοὺς τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν. 20. οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω [b] ἰσόψυχον, ὅστις [c] γνησίως τὰ περὶ [1] ὑμῶν [d] μεριμνήσει. 21. οἱ πάντες γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτῶν [e] ζητοῦσιν, οὐ τὰ τοῦ [2] Χριστοῦ [3] Ἰησοῦ. 22. τὴν δὲ [f] δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ

a Only here in N.T.
b Only here in N.T.; Ps. liv. 14.
c Only here in N.T.
d 1 Cor. vii. 34, xii. 25; Exod. v. 9; Bar. iii. 18.
e 1 Cor. x. 24, xiii. 5.
f In N.T. only in Paul, *e.g.*, Rom. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 9. Rare word. Ps. lxvii. 31 (Symm.).

[1] L υπερ.

[2] So some minn., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. om. του with ℵABCDEFGKLP, Clem.

[3] So Ti., Ws., W.H. (⸢ ⸣) with BL, cop. syr.p. æthro., Thdrt., Thphl., Chr.308 txt. Trg., Alf., Lft., Myr., W.H. (mg.) Ι. Χ. with ℵACDEFGP 17, 39, 47, 115, O.L. vgcle. am. tol. syr.sch. arm., Clem., Chr.304 com., Euth.cod., Victorin., Ambrst. Χριστου K, æthpp., Cyp.307.

performance will be regulated with a view to His glory—πέμψαι. We should expect future infinitive, but the aorist is often used instead "after verbs of hoping and promising in which *wish* or *will* intrudes" (Gildersleeve on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 12, 23).—κἀγώ. He takes for granted that the visit of Timothy will cheer the Philippians. It will cheer him also to know how they do.—εὐψυχῶ. Common in sepulchral Inscrr. in the form εὐψύχει, "farewell!" There are a few exx. elsewhere, *e.g.*, Joseph., *Ant.*, xi., 6, 9, of Ahasuerus, καὶ τὴν Ἐσθὴρ εὐψυχεῖν καὶ τὰ κρείττω προσδοκᾷν παρεθάρρυνεν.—γνοὺς has probably a slightly ingressive force, "when I come to know".

Ver. 20. ἰσόψυχον. "Compounds with ἰσο- usually mean not merely 'like,' but 'as good as,' or 'no better than'" (Jebb on Soph., *O.T.*, 478). To whom does it refer? De W., Myr., Vinc. and others refer it to Paul. But surely it can only apply to Timothy. At least the relative sentence seems to necessitate this interpretation. "I have no one like-minded, I mean having that kind of mind (ὅστις) which will, etc. . . . but ye know his approvedness." Besides, if he were thinking of himself, must he not have added ἄλλον to οὐδένα? —γνησίως, "genuinely". There is no apparent necessity to take it (with Lft. and Vinc.) as = "by an instinct derived from his spiritual parentage". γν. is used frequently in secular writers = true, genuine. *Cf.* Phocyl., 2, γνήσιος φίλος; Pind., *Olymp.*, ii., 21, γνησίαις ἐπ' ἀρεταῖς. *Cf.* chap. iv. 3.—μεριμνήσει = "give one's thoughts to a matter". *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 33, and see a good note in Jebb on Soph., *O.T.*, 1124.

Ver. 21. οἱ πάντες . . . ζητ. This verse has roused surprise. Where were all Paul's faithful brethren in the Lord? Has he no one but Timothy to fall back upon? It must be borne in mind that we have to do with a simple letter, not a treatise, or history of Paul's work. The Apostle speaks in an outburst of strong feeling, for he is a man of quick impulses. He does not for a moment mean that he has no genuine Christian brethren in his company. But he had found, in all probability, that when he proposed to some of his companions, good Christian men, that they should visit far-distant Philippi, they all shrank, making various excuses. Timothy alone is willing, the one man he can least afford to spare. It is hard to part with him at such a critical time. No wonder that he should feel hurt by this want of inclination on the part of the other brethren to undertake an important Christian duty. No wonder that he should speak with severity of a disposition so completely opposed to his own. *Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 33, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ σύμφορον ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν. See esp. Calvin's excellent note *ad loc.*—Χ. Ἰ. The authorities are almost equally balanced as to the readings. See on chap. i. 1 *supr.*

Ver. 22. δοκιμήν. "Approvedness." That character which emerges as the result of testing. *Cf.* Jas. i. 12.—ὡς πατ. τέκ. κ.τ.λ. A mixed construction, the result of refined feeling. Paul first thinks of Timothy as his son in the Gospel, serving him with a son's devotion. But before the sentence is finished, his lowliness reminds him that they are both alike servants of a common Lord, equal in His sight.—εἰς seems here practically equiv. to ἐν, as so frequently in later Greek. The fact is one of real importance for exegesis. (See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 210;

εὐαγγέλιον. 23. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, [g] ὡς ἂν ἀπίδω [1] τὰ περὶ ἐμέ, [h] ἐξαυτῆς· 24. πέποιθα δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς ταχέως ἐλεύσομαι.[2] 25. ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἡγησάμην Ἐπαφρόδιτον τὸν ἀδελφὸν [i] καὶ [i] συνεργὸν [3] καὶ [k] συστρατιώτην [4] μου, ὑμῶν δὲ [l] ἀπόστολον, καὶ

g See note *infr.*
h See note *infr.*
i Of twelve exx. in N.T. only one outside Paul's writings. See esp. Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21; Philm. 24; 2 Macc. viii. 7.
k Philm. 2.
l John xiii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 23; 1 Kings xiv. 6 (A.).

[1] So Ws. with B[3]C (απειδω) DcEKsil.LP, Chr., Thdrt. Ti., Trg., W.H., Alf. αφιδω with ℵAB*D*FG 17, Euth.cod. Ws. admits that αφ. is better attested, but considers it, nevertheless, to be an ancient copyist's blunder, due to the analogy of ἀφορᾶν. He compares εφισταται (εφ.) in 1 Thess. v. 3. See also Acts iv. 29, *v.l.*, εφιδε. (*TK.*, p. 141. See also W-Sch., p. 39, *a*).

[2] So edd. with ℵcBDEFGKL, d, e, g, syrp. arm. æth. go., Euth.cod., Thdrt., Dam., Victorin. προς υμας added by ℵ*ACP 23, 39, 57, 115, f, vg. cop. syrsch., Chr.[305], Thphl., Ambrst. Ws. (*TK.*, p. 109) gives exx. of prepositional additions of this kind appearing in ancient as well as later MSS.

[3] Om. D*, d, e, Victorin., Ambrst.

[4] So ℵBKLP. Edd. συνστρατ. with ACDEFG. This is one of the orthographical points on which Bousset (*Textkrit. Studien*, pp. 102, 103) bases a grouping of N.T. MSS., assigning ℵB to the Hesychian recension. See his very important discussion.

Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 91; Krumbacher, *Kuhn's Zeitschr.*, 27, pp. 543-544). One can hardly discover here the idea of purpose.

Ver. 23. **μέν.** He emphasises the coming of Timothy as distinct from his own.—**ὡς ἄν.** *Cf.* Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xi. 34. "As soon as I shall have thoroughly ascertained my position." This temporal use of **ὡς ἄν** seems foreign to classical prose. It almost means "according as I shall". **ἄν** marks the uncertainty which surrounds the whole prospect. (See W-M., p. 387; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 126.)—**ἀπίδω.** On the form see the crit. note *supr.* **ἀπό** emphasises his turning away his attention from other things and concentrating it upon his own situation, *i.e.*, gaining a definite knowledge of how his affairs stand. Mynster (*Kleine Theolog. Schriften*, p. 173) points out that this verse proves that the Epistle could not have been written at Cæsarea.—**ἐξαυτῆς.** Chiefly in Acts in N.T. = Latin *ilico*. A Hellenistic word. See Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck), 47.

Ver. 24. **ἐν Κυρίῳ.** See on ver. 19. Every mood of Paul's inner life he desires to regulate by the mind and will of Christ.—**ὅτι.** "When an *action* is to be produced, **πείθειν** takes the infinitive, when *belief*, **ὅτι** (of objective knowledge) sometimes infinitive" (Gildersl. on Justin M., *Apol.*, i., 8, 8).

Vv. 25-30. News of Epaphroditus: a cordial welcome for him at Philippi bespoken.—Ver. 25. This verse opens a passage which Clemen (*op. cit.*, pp. 138-141) assigns to the second of the two letters into which he proposes to divide the Epistle. See our *Introduction*. The Apostle, as a matter of fact, passes most naturally from the two visits which he half promises to the return of Epaphroditus, which is an immediate certainty.—**ἡγησ.** Epistolary aorist. He writes from the point of view of those who receive the letter.—**Ἐπαφ.** Only mentioned in this Epistle, unless we are to suppose him to be the same person as **Ἐπαφρᾶς** of Col. i. 7, Philm. 23. Such contractions of names were quite common, *e.g.*, **Ζηνᾶς** = **Ζηνόδωρος**, **Μενίστας** = **Μενίστρατος** (see W-Sch., pp. 142-143). But this hypothesis ill accords with the description in Col. iv. 12, **Ἐπ. ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν**, to say nothing of the fact that, on our view of the dating of the Imprisonment-Epistles, Epaphras would by this time have left Rome.—**ἀδ. κ. συνεργ. κ. συστρ.** Aptly Anselm: *Frater in fide, cooperator in praedicatione, commilito in adversis.* There is no need to suppose (with Gw.) that **συνεργ.** implies that Epaphroditus was in the ministry, or (with Ws.) that **συστρ.** points to Paul's conflict at Philippi. Both terms suit his circumstances at Rome.—**ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπ. κ. λειτ. τ. χρ. μ. ἀπόστολος** is always used of some one entrusted with a mission; it is a word of dignified tone. Moule (*PS.*, p. 133) thinks we have here "a gentle pleas-

[m] λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 26. ἐπειδὴ ἐπιποθῶν [n] ἦν πάντας ὑμᾶς,[1] καὶ [o] ἀδημονῶν, διότι ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἠσθένησε[2]· 27. καὶ γὰρ ἠσθένησε [p] παραπλήσιον θανάτῳ[3]· ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἠλέησεν,[4] οὐκ αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμέ, ἵνα μὴ λύπην [q] ἐπὶ λύπῃ[5] σχῶ.[6] 28. [r] σπουδαιοτέρως[7] οὖν ἔπεμψα αὐτόν, ἵνα, ἰδόντες

m Rom. xiii. 6, xv. 16; Heb. viii. 2. Freq. in LXX.
n Periphrasis very common in Mark, Luke and Acts. In Paul, only Gal. i. 22. See Blass, *N.T. Gramm.*, pp. 198, 199.
o Only Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33.
p Only here in N.T. See W-M., p. 590.
q See note *infr.*
r *Cf.* (although differing) Luke vii. 4; 2 Tim. i. 17; Tit. iii. 13.

[1] So ℵcBFGKLP, f, g, vg. go., Chr., Thdrt., Victorin. Lach. (brackets), W.H. (brackets), Myr. add ιδειν with ℵ*ACDE, d, e, syrr. cop. arm. æth. Euth.cod., Dam., Thphl., Cassiod. Myr. would account for its omission by assimilation to chap. i. 8. But its insertion is equally well accounted for by the same phrase in Rom. i. 11, 1 Thess. iii. 6, 2 Tim. i. 4.

[2] D*E*FG, O.L. vg. αυτον ησθενηκεναι.

[3] So Ti., Trg., Alf., Ws. with ℵ*ACDEFGKL. W.H. θανατου with ℵcBP 29, 31, 44, 80, 115, Chr., Euth.cod.

[4] So KL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. ηλ. αυτον edd. with ℵABC**DEFGP 17, 37, 116, O.L. vg. syrr. arm., Euth.cod., Victorin., Ambrst.

[5] So Chr.montf., Thdrt. Edd. λυπην with all MSS.

[6] D*EFG 1, 23, 44 εχω.

[7] σπουδαιοτερον D*FG.

antry," their gift being a sort of Gospel to him. But its ordinary Greek use as = "delegate" makes this unnecessary.—**λειτουργόν.** "Minister." Evidently the technical, ritual use of this word and its cognates which prevailed in the post-classical age and is found in LXX (of priests and esp. Levites) and Egyptian Papyri (see H. Anz, *Dissertationes Philol. Halenses*, xii., 2, pp. 346-347; Dsm., *BS.*, p. 137 ff.) suggests the idea of their gift as being a sacrifice, an oblation to God. In chap. iv. 18 he calls it expressly a **θυσία.** See an interesting discussion of Paul's use of pagan terms in *Expository Times*, x., Nos. 1-5, by Prof. W. M. Ramsay.

Ver. 26. **ἐπειδή.** Only three times elsewhere in Paul. The difference between it and **ἐπεί** is tersely stated by Ell. (*ad loc.*), who notes that it "involves the quasi-temporal reference which is supplied by **δή**, and thus expresses a thing that at once ensues (temporarily or causally) on the occurrence or realisation of another".—**ἐπιπ. ἦν.** A common N.T. construction. Perhaps the use of the imperfect may be due to Aramaic influence (see Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 113 ff.). In classical Greek it is fairly frequent with the perfect and pluperfect. See Kühner, *Ausführl. Gramm.*, ii., p. 35, *n.* 3.—**πάντας.** The Apostle wishes to disarm all prejudices against Epaphr.—**ἀδημονῶν.** "In sore anguish." In its two other occurrences in N.T. it describes the agony in Gethsemane. While not found in LXX (but several exx. in Symmachus) it occurs a few times in later Greek. The derivations usually given are doubtful.—**ἠκούσατε.** Probably we must suppose that the Philippians, on hearing that Epaphrod. was ill, had written a letter to which *this* is the answer.—**ἠσθένησε.** We might translate, "had fallen sick," an ingressive aorist. But with the same tense in ver. 27, perhaps it is better to look upon the aorist as summing up the whole experience of Epaphrod. as a single fact, and viewing it in this light. This is a common Greek usage (see Burton, *MT.*, p. 20).

Ver. 27. **καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.** "For truly he *was* sick," etc., **καί** intensifying the force of **ἠσθέν.—θαν.** The more common construction of **παραπλ.**, backed by a preponderating weight of authority, favours the dative. The endings **-ου** and **-ῳ** were frequently interchanged in the MSS. (see Ws. *TK.*, p. 18).—**λύπην ἐπὶ λύπην.** The reading **λύπῃ** is merely a simplifying of the construction. The accusative must be read. The usage is practically = **ἐπί** with dative. It denotes the heaping up of one thing upon another with the notion of addition predominant. *Cf.* Matt. xxiv. 2, **οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον**; Isa. xxviii. 10, **θλίψιν ἐπὶ θλίψιν προσδέχου**; Ps. Sol. iii. 7, **οὐκ αὐλίζεται ἐν οἴκῳ δικαίου ἁμαρτία ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαν.** See Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 338.—**σχῶ.** Equiv. to our "get". This is the force of the aorist.

αὐτὸν πάλιν, χαρῆτε, κἀγὼ [s] ἀλυπότερος ὦ. 29. [t] προσδέχεσθε οὖν αὐτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς, καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους [u] ἐντίμους ἔχετε· 30. ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [1] [v] μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισε, [w] παραβουλευσάμενος [2] τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα [x] ἀναπληρώσῃ [3] τὸ ὑμῶν [y] ὑστέρημα τῆς πρός με λειτουργίας.

s Only here in N.T. Common in Greek writers.
t Rom. xvi. 2; 1 Chron. xii. 18.
u Luke vii. 2, xiv. 8; Isa. xxviii. 16.
v See chap. ii. 8 *supr.*
w Only here in N.T. See note *infr.*
x 1 Cor. xvi. 17. *Cf.* Plat., *Symp.*, 188 E (quoted by Grimm), εἴ τι ἐξέλιπον, σὸν ἔργον, ὦ Ἀριστόφανες, ἀναπληρῶσαι.
y In this sense only in Paul, *e.g.*, Col. i. 24. A few exx. in LXX.

[1] So DEKL, Chr., Thdrt., Dam. Lach., Ti., Trg., Ws. **Χριστου** alone with BFG 73, 80 (W.H. mg.). W.H. (⌈⌉) **Κυριου** with ℵAP 17, 31, 47, cop. syr^p. arm. æth., Euth.^cod. (Trg. mg.). Alf., Myr., Lft., Hpt. **το εργον** alone with C. Ws. (*TK.*, p. 7), arguing in favour of **Χριστου,** holds that, through misunderstanding, it was either omitted or (on the analogy of 1 Cor. xv. 58, xvi. 10) altered into **Κυριου.**

[2] So CKLP, Chr., Euth.^cod., Thdrt., Dam. Edd. **παραβολευσαμενος** with ℵABDEFG 177, 178, 179, d, e, g (*parabolatus de anima sua*).

[3] **αναπληρωσει** ℵ 17, 114, 116, d.^scr. **πληρωση** B 36, 43, 44, 109 *al.*

Ver. 28. **σπουδ.** The more regular form is the inferior reading **σπουδαιότερον,** which is due to some copyist. But that in **-ως** is also found in classical Greek. See W-Sch., p. 98. It is quite possible that we have here, as frequently in later popular Greek, a comparative with superlative force (see Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 33). "I sent him with all haste" (including the notion of anxiety and concern which belongs to **σπουδαῖος**).—**ἔπεμ.** Epistolary aorist.—**ἀλυπότ.** Their joy means the lifting of a burden from his heart. He sympathised with Epaphroditus' yearning for home. He sympathised with the Philippians' anxiety for their brother. Chr. aptly quotes Paul's own words in 2 Cor. xi. 29, **τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι.**

Ver. 29. Behind these words must lie some unknown circumstances which affected the feelings of the Philippians towards Epaphrod. It is not sufficient to suppose (with Ws.) that they would be disappointed because he had not stayed long enough at Rome. The **πάσης χαρᾶς** and **ἐντίμους** surely point to some alienation on which we have no light.

Ver. 30. **τὸ ἔργον κ.τ.λ.** The true reading is very difficult to determine with such a conflict of authorities. We are inclined to believe that **τὸ ἔργ.** stood alone as in C. This is certainly the hardest reading of all to account for. At a very early date additions like **Χριστοῦ, Κυρίου,** etc., would be sure to be made.—**μέχρι.** A somewhat rare use of **μ.** *Cf.* Rev. xii. 11, **οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἄχρι θανάτου,** and chap. ii. 8.—**παραβολευσ.** Here, with the great majority of the best authorities, we must read **παραβολευσάμενος.** It is a **ἁπ. λεγ.,** probably formed from **παράβολος,** rash, reckless. *Cf.* the legal term **παράβολον** (later, **παραβόλιον**), the stake which has to be deposited by an appellant, and is forfeited if the action be lost. "Having hazarded his life." *Cf.* the exact parallel in Diod., 3, 36, 4, **παραβαλέσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς.** What risk did he run? Hfm. suggests that his illness was produced by his arrival in Rome during the hot season of the year. Chr. thinks of danger at the hands of Nero. Wohl. supposes that his illness was the result of his severe missionary labours in Rome. May it be that the Apostle was now confined in a far more unwholesome bondage than before (one of the noisome State-prisons? See *Introduction*), and that the assiduous services of Epaphrod. to him there, brought on this severe illness? We believe that this interpretation is justified by the next words **τὸ ὑμ. ὑστέρ. . . . λειτ.** In what was their service towards the Apostle lacking? Evidently in nothing save their own personal presence and personal care of him. This would be the more urgently needed if Paul's outward surroundings had become less favourable. For the phrase **ἀναπλ. τὸ ὑστ.,** *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 17, **τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα οὗτοι ἀνεπλήρωσαν;** 2 Cor. xi. 9.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-3. A SALUTATION CHANGED INTO A WARNING.—Ver. 1. **τὸ λοιπόν.** Probably A.V. rightly trans-

a Rom. xii. 11 (but no exact parallel. So, many exx. in Provv.).

III. 1. ΤΟ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί μου, χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ. τὰ αὐτὰ[1] γράφειν ὑμῖν, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐκ [a] ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ [b] ἀσφαλές.[2] 2. [c] βλέπετε τοὺς [d] κύνας, βλέπετε τοὺς κακοὺς [e] ἐργάτας, βλέπετε τὴν

b No relevant parallel. c Partly parallel are 1 Cor. i. 26, x. 18; 2 Cor. x. 7. Also Mark xiii. 23.
d Matt. vii. 6; Rev. xxii. 15. e See note *infr.*, and *cf.* Matt. ix. 37; Luke xiii. 27; 2 Tim. ii. 15.

[1] ταυτα ℵ*FGP (cop. *ista*).

[2] το ασφαλες A* vid. 23, 31, 37, 73, 238, Procop.

lates "finally" (summing up all his exhortations to them). It must, however, be remembered that in late Greek **λοιπόν** had come to mean scarcely more than **οὖν**. Even in Plato, *Gorg.*, 458 D, there is something very closely approaching this usage. *Cf.* Matt. xxvi. 45 (and on it Aars in *Zw. Th.*, xxxviii., 3, pp. 378-383), Acts xxvii. 20 (where Blass translates by *jam*), 2 Tim. iv. 8. For instances in Epictetus see *Class. Review*, iii., p. 71. It is used regularly in this sense in Modern Greek. (*Cf.* also Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 135.)—**χαίρετε.** This is the impression he wishes to leave upon them. *Cf.* chap. ii. 18, iv. 4.—**τὰ αὐτά.** Alf., Ws., P. W. Schmidt and others refer this to his injunctions concerning joy. But that explanation does not seem to accord with the rest of the verse. "To go on writing the same thing is not irksome (tedious) to me, while for you it is safe." In what cogent sense would it be *safe* to urge them to rejoice? But an excellent meaning is found when we connect the words with the warning that follows. That warning is expressly given for their *safety*. Nothing is more probable than that Paul had frequent correspondence with the Philippians. He must, for instance, have thanked them for their various gifts. In all likelihood, then, **τὰ αὐ.** refers to warnings formerly addressed to them against dangerous teachers apt to lead them astray. He prepares the way for a similar utterance here by a certain tone of apology. Perhaps the slight friction in the Philippian Church, which is hinted at here and there, may have been connected with tendencies in the direction of Judaising. If a connexion is necessary between **χαίρετε** and the subsequent warnings (which is very doubtful in an informal letter like this), it is obvious that the formation of parties (Jewish and heathen-Christian) would, above all things, mar the spirit of Christian joy. [Clemen (*Einheitlichk.*, pp. 139-140) cuts the knot by deriving the latter half of ver. 1 from the redactor. The whole section from iii. 2 to iv. 3 belongs to an old letter to the Philippians. Chap. iv. 4 is the continuation of chap. iii. 1a.] Franke, on the occurrence of this strong warning towards the close of the letter, well compares the parallel case of Luther who, in prospect of death, could not depart without wishing for his followers not only the blessing of God but also hatred of the Pope (Myr.,[5] p. 13).

Ver. 2. It is difficult to understand how anyone could find three different classes in these words (*e.g.*, Ws., who divides them into (*a*) unconverted heathens, (*b*) self-seeking Christian teachers, (*c*) unbelieving Jews. See also his remarks in *A. J. Th.*, i., 2, pp. 389-391). The words are a precise parallel to Paul's denunciations of Judaising teachers in Galatians and 2 Corinthians. *Cf.* Gal. i. 7, 9, v. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 13, ii. 17. The persistent and malicious opposition which they maintained against him sufficiently accounts for the fiery vehemence of his language. To surrender to their teaching was really to renounce the most precious gift of the Gospel, namely, "the glorious liberty of the sons of God". For, in Paul's view, he who possesses the Spirit is raised above all law. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 17, and see Gunkel, *Wirkungen*[2], etc., pp. 96-98.—**βλέπετε.** Thrice repeated in the intense energy of his invective. Literally = "look at" them, in the sense of "beware of" them. It is not so used in classical Greek. Apparently some such significance as this is found in 2 Chron. x. 16, **βλέπε τὸν οἶκόν σου, Δαυείδ.** Frequent in N.T. (see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 87, *n.* 1). He would have used a stronger word than **βλ.** had the Judaisers already made some progress at Philippi. There is nothing to suggest this in the Epistle. But all the Pauline Churches were exposed to their inroads. At any moment their emissaries might appear.—**τοὺς κύνας.** Only here in Paul. Commentators have tried to single out the point of comparison intended, some emphasising the *shamelessness* of dogs, others their

[f] κατατομήν· 3. ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ [g] περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι Θεῷ [1] [h] λατρεύοντες, καὶ [i] καυχώμενοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ [2]

f See note infr.
g See note infr.
h Luke i. 74; Rom. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3 al. Freq. in LXX, e.g., Josh. xxiv. 14.
i More than thirty exx. in Paul; e.g., Rom. ii. 23, v. 11. Cf. Jer. ix. 23, 24; Sir. l. 20 (num. exx. in Sir.).

[1] So ℵ^c D*P, d, e, f, m, vg. go. syr^sch. et p. txt. arm. æth., Chr., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. Θεου with ℵ*ABCD^c EFGKL, cop. syr^p. mg., Eus., Euth.^cod., Ath.

[2] και ου σαρκι D^gr. E^gr.

impurity, others their *roaming tendencies*, others still their *insolence* and *cunning*. Most probably the Apostle had no definite characteristic in his mind. **κύων** was a term of reproach in Greek from the earliest to the latest times. *E.g.*, Hom., *Il.*, xiii., 623. Often in O.T. So here.—**τ. κακ. ἐργ.** *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 13, **ἐργάται δόλιοι.** We have here clear evidence that the persons alluded to were within the Christian Church. They did professedly carry on the work of the Gospel, but with a false aim. This invalidates the arguments of Lips., Hltzm. and M'Giffert (*Apost. Age*, pp. 389-390), who imagine that the Apostle refers to unbelieving Jews, probably at Philippi. —**τ. κατατομήν.** A scornful parody of their much-vaunted **περιτομή.** W-M. (pp. 794-796) gives numerous exx. of a similar paronomasia, *e.g.*, Diog. Laert., 6, 24, **τὴν μὲν Εὐκλείδου σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολήν, τὴν δὲ Πλάτωνος διατριβὴν κατατριβήν.** Lit. = "the mutilation". Their mechanical, unspiritual view of the ancient rite reduces it to a mere laceration of the body. The word occurs in *CIG.*, 160, 27; Theophr., *Hist. Plant.*, 4, 8, 10; Symm. on *Jerem.*, xlviii., 37 = notch, cutting, incision. It is only found here with any reference to circumcision.

Ver. 3. **ἡμεῖς.** The contrast drawn, which has already been before his mind in the ironical expression **κατατομή.**—**ἡ περιτ.** In LXX it is only found in Gen. xvii. 12, Exod. iv. 25 (Jer. xi. 16 has another sense). The verb **περιτέμνω** is very common. Perhaps the choice of this particular compound to denote the rite of circumcision is due, as Dsm. (*BS.*, p. 151) suggests, to the Egyptian use of it as a technical term for the same custom, long in vogue among the Egyptians. Examples are found in the Papyri. Paul uses it here in its strict sense as a token of participation in the covenant with God and of obligation to maintain it. But the further idea belonged to it of being the outward symbol of an inward grace. *Cf.* Deut. xxx. 6. As the rite was regarded essentially as one of purification, the grace associated with it was a cleansing process. This explains expressions like that in Jer. ix. 26, etc.—**οἱ . . . λατρεύοντες.** The participle has become a noun denoting a class of men, spiritual worshippers. Contrast Heb. viii. 5, xiii. 10, and *cf.* Heb. ix. 14. Most edd. with a number of high authorities read **Θεοῦ** (see crit. note *supr.*). This gives a peculiar combination: "who worship by the Spirit of God". But the occurrence of **σαρκί** immediately after clearly suggests the favourite Pauline antithesis of **πνεῦμα** and **σάρξ.** In that case **Θεῷ,** which is supported by some excellent evidence, would be the natural reading, governed by **λατρεύοντες.** Aptly parallel is Rom. i. 9, **ὁ Θεὸς ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου.** Certainly **Θεοῦ,** as the more difficult reading, must be considered. But as **λατρεύω** had come to have the technical sense of worshipping God, the word might be altered at an early date to get rid of a superfluity.—**λατρ.** In LXX it is used exclusively of the service of God, true or false. But it is distinguished from its synonym **λειτουργεῖν** as including the worship of the people as well as the ritual of the priests and Levites. See esp. SH. on Rom. i. 9.—**καυχώμενοι.** One of the Apostle's most characteristic words. It expresses with great vividness the high level of Christian life at which he is living: "exulting in Christ Jesus". It belongs to the same triumphant mood which finds utterance so often in this Epistle in **χαίρω.** This victorious Christian gladness ought to sweep them past all earthly formalism and bondage to "beggarly elements".—**οὐκ ἐν σ. πεποιθ.** **οὐκ** (instead of **μή**) emphasises the *actual* condition of their own Christian life.—**ἐν σαρκί.** On the phrase see Dsm., *N.T. Formel "in Christo,"* p. 125, who regards it as following the analogy of the Pauline **ἐν Χριστῷ.** This is manifestly so in our instance where the expressions stand in juxtaposition. *Carnem appellat quicquid est extra Christum* (Calvin). Here **σάρξ** has a double antithesis, both **Χ. Ἰ.** and

πεποιθότες· 4. καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων [k]πεποίθησιν καὶ[1] ἐν σαρκί· εἴ τις [l]δοκεῖ ἄλλος[2] πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί, ἐγὼ μᾶλλον· 5. περιτομῇ[3] [m]ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ [n]γένους Ἰσραήλ, [o]φυλῆς Βενιαμίν,[4] [p]Ἑβραῖος ἐξ

k 2 Cor. viii. 22; Eph. iii. 12 *al.* Once in LXX, 2 Kings xviii. 19. Condemned by Atticists. See Rutherford, *New Phryn.*, 355. l See note *infr.* m Only here in N.T. See note *infr.* n 2 Cor. xi. 26; Gal. i. 14. Freq. in this sense in LXX. o Acts xiii. 21; Rom. xi. 1 *al.* LXX. p 2 Cor. xi. 22.

[1] Om. και D*E*FG, 4, 30, 73, d, e, f, g, Zahn (*Luthardt's Zeitschr.*, 1885, p. 184).

[2] αλλος δοκει DEFG, 73, 74, O.L. vg. go. syr^p., Victorin.

[3] Edd. with overwhelming weight of authority περιτομῃ.

[4] So Alf. with DE. Ti., Trg., W.H., Ws. Βενιαμειν with ℵABL 37*, 47, Euth.^cod.

πνεύματι. The ordinary use of "self" in the popular religious vocabulary corresponds with wonderful accuracy to the Pauline σάρξ (so also Moule). For a strangely kindred conception *cf.* Seneca, *ad Marc.*, 24, 5: *illi* (*animo*) *cum hac carne grave certamen est* (quoted by Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 21). Of course σάρξ has become a technical term in Paul's controversy with the Judaisers, and that particular side of its meaning must always be kept in view (see Romans and Galatians *passim*).—πεποιθ. The word occurs no less than six times in this short Epistle. Paul has reached firm convictions on the highest things. He *knows* what he believes and what he rejects. That is the real explanation of his strong, exultant joy.

Vv. 4-6. Paul's confidence in the flesh.—Ver. 4. A very close parallel to the thought is found in 2 Cor. xi. 18-23. —καίπερ . . . ἔχων. A rare construction in N.T. Three exx. occur in Hebrews. Viteau (who regards it as a survival of the literary language, see *Le Verbe*, p. 189) would resolve the clause and its context into εἰ καὶ ἔχω πεποίθησιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί, ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες (p. 117), which seems a reasonable explanation.—πεποίθησιν. The Apostle realised to the full what was involved in being a Jew. He felt the high prerogatives of the chosen people of God. *Cf.* Rom. iii. 1-2. They were the heirs of the promises in a unique manner. But these remarkable privileges ought to have produced in them willing submission to God's universal purpose of mercy instead of being incentives to mere self-complacency and bitter prejudice.—καὶ ἐν σ. Zahn (see crit. note *supr.*) omits καί with some good authorities, assigning its origin to a false exegesis which believed that Paul *had* some fleshly trust besides his Christian boasting. But καί seems quite in place, as Paul is simply, for the moment, regarding himself from a purely Jewish standpoint.—εἴ τις δ. πεπ. "If anyone else presumes to trust." A complete parallel is Matt. iii. 9, μὴ δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 16. Akin to this use of δοκεῖν is such a passage as Aristoph., *Ran.*, 564, μαίνεσθαι δοκῶν, "Pretending to be mad". We cannot help thinking that the usage is based on the *impersonal* use of the verb. In later Greek δοκεῖν frequently means "think," *e.g.*, Acts xxvii. 13; *Acta Philip.*, 95, 1; Plut., *Timol.*, viii., 3. In official Greek it is the regular equivalent of Latin *censere*, the technical term to denote the opinion of the Senate (see Viereck, *Sermo Graecus*, etc., p. 72). Holst. acutely notes that "δοκεῖ puts the πεποιθ. ἐν σ. subjectively, and denies that there is a reality corresponding to this false opinion. In this subjectivity there is irony."

Ver. 5. The Apostle seems to feel a certain natural pride in recounting his hereditary privileges. — περιτομῇ ὀκταήμ. The dative of περιτ. must be read, expressing the sphere to which ὀκταήμ. belongs. Literally: "Eight-days-old as regards my circumcision". A.V. satisfies the requirements. He was born in Judaism, and lost none of its advantages from the outset. Proselytes were circumcised as adults. For the usage in this sense see the elaborate list of parallels in Wetstein on John xi. 39.—ἐκ γένους Ἰ. ἐκ often denotes the class or country of a man, *e.g.*, John iii. 1. Paul shared in the glories of the covenant-people. Israel was the theocratic name. —φυλῆς Β. This tribe stood high in Jewish estimation, not only as descending from Rachel, Jacob's best-loved wife, but as remaining loyal to the house of David, and, after the exile, forming with Judah

Ἑβραίων, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος, 6. κατὰ [q] ζῆλον[1] [r] διώκων τὴν[2] ἐκκλησίαν,[3] κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος.

q Rom. x. 2; cf. 2 Cor. vii. 11, ix. 2; 1 Macc. ii. 58 (A).
r Acts xxii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 23 al.

[1] So ℵcDb et cEKLP, Euth.cod., Bas.eth. Edd. ζηλος with ℵ*ABD*FG.
[2] Om. D*FG. [3] Θεου added by FG, 122, f, vg., Aug., Ambrst.

the foundation of the future nation.—Ἑβρ. ἐξ Ἑβρ. For the phrase *cf.* Herodt., 2, 143, Πίρωμιν ἐκ Πιρώμιος; Plat., *Phaedr.*, 246 A, ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. The force of these words has been variously estimated. Lft. and others draw a contrast between Ἑβραῖος and Ἑλληνιστής, the former being a Jew who retained the Hebrew language and customs (see Acts vi. 1). But Euseb., *H.E.*, 2, 4, 2, applies the designation to Philo, and in *Praep. Evang.*, xiii., 11, 2, to Aristobulus, both of them Greek-speaking Jews with little if any knowledge of Hebrew. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 22. The Greek Comm., Th. Mps. and Thdrt., believe that, in using the ancient name, Paul wishes to emphasise the purity of his lineage. Probably they are right.—κατὰ νόμον. Are we to distinguish between νόμος and ὁ νόμος in Paul? Attempts have been made (notably that of Gifford, *Romans* in *Speaker's Comm.*, pp. 41-48) to show that when Paul omits the article he is thinking mainly of the principle of law as a method of justification in opposition to faith, etc. In our judgment it has been made abundantly clear by Grafe (*Die paulinische Lehre vom Gesetz*, pp. 1-11) that, for the Apostle, νόμος with or without the article means the O.T. revelation of the will of God. He makes no distinction between a general conception of Divine law and the special one of the Mosaic law. The Mosaic law is for him the Divine law pure and simple, and therefore has a universal bearing. There are, of course, modifications of this central idea, but they can all be satisfactorily accounted for. Often the insertion or omission of the article with νόμος is entirely a question of formal grammar. Here νόμος is plainly the law of Moses.—Φαρισαῖος. *Cf.* Acts xxiii. 6. For an interesting discussion of the influence of the school of Hillel upon Paul see Wabnitz, *Revue Théol.*, xiii., p. 287 ff. The survivals of Rabbinic doctrines and methods in Paul's thought, however, must neither be exaggerated, nor, because they are Rabbinic, be contemptuously dismissed. "If God was not moving in the Rabbinic thought of Christ's day, what reason have we to say He . . . moves in the thought of to-day?" (P. T. Forsyth). Almost certainly Paul's family must have been in thorough sympathy with strict Judaism. No doubt he would be disowned by them, and this, as Ramsay notes (*St. Paul*, p. 36), would give special force to his words in ver. 8 *infr.*

Ver. 6. Probably ζῆλος (neuter) is the correct form here. In N.T. the neuter occurs only in 2 Cor. ix. 2, but it is found in Ignat., and, alternately with ὁ ζ., in 1 Clem. It is perhaps colloquial (so W-Sch., p. 84), although ὁ ζ. is that used in LXX. ζῆλος would almost have a technical meaning for a strict Jew at that time in connexion with the fanatical party among the Pharisees who called themselves ζηλωταί (*cf.* Schürer, i., 2, p. 80 ff.). *Cf.* Gal. i. 14, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων.—διώκ. τ. ἐκκλησ. *Cf.* Gal. i. 13, ἐδίωκον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὁ διώκων is, in classical Greek, the technical term for the "pursuer" or prosecutor in the law-courts. Strangely enough it was by means of prosecutions that Paul usually persecuted.—κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν ν. "According to (*i.e.*, tested by the standard of) the righteousness which belongs to the sphere of the law." Of course this righteousness, which is here equivalent to right conduct as a whole, is regarded from the point of view of that which justifies before God. For the exceptional prominence which *righteousness* has in Jewish religious thought, see esp. Weber, *Lehren des Talmud*, pp. 269-270, and Charles' admirable note on *Apocal. of Baruch*, xxiv. 1. *Cf.* Ps. Sol. ix. 9 for a very precise formulation of Jewish thought on this subject. It would be wrong to limit δικ. here merely to ceremonial observances. It includes, most probably, the ordinary moral precepts of the law as well.—ἄμεμπτος. Exactly parallel to this description is the case of the rich young man in the Gospels. He also could claim to be κατὰ δικ. τ. ἐν νομ. ἄμεμπ. It was at the next step (ver. 7) that

7. ἀλλ' ἅτινα[1] ἦν μοι [s] κέρδη, ταῦτα ἥγημαι διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν [t] ζημίαν. 8. ἀλλὰ [u] μενοῦνγε[2] καὶ[3] ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ [v] ὑπερέχον τῆς [w] γνώσεως Χριστοῦ[4] Ἰησοῦ[5] τοῦ Κυρίου μου[6]· δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα [x] ἐζημιώθην, καὶ ἡγοῦμαι [y] σκύβαλα εἶναι,[7] ἵνα Χριστὸν

s See note *infr.*, and on chap. i. 21.
t *Cf.* Acts xxvii. 21.
u Rom. ix. 20, x. 18.
v See W-M., p. 294.
w 2 Cor. x. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 18 *al.* (Freq. in Paul.)
x Matt. xvi. 26; 1 Cor. iii. 15.
y Only here in N.T. Common in later Greek.

[1] Ti. ατινα alone with ℵ*AG, 17, d, e, g, Euth.cod., Cyr., Lucif., Amb.

[2] So Ti., Ws., W.H. with ℵAP, 17, 37, kscr., oscr., cop., Did., Euth.cod., Cyr., Thphl. Trg., Alf., Myr., Lft. μεν ουν with BDEFGKL, Chr. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 104.

[3] Om. και ℵ*, 80, f, vgcle. go. cop. æth., Cyr., Lucif. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 110, who points out that και is often omitted even in ancient MSS.

[4] του Χ. Ι.: B, Thdrt. Prob. to conform to διὰ τὸν Χ. or τῆς γνώσ. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 73.

[5] Ιησ. Χρισ. AKP, f, vg. go. syrsch. æth., Bas., Chr., Euth.

[6] ημων AP, syrp. arm. æth., Did., Bas., Cyr., Lucif.

[7] So Alf. with ℵcADcEKLP, syrp. go., Did., Bas., Chr., Cyr., Aug. Om. ειναι edd. with ℵ*BD*FG, 17, d, e, f, g, vg. cop. syrsch. arm. æth., Lucif., Victorin. There is some force in Meyer's argument that ειναι might easily drop out before ινα.

he stopped short. He was unable to "count all things loss for Christ".

Vv. 7-9. Earthly gains counted loss that he might win Christ.—Ver. 7. ἀλλ' ἅτινα. Although in later Greek ὅστις had lost almost all its peculiar force and become simply = ὅς (*e.g.*, Matt. xxii. 2, etc. *Cf.* Jebb in Vincent and Dickson's *Handbook*, p. 302), one feels that something of that force is present here. "But these things, although they were of a class that was really gain to me." *Non de ipsa lege loquitur, sed de justitia quae in lege est* (Estius). The prerogatives mentioned above were real privileges viewed from his old Jewish standpoint, might even be justly regarded as paving the way to salvation.—κέρδη. In the plural it usually refers to money (see Jebb on Soph., *Antig.*, 1326). Perhaps the idea of separate items of profit is before the Apostle's mind (so also Vaughan). For the antithesis between κέρδη and ζημίαν *cf.* Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.*, 5, 4, 6, τὸ μὲν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πλέον τοῦ κακοῦ δὲ ἔλαττον κέρδος, τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον ζημία.—ἥγημαι . . . ζημ. "I have considered and still consider." Tersely, Thdrt., περιττὸς . . . ὁ λύχνος, τοῦ ἡλίου φανέντος.

On vv. 8-11 see Rainy's admirable exposition in *Expos. Bible*, pp. 200-256.—Ver. 8. ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε. Probably γε ought to be read (see crit. note *supr.*), as its absence in some good authorities is accounted for by the ease with which it could be omitted (so D omits it in 2 Cor. xi. 16; DFG in Rom. viii. 32; B in Rom. ix. 20). Almost = "Nay, that is a feeble way of expressing it; I can go further and say," etc. ἀλλά suggests a contrast to be introduced, μέν adds emphasis, while οὖν, gathering up what has already been said, corrects it by way of extending his assertion (γε can scarcely be translated, representing, rather, a tone of the voice in taking back the limitations implied in ἅτινα . . . κέρδη). "Nay rather, I actually count *all* things," etc. We cannot well see, in view of the natural translation of ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε, how the emphasis could be laid on any other word than πάντα. There is no need for contrasting ἥγημαι and ἡγοῦμαι. He does not compare present and past. ἥγημαι already expresses the fixed decision to which he has come. He has spoken of regarding his important Jewish prerogatives as "loss" for Christ's sake. Now he widens the range to πάντα. This is the goal of Christian life. It is not to be divided up between Christ and earthliness. It is not to express itself in attention to certain details. "If we should say *some* things, we might be in danger of sliding into a one-sided puritanism" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 191).—τὸ ὑπερέχον τ. γνώσ. Χ. Ἰ. κ.τ.λ. An instance of the extraordinary predilection of the later language for forming abstract substan-

κερδήσω, 9. καὶ ᶻ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν[1] δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην

ᶻ Luke xvii. 18; Rom. vii. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 2 *al.*

[1] ℵ* places εμ. after δικ.

tives from adjectives and participles. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 17, **τὸ . . . ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν.** Probably = "the surpassing (or supreme) thing which consists in the knowledge," etc. "We beheld His glory." That glory outshines all this earth's guiding-stars.—**τ. γνώσεως.** This knowledge on which Paul is so fond of dwelling is, as Beysch. well expresses it, "the reflection of faith in our reason" (*op. cit.*, ii., p. 177). It is directly connected with the surrender of the soul to Christ, but, as Paul teaches, that always means a close intimacy with Him, from which there springs an ever-growing knowledge of His spirit and will. Such knowledge lays a stable foundation for the Christian character, preventing it from evaporating into a mere unreasoning emotionalism. The conception, which is prominent in Paul's writings, is based on the O.T. idea of the knowledge of God. That is always practical, religious. To know God is to revere Him, to be godly, for to know Him is to understand the revelation He has given of Himself. *Cf.* Isa. xi. 2, Hab. ii. 14. It is natural that in the later Epistles this aspect of the spiritual life should come into the foreground, seeing that already the Christian faith was being confronted by other explanations of man's relation to God. To know Christ, the Apostle teaches, is to have the key which will unlock all the secrets of existence viewed from the standpoint of religion.—**τοῦ Κυρίου μ.** It was as **Κύριος**, the exalted Lord, that Paul first knew Christ. And always it is from this standpoint he looks backwards and forwards. To recognise this is to understand his doctrinal teaching.—**δι' ὃν τ. πάντα ἐζημιώθην. τὰ πάντα** = "the sum-total" as opposed to a part. (So also Holst.) Perhaps in contrasting **ἐζημ.** and **κερδήσω**, as in the similar contrast in ver. 7, he may have in view our Lord's words in Matt. xvi. 26. In N.T. only the passive of **ζημιόω** is used with various constructions. [It gives good sense to regard **καὶ ἡγ. σκύβ.** as a parenthesis, and thus to make **ἵνα κερδ.** along with its parallel **τοῦ γνῶναι** depend on **ἐζημ.** In this case the Apostle speaks from the standpoint of his conversion. See J. Weiss, *Th. LZ.*, 1899, col. 264.]—**σκύβαλα.** The derivation is uncertain. It is most probably connected with **σκῶρ**, "dung". It is often used in this sense itself, but also in the wider meaning of any "refuse," such as the remains of a banquet. See a large collection of exx. from late writers in Wetstein and Lft., and *cf.* the apt parallel in Plautus, *Truc.*, ii., 7, 5, *Amator qui bona sua pro stercore habet.* Probably **εἶναι** ought to be omitted, although there is great divergence in the authorities. (See crit. note *supr.*) It might easily be inserted as parallel to the preceding **εἶναι.**—**ἵνα Χ. κερδήσω.** "That I may win Christ." There is nothing mechanical or fixed about fellowship with Christ. It may be interrupted by decay of zeal, the intrusion of the earthly spirit, the toleration of known sins, the easy domination of self-will, and countless other causes. Hence, to maintain it, there must be the continuous estimating of earthly things at their true value. Accordingly he looks on "winning Christ" as something present and future, not as a past act. (As to the form, an aorist **ἐκέρδησα** is found in Herod., Joseph., LXX, etc. See Kühner-Blass, *Gramm.*, ii., p. 457.)

Ver. 9. **εὑρεθῶ.** It is probably used here in the semi-technical sense which it received in post-classical Greek = **τυγχάνω** with participle (French *se trouver*), "turn out actually to be". "And actually be in Him," from the eschatological standpoint (see Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 192). The idea is involved of a revelation of real character. *Cf.* Gal. ii. 17, **εἰ δὲ . . . εὑρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί.**—**ἐν αὐτῷ.** The central fact of Paul's religious life and thought, the complete identification of the believer with Christ.—**μὴ ἔχων. μή** either depends directly on **ἵνα** or is used to express Paul's own view of what is implied in **εὑρεθ. ἐν α.** This last thought must be regarded as the basis on which the clauses immediately following rest.—**ἐμὴν δικ.** "A righteousness of my own." *Cf. Apoc. of Bar.*, lxiii. 3, "then Hezekiah trusted in his works and had hope in his righteousness". The noun **δικ.** is anarthrous to emphasise the idea belonging to it in its essential force. **ἐμήν** is

a Luke i. 73; Rom. vi. 6, vii. 3. See Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 231. ἐπὶ[1] τῇ πίστει· 10. [a]τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτόν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν[2] κοινωνίαν τῶν[3] [b]παθημάτων αὐτοῦ,

b 2 Cor. i. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 13.

[1] D*E*, O.L. vg. εν πιστει. LP, syrp., Baseth., Chr., connect this clause with the words following.

[2] So DEFGKLP, Bas., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Edd. om. την with ℵ*AB. Meyer keeps την, which he supposes to have been "overlooked as unnecessary".

[3] So Lach., Alf. with ℵcADEFGKLP. Ti., Trg., Ws., W.H. om. των with ℵ*B.

added to define, and then the definition is elaborated by the clause with the article. An instructive parallel is Gal. ii. 20, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ (see an important note in Green, *Gram. of N.T.*, pp. 34-35). **δικαιοσύνη**, as usually in Paul's writings, means a *right relation* between him and God. The retention of the word by Paul to denote the position of the Christian before God is, as Holst. (*Paulin. Theol.*, p. 64) points out, a proof of his close connexion with the Jewish consciousness. We may call it a "forensic" word, for certainly there always lies behind it the idea of a standard appointed by God, a law, the expression of the Divine will. The qualifying words here show what Paul has in view.—**τὴν ἐκ νόμου.** *Cf.* the lament for the destruction of Jerusalem in *Apoc. of Bar.*, lxvii. 6, "the vapour of the smoke of the incense of righteousness which is by the law is extinguished in Zion" (and see Charles' note on xv. 5). This hypothetical **δικ.**, which he calls his own, could only spring from complete conformity to the will of God as revealed in precepts and commands. That is the kind of relation to God which Paul has found to be impossible. On **νόμος** without the article see on ver. 5 *supr.* **τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χ., τὴν ἐκ Θεοῦ δικ. ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει.** The exact character of this **δικαιοσύνη** which Paul prizes must be carefully noted. The presupposition of possessing it is "to be found in Christ". It is not a righteousness which he can win by legal observances. It springs from God. What does this new relation to God precisely mean? The one condition of understanding the Apostle's language is to remember that he combines in his thinking two conceptions of **δικαιοσύνη**, or perhaps we should rather say that his own experience has made vivid for him a two-sided conception of this relation. On the one hand, he thinks of **δικ.** as connected with God, the Judge of men. God, strictly marking sin, might condemn men absolutely, because all have sinned. Instead of that, because of His grace manifested in Jesus Christ the crucified and working through Christ's death, He deals mercifully with sinners, *treats them as righteous on account of the propitiation made by the Righteous One*, treats them as standing in a right relation to Himself, *i.e.*, pardons them. **δικαιοσύνη** thus comes to be God's gracious way of dealing with us, "forgiveness with the Forgiver in it" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 231), the relation with God into which we are brought by His grace for Jesus' sake, regarded more or less as an activity of His, practically = salvation (which, already in O.T., rested upon the rectitude of God's character, see, *e.g.*, Isa. li. 5-8, Ps. xcviii. 2). God's justifying of us makes us **δίκαιοι** in His sight: we possess **δικαιοσύνη.** That, however, might appear arbitrary. But the Apostle gives no ground for such a suspicion. This **δικ. ἐκ Θεοῦ** is only reached "through the faith of Christ," *i.e.*, the faith which Christ kindles, of which He is the author, which, also, He nourishes and maintains (see esp. Haussleiter, *Greifswald. Studien*, pp. 177-178). This **δικ.** is securely founded on faith in Christ (**ἐπὶ τῇ π.**). But what does such faith effect? It is that which makes the believer one with Christ. He shares in all that his Lord possesses. Christ imparts life to him. Christ's relation to the Father becomes his. But this is no longer a being regarded or dealt with by God as if he were **δίκαιος.** Union with Christ makes it possible for the Christian to *be* **δίκαιος**, to show himself such in actual behaviour. Thus **δικαιοσύνη** may express something more than the relation to God into which believers are brought by God's justifying judgment (which for their experience means the sense of forgiveness with the Forgiver in it). It embraces the conduct which is the response to that forgiving love of God, a love only bestowed on the soul united to Christ by

faith (see esp. Pfleid., *Paulin.*, i., p. 175; Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 127-129, 138-139; Häring, **Δικ. Θεοῦ** *bei Paulus*, Tübingen, 1896; Kölbing, *SK.*, 1895, 7 ff.; Denney, *Expos.*, vi., 3, p. 433 ff., 4, p. 299 ff., Holst., *Paulin. Th.*, pp. 65-66).

Vv. 10-11.—Conformity to Christ's death and resurrection. — Ver. 10. **τοῦ γνῶναι.** This infinitive of purpose or motive is frequent in N.T. and later Greek. Among classical authors it is chiefly found in Thucyd., who favours it (see Goodwin, *MT.*, p. 319; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 169 ff.). It is perhaps connected with the use of the genitive after verbs of aiming, hitting, etc. Paul has already spoken in ver. 8 of the **γνῶσις** of Christ. This thought again appeals to him, but now as being the natural development of winning Christ and being found in Him. For with Paul this Christian Gnosis is the highest reach of Christian experience. *Cf.* Wordsworth, *Excursion*, Bk. iv.:—

> For knowledge is delight, and such delight
> Breeds love: yet suited as it rather is
> To thought and to the climbing intellect,
> It teaches less to love than to adore;
> If that be not indeed the highest love.

γνῶσις is the necessary result of intimate communion with Christ. No better comment on the thought can be found than Eph. i. 11-20. *Cf.*, as a most instructive parallel, John xvii. 3. The precise force of **γνῶναι** as opposed to **εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ.** is admirably brought out by Lft. on Gal. iv. 9, where he shows that **γν.** (1) has in view "an earlier state of ignorance" or "some prior facts on which the knowledge is based," and (2) contains "the ideas of thoroughness, familiarity, or of approbation". **γν.** emphasises "the *process* of redemption".—**τὴν δύναμιν τ. ἀναστ. . . . κοινωνίαν παθημ. . . . συμμορφ. . . . τῷ θανάτῳ.** As to readings, **τὴν** must be omitted (with the best authorities) before **κοιν.**, because the latter forms *one* idea with the preceding clause. In the case of **τῶν** it is more difficult to decide. But the evidence, both external and internal, is, on the whole, against it. **συμμορφιζόμενος** is clearly right, having unassailable attestation.—In this passage we have the deepest secrets of the Apostle's Christian experience unveiled. *Qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget* (Anselm). Two experiences are described which cannot be separated: the experimental knowledge of the believer embraces (1) the power of Christ's resurrection, (2) the fellowship of His sufferings, conformity to His death. Paul puts the resurrection first, because it was the Risen Christ he came to know; it was that knowledge which gave him insight into the real meaning of Christ's sufferings and death. But here he thinks altogether of a spiritual process which is carried on in the soul of him who is united to Christ. He has no idea of martyrdom before him (so, *e.g.*, De W., Myr.). Nor is any earthly suffering present to his mind except, perhaps, as a discipline which overcomes sin. Thus Col. i. 24 is not a true parallel (so also Hpt.). The passages which illuminate his meaning are especially Rom. vi. 3-12, viii. 29, Gal. ii. 19-20, vi. 14. Christ, in Paul's view, carries the man who clings to Him in faith through all the great crises which came to Him on the path of His perfecting. The deepest of men's saving experiences run parallel, as it were, to the cardinal events of the Christian revelation, more especially to that atoning death accomplished once for all for the remission of sins. *Cf.* Rom. vi. 5, **σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.** This is the "crucifying of the flesh" in fellowship with Christ, which results in "newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4). On the Cross Christ died, *i.e.*, the earthly part in Him died—His human flesh. But that was the only element in Him that could be tempted. And, as regards that element of His being, He died victorious, able to offer up His human life without spot unto God. They that are Christ's are enabled, by His power communicated to them, through a process of overcoming, to die to earthliness and the appeals made to their fleshly nature. But in dying on the Cross Christ identified Himself with the sin of the world, acknowledging that God's judgment upon sin was righteous and true, as the Head of mankind representing sinners and bearing the burden of their transgression. So, in the Apostle's view, they that are Christ's have the firm assurance that in *Him* the Crucified they have made full confession of their sin to the holy and gracious God. They know, by the witness of the Holy Spirit, that God accepts that confession and forgives them freely and joyfully. For they know that Holiness has accepted Love, and that Love has acknowledged Holiness, or rather, that the holy love of the Father and the Son is revealed in its unity on the Cross of Christ. The result of death with Christ is life in Him. This new life depends on Christ's resurrection. "Because I live, ye shall live also." The *power* (**δύναμιν**) of His resurrection as experienced by the

[c] συμμορφούμενος [1] τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ, 11. εἴ πως [d] καταντήσω εἰς τὴν [e] ἐξανάστασιν τῶν [2] νεκρῶν. 12. οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, ἢ ἤδη [f] τετελείωμαι [3]· [g] διώκω δέ, εἰ καὶ [4] καταλάβω ἐφ᾽ ᾧ καὶ [5] [h] κατελήφθην [6]

c True reading συμμορφιζόμενος only here in N.T.
d Acts xxvi. 7; Eph. iv. 13.
e Only here in N.T.
f *Cf.* Heb. ii. 10, v. 9; Wisd. iv. 13.
g See note *infr.*
h Rom. ix. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 24; Sirach xv. 7.

[1] So ℵcDcEKL, Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Ti., Trg., Alf., Ws., W.H. συμμορφιζομενος with ℵ*ABD*P, 17, 67**, 71, Euth.cod., Bas. FG, d, e, g, go., Iren., Lucif., Victorin. συνφορτειζομενος.

[2] So Myr., with KL, arm. cop. Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. (exc. Myr.) την εκ νεκρων with ℵABDEP, 17, 31 *et al.*, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syrr., Ir., Bas., Euth.cod., Chr. Fgr.Ggr., των εκ. Myr. supposes that εκ was written in margin to explain εξαν., not found elsewhere in N.T., and that so the erroneous insertion of this εκ after των produced την εκ νεκ. This is improbable.

[3] D*EFG, d, e, f, g, Iren., Ambrst. add η ηδη δεδικαιωμαι (FG[2] δικαιωμαι, G* δικαιομαι).

[4] So edd. with ℵcABDcE**KLP, Clem., Eus., Marc., Chr., Euth.cod., Thdrt. Ti. om. και with ℵ*D*E*FG, 39, 112, d, e, f, g, vg., Tert., Hil., Victorin., Ambrst.

[5] Om. Dgr.*Egr.Fgr.G, 67**, Tert.

[6] So BcDcEKLP. Edd. κατελημφθ. with ℵAB*D*FG.

believer is the effect of His victory over death and sin; that victory which has given Him all power in heaven and earth; which enables Him to impart of His own life to those who are in His fellowship. It is not they who live but "Christ liveth in" them. The *organic* connexion between Christ and the Christian is the regulating idea for the Apostle. Christ is, as we have said, the Head and representative of humanity. Hence conformity to Christ (Rom. viii. 29, προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) all along the line, both in living and dying, is a return to the divinely-purposed type, for man was made in the image of God (see *loc. cit.*, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς). "In this appropriation of the death and rising of the Lord Jesus . . . there are three stages, corresponding to the Friday, Saturday and Sunday of Eastertide. Christ died for our sins: He was buried: He rose again the third day. So, by consequence, 'I am crucified with Christ: no longer do I live: Christ liveth in me'" (Findlay, *Galat.* in *Expos. Bible*, p. 159). On the whole thought of this passage, see Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, i., pp. 169, 192-207; Denney, *Expos.*, vi., 4, p. 299 ff.

Ver. 11. εἴ πως καταντ. This construction closely corresponds to the Homeric usage of εἴ κε or ἥν (as in *Odyss.*, 3, 83, πατρὸς ἐμοῦ κλέος μετέρχομαι, ἥν που ἀκούσω) where the protasis really contains in itself its own apodosis "which consists of an implied idea of purpose" or hope (see Goodwin, *MT.*, p. 180; Burton, *MT.*, § 276; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, pp. 62, 116). Here the clause is almost equivalent to an indirect question. The Resurrection is the Apostle's goal, for it will mean perfect, unbroken knowledge of Christ and fellowship with Him. Paul knows by experience the difficulty of remaining loyal to the end, of being so conformed to Christ's death that the power of sin will not revive its mastery over him. So his apparent uncertainty here of reaching the goal is not distrust of God. It is distrust of himself. It emphasises the need he feels of watchfulness and constant striving (*cf.* διώκω, ver. 12), lest "having preached to others" he "be found a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 27. Vv. 24-27 of this chap., along with Rom. viii. 17, are the best parallel to the passage before us). But, on the other side, he is always reminded that "faithful is He that calleth you" (1 Thess. v. 24).—καταντήσω. Probably aorist subjunctive (as corresponding with καταλάβω in ver. 12).—τὴν ἐξαν. τ. νεκρ. Authority, both external and internal, supports the reading τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν. ἐξανάστ. is found nowhere else in N.T., and never in LXX. In later Greek it means "expulsion". It occurs only here in this sense. Holst. suggests that ἐξαν. is used here of the actual resurrection, because ἀνάστασις was used above of

believers with an ethical, ideal meaning. We are disposed to believe (with Ws. and others) that Paul is thinking only of the resurrection of believers (*cf.* Ps. Sol. iii. 13-16 for Jewish thought on this subject, the thought which had been Paul's mental atmosphere). This is his usual standpoint. In the famous passage 1 Cor. xv. 12 ff. it is exclusively of Christians he speaks. We have no information as to what he taught regarding a general resurrection. But considering that it is with spontaneous, artless letters we have to do, and not with theoretical discussions, it would be hazardous to say that he ignored or denied a general resurrection. For him the resurrection of Christians depends on and is conformed to the resurrection of their Lord. Teichmann (*Auferstehung u. Gericht*, p. 67), comparing chap. i. 23 with this passage, holds that Paul, although he has replaced the idea of resurrection by that of a continuous existence after death, occasionally (as here) uses the traditional *termini technici*. This may be so. More probably at one time he would give prominence to the thought of uninterrupted fellowship with Christ after death, while at another his longings would centre round the great crisis when Christ should acknowledge all His faithful servants and make them full sharers in His glory. It is not to be doubted that Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, expected that crisis soon to come.

Vv. 12-16. THE MARK OF THE MATURE CHRISTIAN,—TO PRESS FORWARD.—Ver. 12. **οὐχ ὅτι.** There is a curious difference (see W-M., p. 746) between the use of this phrase in classical and in N.T. Greek. **λέγω** is understood in both cases, but in the classical language the usage is rhetorical = "not only, but". In N.T. its purpose is to guard against misunderstanding, "I do not mean that," etc.—**ἔλαβον.** The aorist sums up the Apostle's experiences as far as the point he has reached, looking at it (with the usual force of the aorist) as a single fact. In English, of course, we must translate, "Not that I *have* already attained" (so R.V.). In Greek a sharper distinction is made between past and present. *Cf.* John xvii. 4, **ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας.** It is needless to ask what is the object of **ἔλαβον.** None is required, just as we speak of "attaining". He has in view all that is involved in winning Christ and knowing Him. Probably the remaining verses of this paragraph are a caution to some at Philippi who were claiming high sanctity, and so affecting superior airs towards their brethren. This would naturally lead to irritation and jealousies.—**τετελείωμαι.** The interesting variant **δεδικαίωμαι** (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 4) is plainly very ancient, the gloss, probably, of some pious copyist who imagined that the Divine side of sanctification was left too much out of sight. **τελειόω** is a favourite word of the writer to the Hebrews. It means literally "to bring to the end" determined by God. See Bleek, *Heb. Brief.*, ii., 1, p. 299. A striking parallel to our passage is Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, iii., 23 (ed. Cohn), **πότε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, μάλιστα νεκροφορεῖν σαυτὴν ὑπολήψῃ; ἆρά γε οὐχ ὅταν τελειωθῇς καὶ βραβείων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξιωθῇς; ἔσῃ γὰρ τότε φιλόθεος, οὐ φιλοσώματος.**—**διώκω.** It is unnecessary to assume the metaphor of the race-course. **δι.** and **καταλαμβάνω** are correlative words (**δι.** esp. frequent in Paul) = "seek and find," "pursue and overtake". *Cf.* Rom. ix. 30, Exod. xv. 9 (LXX). Of course both may be used with a metaphorical colour. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24, and also 2 Clem. xviii. 2 (quoted by Wohl.).—**εἰ καὶ καταλ.** See on **εἴ πως καταντ.** *supr.* The subjunctive here is deliberative as being in an indirect question (see Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 206). We believe **καί** ought to be read, as it would very easily slip out before **κατ.** It emphasises the correspondence with the following **κατελήμφθην**, and may possibly be a sort of correction of **εἴ πως** in the previous verse, "in the hope that I may really grasp (do *my* part in grasping)". Hpt. quotes aptly from Luther: "ein Christ ist nicht im Wordensein sondern im Werden, darum wer ein Christ ist, ist kein Christ".—**ἐφ' ᾧ.** Two distinct interpretations are possible and equally good. It may (1) be = **ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι,** "for this reason, *viz.*, that I," etc., or (2) = **τοῦτο ἐφ' ᾧ,** "that with a view to which I," etc. Whichever be chosen, the sense remains the same. Paul lays, as it were, the responsibility of his attaining upon Christ. Christ's grasp of his whole being (**κατελήμφθην**) must have a definite purpose in it. Paul's Christian progress is the only thing that can correspond (**καί**) to his experience of Christ's power.—**Χ. Ἰ. τοῦ** is certainly to be omitted. It is difficult to decide whether **Ἰ.** ought to be read or not. There is some force in the remark of Ws. that there would be no motive for adding **Ἰ.**, while **Χ.** alone would follow the analogy of vv. 8-9 (see Ws., *TK.*, p. 88).

ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[1] 13. ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ[2] [i]λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι· [k]ἓν δέ, τὰ μὲν [l]ὀπίσω [m]ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς[3] δὲ [n]ἔμπροσθεν [o]ἐπεκτεινόμενος, 14. κατὰ [p]σκοπὸν [q]διώκω ἐπὶ[4] τὸ

i Rom. iii. 28, xiv. 14 (LXX). k John ix. 25. For ellipse, *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 6; Gal. ii. 9, v. 13 (see Blass, *Gr.*, 287-288). l See note *infr.* m Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 2 (with genit.). Here alone (in N.T.) with accus. Often with this constrn. in LXX. n This phrase only here in N.T. See note *infr.* o Only here in N.T. p Only here in N.T. Job xvi. 13; Lam. iii. 12; Wisd. v. 12. q See on ver. 12 *supr.*

[1] So KL, Thdrt. Ti., Ws. X. I. with ℵAP, 47, 73, 80, 109, c^scr., f^scr., syr^p. mg. cop. arm., Chr., Aug., Ambrst. Trg., Alf., Myr. X. with BD*E*FG, 17, 179, d, e, g, go. æth., Clem., Marc., Hil., Victorin.

[2] So Lach., Trg., Alf., Ws. (W.H. mg.) with BD^cEFGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syr.^sch. et p. arm., Tert., Chr., Victorin. Ti., W.H. (⌜ ⌝) ουπω with ℵAD^gr.*P, 17, 23*, 31 *et al.*, cop. æth., Clem., Bas., Euth.^cod., Thdrt.

[3] D*FG, d, e, f, g, vg. εις δε τα.

[4] So DEFGKLP, Bas., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. εις with ℵAB, 17, 73, 80, Clem., Euth.^cod., Cyr. Myr. thinks that επι is explanatory.

Ver. 13. **ἀδελφοί.** This direct appeal to them shows that he is approaching a matter which is of serious concern both to him and them.—**ἐγὼ ἐμαυτόν.** Why such strong personal emphasis? Is it not a clear hint that there were people at Philippi who prided themselves on having grasped the prize of the Christian calling already? Paul has been tacitly leading up to this. He will yield to none in clear knowledge of the difference between the old and the new life. He knows more surely than any how completely he has broken with the past. Yet, whatever others may say, he must assume the lowly position of one who is still a learner. It makes little difference whether **οὐ** or **οὔπω** be read. The authorities are pretty evenly balanced.—**λογίζομαι.** The word (often used by Paul) has the force of looking back on the process of a discussion and calmly drawing a conclusion. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 18 (with note of SH.). The Apostle expresses his deliberately formed opinion.—**ἓν δέ.** There is no need to supply a verb. His Christian conduct is summed up in what follows. Never has there been a more *unified* life than that of Paul as Apostle and Christian. "When all is said, the greatest art is to limit and isolate oneself" (Goethe).—**τὰ μὲν ὀπ. ἐπιλανθ.** There are a few exx. in classical Greek of **ἐπιλανθ.** with the accusative, *e.g.*, Aristoph., *Nub.*, 631. But in the later language there was an extraordinary extension of the use of the accusative. (See Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 220 ff.) Does **τὰ ὀπ.** mean the old life, or the past stages of Christian experience? If the metaphor were strictly pressed, no doubt the latter alternative would claim attention. But pressing metaphors is always hazardous. And parallel passages seem rather to justify the first meaning, *e.g.*, Jer. vii. 24, **ἐγενήθησαν εἰς τὰ ὄπισθεν καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν** (of disobeying God's commands); Luke ix. 62, **βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω**; John vi. 66, **πολλοὶ τῶν μαθητῶν . . . ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.**—**τοῖς ἔμπρ. ἐπεκτ.** **τὸ** and **τὰ ἔμπρ.** are found in Herodot. and Xenoph. Wetstein quotes most aptly from Luc., *de Cal.*, 12, **οἷόν τι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν δρομέων γίγνεται· κἀκεῖ γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἀγαθὸς δρομεὺς τῆς ὕσπληγος εὐθὺς καταπεσούσης, μόνον τοῦ πρόσω ἐφιέμενος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀποτείνας πρὸς τὸ τέρμα κἀν τοῖς ποσὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς νίκης ἔχων, τὸν πλησίον οὐδὲν κακουργεῖ.** In using this comparison, Paul, of course, adapts himself, as among Greeks and Romans, to a custom of their national life. On this kind of adaptation see an excellent discussion in Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 100-104.

Ver. 14. **κατὰ σκ.** "In the direction of the mark." Exactly parallel is Acts viii. 26, **πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβρίαν.** Perhaps akin are uses like Thucyd., 6, 31, **κατὰ θέαν ἥκειν**; Hom., *Odyss.*, 3, 72, **κατὰ πρῆξιν** ("for the sake of business," Ameis-Hentze). It is needless to distinguish between **σκοπόν** and **βραβεῖον** in the Apostle's thought. Both really point to that unbroken and complete fellowship with Christ which is attained through the power of His resurrection, that resurrection being the condition of the believer's victory over sin and death, and making it possible for him to enter the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens". The purified life in heaven is, in a word,

βραβεῖον τῆς [s] ἄνω [t] κλήσεως[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.[2] 15. ὅσοι οὖν [u] τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν[3]· καὶ εἴ τι [v] ἑτέρως φρονεῖτε, καὶ

r 1 Cor. ix. 24.
s Gal. iv. 26; Col. iii. 1.
t Rom. xi. 29; Eph. i. 18; Heb. iii. 1 *al.* u See note *infr.* v Only here in N.T.

[1] Tert. apparently reads ανεγκλησεως.

[2] D*EFgr·G, d, e, g εν Κυριω Ι. Χ.

[3] ℵL, 30, 39, 41 *al.*, Clem. φρονουμεν (so Lft. mg.).

both the goal and the prize. Contrast with this exulting thought *Omar Khayyám*, xxxviii.: "The stars are setting and the caravan starts for the dawn of nothing".—εἰς τὸ βραβ. The word occurs in Comedy, Inscrr. and N.T. (1 Cor. ix. 24). *Cf.* 1 Clem., v., 5, ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑπέδειξεν, where it is perhaps suggested by our passage. It is possibly one of those words which must have been common in colloquial Greek (*cf.* the frequent use of βραβεύς), but have survived only in a few books. εἰς must be read with the best authorities, for, as Lft. notes, "the prize marks the position of the goal". ἐπί is an explanatory gloss.—τῆς ἄνω κλ. "The upward calling." The Apostle seems to mean that the βραβεῖον is the ἄνω κλῆσις (so also Lips.). κλῆσις is the technical word in the Epistles for that decisive appeal of God to the soul which is made in Jesus Christ: the offer of salvation. Those who listen are designated κλητοί. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 30 and Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 165 ff. This κλ. is not merely to "the inheritance of the saints in light". Its effect must be seen in the sanctification of the believer's life on earth. But here the addition of ἄνω suggests that the Apostle has before him the final issue of the calling which belongs to those who have endured to the end, who have run with patience the race set before them. The phrase seems to carry much the same meaning as Heb. iii. 1, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου. *Cf.* the suggestive comment of Chr., τοὺς μάλιστα τιμωμένους τῶν ἀθλητῶν καὶ τῶν ἡνιόχων οὐ στεφανοῦσιν ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ κάτω, ἀλλ' ἄνω καλέσας ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖ στεφανοῖ.—ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Although it would give a satisfactory sense to take these words with διώκω (so *e.g.*, Myr., Ws.), it is far more natural to join them closely with τ. ἄνω κλ. This is emphatically ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Only in connexion with Him has the κλῆσις either in itself or in its goal any meaning.

Ver. 15. τέλειοι. What Paul understands by τέλ. we can easily discover from Eph. iv. 13-14, Col. i. 28, iv. 12, 1 Cor. ii. 6 (*cf.* also the definition of the word in Heb. v. 14 taken in connexion with vi. 1). In all these passages τέλ. depends upon knowledge, knowledge gained by long experience of Christ, resulting both in firm conviction and maturity of thought and conduct. It has not so much our idea of "perfect" = "flawless," as of "perfect" = "having reached a certain point of completeness," as of one who has come to his full growth, leaving behind him the state of childhood (νήπιος). *Cf.* chap. i. 9-10. Lft. supposes a reminiscence of the technical term τέλειος, used in the Mysteries to denote the *initiated*, and imagines Paul to speak with a certain irony of people at Philippi who claimed to be in this fortunate position as regards the Christian faith. There is no need to assume here the language of the Mysteries (as Anrich shows, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen*, Gött., 1894, p. 146, *n.* 1), or to find irony in Paul's words. Probably there *were* some (see on ver. 13 *supr.*) at Philippi who boasted of a spiritual superiority to their brethren and who may have called themselves τέλειοι. This may have been due to special equipment with the Spirit manifesting itself in speaking with tongues, etc. See 1 Cor. xii. *passim.* But Paul takes the word seriously and points out what it involves. [Wernle's attempt in *Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paul.*, pp. 6-7, to show that this passage is no argument against Christian perfection which he believes Paul to hold, rests on the erroneous association of τέλ. with the Mysteries.]—τοῦτο φρ. Let us show our humble conviction that we are still far from the goal which we desire to attain.—καὶ εἴ . . . ἀποκαλ. If, in the case of any separate detail of character or knowledge, you imagine yourselves to be τέλειοι, to have reached the highest point, God will reveal the truth (the true standpoint of humility) on this matter also. The form of the conditional sentence suggests that Paul knew of persons at Philippi who had erroneous views on

τοῦτο ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν ἀποκαλύψει· 16. [w] πλὴν εἰς ὃ [x] ἐφθάσαμεν,[1] τῷ αὐτῷ [y] στοιχεῖν κανόνι, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.[1]

17. [z] Συμμιμηταί[2] μου γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί, καὶ [a] σκοπεῖτε τοὺς οὕτω[3]

w Matt. xxvi. 39; Luke x. 11; Eph. v. 33; Rev. ii. 25.
x Rom. ix. 31; 2 Cor. x. 14; 2 Sam. xx. 13; Cant. ii. 12 *al.*
y Gal. v. 25, vi. 16. *Cf.* Rom. iv. 12.
z Only here in N.T.
a Chap. ii. 4; Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Gal. vi. 1.

[1] So ℵcKLP, syrr. æthpp., Chr., Dam., Thdrt. Edd. τω αυτω στοιχειν (without the words added) with ℵ*AB, 17, 67**, cop. sah. æthro., Hil., Aug. το αυτο φρονειν, τω αυτω στοιχειν, DEFG, 23, 31, 37, O.L. vg., Euth.ocd., Victorin., Ambrst.

[2] So Trg., Alf. with AB3DcEKLP. Ti., Ws., W.H. συνμ with ℵB*D*FG.

[3] So Ti., W.H. with ℵABD*FG. Trg., Alf., Ws. ουτως with DcEKsil.Lsil.P, etc. See Ws., *TK.*, p. 64, who thinks that ουτω is connected with a similar reading at iv. 1. Both he attributes to the arbitrariness of the copyist.

this subject. But his hint of rebuke is very delicately put. εἴ τι κ.τ.λ. It is far-fetched to take this (as Hpt. does) of their judgment on the Judaisers. Paul has forgotten, for the time, the special anxiety which weighs upon him, and has become absorbed in the glorious vista which unfolds itself to the Christian. καὶ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. A firm conviction of the Apostle's. See esp. 1 Cor. ii. 10 (and *cf.* Von Soden, *Abhandlungen C. v. Weiss. gewidmet*, p. 166).

Ver. 16. πλήν. It is quite common as introducing a parenthesis. "Only one thing! So far as we have come, keep the path" (Weizs.). For the word *cf.* Schmid, *Atticismus*, i., p. 133, and Bonitz's *Index* to Aristotle.—εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσ. In later Greek (as in modern) φθάνω has lost all idea of *anticipation* and simply means "come," "reach". *Cf.* 2 Cor. x. 14 (and see Hatz., *Einl.*, p. 199; *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 156). "So far as we have come." In what? Ws. thinks in right φρονεῖν, connecting the words immediately with τοῦτο φρονῶμεν. Kl. supposes the νόμος δικαιοσύνης, referring to the earlier part of the chap. (esp. ver. 9). Does he not rather mean the point reached on the advance towards the goal (the κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκειν), which is the subject directly before his mind? The very use of στοιχεῖν seems to justify this interpretation.—τῷ αὐτῷ. It is, at first sight, natural to refer τ. αὐτ. immediately to ὃ preceding. And this may be right. But there is much force in the interpretation of Lips., who renders "let us walk on the *same* path" (so also Hlst.). The exhortation would then be directed against the difference of opinion and feeling which were certainly present in the Church at Philippi, and is suggested to Paul by the ἑτέρως φρον. of ver. 15. That this was an early interpretation is shown by the *v.l.* of *TR.* The words κανονι το αυτο φρονειν (not found in the best MSS.) are evidently a gloss on the text. "Only, so far as we have come, let us keep to the same path." τῷ αὐτῷ is an instance of a dative common after verbs of "going" and "walking" in N.T. *Cf.* Buttm., *Gram.*, p. 184.—στοιχεῖν. An imperatival infinitive found in Hom., Aristoph., Inscrr. (see Meisterhans, *Gram. d. att. Inschrr.*, § 88 A; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 147). Probably this usage is closely connected with the origin of the infinitive, which was a dative, as is shown, *e.g.*, by the infinitive in English, *e.g.*, "to work". This might easily become an imperative, "to work"! Analogous is the use of χαίρειν and ὑγιαίνειν in Letters. στ. is only found in late writers, although, from the frequency of στοῖχος, we may infer that it must have existed in earlier times. Literally it means "march in file". Moule well observes that στ. more than περιπατεῖν (the common word) suggests the *step*, the detail.

Vv. 17-19. A SOLEMN WARNING AGAINST THE EARTHLY, SENSUAL MIND.—Ver. 17. συμμιμ. The compound is significant. *Uno consensu et una mente* (Calv.). This emphasis on their unity justifies the interpretation of τῷ αὐτῷ favoured above. Paul is compelled to make his own example a norm of the new life. It was not as in Judaism where the Law lay ready to hand as a fixed standard. There was, as yet, no tradition of the Christian life.—σκοπεῖτε. A keen, close scrutiny. *Cf.* Rom. xvi. 17 (but there = "mark so as to avoid").—οὕτω probably points back to μου. It seems more natural to give καθώς its common argumentative force, "even as".—τύπον = (1) "stamp" of a die, (2) "copy, figure," as the stamp bears a figure on

[b] περιπατοῦντας, [b] καθὼς ἔχετε [c] τύπον ἡμᾶς. 18. πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ὑμῖν, νῦν δὲ καὶ κλαίων λέγω, τοὺς [d] ἐχθροὺς τοῦ [e] σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· 19. ὧν τὸ [f] τέλος [g] ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ Θεὸς ἡ [h] κοιλία, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ [i] αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν, οἱ τὰ

b Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 1 John ii. 6.
c 2 Thess. iii. 9; 1 Tim. iv. 12; 1 Pet. v. 3 *al.*
d See note *infr.*
e Contrast Gal. vi. 14.
f Rom. vi. 21; 2 Cor. xi. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 17 *al.*
g See note *infr.*
h Rom. xvi. 18. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 13; Sirach xxiii. 6.
i See note *infr.*

the face of the die, (3) "mould, pattern," by transference from the effect to the cause. Wetst. quotes Diod. Sic., *Ex.* (?), τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον εἰς καλῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων μίμησιν ἀρχέτυπον τιθέναι. See also Radford, *Expositor*, v., 6, p. 380 ff.

Ver. 18. **πολλοὶ κ.τ.λ.** To whom does he refer? Plainly they were persons inside the Christian Church, although probably not at Philippi. This (against Ws.) is borne out by the use of περιπατεῖν compared with περιπατοῦντας (ver. 17) and στοιχεῖν (ver. 16), by κλαίων which would have no meaning here if not applied to professing Christians, and further by ἐχθρούς which would be a mere platitude if used of heathens or Jews. Some (*e.g.*, Schinz, Hort, Cone, etc.) refer this passage to the same persons as he denounces at the beginning of the chapter, the Judaising teachers. And no doubt they might fitly be called ἐχθροὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ (*cf.* Gal. vi. 12-14). But the rest of the description applies far more aptly to professing Christians who allowed their liberty to degenerate into licence (Gal. v. 13); who, from an altogether superficial view of grace, thought lightly of continuing in sin (Rom. vi. 1, 12-13, 15, 23); who, while bearing the name of Christ, were concerned only with their own self-indulgence (Rom. xvi. 18). If there did exist at Philippi any section disposed to look with favour on Judaising tendencies, this might lead others to exaggerate the opposite way of thinking and to become a ready prey to Antinomian reaction. Possibly passages like the present and Rom. xvi. 18 point to the earliest beginnings of that strange medley of doctrines which afterwards developed into Gnosticism. That this is the more natural explanation seems also to follow from the context. The Apostle has had in view, from ver. 11 onwards, the advance towards perfection, the point already attained, the kind of course to be imitated. It seems most fitting that he should warn against those who pretended to be on the straight path, but who were really straying on devious by-ways of their own.—**οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον κ.τ.λ.** "Whom I often used to call," etc. (so also Grotius, Heinrichs, Hfm.). *Cf.* Æsch., *Eumen.*, 48, οὔτοι γυναῖκας ἀλλὰ Γοργόνας λέγω. Hatz. (*Einl.*, p. 223) remarks that in the Greek islands they say μὲ λέγει or λέγει με = "he names me". Paul speaks with a depth and vehemence of feeling (πολλοὶ . . . πολλάκις . . . κλαίων) which suggest his genuine interest in those disloyal Christians who had once seemed to receive his message. If we imagine that the terms he uses are too strong to apply to professing Christians, we must remember that he speaks in a most solemn mood and from the highest point of view.—**τ. ἐχθροὺς τ. στ. τ. Χ.** If we are right in taking λέγω = "call," "name," τοὺς ἐχθ. will come in as the remoter accusative. Otherwise it must be regarded as assimilated to the relative clause, as in 1 John ii. 25. The true Christian is the man who is "crucified with Christ," who has "crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts". The Cross is the central principle in his life. "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." Those here described, by their unthinking self-indulgence, run directly in the teeth of this principle. The same thing holds good of much that passes for Christianity in modern life. "Who has not known kindly, serviceable men hanging about the Churches with a real predilection for the suburban life of Zion . . . and yet men whose life just seemed to omit the Cross of Christ" (Rainy, *op. cit.*, p. 286). It is quite probable that Paul would feel their conduct all the more keenly inasmuch as Judaisers might point to it as the logical consequence of his liberal principles.

Ver. 19. **ἀπώλεια.** Paul regards the two issues of human life as σωτηρία and ἀπώλεια (1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15-16). The latter is a common word for "destruction". There is much in the Epistles to support the statement of Hltzm. (*N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 50): "To be dead and to remain dead eternally, that is to him (Paul) the most dreadful of all thoughts". (Similarly Kabisch, *Eschatol. d. Paul.*, pp. 85,

k ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες. 20. ἡμῶν γάρ[1] τὸ l πολίτευμα ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὑπάρχει, ἐξ οὗ καὶ m σωτῆρα n ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν·

k Jas. iii. 15.
l Only here in N.T.
m P. has it Eph. v. 23. Past. Epp. (ten times). A word found (with excep. of four exx. in Luke's writings) only in later books of N.T.
n 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Heb. ix. 28.

[1] δε d, e, f, g, m, go. arm. æth. syrsch. et p. mg., Clem., Or., Eus., Chr., Thdrt., Cyp., Hil.

134.)—ἡ κοιλία. Most comm. compare Eupolis, Κολακ. 4, κοιλιοδαίμων, a "devotee of the belly". κ. is probably used as a general term to include all that belongs most essentially to the bodily, fleshly life of man and therefore inevitably perishes. *Istorum venter nitet: nostrum corpus atteritur: utrumque schema commutabitur* (Beng.). Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 115 ff.) supposes that we have here the same development of Judaism which is attacked in Col. ii. 20-23. But this type of life was by no means confined to Jews.—ἡ δ. ἐν τ. αἰσχ. "Who boast of what is really a disgrace to them." Wetst. aptly quotes Polyb., 15, 23, ἐφ' οἷς ἐχρῆν αἰσχύνεσθαι καθ' ὑπερβολήν, ἐπὶ τούτοις ὡς καλοῖς σεμνύνεσθαι καὶ μεγαλαυχεῖν. *Cf.* Prov. xxvi. 11, ἔστιν αἰσχύνη ἐπάγουσα ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ ἔστιν αἰσχύνη δόξα καὶ χάρις. (So also Sirach iv. 21.) This was apparently a current proverb. The limiting of αἰσχ. here to sensual sins is doubtful.—οἱ τ. ἐπίγ. φρον. It seems reasonable to explain the nominative as a resumption of the opening words of the sentence, summing up tersely the character in view. *Cf.* Mark xii. 38-40. τὰ ἐπίγ. are opposed to τὰ ἔμπροσθεν or τὰ ἄνω. Curiously parallel is the Homeric phrase (*Odyss.*, 21, 85), νήπιοι ἀγροιῶται ἐφημέρια φρονέοντες.

Vv. 20-21. HEAVENLY-MINDEDNESS AND ITS PROSPECT.—Ver. 20. τὸ πολίτευμα. "Our commonwealth." (Tertull., *municipatus*. Cyp., Iren., *conversatio*.) The thought is certainly suggested by ἐπίγ. φρον. in ver. 19 (this is the force of γάρ). This world has a characteristic spirit of its own. Worldliness is the common bond of citizenship in it. There is another commonwealth, not of the world (John xviii. 36), which inspires its members with a different tone of life. They "seek the things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God". *Cf.* 4 *Ezr.*, 8, 52: *Vobis enim apertus est paradisus . . . praeparata est habundantia, aedificata est civitas*. The stability and security of the *pax Romana* (one of the most favourable influences for Christianity) filled the thought of the time with high conceptions of citizenship and its value. This would specially appeal to the Philippians, who must have prided themselves on possessing the *jus Italicum* with all its privileges (see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Bd. i., pp. 363-365). Again and again Paul himself found his Roman citizenship a sure protection. Perhaps the unjust treatment he had received in that capacity at Philippi (Acts xvi. 22-23, 37-39) resulted in securing for the young Christian community a certain immunity from persecution through the favour of the magistrates who might fear the consequences of their gross violation of justice. The word πολίτευμα had been adopted by the Jews from Greek civic life long before this letter was written (see Hicks, *Classical Review*, i., 1, pp. 6-7, on the whole subject of political terms in N.T.). *Cf.* Philo, *de Conf. Ling.*, p. 78 (ed. Wendl.), πατρίδα μὲν τὸν οὐράνιον χῶρον ἐν ᾧ πολιτεύονται, ξένην δὲ τὸν περίγειον ἐν ᾧ παρῴκησαν νομίζουσαι; Aug., *de Civ. D.*, xi., 1 (quoted by Wohl.); the Latin Mediaev. Hymn, *Urbs Ierusalem beata, Dicta pacis visio, Quae construitur in caelis, Vivis ex lapidibus*; and see Heb. x. 34, Jas. iv. 4, 1 John ii. 17. πολίτ. is used = "commonwealth" in 2 Macc. xii. 7 and Inscriptions. There is a good discussion of Paul's relation to the state in Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., p. 157 ff.—ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Paul had no earthly home.—ὑπάρχει. It is perhaps used to add dignity to the thought, or, possibly, to emphasise the idea of substantial existence and reality. *Cf.* ὑπάρχων in chap. ii. 6.—ἐξ οὗ. It seems needless to make this an adverb. οὗ refers quite directly to πολίτευμα (so also Beng., Hfm., Lips., Holst., etc.).—καί marks the reasonableness of looking for the Saviour from the heavenly commonwealth. Because their πολίτ. is in heaven they have a claim on the Saviour, just as the Philippians might rightfully look for protection to Rome.—σωτῆρα. Used, no doubt, in the technical sense of Christ's deliverance at His coming (so

21. ὃς ° μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ᵖ ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, εἰς [1] τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ [1] ᵠ σύμμορφον [2] τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν ʳ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι ἑαυτῷ [3] τὰ πάντα.

o 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. No other exx. in N.T. Late authors.

p Luke i. 48 (1 Sam. i. 11); Acts viii. 33 (Isa. liii. 8). q For constrn. see note *infr.* Rom. viii. 29. r Eph. iii. 7; Col. ii. 12 *al* (only in P). Four exx. in Wisd.

[1] So Dᵇ ᵉᵗ ᶜ, EKLP, Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Aug. ("an ancient supplement," Myr.). Edd. om. **εις το γενεσθαι αυτο** with ℵABD*FG, d, e, f, g, m, vg. go. cop., many Fathers.

[2] So Trg., Alf., Ws., W.H. with ABDᶜEKLP, etc. Ti. **συνμ.** with ℵD*FG.

[3] So ℵᶜDᶜEL, vg., Chr.[341], Thdrt., Dam., Hil. Ti., Trg., Alf., Myr., Ws. **αυτω** (W.H. **αὑτῷ**) with ℵ*ABD*FGKP, d, e, g, Eus., Epiph., Euth., Chr.

also Kl.), but strangely rare until the Pastoral Epistles. It corresponds to Paul's use of **σωτηρία**.—**ἀπεκδεχ.** The compound emphasises the intense yearning for the Parousia. It is no wonder that early Christian thought centred round that time. There was nothing to root their affections in the world (*cf.* Gal. i. 4). The dominant influence of this expectation in Paul's thinking and working is only beginning to be fully recognised. See some suggestive paragraphs in Wernle's *Der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paul.*, pp. 122-123.—**Κύρ. Ἰ. Χ.** This order is always found in the phrase.

Ver. 21. **μετασχ.** It is doubtful whether, in this passage, any special force can be given to **μετασχ.** as distinguished from **μεταμορφοῦν**, carrying out the difference between **σχῆμα** and **μορφή**. The doubt is borne out by its close connexion here with **σύμμορφον**. Perhaps, however, the compound of **σχῆμα** has in view the fact that only the fashion or figure in which the personality is clothed will be transformed. We have here (as Gw. notes) the reverse of the process in chap. ii. 6-11. The *locus classicus* on the word is 2 Cor. xi. 13-15. It is found in Plato and Aristotle in its strict sense. *Cf.* also 4 Macc., ix., 22. It is Christ who effects the transformation in the case of His followers, because He is **πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν** (1 Cor. xv. 45). *Cf. Apocal. of Bar.*, li. 3: "As for the glory of those who have now been justified in my law . . . their splendour will be glorified in changes, and the form of their face will be turned into the light of their beauty, that they may be able to acquire and receive the world which does not die".—**τὸ σῶμα τ. ταπειν.** The expression must apply esp. to the unfitness of the present bodily nature to fulfil the claims of the spiritual life. It is pervaded by fleshly lusts; it is doomed to decay. **ταπειν.** is plainly suggested by **δόξα** which follows. **σῶμα** is "pure form which may have the most diverse content. Here, on earth, **σῶμα = σάρξ**" (see an illuminating discussion by F. Köstlin, *Jahrb. f. deutsche Th.*, 1877, p. 279 ff.). Holst. (*Paulin. Th.*, p. 10) notes that for this conception of **σῶμα** as "organised matter," the older Judaism had no word besides בָּשָׂר. Later Hellenistic Judaism used the word **σῶμα** in its Pauline sense (see Wisd. ix. 15).—**εἰς τὸ γ. α.** is to be omitted with the best authorities. See crit. note *supr.*—**σύμμορφον** is used proleptically as its position shows. *Cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 13, **στηρίξαι τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀμέμπτους.** Perhaps the compound of **μορφή** is used to remind them of the completeness of their future assimilation to Christ. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 29. The end of the enumeration in that passage is **ἐδόξασεν. δόξα** is the climax here.—**τ. σώμ. τ. δόξης α.** With Paul **δόξα** is always the outward expression of the spiritual life (**πνεῦμα**). It is, if one may so speak, the semblance of the Divine life in heaven. The Divine **πνεῦμα** will ultimately reveal itself in all who have received it as **δόξα.** That is what the N.T. writers mean by the completed, perfected "likeness to Christ". This passage, combined with 1 Cor. xv. 35-50 and 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5, gives us the deepest insight we have into Paul's idea of the transition from the present life to the future. He only speaks in detail of that which awaits believers. Whether they die before the Parousia or survive till then, a change will take place in them. But this is not arbitrary. It is illustrated by the sowing of seed. The Divine **πνεῦμα** which they have received will work out for them a **σῶμα πνευματικόν.** Their renewed nature will be clothed with a corresponding body through the power of Christ who is Himself the source of their

IV. 1. ῞ΩΣΤΕ, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ [a] ἐπιπόθητοι, χαρὰ καὶ [b] στέφανός μου,[1] οὕτω [2c] στήκετε ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἀγαπητοί.[3]

2. Εὐοδίαν[4] [d] παρακαλῶ, καὶ Συντύχην[5] παρακαλῶ, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν

a Only here in N.T. Apost. Fathers.
b See note *infr.*, and *cf.* Prov. xii. 4, xvi. 31, xvii. 6 *al.*
c See on chap. i. 27 *supr.*
d Acts xi. 23, xiv. 22; 1 Thess. iv. 10 *al.*

[1] Om. B*.
[2] So BD*. Edd. **ουτως** with ℵADcEFGLP.
[3] B 17, cop. syrsch. add **μου.** D*, 108*, d, e, go., Victorin. om. **αγαπητοι.**
[4] Alf. **Ευωδιαν** with P 47, *al.*
[5] So Lach., Trg., Ws., W.H. Ti. **Συντυχήν** with Dc.

spiritual life. The **σῶμα σαρκικόν** must perish: that is the fate of **σάρξ.** If there be no **πνεῦμα,** and thus no **σῶμα πνευματικόν,** the end is destruction. But the **σῶμα πνευματικόν** is precisely that in which Christ rose from the dead and in which He now lives. Its outward semblance is **δόξα,** a glory which shone forth upon Paul from the risen Christ on the Damascus road, which he could never forget. Hence all in whom Christ has operated as **πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν** will be "changed into the same likeness from glory (**δόξα**) to glory". Paul does not here reflect on the time when the transformation takes place. That is of little moment to him. The fact is his supreme consolation. On the whole discussion see esp. Hltzm., *N.T. Th.*, ii., pp. 80-81 and Heinrici on 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff.; for the future **δόξα** *cf. Apocal. of Bar.*, xv. 8 (Ed. Charles).—**κατὰ τ. ἐνέργ. ἐνέργεια** is only used of superhuman power in N.T. *Quia nihil magis incredibile, nec magis a sensu carnis dissentaneum quam resurrectio: hac de causa Paulus infinitam Dei potentiam nobis ponit ob oculos quae omnem dubitationem absorbeat. Nam inde nascitur diffidentia quod rem ipsam metimur ingenii nostri angustiis* (Calvin).—**τοῦ δύν.** "His efficiency which consists in His being able," etc. The beginnings of this use of the genitive of the infinitive without a preposition appear in classical Greek. But in N.T. it was extended like that of **ἵνα.** *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Acts xiv. 9, 2 Cor. viii. 11. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 229; Viteau, *Le Verbe*, p. 170.—**ὑποτάξαι.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 24-28.—**ἑαυτῷ. αυτω** must be read with the best authorities. How is it to be accented? Is it to be **αὐτῷ** or **αὑτῷ**? W.H. read the former, regarding this as one of the exceptional cases where "a refusal to admit the rough breathing introduces language completely at variance with all Greek usage without the constraint of any direct evidence, and solely on the strength of partial analogies" (*N.T.*, ii., *Append.*, p. 144). On the other hand, Blass (*Gram.*, p. 35, note 2) refuses to admit **αὑτῷ.** Winer, although preferring **αὑτῷ,** leaves the matter to the judgment of edd. Buttmann gives good reasons for usually reading **αὑτ.** (*Gram.*, p. 111). Certainly **αὑτοῦ** is quite common as a reflexive in Inscriptions of the Imperial age (see Meisterhans, *Gram. d. Att. Inschrr.*, § 59, 5). To sum up, it cannot be said that the aspirated form is impossible, but ordinarily it is safer to omit the aspirate. *Cf.* Simcox, *Lang. of N.T.*, pp. 63-64.

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1-3. Counsels to individual members of the Church.—Ver. 1. **ὥστε.** It seems better to regard this as drawing the conclusion from iii. 17-21 than to refer it to the whole of the discussion in chap. iii.—**στέφ. μ.** *Cf.* the combination in 1 Thess. ii. 19, **τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ χαρὰ ἢ στέφανος καυχήσεως;** the meaning is best seen from chap. ii. 16. He is thinking of the "day of Christ". His loyal Christian converts will then be his garland of victory, the clear proof that he has not run in vain. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24-25, Sirach vi. 31. **στεφανόω** often means "to reward," see Dsm., *BS.*, p. 261.—**οὕτω.** That is, according to the type which has been described in chap. iii. 17 ff.—**στήκετε** is a word of late coinage, belonging to the colloquial language, and leaving as its survival the modern Greek **στέκω.** Often found in N.T.

Ver. 2. **Εὐοδ. κ.τ.λ.** This direct reference to a difference of opinion between two women of prominence in the Philippian Church is probably the best comment we have on the slight dissensions which are here and there hinted at throughout the Epistle. For, as Schinz aptly puts it (*op. cit.*, p. 37), "in such a pure Church, even slight bickerings would make a great impression". We find no trace of the cause. It may have turned on the question discussed in chap. iii.

ἐν Κυρίῳ. 3. καὶ[1] [e]ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ, σύζυγε[2] [f]γνήσιε,[3] [g]συλλαμβάνου[4] αὐταῖς, αἵτινες ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ [h]συνήθλησάν μοι, μετὰ καὶ[5] Κλήμεντος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν[6] συνεργῶν μου, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν [i]βίβλῳ ζωῆς.

e See note *infr.*
f 1 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4.
g Luke v. 7 (no other ex. in N.T.).
h Chap. i. 27.
i See note *infr.*

[1] So 115, Ambrst. Edd. ναι with ℵABDEFGKLP, O.L. vg., etc.

[2] So ℵ*BD^cEKLP. Ti., Alf., Ws., W.H. (⸢ ⸣) συνζυγε with ℵ^cAD*FG (see Bousset, *Textkrit. Studien*, p. 102). W.H. mg. Συνζυγε.

[3] So KL, syrr., Chr., Thdrt. Edd. γν. σ. with ℵABDE(FG)P 17, 47, etc.

[4] So Lach. with AB^cD^cEKLP. Edd. συνλ. with ℵB*D*FG 17 (see Ws., *TK.*, p. 138; Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 103).

[5] Om. και D*EFG, d, e, f, g, vg. go. syr^p. arm. æth., Vict., Ambrst.

[6] ℵ* και των λοιπων after μου.

15-16. It may have been accidental friction between two energetic Christian women. But from the whole tone of the Epistle it cannot have gone far. Six Christian bishops named **Εὐόδιος** are mentioned in the *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.* The feminine name is also found in Inscrr.—**Συντύχη.** The name occurs both in Greek and Latin Inscrr., as well as in the *Acta Sanctorum* (v., 225). Curiously enough, there is no masculine name precisely corresponding to be found except the form *Sintichus* (*C.I.L.*, xii., no. 4703, from Narbo in Gaul. The Inscr. quoted by Lft. is spurious). On the correct accentuation see the elaborate note in W-Sch., p. 71. Lft. has collected valuable evidence to show the superior position occupied by women in Macedonia. See his *Philippians*, p. 56, notes 2, 3, where he quotes Inscrr., in some of which a metronymic takes the place of the patronymic, while others record monuments erected in honour of women by public bodies. We may add, from Heuzey, *Voyage Archéol.*, p. 423, an Inscr. of Larissa, where a woman's name occurs among the winners in the horse-races (see *Introduction*). For the prominence of women generally in the Pauline Churches, *cf.* Rom. xvi. *passim*, 1 Cor. xiv. 34-35. The repetition of **παρακαλῶ** perhaps hints that Paul wishes to treat each of them alike. [Hitzig, *Zur Kritik Paulin. Brr.*, p. 5 ff., exemplifies the pitch of absurdity which N.T. critics reached in a former generation, by supposing that these names represent two heathen-Christian parties, the one Greek, the other Roman.]

Ver. 3. **ναί** must certainly be read with all trustworthy authorities. Exactly parallel is Philm. 20. *Cf.* Soph., *Elect.*, 1445, **σὲ κρίνω, ναὶ σέ.**—**ἐρωτῶ** is common in N.T. = "beseech," *e.g.*, Luke xiv. 18. It is not so found in LXX, and this sense is very rare in late writers.—**γνήσιε σ.** is to be read with the great mass of authorities. We believe that W.H. are right in their marginal reading of **Σύνζυγε** as a proper name. This would harmonise with the other names mentioned. And the epithet **γν.** increases the probability. He requests Syzygus (lit. = joiner together) to help Euodia and Syntyche to make up their differences. "I beseech thee, who art a genuine Syzygus (in deed as well as in name) to help," etc. (so also Myr., Kl., Weizs.). See esp. an excellent discussion by Laurent, *N.T. Studien*, pp. 134-137. The fact that this name has not been found in books, Inscrr., etc., is no argument against its existence. Zygos is found as a Jewish name (quoted by Zunz). Similar compounds such as **Συμφέρων, Συμφέρουσα** occur. Perhaps all the above names were given to them after Baptism. Lft. and others refer **σύνζ.** to Epaphroditus. Chr. thinks of the husband of one of the women addressed. Wieseler (*Chronol.*, p. 458) actually refers it to Christ.—**συλλ.** Paul's friend is plainly a man of tact who can do much to bring the Christian women now at variance together again. Holst. thinks, and perhaps with some reason, that the use of **συλλαμβ.** implies that Euodia and Syntyche were already trying to lay aside their differences.—**αἵτινες.** "Inasmuch as they laboured with me." Their former services to the Gospel are a reason why they should receive every encouragement to a better state of mind. *Cf.* Acts xvi. 13.—**μετὰ καὶ Κλ.** An unusual position for **καί** although found in Pindar, Dionys.

k 1 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. iii. 2; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 18.

4. **Χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ πάντοτε· πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε.** 5. **τὸ** [k] **ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν γνωσθήτω πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς.**

Halicarn., Aelian, and, above all, in Josephus, who delights in this construction (see Schmidt, *De Elocut. Jos.*, p. 16; Schmid, *Atticismus*, iii., p. 337). These words must be taken with **συνήθλ.** He wishes to remind his Christian friend at Philippi of the noble company to which the women had belonged, a company held in the highest esteem in the Philippian Church. **Κλήμης** must have been some disciple at Philippi, unknown to Church history like the others mentioned here. It is nothing short of absurd (with Gw.) to make this Clement the celebrated bishop of Rome. See esp. Salmon, *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, i., p. 555. The same form in **-ης, -εντος** is seen in **Κρήσκης, Πούδης** (2 Tim. iv. 10, 21).—**ὧν τὰ ὀν. ἐν βίβ. ζ.** Perhaps the phrase implies that they had passed away. The Apostle almost seems to foresee the obscurity which will hang over many a devoted fellow-labourer of his. But their names have a glory greater than that of historical renown. They are in the **βίβλος ζωῆς.** The idea is common in O.T. *Cf.* Exod. xxxii. 32, Ps. lxix. 29, Dan. xii. 1. See also *Apocal. of Bar.*, xxiv., 1; *Henoch*, xlvii., 3; 4 *Ezra* xiv., 35; and, in N.T., Rev. iii. 5. Good discussions of the subject will be found in Weber, *Lehren d. Talmud*, pp. 233, 276; Schürer, ii., 2, p. 182.

Vv. 4-9. GENERAL EXHORTATIONS ON THE RIGHT SPIRIT AND THE RIGHT CONDUCT OF LIFE.—Ver. 4. **χαίρετε** expresses the predominant mood of the Epistle, a mood wonderfully characteristic of Paul's closing years.—**πάλιν.** "He doubles it to take away the scruple of those that might say, what, shall we rejoice in afflictions?" (G. Herbert).—**ἐρῶ.** The future of this verb is probably used here, as apparently often in late Greek, for the present.

Ver. 5. **τ. ἐπιεικ.** "Reasonableness." Matthew Arnold finds in this a preeminent feature in the character of Jesus and designates it "sweet reasonableness" (see *Literature and Dogma*, pp. 66, 138). The trait could not be more vividly delineated than in the words of W. Pater (*Marius the Epicurean*, ii., p. 120), describing the spirit of the new Christian society as it appeared to a pagan. "As if by way of a due recognition of some immeasurable Divine condescension manifest in a certain historic fact, its influence was felt more especially at those points which demanded some sacrifice of one's self, for the weak, for the aged, for little children, and even for the dead. And then, for its constant outward token, its significant manner or index, it issued in a certain debonair grace, and a certain mystic attractiveness, a courtesy, which made Marius doubt whether that famed Greek blitheness or gaiety or grace in the handling of life had been, after all, an unrivalled success." A definition is given by Aristot., *Eth. Nic.*, 5, 10, 3, **τὸ ἐπιεικὲς δίκαιον μέν ἐστιν, οὐ τὸ κατὰ νόμον δέ, ἀλλ' ἐπανόρθωμα νομίμου δικαίου,** where the point is that it means a yielding up of certain real rights. This spirit, in the Christian life, is due to those higher claims of love which Christ has set in the forefront. *Cf.* 2 Cor. x. 1, Tit. iii. 2. Their joy (ver. 4) really depends on this "reasonableness" having as wide a scope as possible. It is he who shows forbearance and graciousness all round (**γνωσθ. πᾶσιν ἀνθ.**) who can preserve an undisturbed heart. In Ps. Sol. v. 14 God is called **χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής.—ὁ κ. ἐγγύς.** Quite evidently Paul expects a speedy return of Christ. It was natural in the beginning of the Church's history, before men had a large enough perspective in which to discern the tardy processes of the Kingdom of God. *Cf.* chap. iii. 21. This solemn fact which governs the whole of Paul's thinking, and has especially moulded his ethical teaching, readily suggests "reasonableness". The Lord, the Judge, is at the door. Leave all wrongs for Him to adjust. Forbear all wrath and retaliation (*cf.* Rom. xii. 19 ff.). But further, in view of such a prospect, earthly bickerings and wranglings are utterly trivial. *Cf.* 1 John ii. 28, "Abide in Him, so that if He be manifested, we may have boldness and not be ashamed before Him at His coming." A close parallel is Jas. v. 8.

Ver. 6. **μ. μερ.** "In nothing be anxious." **μερ.** is not common in earlier prose. It is used repeatedly in LXX of anxiety (*a*) approaching dread as Ps. xxxvii. 19, (*b*) producing displeasure as Ezek. xvi. 42, (*c*) of a general kind as 1 Chron. xvii. 9. For the thought *cf.* 4 *Ezra* ii. 27: *Noli satagere, cum venerit enim dies pressurae et angustiae . . . tu autem hilaris et copiosa eris.* See the

6. μηδὲν [l] μεριμνᾶτε, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει μετὰ [m] εὐχαριστίας τὰ [m] αἰτήματα ὑμῶν [n] γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 7. καὶ ἡ [o] εἰρήνη τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα [p] νοῦν, [p] φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ [p] νοήματα [2] ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

l Matt. vi. 25, 27, 31; Luke xii. 22, 25, 26 al.
m See note infr.
n Frequent in N.T.
o Cf. Col. iii. 15.
p See note infr.

[1] του Χριστου A, syrp. mg., Cyr., Proc., Ambr., Pelag.

[2] σωματα Fgr.G, d, e, g, m, Victorin., Chrom.

note on chap. ii. 20 *supr.*—προσευ. κ. τ. δεήσ. προσευχή emphasises prayer as an act of worship or devotion; δέησις is the cry of personal need. See on chap. i. 4 *supr.* *Curare et orare plus inter se pugnant quam aqua et ignis* (Beng.).—μετὰ εὐχ. The word is rarely found in secular Greek (*e.g.*, Hippocr., Polyb., Diod.; see Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 69), or LXX. Paul uses it twelve times, but only twice with the article. Does not this imply that he takes for granted that thanksgiving is the background, the predominant tone of the Christian life? To pray in any other spirit is to clip the wings of prayer.—αἴτημα is found three times in N.T. It emphasises the object asked for (see an important discussion by Ezra Abbot in *N. Amer. Review*, 1872, p. 171 ff.). "Prayer is a wish referred to God, and the possibility of such reference, save in matters of mere indifference, is the test of the purity of the wish" (Green, *Two Sermons*, p. 44).—πρὸς τ. Θεόν. "In the presence of God." A delicate and suggestive way of hinting that God's presence is always there, that it is the atmosphere surrounding them. Anxious foreboding is out of place in a Father's presence. Requests are always in place with Him. With this phrase *cf.* Rom. xvi. 26.

Ver. 7. Hpt. would put no stop at the close of ver. 6. Whether there be a stop or not, this verse is manifestly a kind of apodosis to the preceding. "If you make your requests, etc., . . . then the peace . . . shall guard," etc. ἡ εἰρ. τ. Θ. Paul's favourite thought of that health and harmonious relation which prevail in the inner life as the result of reconciliation with God through Jesus Christ. *Cf.* Matt. xi. 28. It would be an undue restriction of his thought to imagine that he only refers to agreement between members of the Church, although, no doubt, that idea is here included. "This peace is like some magic mirror, by the dimness growing on which we may discern the breath of an unclean spirit that would work us ill" (Rendel Harris, *Memoranda Sacra*, p. 130; the quotation skilfully catches the spiritual conception before Paul's mind). To share anxiety with God is to destroy its corroding power and to be calmed by His peace. Peace is used as a name of God in the Talmud (see Taylor, *Jewish Fathers*, pp. 25-26).—ἡ ὑπερέχ. πάντα νοῦν. "Which surpasses every thought, all our conception." (So also Chr., Erasm., Weizs., Moule, Von Soden, etc.). This meaning seems inevitable from the parallel in Eph. iii. 20, τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν, and *cf.* ver. 19, τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χ. Space forbids the enumeration of the many interpretations given. Wordsworth (*Prelude*, Bk. 14) defines this peace as "repose in moral judgments".—νοῦν . . . καρδίας . . . νοήματα. νοῦς, very much what we call "reason," in Paul's view, belongs to the life of the σάρξ. It is the highest power in that life, and affords, as it were, the material on which the Divine πνεῦμα can work. It remains in those who possess the πνεῦμα as that part of the inner man which is exposed to earthly influences and relations. (See an admirable note in Ws.) καρδία is "a more undefined concept, side by side with νοῦς" (so Lüdemann, *Anthropol.*, p. 16 ff.). It has to do not merely with feelings but with will. νοήματα are products of the νοῦς, thoughts or purposes. Paul would probably regard them as being contained in the καρδία. The word is found five times in 2 Cor. and nowhere else in N.T.—φρουρήσει. A close parallel is 1 Peter i. 5, τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει Θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν. Hicks (*Class. Review*, i., pp. 7-8) presses the figure of a garrison keeping ward over a town, and observes that one of the most important elements in the history of the Hellenistic period was the garrisoning of the cities both in Greece and Asia Minor by the successors of Alexander the Great.

8. Τὸ λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα [q] σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα [r] ἁγνά, ὅσα [s] προσφιλῆ, ὅσα [t] εὔφημα, εἴ [1] τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις [u] ἔπαινος,[2] ταῦτα [v] λογίζεσθε. 9. ἃ καὶ ἐμάθετε καὶ παρελάβετε καὶ ἠκούσατε καὶ εἴδετε ἐν ἐμοί, ταῦτα πράσσετε· καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν.

q 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2 (of persons). r 2 Cor. vii. 11; 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. iii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 2. s Only here in N.T. Sirach. t Only here in N.T. u *Cf.* chap. i. 11; Eph. i. 6, 12, 14. v See on chap. iii. 13.

[1] η K 17, d. scr. [2] επιστημης added by D*E*FG, d, e, f, g, Ambrst.

Cf. Gal. iii. 23. The peace of God is the garrison of the soul in all the experiences of its life, defending it from the external assaults of temptation or anxiety, and disciplining all lawless desires and imaginations within, that war against its higher purposes.—ἐν Χ. Ἰ. Christ Jesus is the sure refuge and the atmosphere of security.

Ver. 8. The thought of this paragraph (vv. 8-9) is closely connected with that of the preceding by the resumption of the phrase ἡ εἰρήνη τ. Θ. (ver. 7) in a new form ὁ Θ. τῆς εἰρήνης (ver. 9). The peace of God will be the guardian of their thoughts and imaginations, only they must do their part in bending their minds to worthy objects. Lft. and Ws. have elaborate classifications of Paul's list of moral excellences. It is not probable, in the circumstances, that any such was before the Apostle's mind.—τὸ λοιπόν is probably used to show that he is hastening to a close. See on chap. iii. 1 *supr.* Beyschl. well remarks on the "inexhaustibility" of the Christian moral ideal which is here presented. It embraces practically all that was of value in ancient ethics.—ἀληθῆ and δίκαια express the very foundations of moral life. If truth and righteousness are lacking, there is nothing to hold moral qualities together. —σεμνά. "Reverend." The due appreciation of such things produces what M. Arnold would call "a noble seriousness" (so also Vinc.). — προσφιλῆ. Our "lovely" in its original force gives the exact meaning, "those things whose grace attracts". The idea seems to be esp. applied to personal *bearing* towards others. See Sirach iv. 7, προσφιλῆ συναγωγῇ σεαυτὸν ποιεῖ; xx. 13, ὁ σοφὸς ἐν λόγῳ ἑαυτὸν προσφιλῆ ποιήσει. *Cf.* W. Pater's description of the Church in the second century: "She had set up for herself the ideal of spiritual development under the guidance of an instinct by which, in those serious moments, she was absolutely true to the peaceful soul of her Founder. 'Goodwill to men,' she said, 'in whom God Himself is well-pleased.' For a little while at least there was no forced opposition between the soul and the body, the world and the spirit, and the grace of graciousness itself was pre-eminently with the people of Christ" (*Marius*, ii., p. 132).—εὔφημα. Exactly = our "high-toned". (So also Ell.) "Was einen guten Klang hat" (Lips.). It is an extremely rare word.—εἴ τ. ἀρετ. κ.τ.λ. "Whatever excellence there be or fit object of praise." The suggestion of Lft., "Whatever value may exist in (heathen) virtue," etc., goes slightly beyond the natural sense, from the reader's point of view. *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, chap. ii., 1, "Rabbi said, which is the right course that a man should choose for himself? Whatsoever is a pride to him that pursues it and brings him honour from men." On the important range of meanings belonging to ἀρετή, see Dsm., *BS.*, p. 90 ff.—ἔπαινος, as Hort (on 1 Pet. i. 7) points out, corresponds exactly to ἀρετή and implies it, including in itself the idea of *moral* approbation. He observes that it refers chiefly to "the inward disposition to acts as actions" (see the whole valuable note).—τ. λογίζ. "Make them the subject of careful reflection." *Meditatio . . . praecedit: deinde sequitur opus* (Calv.).

Ver. 9. It is hardly possible, with Ell., to refer ἃ καὶ κ.τ.λ. immediately to the preceding, without forcing the construction.—ἐμάθ. κ. παρελ. plainly refer to the definite Christian teaching he had set himself to give them. παραλαμβάνω is used regularly of "receiving" truth from a teacher.—ἠκ. κ. εἴδ. ἐν ἐ. This is the impression made upon them by his Christian character, apart from any conscious effort on his part. *Cf.* chap. iii. 17.—ὁ Θ. τ. εἰρ. See on ver. 8 (*ad init.*). It is quite possible that he has partly in view the disregard of these ethical qualities as threatening the harmony of the Church, and as, so far, to blame for the divisions already existing.

10. Ἐχάρην δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ μεγάλως, ὅτι ἤδη ποτὲ [w] ἀνεθάλετε [1] τὸ [2] ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν· ἐφ᾿ ᾧ καὶ ἐφρονεῖτε, [x] ἠκαιρεῖσθε δέ. 11. οὐχ ὅτι καθ᾿ [y] ὑστέρησιν λέγω· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον, ἐν οἷς εἰμί, [z] αὐτάρκης

w Only here in N.T. Ezek. xvii. 24; Sirach i. 18, xi. 22, l. 10 *al.* See note *infr.* x Only here. y Mark xii. 44. z *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 6.

[1] D* εθαλατε. P 1, 4, 43 ανεθαλλετε. [2] FG του.

Vv. 10-14. Delicate expression of thanks for their gift.—Ver. 10. δέ marks the turning of Paul's thoughts to a different subject, or, as Lft. admirably expresses it, "arrests a subject which is in danger of escaping". He has not, up till now, *expressly* thanked them for their generous gift which was, in all likelihood, the occasion of this letter. The very fact of his accepting a present from them showed his confidence in their affection. This was indeed his right, but he seldom laid claim to it. No doubt the delicacy of his language here is due (so also Hilgenfeld, *ZwTh.*, xx., 2, pp. 183-184) to the base slanders uttered against him at Corinth and in Macedonia (1 Thess. ii. 5), as making the Gospel a means of livelihood (see 1 Cor. ix. 3-18, 2 Cor. xi. 8-9, Gal. vi. 6, and Schürer, ii., 1, pp. 318-319).—ἤδη ποτέ. An expressive combination = "already once more" (precisely = *schon wieder einmal*, which has a force corresponding to that of the Greek, which cannot be reproduced in English, that of the *unexpected* nature of the gift. So Ws.).—ἀνεθάλετε. The verb is very rare in secular Greek, while occurring nine times in LXX. This older aorist form takes the place of the more regular one five times in LXX. It is only found in the Bible. (See W-Sch., p. 110; Lobeck, *Paralipomena*, p. 557.) The verb is used both transitively and intransitively. Here it is probably transitive, as in Ezek. xvii. 24 and three other places in LXX (so De W., Ws., Lft., Holst., Lips., etc.). In that case τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν is the accusative governed by it. "You let your care for me blossom into activity again." Myr. thinks it inconsistent with the delicacy of Paul's tone in this passage to take it as transitive. But Paul expressly guards against hurting their feelings by correcting, as it were, his statement by the next clause in which he asserts, "You *did* truly care". This construction seems much more natural than to take τὸ ὑπ. ἐ. φρ. as an accusative of the inner object (so Myr., Gw., Hpt., Eadie). Moule, probably with justice, remarks that "the phrase is touched with a smile of gentle pleasantry" (*Philippian Studies*, p. 245).—ἐφ' ᾧ. The most various interpretations have been given. Some refer ᾧ to the whole phrase preceding. Some make ἀναθάλλειν the antecedent. Ell. renders, "with a view to which" (probably "my interests"; so also Gw., Beet); Lft. "in which" (taking it generally); Hfm. = ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι. The simplest explanation is to regard ἐμοῦ as antecedent (so also Calv., Vaughan). "About whom (lit. = in whose case) you certainly *did* care, were anxious, but you had no opportunity of showing your care in a practical fashion." ἐπί as contrasted with ὑπέρ preceding would express a more indefinite relation to Paul. They were always, as he well knew, thoroughly interested in him. The *definite* relation is connected with the actual bestowing of the gift.—ἠκαιρεῖσθε. Lidd. and Scott quote one instance of the simple verb ἀκαιρέω. It is not certain whether he refers here to lack of means or the want of opportunity to send a gift. The imperfects show the habitual state of their feelings towards Paul.

Ver. 11. The form of vv. 11-13, from ἐγὼ γάρ, is strophic. ἐγὼ . . . εἶναι gives the "theme". Ver. 13 marks the close. The thought is worked out between. See J. Weiss, *Beitr.*, p. 29.—οὐχ ὅτι. See on chap. iii. 12 *supr.*—καθ' ὑστέρησιν. "As regards want." κατά has the same sense as in the phrase τὰ κατ' ἐμέ.—ἐγώ emphasises his own position in a tone of calm independence of circumstances.—ἐν οἷς εἰμί. Taken by itself, the phrase might well mean, "in my present circumstances". But in view of the following verses it seems better to make it general = "in the circumstances in which I am placed at any moment". For exx. of the phrase see Kypke and Wetst. *ad loc.*—ἔμαθον must be translated into English as a perfect, "I have learned". But the Greek has a true aorist force: it sums up his experiences to the moment of writing and regards them as a whole.—αὐτάρκης is admirably illustrated by Plat., *Repub.*, 369 B, οὐκ αὐτάρκης, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐνδεής. "Dr. Johnson talked with approbation of one who had attained to the

εἶναι. 12. οἶδα δὲ[1] [a]ταπεινοῦσθαι, οἶδα καὶ[2] [b]περισσεύειν· ἐν [c]παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι [d]μεμύημαι καὶ [e]χορτάζεσθαι καὶ πεινᾷν, καὶ περισσεύειν καὶ [f]ὑστερεῖσθαι. 13. πάντα [g]ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ [g]ἐνδυναμοῦντί με Χριστῷ.[3] 14. πλὴν καλῶς ἐποιήσατε [h]συγκοινωνήσαντές[4]

a 2 Cor. xi. 7. See note infr.
b See ver. 18. Luke xv. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 12.
c 1 Cor. i. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 8, viii. 7; 1 Thess. v. 18.
d Only here in N.T.
e Often in Gospp. Ps. civ. 13.
f Luke xv. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 9; Heb. xi. 37; Sirach xi. 11.
g See note infr.
h Eph. v. 11; Rev. xviii. 4.

[1] So 137, some other minn. Edd. και with ℵABD, etc. Myr. supposes δε to have arisen from the last syll. of οιδα.

[2] A syr[sch]. om. και.

[3] So ℵ[c]D[c]E[gr.]F[gr.]GKLP, Ath., Cyr., Chr., Euth.[cod.], Thdrt., etc. Edd. om. Χριστῳ with ℵ*ABD* 17, d, e, f, r, vg. cop. arm. æth., Clem., Victorin., Ambrst. It was very probably added from 1 Tim. i. 12.

[4] So Lach., Trg., Alf. with ℵB[c]D[c]K[all.]LP. Ti., Ws., W.H. συνκ. with AB*D*EFG.

state of the philosophical wise man, that is, to have no want of anything. 'Then, sir,' said I, 'the savage is a wise man.' 'Sir,' said he, 'I do not mean simply being without,—but not having a want'" (Boswell's *Johnson*, p. 351, Globe ed.).

Ver. 12. οἶδα κ.τ.λ. καί must be read with all good authorities. The one καί must be correlative to the other, unless he intended to continue the sentence without the second οἶδα (see an excellent note on καί in N.T. in Ell. *ad loc*. He defines somewhat too minutely). Examples of the infinitive after οἶδα are to be found in classical Greek.—ταπειν. The best comment on this is 2 Cor. xi. 7, ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε. There it means, "keeping myself low" (in respect of the needs of daily life). Moule aptly quotes Diod., i., 36 (speaking of the Nile), καθ' ἡμέραν . . . ταπεινοῦται = "runs low".—ἐν παντ. κ. ἐν π. A vague, general phrase = "in all circumstances of life". It has no immediate connexion with μεμύημαι (*cf*. a similar expression τῷ παντί in Xen., *Hell*., 7, 5, 12, and τοῖς πᾶσιν or πᾶσιν in Thucyd., Soph., etc.).—μεμύημαι. The verb was originally used of one initiated into the Mysteries. It came (like our own "initiated") to lose its technical sense. But the word probably implies a difficult process to be gone through. *Cf*. Ps. xxv. 14: "The *secret* of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant" (Vaughan), and Wisd. viii. 4, μύστις γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης. In later ecclesiastical usage ὁ μεμυημένος = a baptised Christian (an instructive hint as to the growth of dogma). See Anrich, *Das Antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 158. μεμύ. goes closely with the infinitives following. *Cf*. Alciphron, 2, 4 *ad fin*., κυβερνᾶν μυηθήσομαι.—χορτάζεσθαι is a strong word, used originally of the feeding of animals, which gradually became colourless in the colloquial language (see *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 82).—πεινᾶν should be written without *iota subscript*. It is contracted here with α as usually in later Greek. See Phrynichus (ed. Lobeck), 61, 204. So always in LXX.—ὑστερεῖσθαι has the rare meaning "to be in want" (absol.), or rather (in middle), "to feel want". *Cf*. 2 Cor. xi. 9, and esp. Sirach xi. 11, ἔστιν κοπιῶν καὶ πονῶν καὶ σπεύδων, καὶ τόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑστερεῖται.

Ver. 13. π. ἰσχ. It is difficult to decide whether π. is accusative or merely adverbial. *Cf*. Jas. v. 16 (where apparently ἰσχύει has the accusative), and Wisd. xvi. 20, ἄρτον . . . ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἔπεμψας . . . πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν ἰσχύοντα. For the other alternative see Hom., *Odyss*., 8, 214.—ἐνδυν. *Cf*. Eph. vi. 10, ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ; Jud. vi. 34 (cod. A), πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐνεδυνάμωσεν τὸν Γεδεών. It is a rare word. The adjective ἐνδύναμος, from which it springs, is only found in late Byzantine Greek. An apt parallel to the whole context is Ps. Sol. 16, 12, ἐν τῷ ἐνισχῦσαί σε τὴν ψυχήν μου ἀρκέσει μοι τὸ δοθέν.—Χριστῷ must be omitted. See crit. note *supr*.

Ver. 14. πλήν. See on chap. iii. 16. "All the same, I rejoice in your kindness."—καλῶς. Hort (on 1 Pet. ii, 12) points out that καλός "denotes that kind of goodness which is at once seen to be good".—συνκ. (the preferable spelling).

μου τῇ θλίψει.[1] 15. οἴδατε δὲ[2] καὶ ὑμεῖς, Φιλιππήσιοι, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, ὅτε ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, οὐδεμία[3] μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς [i]λόγον [k]δόσεως καὶ λήψεως,[4] [k]εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι· 16. ὅτι καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ καὶ [l]ἅπαξ καὶ [l]δὶς εἰς[5] τὴν [m]χρείαν μοι[6] ἐπέμψατε. 17. οὐχ ὅτι [n]ἐπιζητῶ τὸ [o]δόμα, ἀλλ' ἐπιζητῶ τὸν

i See ver. 17. *Cf.* συναίρειν λόγον in Matt. xviii. 23, xxv. 19.
k Sirach xli. 19, xlii. 7. *Cf.* Jas. i. 17.
l See note *infr.*
m Ver. 19; Acts xx. 34; Rom. xii. 13 *al.*
n Matt. vi. 32; Luke xii. 30; Rom. xi. 7 *al.*
o Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 13. Often in LXX. See Grimm-Thayer *ad voc.*

[1] τ. θλ. μ. DEFG, O.L. vg.

[2] Om. δε Dgr.*Egr.* 37, 115 *al.*, syrp. arm. æth., Chr., Thdrt.

[3] οτι inserted before ουδ. by D*E*Fgr.G, d, e, g.

[4] So BcDcEKLP. Edd. λημψ. with ℵAB*D*FG.

[5] Om. εις AD*(E*) 39, 73, go. arm. æth., Victorin. Lach. and Lft. bracket.

[6] μου DELP, g, syrp. cop. arm., Proc., Thphl., Aug., Ambrst.

In classical usage (almost confined to Demosth.) this verb has the genitive of the thing in which a share is given. They had made common cause with his affliction (probably referring to his imprisonment). The bringing forward of **μου** emphasises their personal relation to the Apostle, which was apt to be obscured by the form of expression used.

Vv. 15-19. Their earlier and later generosity and its Divine reward.—Ver. 15. **δέ** marks the transition to his first experience of their generosity. "But this is no new thing, for you have always been generous. You know this as well as I do" (**καὶ ὑμεῖς**).—**Φιλιππήσ.** (A Latin form, see Ramsay, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, i., 1, p. 116.) He singles them out from all the other Churches.—**ἐν ἀρχ. τ. εὐαγ.** It is difficult to see (in spite of Haupt's objections) how this could mean anything else than "at the time when the Gospel was first preached to you". That had been about ten years previously. *Cf.* 1 Clem. 47, **ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου· τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν;** probably this is the gift referred to in 2 Cor. xi. 9 (*cf.* Acts xviii. 5). He refused to take any pecuniary aid at Corinth lest the Judaising teachers should make it a ground for false charges.—**μοι . . . ἐκοινών.** This use (in N.T.) is apparently confined to the Epistles. A precise parallel (**κοιν.** with dative and **εἰς**) is found in Plat., *Repub.*, v., 453 A.—**εἰς λόγ. δ. κ. λ.** Lit. = "No Church communicated with me so as to have an account of giving and receiving" (debit and credit). The whole of the context has a colouring of financial terms. Probably Paul uses them in a half-humorous manner. The combination of **δ.** and **λ.** is frequent. *Cf.* Sirach xlii. 7, **δόσις καὶ λῆμψις παντὶ ἐν γραφῇ**, and in Latin authors, Cic., *Lael.*, 16, *ratio acceptorum et datorum*. Numerous exx. are given by Wetst. Paul had bestowed on them priceless spiritual gifts. It was only squaring the account that he should receive material blessings from them. Their mutual relations are expressed by the Apostle very delicately, as throughout this paragraph. His manner here gives a luminous view of his refined sensibility.

Ver. 16. **ὅτι κ.τ.λ.** We are greatly inclined to take **ὅτι** here, as in ver. 15, as dependent on **οἴδατε**. "Ye know . . . that at the beginning . . . that even in Thessalonica," etc. Thessalonica was a city of far greater wealth and importance than Philippi. **καί** might, however, emphasise the fact that they began *at once* to support him.—**ἅπαξ κ. δίς** is probably to be taken literally. *Cf.* Deut. ix. 13, **λελάληκα πρὸς σὲ ἅπαξ καὶ δίς**; 1 Macc. iii. 30, **εὐλαβήθη μὴ οὐκ ἔχει ὡς ἅπαξ καὶ δίς**. It is interpreted in a more general sense by Lft. and Wohl.—**εἰς τ. χρείαν. εἰς** should be read with most of the best authorities. It is probably used here in a semi-technical meaning often found in Papyri (see Dsm., *BS.*, pp. 113-115; *NBS.*, p. 23) and also in Paul, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, **τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους**; Rom. xv. 26, **κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχούς**. It describes the object of gifts, collections, etc., or the various items in an account which have to be met. This interpretation accords with the financial colouring of the passage.

Ver. 17. **τὸ δόμα.** It is not the actual gift put into Paul's hands which has

p Rom. v. 20, vi. 1; 2 Thess. i. 3; 2 Pet. i. 8.
q Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16.
r No precise parallel to this sense. Verb common in N.T. and LXX.

καρπὸν τὸν [p] πλεονάζοντα εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν. 18. [q] ἀπέχω δὲ πάντα καὶ περισσεύω· [r] πεπλήρωμαι, δεξάμενος παρὰ[1] Ἐπαφροδίτου τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν,[2] [s] ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, θυσίαν [t] δεκτήν, [u] εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ. 19. ὁ δὲ Θεός μου πληρώσει[3] πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον[4] αὐτοῦ ἐν [v] δόξῃ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. 20. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

s Eph. v. 2. ὀσμ. εὐωδ. often in LXX. t Luke iv. 24; Acts x. 35 *al.* In LXX, *e.g.*, Isa. xlix. 8 *al.* u Rom. xii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 9 *al.* Wisd. iv. 10, ix. 10. v 1 Cor. xv. 43; Col. iii. 4 *al.*

[1] A om. **παρα.**

[2] Dgr.*Egr.* add **πεμφθεν.** FG, d, e, f, g, r, Iren., Cyp., Vict., Ambrst. add **πεμφθεντα.**

[3] **πληρωσαι** D*FG 17, 37, d, e, f, g, r, vg., Chr., Euth.cod., Cyr., Thdrt., Thphl., Vict., Ambrst.

[4] So Db et cEKL, Chr., Cyr. Edd. **το πλουτος** with ℵ*BD*FGP 17, 67**, Euth.cod.

brought him joy, but the giving (**δόσις,** ver. 15) and the meaning of that giving. It is the truest index to the abiding reality of his work.—**καρπὸν . . . πλεονάζοντα . . . λόγον.** We believe that Chr. is right in regarding these terms as belonging to the money-market. **ὁ καρπὸς ἐκείνοις τίκτεται** (Chr.). "Interest accumulating to your credit." This is favoured by the language of vv. 15-16 *supr.* **πλεονάζειν** is never used in a good sense in classical Greek, but always = "exceed," "go beyond bounds".

Ver. 18. **ἀπέχω.** The use of this word adds much force to the thought, when we bear in mind that it was the regular expression in the Papyri to denote *the receipt of what was due*, *e.g.*, Faijûm Pap., Sept. 6, A.D. 57: **ἀπέχω παρ' ὑμῶν τὸν φόρον τοῦ ἐλα[ι]ουργίου ὧν ἔχετε [μο]υ ἐν μισθώσει.** (Dsm., *NBS.*, p. 56.) Chr. evidently knew this sense, for he says, "**ἔδειξεν ὅτι ὀφειλή ἐστιν τὸ πρᾶγμα· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν, ἀπέχω**". Thus the prevailing tone of the whole context is maintained. The word is almost = "I give you a receipt for what you owed me". The genial strain of humour is in no discord with his more serious thoughts.—**περισσεύω.** *Cf. Sayings of Jew. Fathers*, p. 64: "Who is rich? He that is contented with his lot."—**πεπλήρ.** Classical Greek would hardly use the word in this personal sense. The closing words of the verse have underlying them the idea of sacrifice. A gift to an Apostle or spiritual teacher seems to have been regarded in the Early Church, like the gifts brought in the Eucharist, as an offering to God. The recipient is looked upon as the representative of God (see Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, pp. 74 ff., 81 *n.*).—**ὀσμ. εὐωδ.** "A scent of sweet savour."—**θυσίαν δεκτ.** "A technical term according to Sirach xxxii. 9" (Hpt.).—**εὐάρεστον.** *Cf.* Rom. xii. 1 ff., which bears closely upon the whole passage.

Ver. 19. **ὁ δὲ Θεός κ.τ.λ.** God's treatment of them corresponds to their treatment of Paul. They had ministered to his **χρεία,** so that he could say **πεπλήρωμαι.** That was the side of the reckoning which stood to their credit. Here is the other side. "My God shall repay what has been done to me His servant for the Gospel's sake. He, in turn, shall satisfy to the full (**πληρώσει**) *every need of yours.*"—**τὸ πλοῦτος** must be read. See crit. note *supr.* So also in 2 Cor. viii. 2, Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8, 16, Col. i. 27, ii. 2. But **ὁ πλοῦτος** in Eph. i. 18, and repeatedly both in nominative, genitive and accusative singular. Modern Greek uses **πλοῦτος, βίος, θρῆνος** sometimes with **ὁ,** sometimes with **τό.** LXX generally has **ὁ.**—**ἐν δόξῃ.** The phrase is regarded by some (*e.g.*, Beng., Ws., Eadie, etc.) as = "in a lavish, magnificent way". This is to strain the sense. It is much more natural, comparing Rom. viii. 21, Eph. i. 18 (**τίς ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας**), to think of it as the future Messianic glory which Paul believed to be so near (so Lft., Kl., etc.).

Ver. 20. Doxology. *Doxologia fluit ex gaudio totius epistolae* (Beng.). On the phrase **τοὺς αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων** see the excellent note in Grimm-Thayer *ad loc.*

Vv. 21-23. GREETINGS AND BENEDICTION.—Ver. 21. Perhaps this last para-

21. [w] Ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί. 22. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι, μάλιστα δὲ οἱ ἐκ [1] τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας.

w Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 *al.*

23. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν [2] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων [3] ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.[4]

Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης δι' Ἐπαφροδίτου.[5]

[1] B απο.

[2] So Dgr.Egr.P, kscr., f, r, syrsch. et p. cop. æth., Chr., Thdrt., Victorin., Ambrst. Edd. om. ημων with ℵABFgr.GKL, d, e, g, arm., Euth.cod.

[3] So also Myr. with ℵcKL, syrr., Chr., Thdrt., Thphl. Edd. μετα του πνευματος with ℵ*ABDEFGP 6, 17, 31, 47, d, e, f, g, r, vg. cop. arm. æth., Euth.cod., Victorin., Ambrst.

[4] So ℵADEKLP *et al.*, d, e, r, vg. cop. syrr. arm. æth., Thdrt., Dam., Ambrst. Ti., Ws., W.H. om. αμην with BFG 47, f, g, sah., Chr., Euth.cod., Vict.

[5] So KL, syrr., Thdrt., etc. Edd. προς φιλιππησιους with ℵAB 17, 135. The latter form is plainly the more ancient, the other being an expansion based on the contents of the Epistle.

graph may have been written by the Apostle's own hand (so Von Soden and Laurent, *op. cit.*, p. 9). *Cf.* Gal. vi. 11. —**ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** These words are to be taken in close connexion with **ἀσπάσασθε.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 19, **ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν Κυρίῳ πολλὰ Ἀκύλας.** — **ἀδελφοί.** Perhaps these were Roman Christians who aided Paul in his labours (see M'Giffert, *Ap. Age*, p. 397). At least they would be included.

Ver. 22. **μάλιστα.** If by this time, as is probable (see *Introduction*), Paul had been removed from his lodging to one of the state prisons near the palace, it is plain that Christians of the Imperial household would have special opportunities of close intercourse with him.—**οἱ ἐκ τῆς Κ. οἰκίας.** See esp. SH., *Romans*, pp. 418-423, as supplementary to Lightfoot's important discussion; and also, Riggenbach, *Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Th.*, 1892, pp. 498-525, Mommsen, *Handbuch d. röm. Alterth.*, ii., 2 (ed. 3), pp. 833-839. SH. point out that a number of the names mentioned for salutation in Rom. xvi. occur in the *Corpus* of Latin Inscriptions as members of the Imperial household, which seems to have been one of the chief centres of the Christian community at Rome. In the first century A.D. most of the Emperor's household servants came from the East. Under Claudius and Nero they were people of real importance. And we find, from history, that Christian slaves had great influence over their masters. See Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, i., pp. 70 ff., 74, 110-112.

Ver. 23. Probably **μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** ought to be read with all the chief authorities instead of **πάντων.** Myr., however, supposes that these words have been inserted from Gal. vi. 18, to which he would also attribute **ἡμῶν** *supr.*, which is probably spurious.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

COLOSSIANS

INTRODUCTION.

Section I.—Colossæ, Laodicea, Hierapolis.

Colossæ was a city of Phrygia, situated on the southern bank of the Lycus, a tributary of the Mæander. The river passes here through a narrow gorge, by sheer and rocky sides. Its water is nauseous, and impregnated to a most unusual degree with carbonate of lime, which has formed very remarkable incrustations along its course. Rising steep from the glen in which the city lay was Mount Cadmos, towering to a height of 7,000 feet. The district is volcanic and subject to earthquakes, and a very disastrous one destroyed Laodicea, and probably Colossæ and Hierapolis, in the reign of Nero. The soil was very fertile; and its pastures reared a noted breed of sheep. Both Colossæ and Laodicea were very famous for their woollen manufactures. The former town was at one time of great importance, and is mentioned as such by Herodotus (vii., 30) and Xenophon (Anab., i., 2, 6). But the foundation of Laodicea, probably in the reign of Antiochus II. (261-246 B.C.), gave the death-blow to its supremacy. This city was only eleven miles distant, lying also on the south of the Lycus, but in a position far better fitted to secure commercial success. It was one of the richest cities in the province of Asia, and recovered from its destruction by the earthquake without receiving help from imperial funds. The third town mentioned in this Epistle, Hierapolis, lay to the north of the Lycus, six miles from Laodicea, opposite to which it stood, and thirteen from Colossæ. Its name indicates its character as a sacred city, and it "was the centre of native feeling and Phrygian nationality in the valley" (Ramsay). While it was influenced, especially as to its form, by Greece, "the religion continued to be Lydo-Phrygian". The population of Colossæ was probably for the most part Phrygian, with Greek admixture. In Laodicea the Jews were fairly numerous, though less so than at Apameia, and in this respect Colossæ probably resembled it. The Talmud says that the wines and baths of Phrygia had separated

the Ten Tribes from Israel; and we have evidence that the Phrygian Jews compromised with heathenism to an extent possible only to those who held their ancestral faith most loosely. They probably accepted Christianity readily, and thus lost their racial identity.

We have no information as to the introduction of Christianity into these cities, in all of which Churches had been planted. They had not been founded by Paul, though some of their members were known to him. They seem to have owed their origin to Epaphras, who was probably one of Paul's converts, and since the Apostle gives emphatic approval to his teaching, they had been instructed in the Pauline type of doctrine. Apparently they consisted for the most part of Gentiles (this is suggested, though not proved, by i. 21, 27, ii. 13, iii. 7). We may conjecture from iv. 10 that Paul had written an earlier letter to them, to which they had sent a reply by Epaphras. Recently they had been assailed by a form of false teaching, and while they remained, so far, loyal to the doctrine they had been taught (i. 4, ii. 5), the danger was sufficiently serious to call forth this letter, which had perhaps been preceded by a letter addressed to Laodicea. It was sent by Tychicus, who was accompanied by Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, whom Paul was sending back to his master, with a letter asking forgiveness for the culprit.

Section II.—Angelology.

Since this subject has an important relation to the false teaching in the Colossian Church, to the authenticity of the Epistle and the exegesis of several passages, it is necessary to treat it in some detail so far as this is relevant here, and more convenient to devote a special section to it. The doctrine of angels has considerable prominence in the Old Testament, but received great development in later Judaism, both among the Rabbis and in the apocalyptic literature. The influence of these ideas on the New Testament writers is very marked. In this connexion the points to be specially noticed are the relation of the angels to nature and men, their ethical character, their ranks and their association with the Law.

In the O.T. the connexion of the angels with the forces of nature is not made prominent. The cherubim, it is true, appear in close connexion with natural phenomena, and probably were originally identical with the thunder-cloud. But we have no warrant for regarding them as angels. In Ps. civ. 4 God's messengers and ministers are said to be made of wind and fire. In later literature this

thought receives great extension. According to the older Jewish representation their work in nature was limited to extraordinary cases; but later this was not so, and the whole world was thought to be full of spirits and demons. In the Book of Jubilees the angels are brought into close relation with the elements. The author mentions angels of fire, wind, tempest, darkness, hail, hoar-frost, valleys, thunder, lightning, cold, heat, the seasons, dawn and evening, and all spirits of His works in heaven and earth. Similarly in Enoch lx. we read of spirits of sea, hoar-frost, hail, snow, mist, dew and rain. Again in the Slavonic Enoch xix. 4 we have "the angels who are over seasons and years, and the angels who are over rivers and the sea, and those who are over the fruits of the earth, and the angels over every herb, giving all kind of nourishment to every living thing". In the N.T. this conception is also found, especially in the Apocalypse. Thus we read of an angel "that hath power over fire" (xiv. 18) and an "angel of the waters" (xvi. 5), *cf.* also vii. 1, viii. 5, 7-12. The interpolation in John v. 4 presents us with the same idea in the angel that troubled the waters. In Heb. i. 7 the language of Ps. civ. 4 is reversed, and God is said to make His angels winds and His ministers a flame of fire. A similar belief in the evanescent personality of the angels is expressed in the Rabbinical statements of the daily creation of angels, and their transformation now into this, now into that. While these thoughts are all but unknown to the O.T., it frequently connects the sons of God with the stars. In the Song of Deborah the stars fight against Sisera (Jud. v. 20); in Job xxxviii. 7 the morning stars are identified with the sons of God. In Neh. ix. 6 the host of heaven is actually said to worship God, and by this personal beings must be meant (*cf.* Is. xxiv. 21 with ver. 23). In Enoch we read of "a prison for the stars of heaven and the host of heaven" (xviii. 14), and of "the stars which have transgressed the commandment of God, and are bound here till ten thousand ages, the number of the days of their guilt, are consummated" (xxi. 6). A similar association is found in Rev. ix. 1 (*cf.* ver. 11). A closely related function of the angels is that of ruling and representing the nations. This is first found in Deut. iv. 19, xxxii. 8, LXX (*cf.* xxix. 26). According to these passages the nations are allotted to the host of heaven or the sons of God, while Yahweh chooses Israel for Himself (*cf.* Sirach xvii. 17). This undergoes a development in Daniel. In Deuteronomy the nations have their angels, while Israel has Yahweh. In Daniel Israel also has its own angel, Michael. In Is. xxiv. 21-23 we find the same thought, the host of the high ones on high being connected with the kings of the earth. In Rabbinical literature we have a

similar idea; the angels of the nations have a relation of solidarity with their peoples, and God punishes them before He punishes the nations themselves (Weber, *System der pal. Theol.*, 1880, p. 165). In the N.T. the angels of the seven churches in the Apocalypse are to be interpreted in a similar way.

From the functions which the angels exercise it might be expected that ethical distinctions would not be made prominent. In the older Biblical literature there is no reference to evil spirits, in the modern sense of the term. The angels are instruments to effect Yahweh's will. They are good or evil not in virtue of intrinsic character, but of the mission on which they may be sent. The "angels of evil" who bring the plagues on Egypt (Ps. lxxviii. 49), the "destroyer" who smites the first born (Ex. xii. 23), the evil spirit that troubles Saul, the angel that slays the Israelites (2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 17), or Sennacherib's army with the pestilence, the lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets, the cynical Satan who smites Job in property, family and person to prove that he does not serve God for nought, all alike belong to the heavenly host and are God's servants, who live to do His will. They are evil so far as their mission is to inflict evil. Our distinction between good and evil angels is unknown; moral features, if present, are rudimentary. When they are called the "holy ones" no ethical reference is intended, but simply their consecration to the service of God. Immoral actions are attributed to them. Thus the sons of God have children by the daughters of men (Gen. vi. 1-4), and the host of the high ones on high have to be visited with punishment for the wrongs done by the kingdoms under their charge (Isa. xxiv. 21). In Ps. lxxxii. the Elohim are rebuked by God in the heavenly assembly for their unrighteous rule, and this is so also in Ps. lviii. In Job we have similar thoughts. Twice Eliphaz insists on the imperfection of the angels, once in his wonderful description of the spirit who said to him, "Behold He putteth no trust in His servants, and His angels He chargeth with folly" (iv. 18); and again, speaking for himself, "Behold He putteth no trust in His holy ones; yea the heavens are not clean in His sight" (xv. 15). (Similarly Job himself, xxi. 22, though Duhm corrects the text.) Bildad also says that God "maketh peace in His high places," and that "the stars are not pure in His sight" (xxv. 2, 5). In later Jewish theology, when the distinction of angels and demons has become explicit, the angels are frequently represented as far from perfect. The proof of this may be seen in Weber. The following points may be selected for mention. The angels envied Israel the Law; "the angels of ministry coveted it, and it was concealed from them". On Sinai God gave Moses the

face of Abraham, the entertainer of angels, that the angels might do him no harm. They raise objections to God's decrees, and not in vain; they even prevent His wishes from being carried into execution. Gabriel was disobedient, and was punished on that account; but Dubbiel, who was set in his place, showed himself hostile to Israel, and was therefore replaced by Gabriel. Judgments are inflicted on the angel princes. Their sinlessness is only relative; sin is wanting only in so far as it is rooted in sensuality. A similar view is found in Enoch: the stars are punished for disobedience, and the "watchers" for their union with the daughters of men. It is also clear that where angels are thought of as elemental spirits the question of their morality can hardly arise. In the Apocalypse the angels of the Churches are praised or blamed for the spiritual condition of these Churches, which shows once more how unjustifiable is the sharp division of angels into the two classes of perfectly sinless and irremediably evil. Angels are mentioned which are not evil spirits, and yet are not wholly good.

In the O.T. not much is said which would lead us to infer any gradation of rank among angels, though in Daniel an elementary system of division is present. In Rabbinical theology we have a developed hierarchy, in which ten orders are enumerated (Weber, p. 153). In Enoch we read: "And He will call on all the host of the heavens and all the holy ones above, and the host of God, the Cherubim, Seraphim and Ophanim, and all the angels of powers and all the angels of principalities, and the Elect One, and the other powers on the earth, over the water, on that day" (lxi. 10). Similarly we read in the Slavonic Enoch that in the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones and the watchfulness of many eyes. There were ten troops, a station of brightness" (xx. 1, *cf.* 3). Ranks of angels are recognised also in the N.T.

In Deut. xxxiii. 2 we have in our present text, which probably needs correction, a reference to the coming of God to His people from Sinai and from "holy myriads". The LXX reads "with the myriads of Kadesh," but has a reference to "angels with Him on His right hand" in the next clause. This passage was interpreted to mean that the Law had been given through angels. We find this in Rabbinical writings, also in the report of a speech of Herod the Great in Josephus, *Ant.*, xv., 5, 3. In the Book of Jubilees we have detailed accounts of the giving of precepts by the angels. We find a reference to this function of the angels in the speech of Stephen (Acts vii. 53, *cf.* ver. 38) and the Epistle to the Hebrews (ii. 2).

Turning now to Paul, we find marked coincidences with the later Jewish view. For the connexion of the angels with nature, we have his phrase the "elements of the world" (Gal. iv. 3, *cf.* ver. 9), which should be interpreted as personal elemental spirits, to which the pre-Christian world was in subjection (see note on ii. 8). The connexion with the stars is probably present in the phrase "celestial bodies" (1 Cor. xv. 40), a term which suggests that they were animated by spirits. The moral imperfection of angels is also a Pauline conception. He speaks of angels, principalities and powers, which might be expected to separate us from the love of God (Rom. viii. 38), he supposes the case of an angel from heaven preaching another doctrine than what he taught (Gal. i. 8), women have to be veiled at the Christian assemblies because of the angels (1 Cor. xi. 10, a precept suggested by Gen. vi. 1-4), the principalities and powers have to be subjected to the Son (1 Cor. xv. 24), the rulers of this world, through ignorance of God's wisdom, crucified the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 6-8), Christians are to judge the angels (1 Cor. vi. 2). These passages, it is true, have been otherwise explained. But the exegesis has been unnaturally forced through the initial mistake of assuming that the angelic world is sharply divided into sinless and fallen spirits. Once this is surrendered the natural interpretation becomes possible. Again we find ranks of angels recognised by Paul. In Rom. viii. 38 we have "angels and principalities and powers," in Cor. xv. 24 we have "every principality and every authority and power," in Thess. iv. 16 the archangel is mentioned. He also shares the belief that the Law was given by the mediation of angels (Gal. iii. 19).

When we approach the Epistle to the Colossians and its companion Epistle by this line of investigation we find nothing that should cause us any surprise. A worship of angels, such as was inculcated by the false teachers, was quite a natural application of the Jewish doctrine. Gfrörer says: "According to the testimonies cited, the entire activity of God in the world is mediated through angels. This belief was not without special dangers. One could easily fall into the error that the angels should be worshipped instead of God, since they help men more than the Eternal. That at the time of the Second Temple there really were men who taught this we see from the utterance of the Apostle Paul (Col. ii. 18)" (*Jahrhundert des Heils*, i., p. 376). A proof of the custom among the Jews is often quoted from the Preaching of Peter, in which the Jews are said to worship angels and archangels. Celsus brings a similar charge against the Jews, and numerous Talmudical prohibitions attest the prevalence of this cult. The opening section of the

Epistle to the Hebrews is thought by some to be directed against angel worship, but this is improbable. Twice in the Apocalypse the angel who shows the visions to the writer restrains him from an attempt to worship him. This seems to have a polemical reference to angel worship. There is a similar passage in the Ascension of Isaiah, vii. 21, *cf.* viii. 4, 5. In the Testament of Levi the seer asks the angel to tell him his name that he may call upon him in the day of trouble. So in the Testament of Dan, the patriarch bids his children "draw near to God and the angel". We have no ground in the angel worship for assuming a post-Pauline date, since already before Paul's time the conditions for it were present. That the angelic orders were created by the Son follows from the fact that the creation of all was ascribed by Paul to Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6), combined with the fact that, as we have seen, Paul recognised the existence of angelic orders. That he adds "thrones" and "lordships" to the list in Colossians is no proof of difference of authorship, for in the undisputed Epistles the lists, which he gives, vary. That they are included in the scope of the Son's work of reconciliation cannot be objected to on the ground that they did not need this, for the doctrine of angelic sinlessness is contrary to the teaching of Paul, as also to that of the O.T. and Jewish theology. A more plausible difficulty may be urged as to the method of Redemption. The death of Christ was a death in the body of flesh, and thus availed to destroy the sinful flesh in humanity. But it might be said, How can this have any effect on the angelic world? Should we not say: "Not of angels doth He take hold, but He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham"? It is true that the N.T. writers, Paul included, think in the main of the effects of Christ's death on mankind. But in face of the false teaching it was natural for Paul to draw an inference already implicit in his doctrine. Wherever sin was present, there grace was present to meet it; and this grace found its expression in the Cross of Christ. No limit could be set to its saving power; for angels as for men it made complete atonement. And the relation to the angels which this involved is just what we should expect in Paul. The redemption of man was made possible by Christ's Headship of the race. That He was the Head of the angelic world was a natural thought to Paul, once he regarded Christ as its Creator, and realised its need for redemption. His connexion with it went back to its creation, and therefore His redeeming acts could avail for it, as for the race of men. It was also a natural thought for Paul, since the Cross abolished the Law, and the Law had been given by angels, that in the death of Christ God had despoiled and triumphed over

the angelic powers. That the angels of the Law had brought about the death of Christ is the probable sense of 1 Cor. ii. 6-8. That they did it in ignorance of God's wisdom tallies with the statement that it is through the Church that the manifold wisdom of God is to be made known to the principalities and powers. It is not in virtue of any personal hostility to Christ that they crucified Him, but in virtue of their complete identity with the Law. The Law was against us, and Law and grace are incompatible. If so, the angels of the Law would necessarily, according to Jewish angelology, stand in opposition to Christ, till they were despoiled of the dominion they had exercised and placed in their true position. So far then from holding any position of authority, or exercising any mediatorial function, they are for the Christian as if they were not. He has died to the Law, and therefore to the angels of the Law, and all those elemental spirits, to which both Judaism and heathenism had been in subjection. All that he hoped to win through worship of them, and more than all, he has already in Christ. To serve them is to fall back into bondage to unmeaning ordinances, to miss the substance while clutching at the shadow. The angelology of the Epistle is thus in harmony with that of Paul, as gathered from the certainly genuine Epistles; and where it shows advance, the development is on thoroughly Pauline lines, and amply accounted for by the false teaching which it refutes. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Epistle on the ground of its doctrine of angels. It is an interesting fact that the Council of Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, condemned angel worship; and the worship of Michael, which Theodoret, in the fifth century, speaks of as still carried on in the district, existed into the Middle Ages.

Section III.—The False Teaching and its Refutation.

The false teaching against which the Epistle is chiefly directed was of a Jewish type. This is clear alike from the characteristics mentioned and the nature of the polemic. It insisted on observance of regulations as to meats and drinks, festivals, new moons and Sabbaths. It drew on the tradition of men as its source. The reference to circumcision seems to show that the false teachers attached value to it; and the declaration that the Law has been abolished, which forms the basis for the definite attack, shows that they regarded it as still binding. Other characteristics are mentioned which are not so exclusively Jewish. It is spoken of as a philosophy and empty deceit, which was plausible and gave a reputation for

wisdom. It had the "elements of the world" and not Christ for its content; and was characterised by a humility which found expression in the worship of angels, but was not incompatible with fleshly conceit. It inculcated severity to the body, and imposed ordinances against certain foods. It is possible that the teachers asserted that they had visions of angels (ii. 18), but unfortunately the phrase from which this is inferred is exegetically uncertain and possibly corrupt. The false teachers were Christians, as is clear from the words, "not holding fast the Head"; but probably they did not assign to Christ His true place. It is possible that they thought of Christ as Paul did, and did not see that their peculiar views were incompatible with their doctrine of Christ; but this seems less likely.

It is not unnatural that many scholars should have seen in this teaching something which, while partially, was not wholly Jewish. And the most obvious solution, especially for those who dated the Epistle in the second century, was to regard the heresy as a form of Judaistic Gnosticism. In favour of this were alleged the use of the term "philosophy," the stress laid on "wisdom," the counter-presentation of Christianity as "full knowledge of the mystery," the asceticism which forbade drinks as well as meats, the angel worship which might rest on a doctrine of intermediaries between men and God, the emphasis on the universality of the Gospel in contrast to the exclusiveness of an intellectual aristocracy. It is certainly difficult to find full-blown Gnosticism mirrored in our Epistle. But it is also improbable that we have Gnosticism even in a rudimentary form. We are certain of the Jewish nature of the teaching, and if it can be explained from Judaism alone, we have no warrant for calling in other sources. "Philosophy" was a term used by Philo and Josephus for purely Jewish theology or sects; and in a Gentile community the common Greek term would naturally be employed, whatever the character of the system might be. Hort suggests that the term is used in a sense akin to the later use to denote the ascetic life, but this is uncertain. The stress on "wisdom" and "knowledge" may be paralleled from the Corinthian Church, where there was certainly no Gnosticism. Intellectual exclusiveness was no monopoly of the Gnostics; the Pharisees, with their contempt for the people of the land, accursed through their ignorance of the Law, were conspicuous examples of it; and it is a failing common enough in certain types of character. The angelolatry, as we have seen already, is perfectly explicable from the Judaism of Paul's time. The prohibition of drinks, while it goes beyond the Law, is an extension of it, for which we find a parallel

in Heb. ix. 10. Asceticism, it is true, is hardly a characteristic of Judaism. Yet fasting was considered to have a religious value, especially among the Pharisees, and Paul himself buffeted the body and brought it into bondage. Nor is it clear whether asceticism was regarded as an end in itself or a means to an end. It might be practised to induce visions. But, apart from this, it is a tendency so congenial to certain temperaments that all need for postulating a Gnostic origin, through a belief in the evil of matter, disappears.

It has, with more plausibility, been suggested that we should seek for its origin in Essenism, or some form of teaching with Essene affinities. In favour of this it may be said that the Essenes were extremely rigid in keeping the Sabbath, they had some secret lore about the angels, they abstained from meat and wine, they eliminated marriage from their communal life. But there is no indication of any extreme Sabbatarianism at Colossæ; what Paul attacks is the view that the Sabbath law should be regarded as still binding. The doctrine of angels has been already amply explained apart from Essenism, while we have no proof that the Essenes worshipped angels. Nor are we acquainted with the precise view of the false teachers as to eating and drinking, whether this involved abstinence from meat and wine. In any case the precepts of the Law as to food, with the extension they appear to have received in later Judaism (Heb. ix. 10), seem sufficient to account for this phase of the false teaching. And there is not a word in the Epistle to warrant us in assuming that there was any attack on marriage at Colossæ. Further, there is no reference to some of the most important Essene practices. Such are their frequent washings, their alleged worship of the sun, their communal life, their "fearful oath" on initiation, their protracted and severe probation and their use of magic. And, lastly, we know nothing of Essenism at this time in Phrygia. For the most part the sect had its home by the Dead Sea, and before the destruction of Jerusalem it seems to have been unknown outside Palestine. Klöpper tries to turn the edge of these arguments by limiting this element to a dynamic influence of Essene principles on the Jews of the Dispersion, by urging that we should expect the larger movement of Essenes to Christianity after the destruction of Jerusalem to have been preceded by isolated instances, and by the reminder that we know the heresy only imperfectly. Lightfoot similarly is content to argue for Essene affinities in the false teaching. But in face of the absence from it of some of the most striking features of Essenism, and the possibility of accounting for it from contemporary Judaism, it seems much safer to set aside this theory

as to its origin. In the modified form given to it by Klöpper it scarcely seems worth contending for at all.

It is noteworthy that Paul does not, as in Galatians, attack this teaching by arguments drawn from the O.T. This has been explained by the view that the errors were not doctrinal but practical. But this seems to be improbable, and it is more likely that Paul does not establish his positions by proof passages because this would have been unconvincing to his antagonists, who might perhaps have evaded their force by allegorical interpretation. His refutation consists partly in pointing the moral of their own experience, partly in a positive exposition of great Christian truths with which the false teaching was incompatible, partly in direct attack. In recalling them to their own experience of salvation, he is throughout suggesting that the Gospel which had thus proved its power in them stood in no need of being supplemented; all that was necessary was for them to hold firmly by the form in which they had learnt it, and strive continually to appropriate its meaning and power more completely. The teachers by failing to hold fast the Head were cutting themselves off from the source of life. He reminds his readers that they had passed into the kingdom of the Son from the realm of darkness, they had received deliverance, the forgiveness of sins, had been reconciled to God, and been qualified for the saints' inheritance in light. They must be loyal to the truth they had heard, walk in Christ, rooted and built up in Him. This truth was not proclaimed to and tested by them alone, it was proved by its rapid extension in the world. Doctrinally the false teaching was tacitly refuted by an exhibition of the true place and work of the Son. He is the image of God, Lord of the universe, in whom all things were created, including all ranks of angels. They were created through Him and even for Him, so that as to origin they were dependent on, and as to end subservient to Him. The whole fulness dwelt in Him, and therefore reconciliation of all things to God, again including the angels, could be made by Him. And thus not only is there no room for angelic mediators; they themselves needed to be reconciled to God. It is in Christ that all the fulness of the Godhead dwells; it is in Him that all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden. His death abolished the Law and spoiled the principalities and powers; hence the precepts of the former held good no longer, and worship ought plainly not to be offered to the latter. Believers had died with Christ to these elemental spirits, and could no longer be subject to their restrictions. The direct attack may be thus summarised. This so-called "philosophy" is only an empty delusion

resting on human tradition, with the elements of the world and not Christ for its content; in holding fast to antiquated ordinances it lets slip the substance to grasp the shadow; it is, in spite of its humility, a manifestation of fleshly conceit, but devoid of real wisdom; and the things from which it commands abstinence are so insignificant that they perish in the act of use.

Section IV.—The Authenticity of the Epistle.

The external evidence for the Pauline authorship of the Epistle is as strong perhaps as we have any right to expect. It is first referred to by name in the Muratorian Canon and by Irenæus. It was probably used by Justin Martyr and Theophilus; and it is not unlikely that there are echoes of it in Barnabas, Clement of Rome and Ignatius. But these are quite insufficient to prove acquaintance with the Epistle, still less the Pauline authorship. It is more important that Marcion included it in his canon, but this again is not at all conclusive proof of the genuineness. The question has to be settled by the evidence drawn from the Epistle itself. On the ground of internal evidence many critics have decided against its authenticity. Mayerhoff (1838) was the first to reject it. The Tübingen school, including Hilgenfeld, treated it as a second century work. Ewald thought that Timothy wrote it after consultation with Paul. Holtzmann (1872), following a view indicated by Hitzig, recognised a Pauline nucleus, but regarded more than half of the Epistle as non-Pauline. Von Soden (1885) reduced considerably the range of interpolation in a series of articles on Holtzmann's hypothesis, but has since recognised the whole Epistle as Pauline, with the exception of i. 16^b, 17, which he thinks may be a gloss, since it disturbs the symmetry.

The authenticity has been impugned on various grounds: the language and style, the false teaching, the angelology, the Christology, the likeness to Ephesians. Enough has been said already of the false teaching and the angelology, so that it is needless to add anything here. The Epistle has a considerable number of words which are peculiar to itself, but on the whole not an exceptional number (34); and the contents of ch. ii. would have made even a larger proportion not at all strange. Greater difficulties are caused by the style. It is heavier and less impetuous than in Galatians Corinthians and Romans. Several of the logical particles most common in Paul are almost absent. There are also strange collocations of words (of which Haupt gives a good list), many being

combinations of two or three dependent genitives, accumulated synonyms, numerous compound words. But these features may be partially paralleled in the earlier letters; and where they cannot be we may rightly lay stress on the difference of Paul's circumstances and the problems with which he had to deal. Letters written in the heat of conflict with Judaisers and impugners of his authority, written too when he was in full career as a missionary and had pressing on him the care of all the Churches, must in the nature of the case be very different from a letter written, not to fight for the very existence of the Gospel, but to warn a still loyal Church against a pernicious error, and written in enforced retirement, with ample time for meditation.

The Christology, it is true, presents an advance on what we find in the earlier Epistles. Not in the position it assigns to the Son as Creator, for that is found in 1 Cor. viii. 6, but in that it speaks of Him also as the goal of the universe. Elsewhere it is God who is thus spoken of (1 Cor. viii. 6, Rom. xi. 36). But this is less cogent than it appears at first sight. Paul teaches that all things have to become subject to the Son, that He may deliver the Kingdom to the Father (1 Cor. xv. 24-28). And it would be as warrantable to conclude that Romans and 1 Corinthians were by different authors, for in the passages already mentioned creation is said to have been effected, now through God (Rom. xi. 36), and now again through Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6). A doctrine of Christ quite as lofty is found in Philippians; and the conclusive refutation of the false teaching was just this setting of the Son in His true position. The doctrine of Christ's work is expressed in a thoroughly Pauline way, which bears all the marks of authenticity. It is not a slavish imitation, but a fresh and luminous presentation. And yet it is in such perfect harmony with Paul's own doctrine that it seems improbable that it can be due to another hand; and more than improbable when we remember that no other early Christian writer known to us, with the partial exception of the author of 1 Peter, has been able to reproduce the Pauline doctrine, any more than Penelope's wooers could bend Odysseus' bow. The only point under this head which raises suspicion is the extension of the reconciliation to God effected by Christ to the angelic powers. What has been already said on this need not be repeated here.

Lastly, its relation to Ephesians has aroused suspicion. The problem thus presented is unique in the N.T., and has elicited numerous solutions. It has been pressed against the authenticity of Ephesians more generally than of Colossians; though Mayerhoff

thought that Ephesians was genuine and Colossians the copy. If one Epistle is copied from the other, suspicion is aroused only against the copy; and since, if this is the relation, Colossians is more likely than Ephesians to be the original, we should find in this fact a proof of the genuineness of the former. For if a later writer wrote a letter purporting to come from Paul, and used in it a letter that bore Paul's name, there is a strong presumption that the latter would be of well-attested genuineness. But the problem is hardly so simple. Holtzmann, in a work described by Godet "as a masterpiece of exactness, patient labour and wisdom," reached the conclusion that the Epistles exhibit the phenomenon of mutual indebtedness. Sometimes Ephesians seems to be the original, sometimes Colossians. Accordingly he formulated the theory that Paul wrote an Epistle to the Colossians, on the basis of which a later writer composed Ephesians. He then returned to the original Epistle and expanded it by free extracts from his own writing, adding also a polemic against Gnosticism. This theory was examined by Von Soden, who tested very carefully Holtzmann's reconstruction of the original Epistle. He also pointed out that it was justifiable to eliminate only such passages as Paul could not have written. He rejected only i. 15-20, ii. 10, 15, 18^{b}. This was in 1885. A more exhaustive study of Paulinism has led him to accept the authenticity of the Epistle as a whole in his commentary (1891). Holtzmann's theory is examined by Dr. Sanday and Dr. Robertson in the articles "Colossians" and "Ephesians" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.), and to these discussions the reader may refer for fuller details. J. Weiss in a review of Abbott's commentary has recently expressed himself in favour of a solution, not precisely in Holtzmann's form, but on his lines (*Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 29th Sept., 1900). It may be said here that it is hard to understand why a writer should give himself so much trouble. His purpose would have been served by one Epistle, a still larger "Ephesians," in which what he inserted in Colossians should have found its home. Very few have accepted the theory in its entirety. Yet if Holtzmann's observations are correct, only two theories seem to be tenable, one the theory he has himself proposed, the other that both Epistles are genuine. His own theory is far too complicated to be probable. The similarities occur often in different contexts, and express quite different ideas, yet each is natural in its place. This is difficult to account for in an imitator, who would be fettered by the document which he was using; but in a writer such as Paul, rich in ideas but unused to formal composition, such resemblance and yet such

difference in letters written together was quite to be expected. No trace of the process has been left in the textual evidence, and this is a cogent argument against the theory. The only alternative, then, to Holtzmann's view seems to be that both letters were written by Paul; and thus his investigation becomes the firm basis for quite another result than the author contemplated. We cannot in that case speak of mutual indebtedness; the phenomena that suggested this explanation are amply accounted for by the unity of authorship. It is noteworthy that Jülicher, who has no leaning to traditional opinions, thinks that the best solution of the problem is to be found in the acceptance of the authenticity of both Epistles (*Einl. i. d. N.T.*, 1894, p. 97, but compare the more dubious tone of his article in the *Enc. Bibl.*, 1899). This view, it may be added, is confirmed by the close connexion of Colossians with Philemon, which, if genuine, all but guarantees the genuineness of Colossians; and that it is not authentic has been argued solely to dispose of its testimony to Colossians. We may therefore accept this Epistle with confidence as the work of Paul.

SECTION V.—PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION.

Since Paul was a prisoner when he wrote it, our only alternatives are Cæsarea and Rome. Meyer, Weiss, Haupt and others have argued for Cæsarea. What Weiss regards as decisive is that Paul speaks in Philemon of going to Colossæ on his release, whereas in Philippians, written from Rome, he says that he hopes to go into Macedonia. But this proves nothing, for Macedonia might have been taken on the way; and, besides, Paul's plans might have changed in the interval. Haupt thinks that the genuineness of the letters can be maintained only on the assumption that they were written at Cæsarea, since letters so unlike Philippians cannot have been written so near to it as their composition at Rome would demand. He thinks their peculiar character is best explained by the fact that Paul in his confinement, unable to preach, was driven in upon himself, and thought out more fully than before the implication of his Gospel. The fruit of this we find in Colossians and Ephesians. This is of too speculative a character to bear any weight. On the other hand, it is certainly more probable that a runaway slave should have fled to Rome than to Cæsarea; for although Cæsarea was nearer for Onesimus than Rome, the latter was more accessible, and afforded a far safer concealment. Paul's expectations of release were more natural at Rome than at Cæsarea.

During the latter part of his imprisonment at Cæsarea he knew that he was going to Rome. It would be necessary then to place the letter in the earlier part. But it does not well suit this, for Paul had for a long time been anxious to see Rome, and it is most unlikely that he should think of going to Colossæ first. It would be very strange, further, if Paul wrote from Cæsarea, that he should be silent about Philip, whose guest he had been shortly before, and should leave us with the impression that he was unsympathetic. The general situation presupposed in the Epistle suits Rome better than Cæsarea.

This would be practically certain if these Epistles were written after Philippians, as Bleek, Lightfoot and several English scholars suppose. But the more usual view which makes Philippians the latest of the Imprisonment-Epistles seems to be preferable. The argument from theological affinities is most precarious; and Colossians, as well as Philippians, presents striking parallels with Romans. The theological system of Paul was formed before he wrote our earliest Epistle, yet how little Paulinism there is in Thessalonians, or even in 1 Corinthians. We have no right to expect the thoughts of Colossians to reappear in Philippians, a simple letter of thanks to a Church where the Colossian type of false doctrine had not appeared. Indeed, how much there is in Colossians that does not recur in Ephesians, and how much Ephesians adds to what we find in Colossians! Yet these were written practically together. Three years at least lay between Romans and the earliest time at which Philippians could have been written, and less than eighteen months between this time and the latest date that can be assigned to Colossians. Further, Paul seems in Philippians to express a more decided conviction as to the speedy settlement of his fate than in Philemon; and he looks forward to death as a not unlikely contingency. In Philippians Paul also speaks of sending away Timothy shortly, whereas he is with Paul in Colossians. If 2 Tim. iv. 19 dates, as some scholars think, from this imprisonment, this would agree best with the priority of Colossians, for in Philippians Paul speaks of sending him away, in 2 Timothy we find him gone. This, however, is not very cogent. It seems best to adhere to the usual view and to date the Epistle during the early part of Paul's Roman Imprisonment. The year to which we assign it depends on the general view we take as to the chronology of Paul's life. We may perhaps place it in A.D. 59. [The article on "Chronology of the New Testament" by C. H. Turner in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* may be consulted.]

SECTION VI.—SELECTED LITERATURE.

Of patristic commentaries those of Chrysostom (*Homilies*), Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret may be mentioned. Of later commentaries earlier than the modern period Calvin and Bengel are perhaps the most important. The chief modern commentaries by foreign writers are those of De Wette, Meyer, Ewald, Hofmann, Klöpper, Franke (in Meyer), Oltramare, Von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*), Wohlenberg (Strack-Zoeckler) and Haupt (latest edition of Meyer). Among English commentaries those of Eadie, Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Findlay (in the *Pulpit Commentary*), Beet, Moule and Abbott (*International Critical Commentary*) may be mentioned. Klöpper is important for the discussion of theological questions, especially the angelology, but the style is very diffuse. Oltramare is very full and thorough, but at times eccentric. He is also quite ignorant of English work. Von Soden is valuable, and has frequently influenced Abbott. Much the best commentary on the Epistle is that of Haupt, which, though in Meyer, is an entirely new work. For close grappling with the thought of the Epistle it has no rival. It sometimes presses the argument from the connexion too far, and is perhaps sometimes too subtle; but these are very slight defects. We still need in English a commentary of this kind, to unravel the thought of this most difficult Epistle. Our most important works, those of Ellicott, Lightfoot and Abbott, are of special value from the philological standpoint. Lightfoot is very full on points of history, and contributes a valuable excursus on the Essenes. His discussions of special words are also full and luminous. He is less strong in exegesis and Biblical theology. Abbott is "mainly philological," and as such most thankworthy, especially for the frequent testing of Lightfoot's results. Findlay is also excellent and deserves to be much better known. Moule rests for the most part on Lightfoot, but is very scholarly and at times independent. Maclaren in the *Expositor's Bible* exhibits the insight and felicity of exposition which characterise all his work. Moule's *Colossian Studies* should also be mentioned.

For critical discussions the New Testament Introductions may be consulted, and especially Sanday's very valuable article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed.). The most thorough critical discussion is Holtzmann's *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe* (1872), on which Von Soden wrote a series of elaborate articles in the *Jahrb. f. protestant. Theol.* for 1885. For the theology of the Epistle the

works on New Testament Theology and on Paulinism may be consulted. Everling's *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie* is the best work on a subject of great importance for the correct understanding of the Epistle. Lueken's *Michael* (1898) may also be mentioned. H. St. John Thackeray's *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, published since this commentary went to press, contains a useful chapter on angelology. G. C. Martin's commentary in the *Century Bible* appeared too late to be used in any way.

NOTE.—The text of the Epistle here printed is a critically revised text, and that on which the commentary is based. The abbreviations in the notes need no explanation. The commentary was finished in September, 1898; references to later literature have been sparingly introduced in proof. The author may be permitted to add that his chief concern has been to expound the thought, since it was desirable, in view of the limits assigned, to concentrate attention mainly on one side of exegesis, and in the English commentaries on the Epistle the philological side is already amply represented. It has therefore been necessary to assume much in the way of philological results in order to gain space for the elucidation of the thought.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΚΟΛΑΣΣΑΕΙΣ[1] ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς 2. τοῖς ἐν Κολοσσαῖς[2] [a]ἁγίοις καὶ [b]πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ [c]Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.[3]

a 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 1. b 2 Cor. vi. 5. c iii. 17.

[1] **Κολασσαεις**: Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with AB*KP. **Κολοσσαεις**: T., Ws. with ℵBcDFG, probably by assimilation to **Κολοσσαις** (i. 2).

[2] **Κολοσσαις**: T., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵBDEFGL. **Κολασσαις**: Ln., Tr. with KP 17, by assimilation to title.

[3] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BDEKL 17. **και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου**: added by T.R. [Ln.] with ℵACFG and most MSS. by assimilation to Pauline usage.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1, 2. SALUTATION OF PAUL AND TIMOTHY TO THE CHRISTIANS OF COLOSSÆ.—Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος . . . διὰ θελ. Θεοῦ.** The reference to his apostleship is not due to any attack on his apostolic authority or teaching, as in the case of the Epistles to the Galatians or Corinthians, but, as in the Epistle to the Romans, to the fact that he was unknown to those to whom he was writing. Similarly reference is made to it in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the letter being sent to Churches, to some of which, probably, Paul was unknown. In writing to the Macedonian Churches it is not mentioned, for they had been founded by him and remained loyal.—**Τιμόθεος**: included in the salutations in Thess., 2 Cor., Phil. and Philm. He would be known by name to the Colossians as Paul's companion, but probably not personally. Ramsay's conjecture (also put forward by Valroger) that he may have founded the Church is unsupported and improbable (see ver. 7), while Ewald's view that he wrote the bulk of the Epistle, after consultation with Paul, has nothing to recommend it, and is open to serious objections. **ὁ ἀδελφός** is added to balance **ἀπόστολος**, and has no reference, as Chrysostom thought, to Timothy's official position.

Ver. 2. Paul does not address the Church as a Church. This has been explained by the fact that he stood in no official relation to the community, and therefore addressed individuals. But he does not mention the Church in *Philippians*, though he had founded it. The omission may be accidental; but he seems to have changed his custom in his later Epistles, since it occurs in all his letters to Churches from *Romans* downwards.—**ἁγίοις** may be an adjective (so Kl., Weiss and others), but more probably a substantive (so Mey., Ell., Lightf., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), since Paul seems not to use it in the plural in an adjectival sense, except in Eph. iii. 5, and in the salutations of 2 Cor., Eph. and Phil. it is certainly a substantive. Like **ἀδελφοῖς** it may be joined with **ἐν Χ.**, but should more probably be taken by itself. The saints are those who are set apart for God, as belonging to His holy people, the Israel of God (Gal. vi. 16); the privileges of the chosen nation under the Old Covenant being transferred to Christians under the New.—**πιστοῖς**: not to be taken

3. Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ[1] τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ[2] πάντοτε [d] περὶ[3] ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, 4. ἀκούσαντες τὴν [e] πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε[4] εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, 5. διὰ τὴν [f] ἐλπίδα τὴν [g] ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἣν

d iv. 3.
e With ἐν, Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15.
f Objective, Rom. viii. 24; Gal. v. 5; Tit. ii. 13.
g 2 Tim. iv. 8.

[1] So W.H., R.V. with BC*, possibly by assimilation to θ. π. (ver. 2). και πατρι: T., Tr. with ℵAC²DᶜKLP, probably to avoid unusual expression. τω πατρι: Ln., Ws. with D*FG, Chrys. inserted for similar reason.

[2] So Ws. with B. Ιησου Χριστου: Ln., T., Tr. [W.H.], Lft., R.V. with other MSS.

[3] So T., W.H., Lft. with ℵACDᶜKLP. υπερ: Ln., Tr., W.H. mg., Ws. with BD*FG 17, probably from ver. 9.

[4] ην εχετε: Ln., T., Tr., [W.H.] with ℵACD*FGP 17, possibly conformed to Philm. 5. την: Ws. with DᶜKL, perhaps by assimilation to Eph. i. 15; B omits, perhaps rightly.

in the passive sense (as by Ew., Ell., Lightf., Abb., R.V.) = "steadfast," "faithful," with tacit reference to the falling away to false doctrine. Combined with ἀδελφ. its meaning would be faithful to Paul, which would have no point here. It should be taken here, as by most commentators, in the sense of "believing".—ἐν Χριστῷ. It is significant that Χριστός occurs alone very frequently in this Epistle, but Ἰησοῦς never (though Κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ, ver. 3; Κυρ. Ἰησ., iii. 17). No doubt this is to be accounted for by the need for emphasis on the doctrine of the Person of Christ.—χάρις ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη. This combination is found in all the Epistles that claim to be Paul's except the Pastorals, where it is modified. The formula, which was probably constructed by Paul, combines the Greek and Hebrew forms of salutation.—ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. This is not added in 1 Thess. The other Epistles add καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. No importance is to be attached to their omission here. *Cf.* the similarly shortened form ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν (iv. 18).

Vv. 3-8. Paul's thanksgiving for the tidings he has received of the spiritual welfare of the Colossians. According to his usual custom (so in Thess., 1 Cor., Rom., Phil., Philm.), Paul begins his letter with an expression of his thankfulness to God for the Christian graces of his readers. There is, however, a certain conventional element in these greetings, as may be seen from a comparison of similar formulæ in letters found among recently discovered papyri (see articles by Prof. Rendel Harris in *The Expositor* for Sept. and Dec., 1898). Eph. i. 15-17 is parallel to vv. 3, 4 and 9.—Ver. 3. τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ κ.τ.λ.: "to God, the Father of our Lord Jesus". Even if Θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ were read, we should probably not make Κυρίου dependent on Θεῷ as well as πατρί, since this is not Paul's usual language, though it is found in Eph. i. 17 (ὁ Θεὸς τ. Κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. Χ.).—πάντοτε is connected by several commentators (Beng., Alf., Ell., Findl., R.V.) with προσευχ. In favour of this is οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπ. ὑμ. προσευχ. (ver. 9). But more probably it should be taken with εὐχαριστ. (Mey., Lightf., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), as this is the usual collocation in Paul. But περὶ ὑμῶν belongs to προσευχ., not (as Lightf., Ol.) to εὐχαριστ. "We always give thanks when we pray for you."

Ver. 4. Paul now introduces the grounds of his thankfulness, the good report he has heard as to the faith and love of the Colossians. He refers to it again (ver. 9).—πίστιν ἐν Χ. ἐν may be equivalent to εἰς, but probably indicates "the sphere in which their faith moves rather than the object to which it is directed" (Lightf.). This faith rests upon Christ. πίστ. is wrongly taken by Ewald to mean "fidelity".—πάντας, *i.e.*, all Christians throughout the world, whose unity in the universal Church was a thought much in Paul's mind at this time.

Ver. 5. διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα. This is connected by Bengel, followed by several recent commentators (Hofm., Kl., Ol., Haupt, Weiss, Abb.), with εὐχαριστοῦμεν. Having heard of their faith and love, Paul gives thanks for the hope laid up for them in heaven. Lightfoot and Soden urge that in this way the triad of Christian

[h] προηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 6. τοῦ [i] παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς, καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἔστιν, [k] καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκού-

h Class. only here in Bib. Gk.

i With εἰς, 1 Macc. xi. 63; only here in N.T.; often in class. Gk.; with πρὸς four times in N.T.

k Middle only here.

graces, faith, hope and love, is broken up. But "hope" is objective here, not the grace of hope, but the object of that hope. It is true that Paul glides from the subjective to the objective use of ἐλπίς in Rom. viii. 24, but if this combination had been intended here he would probably have simply co-ordinated the three terms. A more serious objection is that εὐχαριστ. is so far away, though Haupt urges that διὰ τ. ἐλπ. could not have come in earlier. Further, Paul never uses this constr. εὐχαριστ. διά. It is also his custom, at the beginning of his Epistles, to give thanks for the Christian character of his readers (which he hardly does in ver. 4), not for the heavenly reward that awaits them. Others (De W., Lightf., Sod.) connect it with τ. πίστιν . . . καὶ τ. ἀγάπην. This gives a good sense, their faith and love have their ground in their hope of reward. But we should have expected the article before a clause thus added to substantives. It is simplest to refer it to τὴν ἀγ. ἣν ἔχετε (Chrys., Mey., Ell., Alf., Franke), and interpret it of the love which is due to the hope of a heavenly reward. It is urged that a love of this calculating kind is foreign to Paul, but *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 6, Gal. vi. 9.—**ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς.** *Cf.* the reward or treasure in heaven (Matt. v. 12, vi. 20, xix. 21), the citizenship in heaven (Phil. iii. 20), the inheritance reserved in heaven (1 Pet. i. 4).—**ἣν προηκούσατε.** The reference in προ. is disputed. Bengel and Klöpper think it means before the writing of this letter; Meyer, Hofmann and Haupt before its fulfilment. But more probably it is to be taken of their first hearing of the Gospel (so Lightf., Ol., Abb.), perhaps in tacit contrast to the false teaching they had recently heard. Haupt, it is true, denies that there is any reference to the false teachers in vv. 2-8; but though none can be proved, it is surely probable that the turn of several expressions should be determined by the subject which was uppermost in the Apostle's mind, and that he should thus prepare his readers for the direct attack.—**λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.** *Cf.* Eph. i. 13, according to which τ. εὐαγγ. should be taken as in apposition to λόγ. τ. ἀλ., "the word of truth, even the Gospel," though it is often explained as the word of truth announced in the Gospel. It is not clear what λόγ. τ. ἀλ. means. Several give the genitive an adjectival force, "the true word," but more probably it expresses the content, the word which contains the truth. Perhaps here also there is a side-thrust at the false teachers.

Ver. 6. This word of the truth has been defined as the Gospel, but Paul now proceeds to indicate more precisely what he means by this term. It is that Gospel which they have already received, not the local perversion of it that has recently been urged on their notice, but that which is spreading in the whole world, its truth authenticated by its ever-widening area and deepening influence on its adherents, and which manifests the same inherent energy among the Colossians themselves, in the form in which they learnt it from their teacher Epaphras.—**καθὼς καὶ ἐν παντὶ . . . ἐν ὑμῖν.** According to the *TR.* καὶ ἔστι, two statements are made—that the Gospel is present with the Colossians as it is present in all the world, and that it is bearing fruit and increasing as it is among the Colossians. The omission of καὶ before ἐστὶν καρ. creates a little awkwardness, since καθὼς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν seems then superfluous. Lightfoot takes ἐστ. καρ. together as a periphrasis for καρποφορεῖται, but this construction is very rare in Paul. The symmetry of clauses is much better preserved if, with Soden and Haupt, we write ἔστιν, καρ. We thus get the same double comparison as with the *TR.*, Paul passing from the special to the general, and from the general back to the special. For the hyperbole ἐν π. τ. κόσμῳ, *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8, Rom. i. 8, x. 18. As Gess points out (*Christi Person und Werk*, ii., 1, p. 228), Paul wishes here and in ver. 23 to widen the outlook of the Colossians, since the more isolated the community the greater the danger from seducers. For the similar feeling that local idiosyncrasies are to be controlled by the general custom of the Church, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 16, xiv. 36 (*cf.* 33).—**καρποφορούμενον καὶ αὐξανόμενον.** The former of these participles expresses

σατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ· 7. καθὼς ἐμάθετε ἀπὸ Ἐπαφρᾶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ [l] συνδούλου ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[1] διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 8. ὁ καὶ [m] δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι. 9. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [n] προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι,[2] ἵνα [o] πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ

l Only here and iv. 7 in Paul.
m Only here and 1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 13 in Paul.
n Mark xi. 24.
o With acc., Phil. i. 11.

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with ℵ*ABDFG, possibly under influence of **συνδ. ημ.** and **ημιν** (ver. 8). **υμων**: T., Ws., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵcDbKL 17; most vss. probably conformed to **υπερ υμων** (ver. 9) and **τ. υμων αγ.** (ver. 8).

[2] **και αιτουμενοι**: omitted by BK through homœoteleuton.

the inward energy of the Gospel (dynamic middle) in its adherents, the latter its extension in the world by gathering in new converts.—**ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας.** This expresses the further fact that the progress of the Gospel has been continuous from the first in the Colossian Church.—**ἠκούσατε . . . Θεοῦ.** It is uncertain whether **χάριν** is governed by both verbs (so Lightf., Kl., Ol., Sod., Abb.) or by the latter only (so Mey., Ell., Haupt). In the former case **ἠκούσ.** will mean "were instructed in". But it is simpler to translate "ye heard it [*i.e.*, the Gospel] and knew the grace of God". **ἐπέγνωτε** should strictly imply full knowledge, but as the reference is to the time of their conversion it seems doubtful whether this shade of meaning should be pressed. **ἐπίγνωσις** is in his mind. The word occurs twice in the context. The grace of God is probably mentioned in opposition to the false teachers' doctrine of ordinances and rigorous asceticism.—**ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**: not to be taken as if an adjective with **χάριν**, "the true grace of God," for there is no false grace of God, but with **ἐπεγ.** in the sense that they knew the Gospel as it truly is, in its genuine reality, in opposition to the travesty of it recently introduced.

Ver. 7. **καθὼς**, *i.e.*, in the manner in which. Paul thus sets the seal of his approval on the form of the Gospel which they had learnt from their teacher, and also on the teacher himself.—**Ἐπαφρᾶ.** Epaphras was apparently the founder of the Colossian Church, **ἐμάθετε** referring to the same time as **ἠκούσατε.** He had remained in connexion with it (iv. 12), and seems to have come to Paul to inform him of the teaching that was threatening its welfare. He is not to be identified with Epaphroditus (Phil. ii. 25 *sq.*, iv. 18), who was connected with Philippi. The name was common.—**ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.** This is probably the correct reading; Epaphras is a minister to the Colossians on Paul's behalf, since he has accomplished a task which belonged to Paul's sphere as the Apostle of the Gentiles. The reading **ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** may be taken in two ways, either (preferably) that he was a minister of Christ for the sake of the Colossians, in which case we should probably have had **ὑμῖν** or **ἐν ὑμῖν** or simply **ὑμῶν**; or that he ministered to Paul as the representative of the Colossians, for which we should have expected "my minister" instead of "minister of Christ".

Ver. 8. **τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην** may be taken in the general sense of ver. 4, though many think it is their love to Paul that is meant; and this is favoured by **δηλ. ἡμ.**, and perhaps by **καὶ ἡμεῖς** in ver. 9. **ἐν πνεύματι** is added to show that this love is in the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 9-14. Paul's unceasing prayer for that moral discernment which will enable them to please God in all their conduct, that strength which will give them endurance in face of all provocation and trial, and that thankfulness to God, which befits the great deliverance He has achieved for them through His Son.—Ver. 9. **διὰ τοῦτο.** The good report from Colossæ prompts Paul's prayer. Apparently the reference is to all that has been said in vv. 4-8, though Haupt confines it to ver. 8.—**καὶ ἡμεῖς**: "we also," *i.e.*, as the Colossians had prayed for Paul, so he had made unceasing prayer for them. Similar assurances are common in the letters of the period, but their conventional character must not in the case of one of so intense a nature as Paul's lead us to degrade them into polite commonplaces. — **προσευχόμενοι καὶ αἰτούμενοι.** The former verb is general, the latter special, referring to

συνέσει πνευματικῇ, 10. περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν [p] ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι τῇ ἐπιγνώσει [1] τοῦ Θεοῦ, 11. ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει [q] δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν

p Only here in N.T.; in Philo of pleasing *God*; in bad sense, Theoph., *Char.*, 5; Arist., *Eth. Eud.*, ii., 3; *Pol.*, vi., 2, etc.; Diod., xiii., 53.

q Only here, Heb. xi. 34 and (?) Eph. vi. 10 in N.T., or Gk. vss. of O.T. Elsewhere in Paul, ενδυν.

[1] So edd. with ℵABCD*EFGP 17. **εις την επιγνωσιν**: D^{c}KL, probably to simplify the constr., perhaps assisted by **την επιγνωσιν** (ver. 9).

the definite request. Soden thinks the middle (**αἰτούμενοι**) is chosen to express Paul's personal interest, but there seems to have been no distinction between the middle and active of this verb in later Greek.—**ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν.** After verbs of praying, etc., **ἵνα** is used in a weakened sense to express the content of the prayer. **πληρ.** with the accusative is not precisely the same as with the genitive or dative. So here "filled with respect to". **ἐπίγνωσις** is stronger than **γνῶσις.** Meyer defines it as the knowledge which grasps and penetrates into the object.—**τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.** This does not mean God's counsel of redemption (Chrys., Beng., De W., Kl.), nor "the whole counsel of God as made known to us in Christ" (Findl.), but, as the context indicates (ver. 10), the moral aspect of God's will, "His will for the conduct of our lives" (Mey., Sod., Haupt, Abb.).—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ**: to be taken with the preceding, not (as by Hofm.) with the following words. **σοφία** is general, **σύνεσις** special. **σοφία** embraces the whole range of mental faculties; **σύνεσις** is the special faculty of intelligence or insight which discriminates between the false and the true, and grasps the relations in which things stand to each other. The addition of **πνευμ.** shows that both are to proceed from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They thus stand in opposition to fleshly wisdom (2 Cor. i. 12), and especially, it would seem, though Haupt denies this, to the false wisdom, by which the Colossians were in danger of being ensnared (*cf.* **τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,** ii. 18). The repetition of **πᾶς** in this context should be noticed. The early part of the Epistle is strongly marked by repetition of particular words and phrases.

Ver. 10. **περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου** (*cf.* Eph. iv. 1). This lofty wisdom and insight is not an end in itself. It must issue in right practice. Doctrine and ethics are for Paul inseparable. Right conduct must be founded on right thinking, but right thinking must also lead to right conduct. The infinitive expresses result "so as to walk". **τοῦ Κυρ.,** *i.e.*, of Christ, not of God (Hofm., Ol.). In 1 Thess. ii. 12 **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is used, but **ὁ Κύρ.** in Paul means Christ.—**ἀρεσκείαν** in classical Greek used generally in a bad sense, of obsequiousness. But it often occurs in Philo in a good sense; see the note on the word in Deissmann's *Bible Studies*, p. 224. **καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι.** For the collocation *cf.* ver. 6. The participles should probably be connected with **περιπατῆσαι,** not (as by Beng., Hofm., Weiss) with **πληρωθῆτε,** which is too far away. The continuation of an infinitive by a nominative participle instead of the accusative is frequent in classical Greek, and occurs several times in Paul (ii. 2, iii. 16, Eph. iv. 2, 3). They should not be separated. The whole clause should be translated "bearing fruit and increasing in every good work by the knowledge of God". Fruit bearing is one of Paul's favourite metaphors.—**τῇ ἐπιγνώσει**: not as R.V. and Moule "in the knowledge," for Paul has already spoken of this in ver. 9, but "by the knowledge," the knowledge of God being the means of their spiritual growth. Meyer, against the overwhelming weight of evidence, reads **εἰς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν,** "as regards the knowledge". This would make knowledge the goal of conduct (*cf.* John vii. 17), whereas previously the relation is reversed.

Ver. 11. **ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει**: "with all power," **ἐν** being instrumental. **κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.** The equipment with power is proportioned not simply to the recipient's need, but to the Divine supply. God's glory is His manifested nature, here as manifested in might.—**εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν.** This equipment with Divine power is not, as we might have expected, said to be given with a view to deeds

μετὰ χαρᾶς, 12. εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ [r] πατρὶ τῷ [s] ἱκανώσαντι[1] ὑμᾶς[2] εἰς τὴν [t u] μερίδα τοῦ [u v] κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί, 13. [v] ὃς ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς [w] ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς

r Absol., 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. vi. 18 (quot.); Rom. vi. 4; Eph. ii. 18; Acts i. 4, 7, ii. 3; 1 John. s LXX; Dion. Hal.; only here and 2 Cor. iii. 6 in N.T. t Only here and 2 Cor. vi. 15; Luke x. 42; Acts viii. 21, xvi. 12 in N.T. u Acts viii. 21. v Acts xxvi. 18. w Luke xxii. 53.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with nearly all ancient authorities. **καλεσαντι**: D*FG 17, by substitution of more usual word, helped by similarity of the two words. **καλεσαντι και ικανωσαντι**: Ln., Ws. with B alone, by combination of two readings.

[2] So T., W.H., Ws., Tr. mg., R.V. mg., Lft. mg. with ℵB. **ημας**: L., Tr., Lft., R.V. with ACDEFGKLP, probably under influence of **ημας** (ver. 13).

of great spiritual heroism, but for the practice of passive virtues, since this often puts the greater strain on the Christian's strength. **ὑπομ.** is endurance, steadfastness in face of trials, temptations and persecutions; **μακροθ.** is forbearance, the patience of spirit which will not retaliate. "The one is opposed to *cowardice* or *despondency*, the other to *wrath* or *revenge*" (Lightf.). There seems to be no reference in **μακροθ.**, as Alford supposes, to their attitude in conflict with error.—**μετὰ χαρᾶς**: not to be taken (as by Mey., Ell., Hofm., Weiss, Abb.) with **εὐχαριστ.**, which would be tautological and throw a false emphasis on these words, but with **ὑπομ. κ. μακροθ.** It forms a very necessary addition, for the peculiar danger of the exercise of those qualities is that it tends to produce a certain gloominess or sourness of disposition. The remedy is that the Christian should be so filled with joy that he is able to meet all his trials with a buoyant sense of mastery.

Ver. 12. **εὐχαριστοῦντες**: not to be taken with **οὐ παυόμεθα**, ver. 9 (Chrys., Beng.). Usually it is co-ordinated with the two preceding participial clauses. Haupt objects that it would be strange if thankfulness for participation in salvation were mentioned only after its consequences for Christian conduct had been deduced. He thinks it is a more precise development of **μετὰ χαρᾶς**; joy being produced by our thankful consciousness of the benefits thus secured to us. There is force in this, though the form of expression strongly suggests the common view, and considerations of order should not, perhaps, be so rigidly pressed.—**τῷ πατρὶ**. The word is selected to emphasise God's Fatherly love as the source of their redemption; though Soden thinks that, as in Rom. vi. 4, Paul has in mind God's relation to Christ (so Alf.).—**τῷ ἱκανώσαντι ὑμᾶς**: "who qualified you". The reference is to status rather than character.—**εἰς τὴν μερίδα . . . φωτί**. Lightfoot thinks **τ. μερ. τ. κλ.** is the portion which consists in the lot, **κλήρου** being a genitive of apposition (so Sod., Abb.). But probably **κλ.** is the general inheritance in which each individual has his **μέρ.** The lot is the blessedness awaiting the saints. More controverted is the connexion of **ἐν τῷ φωτί**. Meyer connects it with **ἱκανώσ.** and takes **ἐν** as instrumental "by the light". This is harsh, and **φωτί** in contrast to **σκότους** (ver. 13) cannot mean the Gospel. Others connect it with **ἁγίων**, either in the sense of angels (so Kl., Franke and Lueken) or saints (so Ol. and others). But the angels are never in the N.T. called **οἱ ἅγιοι**, though this term is used for them in the O.T. and Jewish Apocalyptic. Further, the contrast with the "darkness" of ver. 13 loses its force unless the "holy ones" are Christians as opposed to non-Christians. And if Paul had meant this he would have expressed himself more plainly. Nor is any such reference probable in an Epistle directed especially against over-valuation of the angels. If saints are meant, unless (with Ol.) we give **φωτί** merely an ethical sense, they must be saints in heaven, for which we should have expected **τῶν ἐν φωτί**, as the object of the addition would be to distinguish them from saints on earth. **ἐν φωτί** should therefore be connected either with **μερίδα** (Beng.), **μερίδα τ. κλήρου** (Alf., Lightf.), or **κλήρου** (De W., Ell., Sod., Haupt). The difference is slight, and it seems simplest to connect with **κλ.**, "the lot of the saints [situated] in the light"; **ἐν** being probably local, and not expressing, as in Acts viii. 21, the idea of a share in the light. The precise sense of **φῶς** is disputed. Oltramare takes it of the state of holiness in which Chris-

τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, 14. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν[1] τὴν [x] ἀπολύτρωσιν, τὴν [y] ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν· 15. ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ

x Plut., *Pomp.*, p. 631 B; Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 2, 3; Philo, *Qu. om. pr. lib.*, § 17; Diod., *Fragm.*, xxxvii., 53; in LXX only Dan. iv. 30; in N.T. ten times.

[1] So edd. (except Ln. ed. min.) with almost all authorities. **εσχομεν**: W.H. mg. with B cop., probably a conformation to aorists of ver. 13.

tians live, so that the distinction between saints on earth and in heaven does not arise. But the immediate impression of the phrase is that the heavenly kingdom, where God dwells in light, is referred to.

Ver. 13. Paul now explains how God has qualified them for their share in the heavenly inheritance. On this passage Acts xxvi. 18 should be compared; the parallels extend to ver. 12, 14 also.—**ἐρύσατο.** The aorist refers to the time of conversion. The metaphor implies the miserable state of those delivered and the struggle necessary to deliver them.—**ἐξουσίας**: "ubi τῇ βασιλείᾳ opponitur, est tyrannis" (Wetstein, so also Chrys., Lightf., Kl.). This would heighten the contrast between the power of darkness and the "kingdom of the son of His love". But Abbott argues forcibly against this view, especially with relation to the N.T. usage. He quotes Rev. xii. 10, **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ,** where the contrast obviously cannot be maintained. Grimm takes the term as a collective expression for the demoniacal powers; and Klöpper says that in Paul **ἐξ.** is not a mere abstract term, but signifies the possessors of power. Here, however, he rightly sees that the contrast to **βασ.** makes this meaning inappropriate, and that for it **ἐρύσ. ἀπό** would have been expected rather than **ἐρύσ. ἐκ.** Accordingly he interprets it as the dominion possessed by the (personified) darkness. — **τοῦ σκότους**: taken by Hofmann as a genitive of apposition, but the obvious interpretation is to take it as a subjective genitive, the dominion which darkness exercises. We should have expected simply "out of darkness" to correspond to "in light," but Paul changes the form, partly to insist that the darkness is not a mere state but exercises an active authority, partly to secure a parallel with the kingdom of God's Son. But we are not justified (with Mey., Kl.) in personifying **σκότος,** for the primary contrast is with **φωτί** not **υἱοῦ.**—**μετέστησεν.** Wetstein quotes Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 11, 1 (Tiglath-Pileser's deportation of N.E. Israel), and Lightfoot thinks that this use of the word suggested the choice of it here, and this is made more probable by the addition of **εἰς τ. βασ.** Meyer, however, quotes a striking parallel from Plato, where no such reference is present: **ἔκ τε φωτὸς εἰς σκότος μεθισταμένων καὶ ἐκ σκότους εἰς φῶς** (*Rep.*, p. 518 A).—**βασιλείαν.** Meyer insists that this is the Messianic kingdom, and as the realisation of this lay in the future to Paul the clause must have a proleptic reference, citizenship in the kingdom being guaranteed by their conversion. But the argument rests on a false premiss, for in 1 Cor. iv. 20, Rom. xiv. 17, the sense is not eschatological. Nor, indeed, can it be so here, for the translation into the kingdom must have taken place at the same time as the deliverance.—**υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ.** Augustine, followed by Olshausen and Lightfoot, takes **ἀγάπης** as a genitive of origin, and interprets, the Son begotten of the essence of the Father, which is love. This has no parallel in the N.T., and rests, as Meyer points out, on a confusion of the metaphysical with the ethical essence of God. The phrase is practically equivalent to His beloved Son, but is chosen for the sake of emphasis to indicate His greatness and the excellence of His kingdom. There is, perhaps, the further thought that the love which rests on the Son must rest also on those who are one with Him.

Ver. 14. This verse is parallel to Eph. i. 7. **ἐν ᾧ**: not by whom, but in whom; if we possess Christ, we possess in Him our deliverance.—**ἔχομεν**: (present) we have as an abiding possession.—**ἀπολύτρωσιν**: "deliverance". The word is generally interpreted as ransom by payment of a price, for which Mark x. 45, **δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν,** may be compared. But it is not certain that the word ever has this meaning. It is very rare in Greek writers (see reff.). The passage from Plutarch refers to pirates holding cities to ransom. But obviously the word here does not mean that we procure release by paying a ransom. The word is often used simply

Θεοῦ τοῦ [y] ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, 16. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα [1] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ [2] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ [z] ὁρατὰ

y So of God, 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. xi. 27.
z Only here in N.T.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H. with ℵ*BD*E*FGP 17, possibly by homœoteleuton. τα: inserted before εν τοις ουρανοις by Ws. (who thinks it indispensable before τα ορατα) with ℵcADcKL.

[2] So T., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*B. τα: inserted before επι της γης by [Ln.], [Tr.] with ℵcACDEFGKLP.

in the sense of "deliverance," the idea of ransom having disappeared. (So in Rom. viii. 23, Eph. iv. 30, Luke xxi. 28.) It is best therefore to translate "deliverance" here, especially as this suits better the definition in the following words. The remission of sins is itself our deliverance, whereas it stands to the payment of the ransom as effect to cause. The elaborate discussion in Oltramare may be referred to for fuller details, with the criticism in Sanday and Headlam's note on Rom. iii. 24; also Abbott on Eph. i. 7; Westcott on Heb., pp. 295, 296; Ritschl, *Rechtf. und Versöhn.* ii., 222 *sq.*—**τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν.** The similar definition of **ἀπολ.** in Eph. i. 7 tells against Lightfoot's view that it is added here against erroneous definitions by the false teachers, who very probably did not employ the term. The precise phrase does not occur elsewhere in Paul. **τ. ἁμ.** depends simply on **τ. ἀφ.**, not, as Hofmann thinks, on it and **τ. ἀπολ.**, for the latter is not used with the object from which deliverance is effected.

Vv. 15-21. This Son in whom we have our deliverance is the manifestation of God, the Lord of the universe, the Creator of all things in heaven and earth, including the angelic powers, and He is the goal for which they have been created. And as He is the first in the universe, so also He is Head of the Church, who has passed to His dominion from the realm of the dead, that He might become first in all things. For the Father willed that in Him all the fulness of Divine grace should dwell, and thus that He should reconcile to Him through His blood all things not on earth only but also in the heavens, in which reconciliation the Colossians have their part.—Ver. 15. With this verse the great Christological passage of the Epistle begins. Its aim is to refute the false doctrine, according to which angelic mediators usurped the place and functions of the Son in nature and grace. He, and He alone, is the Creator, Redeemer and Sovereign of all beings in the universe, including these angelic powers. The passage does not deal with the eternal relations of the Son to the Father, but with the Son's relations to the universe and the Church. It is not of the pre-existent Son that Paul begins to speak, but of the Son who now possesses the kingdom, and in whom we have our deliverance (**ὅς** refers back to **τ. υἱοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τ. ἀπολύτρωσιν**). The work of the Son in His pre-existent state is referred to, that the true position of the exalted Christ may be rightly understood. As in other great theological passages in the Pauline Epistles, the metaphysical element is introduced for the sake of the practical. But it would be absurd to infer from this that it had little importance for the Apostle himself. He assumes the pre-existence of the Son as common ground, and is thus applying a fundamental Christian truth, which would form part of the elementary instruction in his Churches, to a new form of false teaching.—**ὅς ἐστιν.** It is the exalted Christ of whom Paul is speaking, as is suggested, though not necessarily implied by the present, but more forcibly by the previous relative clause. We could not feel confident in arguing back from the function of the exalted Son to be **εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ** to that of the pre-incarnate Son, but what would be a plausible inference from this passage is asserted in Phil. ii. 5.—**εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.** As image of God the Son possesses such likeness to God as fits Him to be the manifestation of God to us. God is invisible, which does not merely mean that He cannot be seen by our bodily eye, but that He is unknowable. In the exalted Christ the unknowable God becomes known. We behold "with unveiled face the glory of the Lord," and so "are changed into the same image" (2 Cor. iii. 18), God has "shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge

of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (iv. 6), and it is the unbelieving on whom "the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God," does not shine (iv. 4). These passages illustrate Paul's language here, and show that it is not, as Oltramare argues, of physical visibility or invisibility that he is speaking. Christ is the image of God for Christians. This, it is true, is only part of His wider functions. The Son is the Mediator between God and the universe. His work in grace has its basis in His place and work in nature. But it is the aspect of His work of which Paul is here speaking. The view of some of the Fathers that the Son, as image of the invisible God, must be Himself invisible is precisely the opposite of that intended by Paul.—**πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.** **πρωτότοκος** in its primary sense expresses temporal priority, and then, on account of the privileges of the firstborn, it gains the further sense of dominion. Many commentators think both ideas are present here. Soden and Abbott, on the other hand, deny that the word expresses anything more than priority to and distinction from all creation, while Haupt again thinks that all the stress is on the idea of dominion, the Son is ruler of all creation (similarly Ol. and Weiss, who says that no temporal *prius* lies in the expression). It is undeniable that the word in the O.T. had in some cases lost its temporal significance, *e.g.*, Exod. iv. 22, Ps. lxxxix. 28. Schoettgen instances the fact that R. Bechai spoke of God as "the firstborn of the world," though, probably, as Bleek says in his note on Heb. i. 6, this is to be regarded "nur als eine Singularität". The course of the argument seems to require that the stress should lie on the lordship of the Son rather than on His priority to creation. For what Paul is concerned to prove is the superiority of Christ to the angels, and for this the idea of priority is not relevant, but that of dominion is. Whether the word retains anything of its original meaning here is doubtful. If so, it might seem most natural to argue with the Arians that the Son is regarded as a creature. Grammatically it is possible to make **πάσης κτίσεως** a partitive genitive. But this is excluded by the context, which sharply distinguishes between the Son and **τὰ πάντα**, and for this idea Paul would probably have used **πρωτόκτιστος**. The genitive is therefore commonly explained as a genitive of comparison. Oltramare says that such a genitive after a substantive is a pure invention, but it is explained to be after the **προ** or **πρωτο** in **πρωτότοκος** (*cf.* John i. 15, **ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν**). This, as Lightfoot says, "unduly strains the grammar," and on this account it seems best to exclude the temporal element altogether. The pre-existence is sufficiently asserted in what follows. There seems to be no real affinity with Philo's doctrine of the Logos as **πρωτόγονος**.—**πάσης κτίσεως** may be taken either as a collective, "all creation" (Lightf., R.V.), or distributively, "every creature" (Mey., Ell., Haupt, Abb.). Lightfoot urges in favour of the former that **πρωτότ.** "seems to require either a collective noun or a plural". But if **πρωτότ.** be taken in the sense of ruler, this is not so; and Haupt points out that **πᾶσα κτίσις** elsewhere is used of every created thing, and that Paul uses **κτίσις** without the article in the sense of creature. It is accordingly best to take it so here, "firstborn of every creature". A further question is raised as to what the term includes. Haupt thinks its sense is limited to spiritual beings, since (1) Paul is proving the superiority of Christ to the angels, (2) he defines by **τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς** not including heaven and earth themselves, (3) **εἰς αὐτὸν** shows that animate creatures must be referred to. At the same time he is careful to point out that, according to Jewish ideas, shared, no doubt, by the false teachers, the heavenly bodies were regarded as possessed of souls and as standing in the closest relation to the spirit world. This, combined with the fact that all material things were supposed similarly to have guardian spirits, rather tells against his limitation. For Paul really was concerned to show not only that Christ was superior to the angels, but that He and not the angels was Lord of the material creation. The phrase should therefore be taken in its full sense, though probably it is the spiritual side of the universe that he has chiefly in mind. The interpretation of creation as the new creation, adopted by many Fathers to meet the Arian inference that the Son was a creature, scarcely needs refutation. It would have no point against the false teaching at Colossæ, nor can it be carried through the passage, ver. 16 being decisive against it. Paul would probably have said firstborn of the Church or of the new creation if he had meant this.

Ver. 16. Paul now gives the ground for the designation of the Son as **πρωτότ. π. κτίσεως.** In Him **τὰ πάντα** were created. From this it follows that the Son cannot be a creature, for creation

καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε [a] θρόνοι εἴτε [b] κυριότητες εἴτε [c] ἀρχαὶ εἴτε [c] ἐξουσίαι, τὰ πάντα [d] δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ [e] εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, 17. καὶ

a *Test. Lev.*; only here in N.T. b Eph. i. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8. c ii. 10, 15; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21, iii. 10, vi. 12; Tit. iii. 1; αγγελοι with αρχαι, Rom. viii. 38 with εξουσιαι; 1 Pet. iii. 22. d 1 Cor. viii. 6; John i. 3; Heb. i. 2; of God, Rom. xi. 36; Heb. ii. 10. e Of the Son, only here; of God, Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6.

is exhausted by the "all things" which were so created in Him ("omnem excludit creaturam," Bengel).—**ἐν αὐτῷ**: this does not mean "by Him". The sense is disputed. The schoolmen, followed by some modern theologians, explain that the Son is the archetype of the universe, the **κόσμος νοητός**, the eternal pattern after which the physical universe has been created. So Philo held that the Logos was the home wherein the eternal ideas resided. But it is by no means clear that Alexandrian influence can be traced in the Epistle. Further, the notion of creation is not suitable to the origin of the ideal universe in the Son. If the Son was from eternity the archetype of the universe, then **ἐκτίσθη ἐν αὐτῷ** ought not to have been used, both because the aorist points to a definite time and the idea of creation is itself inapplicable. But that the ideal universe was at some time created in the Son is an highly improbable, if it is even an intelligible, idea. Again, the sense of **ἐκτίσθη** is controlled by that of **κτίσις**, which does not refer to the ideal universe. It must therefore refer to the actual creation of the universe. If Paul had intended to speak of the realisation in creation of the ideal universe which had in the Son its eternal home he would have said **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**. Others (Mey., Ell., Moule) take **ἐν αὐτῷ** to mean simply that the act of creation depended causally on the Son. This is perhaps the safest explanation, for Haupt's interpretation that apart from His Person there would have been no creation, but with His Person creation was a necessity—in other words, that creation was "given" in Christ—seems with the aorist and the choice of the word **ἐκτίσθη** to be inconsistent with the eternal existence of the Son.—**τὰ πάντα**, *i.e.*, the universe in its widest sense regarded as a collective whole.—**ἐν τ. οὐρανοῖς κ. ἐπὶ τ. γῆς.** As Lightfoot points out, "a classification by locality," while **τὰ ὁρατὰ κ. τ. ἀόρατα** is a "classification by essence". The two do not precisely correspond, for the divisions cross each other to some extent, though some confine the things in heaven to the world of spirits, and the things on earth to the world of men, in which case they would correspond to things invisible and things visible. Against this see above on **π. κτίσεως.**—**εἴτε θρόνοι κ.τ.λ.** This is not an exhaustive definition of **τὰ πάντα**, for Paul selects for mention those creatures to whom worship was paid by the false teachers. The names, as in similar lists, denote angels and not earthly powers. For some of them occur in Jewish angelology, and a reference to earthly dignities would be irrelevant to the polemical purpose of the passage. These angels, Paul insists, so far from being superior or equal to Christ, were as inferior to Him as the creature is to the Creator. They owed their very existence to Him, and could not therefore be allowed for one moment to usurp His place. Lightfoot thinks that Paul is expressing no opinion as to their objective existence, but is simply repeating subjective opinions; and that both here and in ii. 18 he shows a "spirit of impatience with this elaborate angelology". But in face of the detailed proof that he accepted the doctrine of various orders of angels (given most fully by Everling), this cannot be maintained, nor is there any polemical reference in Eph. i. 21. It may be questioned whether any inference can be drawn as to the order of the ranks of angels. The order in the parallel list, Eph. i. 21, is **ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, δύναμις, κυριότης,** on which Godet remarks that in Col. the question is of creation by Christ from whom all proceed, hence the enumeration descends; but in Eph. of the ascension of the risen Christ above all orders, hence the enumeration ascends. But it must be urged against this not merely that only three out of the four titles coincide, but that the order is not fully inverted. Possibly Paul employs here the order of the false teachers (so Kl.). The order apparently descends, but it is questionable if this is intentional, for if the highest orders were inferior to Christ, *a fortiori* the lower would be. **θρόνοι**: taken by some to be the angels of the throne, that is angels who, like the cherubim, bear the throne of God. But it is more probable that they are those seated on thrones (*cf.* Rev. iv. 4). On these orders, *cf.* the *Slavonic Enoch*,

xx., 1. In the seventh heaven Enoch saw "a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels, and incorporeal powers and *lordships and principalities and powers;* cherubim and seraphim, *thrones* and the watchfulness of many eyes". Also *Enoch*, lxi., 10, "and all the angels of *powers* and all the angels of *principalities*". *Test.*, xii., *Patr. Levi.*, 3, **ἐν δὲ τῷ μετ' αὐτόν εἰσι θρόνοι, ἐξουσίαι, ἐν ᾧ ὕμνοι ἀεὶ τῷ Θεῷ προσφέρονται.**—**κυριότητες**: apparently inferior to **θρόνοι.**—**ἀρχαὶ . . . ἐξουσίαι** usually occur together and in this order.—**τὰ πάντα . . . συνέστηκεν**: thrown in as a parenthesis.—**δι' αὐτοῦ.** The Son is the Agent in creation (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6); this definitely states the pre-existence of the Son and assumes the supremacy of the Father, whose Agent the Son is.—**εἰς αὐτὸν.** That the Son is the goal of creation is an advance on Paul's previous teaching, which had been that the goal of the universe is God (Rom. xi. 36; *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6, **ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν**). It is urged by Holtzmann and others as decisive against the authenticity of the Epistle as it stands. But in 1 Cor. xv. 25 *sq.* all things have to become subject to the Son before He hands over the kingdom to the Father. We find the same thought in Matt. xxviii. 18 and Heb. ii. 8. And, as Oltramare and others point out, in 1 Cor. viii. 6, **δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα** is said of Christ, but of God in Rom. xi. 36. Yet this difference is not quoted to show that Romans and Corinthians cannot be by the same hand, and it is equally illegitimate to press **εἰς αὐτ.** as inconsistent with Pauline authorship. —**ἔκτισται.** The perfect, as distinct from the aorist, expresses the abiding result as distinct from the act at a definite point of time (*cf.* John i. 3, **ἐγένετο** followed by **γέγονεν**).

Ver. 17. **αὐτός ἐστιν. αὐτ.** is emphatic, He and no other. Lightfoot (followed by Westcott and Hort and Ellicott) accents **ἔστιν**, "He exists," on account of the present, and compares **ἐγὼ εἰμί** (John viii. 58). But there **ἐγὼ εἰμί** stands alone, whereas here **αὐτ. ἐστ.** is completed by **πρὸ πάντων.** Besides, there is no object in the assertion of the existence of the Son here. The sense of **ἐστὶν** depends to some extent on that of **πρὸ πάντων.** If, as is usual, **πρὸ** is taken here as temporal, **αὐτός** will be the pre-incarnate Son. If, however, with Haupt, it be taken to assert superiority in rank, **αὐτός** will be the exalted Christ, and the present will be quite regular. It is urged that for this some other preposition, such as **ἐπὶ** or **ὑπέρ,** would have been expected. Gess says that in each of the eleven other passages in which it occurs in Paul it is temporal, and in the other N.T. passages (37) it is used of place or, as generally, of time, except in Jas. v. 12, 1 Pet. iv. 8, where it is used of rank. It is used, however, in classical Greek in this latter sense. Perhaps it is safest to allow the general Pauline usage to determine the sense here. In this case **πρὸ** is temporal and **ἐστιν** a timeless present. **πάντων** is, of course, neuter, like **τὰ πάντα,** not masculine.—**συνέστηκεν**: "hold together". The Son is the centre of unity for the universe. He keeps all its parts in their proper place and due relations and combines them into an ordered whole. Apart from Him it would go to pieces. Philo ascribes a similar function to the Logos. Haupt thinks that this thought that Christ is the principle of coherence for the universe is not in the passage, which means no more than that He sustains it (*cf.* Heb. i. 3, **φέρων τὰ πάντα**).

The interpretation of vv. 15-17 given by Oltramare should not be passed over. He eliminates the idea of pre-existence from the passage, and says that the reference is throughout to Christ as Redeemer. God had in creation to provide by a plan of Redemption for the entrance of evil into the universe, and only on that condition could it take place. So since Christ is the Redeemer, creation is based upon Him, He is the means to it, and the end which it contemplates. He objects to the common view on the following grounds: (1) Elsewhere Paul speaks of God, not Christ, as the Creator and goal of the universe; (2) Paul starts from the Christ in whom we have redemption as **πρωτότ. π. κτίσεως,** and in ver. 18, which refers to the same Person as ver. 17, He is spoken of as the Head of the Church, therefore the context is against any reference to a pre-incarnate Christ; (3) He carefully avoids saying that the Son has created all things, though he has to change the subject of the sentence. In reply to (1) it may be said that the Son acts as Agent of the Father, and so creation may be referred to either, and that while Paul contemplates the final surrender by the Son of the kingdom to the Father, he also contemplates a prior subjection of everything to the Son. Oltramare himself, for another purpose, points to apparent inconsistency in John (John i. 2 compared with Rev. iii. 14, iv. 11, x. 6) and the author of Hebrews

αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ [f] συνέστηκεν, 18. καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή,[1] πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς [g] πρωτεύων,

f Plato, *Rep.*, 530 A; Arist., *de Mun.*, vi., 471; Philo, *de Plant.*, *Noe* 2, *Quis rer. div. haer.* 12.

g Class.; LXX; only here in N.T.; *cf.* φιλοπρωτ., 3 John 9.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., Lft., Ws. with nearly all ancient authorities. η αρχη: [W.H.] with B 47, under influence of εστιν η κεφαλη.

(i. 2 compared with ii. 10, xi. 3). If these writers did not find the two views incompatible, why should Paul have done so? In reply to (2) it may be urged that Paul's hold on the personal identity of the Son in the states through which He passed was strong enough to enable Him to glide from one to the other without any sense of incongruity. As to (3), the change in the form of sentence is probably to prepare for δι' αὐτοῦ κ. εἰς αὐτὸν. There is a similar change at ver. 19, where ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ corresponds to ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ (ver. 16). His own view is open to fatal objections. It is not clear that the creation of the angels who did not fall would be conditional on provision being made for Redemption, nor yet how this would prove the superiority of the Redeemer to these angels. The insuperable difficulty, however, is that the thought is so far-fetched and not naturally suggested by the words. ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα can hardly be consistent with the creation of the universe long before the Son came into existence. Nor can δι' αὐτοῦ mean merely that the Son was an indispensable condition for the creation of the universe, it implies active agency. Nor is any adequate explanation of τ. πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν given. Besides, Phil. ii. 5-8 sufficiently proves that Paul believed in the pre-existence of Christ, and that makes it less than ever justifiable to take the passage in other than its plain sense.—Gess, it may be added, explains that the firstborn is the one who opens for those who follow the path of life, and by his consecration to God must purchase for them the Divine good pleasure. Exod. xiii. 2, 12 *sq.* and Num. iii. 12 *sq.* are quoted to prove this, but neither says anything of the purchase of Divine favour for those born after. Exod. iv. 22 and Ps. lxxxix. 27 are explained to mean, accordingly, that Israel and David, not the nations and their kings, are objects of God's good pleasure and mediators of it to the world. πρωτότ. π. κτ. is therefore explained as the opener of the path of life and mediator of God's love to every creature. But this is to overlook the fact that in Ps. lxxxix. the firstborn is further defined as the highest of the kings of the earth.

Ver. 18. The false teachers not only wrongly represented the relation of the angel powers to the universe, but they assigned them a false position in the work of redemption and a false relation to the Church. Hence Paul passes from the pre-eminence of the Son in the universe to speak of Him as Head of the Body. He is thus supreme alike in the universe and the Church.—ἡ κεφαλὴ τ. σώματος (*cf.* ii. 19, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15, 16, v. 23). For Christ as Head simply, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 3. For the Church as the body of Christ, ver. 24, Eph. iv. 2, 1 Cor. xii. 27, Rom. xii. 5. For Christians as the members of Christ's body, Eph. v. 30, 1 Cor. xii. 37. For Christians as "severally members one of another," Rom. xii. 5. By this metaphor of "the head of the body" is meant that Christ is the Lord and Ruler of His Church, its directing brain, probably also that its life depends on continued union with Him. The Church is a body in the sense that it is a living organism, composed of members vitally united to each other, each member with his own place and function, each essential to the body's perfect health, each dependent on the rest of the body for its life and well-being, while the whole organism and all the individual members derive all their life from the Head and act under His guidance. And as the body needs the Head, to be the source of its life and the controller of its activities, and to unify the members into an organic whole, so the Head needs the body to be His instrument in carrying out His designs. It is only in Colossians and Ephesians that Christ appears as Head of the Church, but the emphasis in Colossians is on the Headship, in Ephesians on the Church.—τῆς ἐκκλησίας: often taken as in apposition to σώματος. For this we should have expected τ. σώμ. αὐτοῦ, τ. ἐκκλ. (*cf.* ver. 24). It may also be taken as epexegetical of σώματος (so Weiss and Haupt, who quotes 1 Cor. v. 8, 2 Cor. v. 5, Rom. iv. 11, viii. 21, xv. 16

19. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, 20. καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ [h] ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, [i] εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ

h Only here, ver. 21, and Eph. ii. 16 in class. or Bib. Gk. Elsewhere in Paul καταλ., but Rom. v. 10 (*bis*); 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 18-20 (*ter*) only. i Prov. x. 10; Hermes in Stob.; only here in N.T.

as parallels, all of which, however, are not clear). ἐκκλ. is here the universal Church.—**ὅς ἐστιν**: inasmuch as He is. Paul is giving a reason for the position of the Son as ἡ κεφ. τ. σώματος.—**ἀρχή** is not to be taken in the sense of ἀπαρχή, nor is it certain that it has, as Lightfoot and others think, the sense of originating power. It is defined by πρωτότ. ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν, and this seems to throw the stress rather on the idea of supremacy than that of priority. There is perhaps a tacit reference to ἀρχαί (ver. 16).—**πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν**: "firstborn from among the dead". In Rev. i. 5 we have ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, which expresses a different idea. If the temporal reference in πρ. is the more prominent, the meaning will be that He is the first to pass out of the dominion of death. But if sovereignty is the leading idea, the meaning is that from among the dead He has passed to His throne, where He reigns as the living Lord, who has overcome death, and who, before He surrenders the kingdom to the Father, will abolish it.—**ἵνα . . . πρωτεύων**: the purpose for which He is ἀρχή, πρωτότ. ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν. He is supreme in the universe. He has to become supreme in relation to the Church. αὐτὸς is emphatic; ἐν πᾶσιν neuter not masculine, on account of the context.

Ver. 19. This verse with ver. 20 shows how the Son was able to hold the position assigned to Him in ver. 18. Further, this verse leads up to ver. 20. The thought is then: All the fulness dwelt in the Son, therefore reconciliation could be accomplished through the blood of His cross, and so He became the Head of the body.—**εὐδόκησεν.** Three views are taken as to the subject of the verb. (1) Meyer, Alford, Lightfoot, Oltramare, Haupt and the great majority of commentators supply ὁ Θεός as the subject. (2) Ewald, Ellicott, Weiss, Soden and Abbott make πλήρωμα the subject. (3) Conybeare, Hofmann and Findlay supply ὁ υἱός or ὁ Χριστός. In favour of (3) the unique emphasis on the sovereignty of Christ in this passage is urged, also that it prepares the way for the reference of ἀποκαταλλάξαι and εἰρηνοποιήσας to Christ, in accordance with Eph. ii. 14-16, v. 27. It is also true that the subject from ver. 15 is, for the most part, the Son. But the usage of Paul leads us to think of the Father, not of the Son, as the One who forms the eternal purpose (Eph. i. 9, 2 Cor. v. 19). Nor does ver. 20 run on naturally. If the Son is the subject of "was well pleased," the obvious interpretation of δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκ. is to reconcile through the fulness, which is highly improbable. We should accordingly have to give to δι' αὐτοῦ a reflexive sense, and translate "through Himself," which is grammatically possible, but not natural. There is the further objection which it shares with (1) that a change of subjects to the infinitives is required, πλήρωμα being the subject of κατοικ., while that to ἀποκατ. is Θεός or υἱός. But it is less awkward in (1) than in (3), for the former does not make the Son at once the originator and the Agent of the plan of reconciliation. Against (1), besides the objection just mentioned, it may be said that the construction with εὐδόκ. is unusual, for its subject is elsewhere in the N.T. the subject of the following infinitive (this tells against (3) also), and that in a passage of such importance the subject could not have been omitted. But for the omission of the subject Lightfoot compares Jas. i. 12, iv. 6. What, however, is really decisive in its favour is the difficulty of accepting (2). The expression "all the fulness was well pleased" is very strange in itself. But what is much stranger is that the fulness was not only pleased to dwell in Him, but through Him to reconcile all things unto Him. And the only natural course is to refer εἰρηνοπ. to the subject of εὐδόκ., but the masculine makes it difficult to regard πλήρ. as that subject. We should therefore translate "God" [or "the Father"] "was well pleased".—**πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα.** On πλήρωμα the detached note in Lightfoot, pp. 255-271, should be consulted, with the criticism of it in an article on "The Church as the Fulfilment of the Christ," by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson (*Expositor*, April, 1898), also Oltramare's note. Lightfoot urges in opposition to Fritzsche that πλήρωμα has always a genuinely passive sense, not the pseudo-passive sense "id quo res impletur" which Fritzsche gave

k Several times in LXX; only here and Eph. ii. 12, iv. 18 in N.T.

αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ[1] εἴτε τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἴτε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, 21. καὶ ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας [k] ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ

[1] So T. [W.H.], Lft., R.V., Ws. with ℵACD^bcEKP. δι' αυτου: omitted by Ln., Tr. with BD*FGL, by homœoteleuton.

it, and which is really the active "id quod implet," but that which is completed. The basis of the decision is that substantives in -μα, since they are derived from the perfect passive, must have a passive sense. But, as Prof. Robinson points out, these substantives have their stem not in -μα but in -ματ, and therefore are not to be connected with the perfect passive. He reaches the conclusion that if a general signification is to be sought for, we may say that these nouns represent "the *result* of the agency of the corresponding verb". If the verb is intransitive the substantive will be so; if it is transitive and the substantive corresponds to its object the noun is passive, but if the substantive is followed by the object of the verb in the genitive it is active. According to the double use of πληροῦν to "fill" and to "fulfil," πλήρωμα may mean that which fills or that which fulfils, the fulness, fulfilment or complement. Oltramare comes to the conclusion that the word means perfection, and interprets this passage to mean that ideal perfection dwelt in Christ. Accordingly he escapes the question what genitive should be supplied after it. It does not seem, however, that the word meant moral perfection. Many think that θεότητος should be supplied after πλήρωμα, as is actually done in ii. 9. Serious difficulties beset this view. If we think of the eternal indwelling, we make it dependent on the Father's will, an Arian view, which Paul surely did not hold. Alford's reply to this (endorsed by Abbott) that all that is the Son's right "is His Father's pleasure, and is ever referred to that pleasure by Himself," is anything but cogent, for εὐδόκησεν refers to a definite decree of the Father, and the obvious meaning of the words is that it lay within the Father's choice whether the πλήρωμα should dwell in the Son or not. It might refer to the exaltation of Christ, in which the Son resumed that of which He had emptied Himself in the Incarnation. This would follow the reference to the resurrection in ver. 18. But the order does not indicate the true logical or chronological sequence. Vv. 19, 20 give the ground (ὅτι) on which the Son's universal pre-eminence rests, and ver. 20 is quite incompatible with this reference to the exalted state, coordinated as κατοικ. and ἀποκατ. are by καί. But neither does it suit the incarnate state, which was a state of self-emptying and beggary; even if we could attach any very definite meaning to the words that in the Incarnate Son the Father was pleased that all the fulness of the Godhead should dwell. We should, therefore, probably reject the view that τὸ πλήρωμα means the fulness of the Godhead. Since the co-ordinate clause speaks of reconciliation through the blood of the cross, it seems probable that we should regard ver. 19 as asserting such an indwelling as made this possible. We should therefore with Meyer explain τὸ πλ. as the fulness of grace, "the whole *charismatic riches of God*" (so also De W., Eadie, Alf., Findl.). Haupt thinks that the full content of the Divine nature is referred to, but with special reference to the Divine grace, and so far he agrees with Meyer. We should also, with Meyer, interpret the indwelling as having reference to the sending of the Son in the incarnation. The Father was pleased that He should come "with the *whole treasure* of *Divine grace*". Thus equipped His death procured reconciliation. Gess takes it similarly, though he thinks, on the whole, that a gradual process is referred to. Findlay's modification of this in favour of a reference to the Ascension (for which he compares Eph. i. 20-23) must be rejected on the grounds mentioned above. The decree of the Father may be supra-temporal, as Haupt thinks, the aorist being used as in Rom. viii. 29, though it is more obvious to take it as referring to the time when He was sent. Two other interpretations of τὸ πλ. may be mentioned. Theodoret and other Fathers, followed by some moderns, have explained it to mean the Church. But the indwelling of the πλ. prepares the way for the reconciliation, in consequence of which the Church first becomes possible. Nor could πλ. by itself mean this; in Eph. i. 22 the reference is supplied by

the context. More possible is the view that it means the universe = τὰ πάντα, ver. 16 (Hofm., Cremer, Godet, who compares "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness of it"). In that case the genitive supplied would be τῶν πάντων from ver. 20. But if the reference in this be to the summing up of all things in Christ (Eph. i. 10), it is excluded by the fact that the indwelling of the fulness is contemporaneous with the incarnate state. A more plausible interpretation would be to regard τὰ πάντα as dwelling in Christ before His death, and by sharing that death, attaining reconciliation with God. This would be an extension of the Pauline thought that all men died when Christ died (2 Cor. v. 14). But it would be an extension precisely corresponding to that of the scope of redemption in ver. 20, for which, indeed, it would admirably prepare the way, the universe dwelling in the Son that His death might be universal in its effects. That the Son is not only Head of the race, but Head also of the universe, is a familiar thought in these Epistles, and as His acts are valid for the one so also for the other. Nothing more is implied for the relation of the universe to Christ than of the race, and if the main stress be thrown on angels and men, there is nothing incongruous in the idea. Whether Paul would have used it in this sense without fuller explanation is uncertain; but in any case a genitive has to be supplied. A further question must be briefly referred to, that of the origin of the term. Several scholars think it was already in use as a technical term of the false teachers at the time when the letter was written. This is possible, and in its favour is its absolute use here; but, if so, it is strange that Paul should use it with such different applications. It is more probable that its origin is due to him.—κατοικῆσαι. The word expresses permanent abode as opposed to a temporary sojourn. Bengel says aptly "Haec inhabitatio est fundamentum reconciliationis".

Ver. 20. To this verse Eph. i. 10, ii. 16, are partially parallel. It supplies the basis for the Son's pre-eminence (ver. 18) in His reconciling death.—δι' αὐτοῦ: through the Son.—ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν. The choice of ἀποκατ. instead of the more usual καταλλ. is for the sake of strengthening the idea, and by insisting on the completeness of the reconciliation accomplished to exclude all thought that reconciliation by angels is needed to supplement that made by Christ. The reconciliation implies previous estrangement. It is the universal sweep of this passage that makes it at once fascinating and mysterious. Numerous expedients have been devised by exegetes to avoid the plain meaning of the words. The natural sense is that this reconciliation embraces the whole universe, and affects both things in heaven and things on the earth, and that peace is made between them and God (or Christ). The point which creates difficulty is the assertion that angels were thus reconciled. Some have evaded this by interpreting τὰ πάντα of the things in heaven below the angels and those on earth below man. It might be possible to parallel the latter reconciliation with Paul's prophecy of the deliverance of animate and inanimate nature (excluding man) from the bondage of corruption (Rom. viii. 19-23). But the two are not identical, for one is and the other is not eschatological, and reconciliation is not deliverance from the bondage of corruption. And this helps us little to explain what the reconciliation of all things in heaven is. Nor is any such limitation legitimate; on the contrary, it is precisely in the opposite direction that any limitation would have to be made; for in its full sense reconciliation can only be of beings endowed with moral and spiritual nature. In vv. 16, 17 angelic powers are explicitly included in τὰ πάντα. It is plain that εἰς αὐτὸν excludes the view that a reconciliation of angels and men is intended. This is so even if with Chrysostom and others (including apparently Abbott) we make τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γῆς and τὰ ἐν τ. οὐραν. depend on εἰρηνοπ. For this still leaves unexplained ἀποκ. τ. πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, which makes the reference to angels undeniable. Bengel's note, "Certum est angelos, Dei amicos, fuisse inimicos hominum Deo infensorum," may be perfectly true. But it is irrelevant here, for only by forcing the words can εἰρηνοπ . . . οὐραν. be regarded as other than epexegetical of the preceding clause, and in particular τ. ἐπὶ τ. γῆς and τὰ ἐν τ. οὐραν. as a resolution of τ. πάντα. Abbott's suggestion that τὰ ἐν. τ. οὐραν. may be inhabitants of other worlds may be true, though for Paul the thought is far-fetched, but does nothing towards excluding the angels. He urges that ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is not necessarily equivalent to "in heaven". But not only did Jewish angelology place the angels in the heavens, but Paul did so too, and has done so only just before in this passage, defining τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐραν. as the various orders of angels (ver. 16).

ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς. 22. νυνὶ δὲ ἀποκατηλλάγητε[1] ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου,[2] παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ [1] ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον

[1] Only here and 1 Cor. i. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 6, 7 in N.T.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H. mg., R.V. mg., Lft., Ws. with B. **αποκατηλλακηται**: 17, a corruption from the text. **αποκατηλλαγεντες**: D*FG, Latin d, e, g, m, Goth., Iren. (transl.) and others, an incorrect correction of text to improve the grammar. **αποκατηλλαξεν**: T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with all other authorities, an alteration for the sake of smoothness, helped by active in ver. 20.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with most authorities. **αυτου**: inserted after **θανατου** [Ln.], [Lft.] with ℵAP.

Further, not only is this exclusion of the angels from the scope of reconciliation inconsistent with the terms of the passage, it omits a very important point in Paul's polemic. To the angels the false teachers probably ascribed the function of procuring the reconciliation of men with God. (*Cf.* Enoch xv. 2, "And go, say to the watchers of heaven, who have sent thee to intercede for them: you should intercede for men, and not men for you".) How effective is Paul's reply that these angels needed reconciliation themselves! Assuming, then, that angels are included among those reconciled, and that this is also referred to in the words "having made peace through the blood of His cross," the question arises, What did Paul mean by this? Meyer says that in consequence of the fall of the evil angels the angelic order as a whole was affected by the hostile relation of God to them, and the original relation will be fully restored when the evil angels are finally cast into hell. But apart from the speculative nature of this explanation, and the injustice it imputes to God, the reference is certainly not eschatological. Godet lays stress on **εἰς αὐτὸν**, and suggests that the reconciliation is not to God but with reference to God. He thinks that the passing over of sins by God (Rom. iii. 25) might cause the angels, who had been mediators in the giving of the law, difficulties as to the Divine righteousness. This was met and removed by the cross, which revealed God's attitude to sin and reconciled them to His government. We do not know that the angels needed this vindication, which, of course, it was a function of Christ's death to give, though it is possible (Eph. iii. 10, 1 Pet. i. 12). But this interpretation seems to be excluded by the explanation of reconciliation as making peace. And **εἰς αὐτὸν** was probably chosen instead of **αὐτῷ** on account of **εἰς αὐτὸν** (ver. 16), and because it was stronger and expressed the thought of God or Christ as the goal. The explanation that the angels were confirmed, and thus made unable to fall, is altogether inadequate. Harless, Oltramare and others admit a reconciliation of men and angels to God, but without asserting that **τὰ ἐν τ. οὐρ.** needed reconciliation. Wherever it was needed Christ effected it. But Paul's division of **τὰ π.** into two categories marked by **εἴτε . . . εἴτε** shows that the statement has reference not simply to these classes taken together as a whole, but to each taken singly. Alford, in his suggestive note, after saying that such a reconciliation as that between man and God is not to be thought of, since Christ did not take on Him the seed of angels or pay any propitiatory penalty in the root of their nature, gives as his interpretation "all creation subsists in Christ: all creation therefore is affected by His act of propitiation: sinful creation is, in the strictest sense, *reconciled* from being at enmity: sinless creation, ever at a distance from His unapproachable purity, is lifted into nearer participation and higher glorification of Him, and is thus *reconciled*, though not in the strictest, yet in a very intelligible and allowable sense". Unfortunately this cannot be accepted, for the strict is the only allowable sense. But it is on the right lines, and indicates the direction in which a solution must be sought. This, as several recent scholars have urged (Kl., Gess, Everling and others), is through taking account of the Biblical and Jewish doctrine of angels. That the angels are divided into the sharply separated classes of sinless and demoniacal is a view on which this passage remains inexplicable. Nor is it the Old Testament or the Jewish doctrine, or, it may be added, the doctrine of Paul. Perhaps we need not, with Gess, think of an intermediate class, or, with Ritschl,

of the angels of the Law. To Jewish thought angels stood in the closest relations with men, and were regarded as sharing a moral responsibility for their acts. The angelic princes of earthly kingdoms in Daniel, and the angels of the Churches in the Apocalypse, are Biblical examples of this. A large number of Pauline passages harmonise with the view that the angelic world needed a reconciliation. The detailed proof of this cannot be given here; it belongs to the discussion of the angelology of the Epistle. (See *Introd.*, section ii.) But if the angels needed it, how could it be effected through the blood of the cross? It is not enough to answer with Haupt that the reconciliation of men affected the angels who were closely united with them. A direct effect seems to be intended, and the difficulty is that stated by Holtzmann, that with the flesh all capacity is absent from the angels of Paul, to share in the saving effects of the death of God's Son, which was made possible through the assumption of the flesh, and in which sin in the flesh is condemned. In answer to it these considerations may be urged. The Son is Head of the angels, as He is Head of humanity; therefore His acts had an effect on them independently of their effect on men. His death must not be narrowly conceived as physical only, as the destruction of the material flesh. It was the destruction of the sinful principle; and therefore is independent in its effects of the possession of material bodies by those whom it saves. And this cannot be set aside by the fact that Paul uses such a physical term as blood of the cross, for the death of Christ was surely more to him than a mere physical incident. So far, then, as the angel world was affected by sin, it needed reconciliation, and received it in the atoning and sin-destroying death of Christ its Head. That in this reconciliation evil angels are not included is clear from the fact that Paul does not regard it as having had effect on them corresponding to that on men. Lueken points out that Paul adds "through Him" to the words "through the blood of His cross," and refers the latter to the reconciliation of men and the former to that of angels, so that they are simply said to be reconciled through Christ. But the **δι' αὐτοῦ** is an emphatic resumption of **δι' αὐτοῦ** at the beginning of the verse.—**εἰς αὐτόν.** It is uncertain whether this should be referred to God or Christ. The former is possible, for **αὐτός** may be reflexive, and reconciliation is usually to God (so Eph. ii. 16, also 2 Cor. v. 18-20, Rom. v. 10). We should also have expected **δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν** if Christ had been meant. On the other hand, the reference to Christ is favoured by the fact that elsewhere in this passage **αὐτός** always refers to Christ, and by the parallel with ver. 16, **ἐν αὐτῷ . . . δι' αὐτοῦ . . . εἰς αὐτόν.** Decision is difficult; it is perhaps safest to let the Pauline usage determine the reference, and interpret "unto Himself".—**εἰρηνοποιήσας.** In Ephesians great emphasis is laid on the peace between Jew and Gentile, established by the cross, an emphasis quite to be expected where the unity of the Church is the leading thought; but not to be found here, for the peace is obviously between God on the one side and men and angels on the other; besides which the thought would have no relevance in this connexion.—**διὰ τ. αἵματος τ. σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ.** The combination of the two terms is perhaps for the sake of insisting on the historical fact of the reconciling death against the tendency to seek peace with God through angelic mediators.—**τὰ ἐπὶ τ. γῆς,** probably governed by **ἀποκατ.,** rather than **εἰρηνοπ.,** since it and the companion phrase seem to be epexegetical of **τὰ πάντα.**

Ver. 21. For this verse *cf.* Eph. ii. 1, 12. Usually **καὶ ὑμᾶς** is made to begin a new sentence. Even with the reading **ἀποκατήλλαξεν** the construction is not quite regular, but with the probably correct reading, **ἀποκατηλλάγητε,** a violent break in the context is involved, since Paul begins with the second person as the object and suddenly makes it the subject. Such an anacoluthon is possible in dictation, but very improbable unless several words had intervened, so that the beginning of the sentence should be forgotten. This is not the case here. Lachmann (followed by Lightf. and others) takes **νυνὶ δὲ . . . θανάτου** as a parenthesis, in which case **παραστῆσαι** depends on **εὐδόκησε,** and **ὑμᾶς** is repeated "to disentangle the construction". The irregularity is thus avoided. Haupt objects that it is unlikely that Paul should have continued after so long a sentence as ver. 20 with the same construction, and also that the thought in this part of the sentence, "to present you holy," is not co-ordinated to the thoughts in **κατοικ.** and **ἀποκατ.** For in the latter the thought is that it is the Son in whom the fulness dwells and through whom reconciliation is effected. But this thought of the pre-eminence of the Son in the work of salvation is not con-

m Only here and 1 Cor. vii. 37, xv. 58 in N.T.
n Only here in N.T.

αὐτοῦ, 23. εἴ γε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ [m] ἑδραῖοι καὶ μὴ [n] μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὗ ἠκούσατε, τοῦ κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος.

tinued in ver. 22, where the thought is of the Christian standing of the Colossians before God. It is therefore unlikely that **παραστ.** should depend on **εὐδοκ.** Accordingly, with Haupt and Weiss, a comma should be placed at the end of ver. 20, and a full stop at the end of ver. 21. **ὑμᾶς** in ver. 21 will then depend on **ἀποκατ.** It might seem an anti-climax after the wide sweep of ver. 20 to narrow down the reference to the Colossians. But we have a similar case in ver. 6, and the personal application of a universal truth is anti-climax only to a rhetorician. The danger of the Colossians makes it peculiarly appropriate here.—**καὶ ὑμᾶς**: "you also".—**ὄντας** emphasises that this state was continuous.—**ἀπηλλοτριωμένους**: "estranged," *i.e.*, from God, probably not to be taken as counted as aliens by God, but as expressing their attitude to God.—**ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ.** Meyer takes **ἐχθ.** as passive, regarded as enemies by God, but the qualification **τῇ διαν.** and the further addition **ἐν. τ. ἔργ. τ. πον.** makes this very improbable. It involves the translation of **τῇ διαν.** "on account of your state of mind," for which **διά** with the accusative would have been expected. But it is much simpler to take **διαν.** as dative of the part affected, and **ἐχθ.** as active, hostile to God in your mind. **διανοία** (used only here and Eph. ii. 3, iv. 18 by Paul) means the higher intellectual nature, but specially on the ethical side; it is usually in the LXX the translation of "heart". Cremer defines it as "the faculty of moral reflexion". **ἐν τ. ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς**: to be connected with **ἀπηλλ. καὶ ἐχθ.** The preposition indicates the sphere in which they were thus estranged and enemies.

Vv. 22, 23. Their reconciliation will result in the presentation of themselves as blameless before God, if they are steadfast in the Gospel they have heard, which is no other than that preached throughout the world.—Ver. 22. **νυνὶ** in contrast to **ποτὲ**: "now," not "at the present moment," but "in the present state of things," thus, as Lightfoot points out, admitting an aorist, referring to an action lying in the past. **ἀποκατηλλάγητε**: "ye were reconciled," but scarcely to be represented in English except by the perfect. **ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ.** It is disputed why Paul should add to **σώμ.** the defining words **τ. σαρκὸς α.** Bengel, Lightfoot and Moule think they are added to distinguish Christ's physical from His mystical body, the Church. But this would imply an incredible obtuseness on the part of his readers, for **διὰ θαν.** sufficiently fixes the reference to the physical body; and, as Meyer points out, the contrast to the body of His flesh is the glorified body, not the Church. Nor is a reference to Docetism probable. We have no evidence that it had appeared so early, and Paul would not have refuted it by a mere aside. Oltramare thinks that they are added because the flesh was the actual seat of suffering. But the addition would have been unnecessary, for **ἐν τ. σώμ.** was sufficient in itself. The most satisfactory view is that Paul has in mind the false spiritualism which thought reconciliation could be accomplished by spiritual beings only, and hence attached little or no value to the work of Christ in a body composed of flesh (Mey., Alf., Ell., Haupt, Abb.). In opposition to this Paul emphasises the fact that it was just by the putting to death of this body composed of flesh that reconciliation was effected, and thereby excludes from the work the angels who had no body of flesh. But while this is so, it is hard to avoid the impression that the phrase is also chosen because in the corresponding experience of Christians their death to sin is the removal of the **σῶμα. τ. σαρκός** (ii. 11).—**παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς**: *cf.* Eph. v. 27. With the reading **ἀποκατήλλαξεν** the infinitive expresses purpose, "He reconciled in order to present". With **ἀποκατηλλάγητε**, if we adopt Lightfoot's parenthesis, the infinitive will depend on **εὐδόκ.** (ver. 19). But if **νυνὶ δὲ** begins a new sentence we should translate "ye were reconciled to present yourselves". This presentation is usually taken to be at the judgment, and that is the impression the passage naturally makes. Hofmann, Lightfoot and Haupt refer it to God's present approbation. Haupt thinks the presentation is just the same as the reconciliation. Reconciliation has not to

24. [1] Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ [n] ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν [o] θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ

[o] θλ. τ. Χ. only here.

[1] So edd. with non-Western authorities, perhaps by homœoteleuton. **ος**: inserted before **νυν** by Haupt with DEFG, perhaps by dittography. See note.

do with a change of feeling in God or man, but of the relation of God to men. It is synonymous with justification. This **παραστ.** is a continuous process dependent on continuance in faith and love. He urges that Paul regards the judgment as depending on moral conditions, not on the holding fast of faith and love. But a distinction of this kind should not be pressed in the case of Paul; for him faith was the root of morality, and love the fulfilment of the Law.—**κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.** Generally this is taken to be before God. But since Paul elsewhere teaches that we must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, it seems best (with Meyer) to take **αὐτοῦ** in the same way.—**ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους.** Soden and Haupt insist that these are not ethical but religious terms. This is probably correct; since the reference is to the judgment, they have a forensic sense. **ἀμώμους** probably means blameless rather than undefiled, and this is supported by the addition of **ἀνεγκλ.**

Ver. 23. **εἴ γε** with the indicative expresses the Apostle's confidence that the condition will be fulfilled. — **ἐπιμένετε.** This abiding in faith is the only, as it is the sure way, to this presentation of themselves **κατ. αὐτ.** This is directed against the false teachers' assurance that the gospel they had heard needed to be supplemented if they wished to attain salvation. It needs no supplementing, and it is at the peril of salvation that they lose hold of it.—**τεθεμελιωμένοι** refers to the firm foundation, **ἑδραῖοι** to the stability of the building.—**μὴ μετακινούμενοι.** The perfect participle here gives way to the present, expressing a continuous process. It may be passive or middle, probably the former. —**ἀπὸ τ. ἐλπίδος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: to be taken with **μετακιν.** alone, not, assuming a zeugma, with the three co-ordinate expressions (Sod.), for it is not at all clear that the last of these keeps up the metaphor of a building. The hope of the Gospel is the hope given by or proclaimed in the Gospel.—**οὗ ἠκούσατε.** Paul again sets his seal on the form of the Gospel which they had received, and again insists on the universality of its proclamation, its catholicity as guaranteeing its truth (see on vv. 5-7).—**ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει**: "in presence of every creature"; **π. κτ.**, as in ver. 15, with the limitation **τ. ὑ. τ. οὐρ.** —**οὗ ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ Παῦλος διάκονος**: *cf.* Eph. iii. 7. This phrase contains a certain stately self-assertion; the Apostle urges the fact that he is a minister of this Gospel as a reason why they should remain faithful to it. His apostolic authority, so far from being impugned by the false teachers, was more probably invoked; so Paul throws it in the balance against them. It is also true that the Gentile mission was so bound up in his own mind with his apostleship that a reference to the one naturally suggested a reference to the other. By this clause Paul effects the transition to ver. 24.

Vv. 24-29. PAUL REJOICES THAT HIS SUFFERINGS ARE FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CHURCH, IN WHOSE SERVICE HE FULFILS HIS DIVINELY APPOINTED TASK, OF FULLY PREACHING THE LONG HIDDEN BUT NOW REVEALED MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL, WHICH IS UNIVERSAL IN ITS SCOPE, A TASK IN WHICH HE USES ALL THE MIGHTY STRENGTH WITH WHICH GOD HAS ENDOWED HIM. — Ver. 24. It is usually assumed that **ὃς** read by the Western text is due to dittography; but it may quite as easily have fallen out through homœoteleuton as have been inserted. It is, however, omitted by such an overwhelming combination of MSS. that it would not perhaps be justifiable to place it in the text. On grounds of internal evidence a strong case can be made out for the insertion. Lightfoot omits, and thinks the abruptness characteristic of Paul. He quotes as parallels 2 Cor. vii. 9, 1 Tim. i. 12. But the connexion in the former case is uncertain; Westcott and Hort do not begin a new sentence with **νῦν χαίρω**; if correctly, it is not a true parallel. But if otherwise there is not the abrupt change of subject we find here, for Paul has been speaking of his previous regret, and **νῦν χαίρω** follows naturally on this. In the latter case, apart from the dubious authenticity of the Epistle, ver. 12 naturally continues ver. 11. On the other hand, it is very characteristic of our Epistle for transitions to be effected by the relative. Without it we have no preparation for

σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία, 25. ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι

ver. 24, for **νῦν** is not transitional. And with it the appeal to their loyalty in **οὗ ἐγεν. ἐγὼ Π. διάκ.** is greatly strengthened.—**νῦν χαίρω**: "I now rejoice," not "now, in contrast to times of repining," or "now as I contemplate the greatness of redemption," but simply "in my present condition as a prisoner". Joy in suffering is a familiar Pauline idea.—**ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν**: not, as Meyer and Haupt, "over my sufferings," for which **ἐπὶ** would have been expected (though *cf.* Phil. i. 18, Luke x. 20), but "in my sufferings," **ἐν** denoting the sphere in which, not (as Ell.) both sphere in and subject over which.—**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**: *i.e.*, for your benefit. Oltramare compares Phil. i. 29, Eph. iii. 1, 13, 1 Pet. iii. 18, and interprets "for love of you"—a fine thought; but probably that is not in Paul's mind.—**ἀνταναπληρῶ.** The meaning of this verb is much disputed. **ἀναπληροῦν** is "to fill up". **ἀντι-** in composition has, according to Grimm, the following senses: opposite, over against; the mutual efficiency of two; requital; hostile opposition; official substitution; but some of these do not occur with verbs. He explains it in this way: "What is wanting of the affliction of Christ to be borne by me, that I supply in order to repay the benefits which Christ conferred on me by filling up the measure of the afflictions laid upon Him". **ἀντι-** on this view means "in return for". Another view proposed is that Paul makes up by present suffering for his former persecution. Winer (followed by Lightf., Findl., Moule) says **ἀναπλ.** is used of him who "**ὑστέρημα** *a se* relictum *ipse* explet," and **ἀνταναπλ.** of him who "alterius **ὑστέρημα** de suo explet" (quoted in Meyer). The parallels Lightfoot quotes are intended to show that "the supply comes from an opposite quarter to the defect". He takes the sense to be that Paul suffers instead of Christ, and translates "I fill up on my part," "I supplement". Abbott pertinently points out that in the two instances in which **ἀναπληροῦν** is used with **ὑστέρημα** (1 Cor. xvi. 17, Phil. ii. 30) the supply comes from an opposite quarter to the defect, and therefore we have no more reason for including this idea in **ἀνταναπλ.** than in **ἀναπλ.** The simplest explanation is that of Wetstein, "**ἀντὶ ὑστερήματος** succeedit **ἀναπλήρωμα**". (So Mey., Ell., Alf., Haupt, Abb.) We thus get the idea that over against or corresponding to the previous defect comes the filling up. To Lightfoot's criticism that this deprives **ἀντὶ** of its force, Ellicott replies that there is no such clear correspondence of personal agents as would be needed to substantiate the assertion. It is impossible to feel sure which of these views is right, but this is of negative importance, since it excludes arguments (such as Lightfoot's) as to the meaning of the rest of the verse, based on the sense of this verb.—**τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ.** Leaving out of account such interpretations as "afflictions for the sake of Christ," or "afflictions imposed by Christ," the following are the chief views that have been taken: (1) Many Romanist commentators explain the sufferings of Christ to be His mediatorial sufferings, left incomplete by Him and completed by His saints, Paul taking his share in this. (2) Lightfoot, Oltramare, Findlay, Haupt and others agree with (1) in taking **τ. θλ. τ. Χ.** as the sufferings which Christ endured on earth. But they deny that these are mediatorial sufferings; they had "a ministerial utility". Christ suffered for the kingdom of God, and His followers must continue this. Hofmann's view is a special form of this. Christ was sent only to Israel, and endured sufferings in His ministry to it. Paul fills up what is left of these sufferings, as Apostle to the Gentiles. (3) Meyer, followed by Abbott, thinks the afflictions are Paul's own, and are called the afflictions of Christ, because they are of the same essential character. Since his sufferings are still incomplete, he speaks of filling up the measure of them. (4) The sufferings are those of the Church, which are still incomplete. They are called the afflictions of Christ because they are those of His body. Thus Bengel: "Fixa est mensura passionum, quas tota exantlare debet ecclesia. Quo plus igitur Paulus exhausit, eo minus et ipsi posthac et caeteris relinquitur. Hoc facit communio sanctorum." Cremer similarly says that the defect is not in what Christ suffered, but in the communion of the Church in His sufferings. Paul concentrates on himself the hate of the world against Christ and His Church. (5) The sufferings are the sufferings of

τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 26. τὸ μυστήριον τὸ [p] ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν [q] αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ,

p Only here and 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 9; Luke x. 21 in N.T.   q 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. iii. 11; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25.

Christ, not, however, those which He endured on earth, but those which He endures in Paul through their mystical union. The defect is not (as in 4) in the sufferings of the Church, but in Christ's sufferings in Paul. (1) must be set aside on the ground that **θλίψις** is not used of Christ's atoning sufferings, for which Paul employs **αἷμα, θάνατος, σταυρός**. (3) must be rejected because the afflictions of Christ can hardly mean afflictions like those of Christ. (4) is to be rejected on similar grounds, the defect is in Christ's own suffering, not in that of the Church. Besides there would be an un-Pauline arrogance in the claim that he was filling up the yet incomplete sufferings of the Church. We are thus left with (2) and (5), each of which takes "the afflictions of Christ" in the strict sense of afflictions endured by Christ Himself. We cannot, with Lightfoot, decide against (5) on the ground that **ἀνταναπλ.** excludes an identification between the sufferings of Paul and Christ. Hofmann's view is very attractive on account of the context, in which Paul is speaking of his Apostleship to the Gentiles. It is perhaps the best form of (2), and may be right. It, however, labours, with (2) generally, under the objection that it implies defect in Christ's earthly sufferings, for **ὑστέρημα** means defect, and also that the claim thus made to fill up the defect left by Christ is strangely arrogant. It is therefore best to accept (5). It is urged that there is no N.T. parallel to the idea that Christ suffers in His members. But, apart from Acts ix. 4, Paul's doctrine of union with Christ is such that we should almost be compelled to infer that Christ suffered in His members, even if Paul had not here affirmed it. And there is no arrogance here. For Paul does not claim to fill up the defects in Christ's earthly suffering or in the sufferings of the Church, but in the sufferings which he has to endure in his flesh, which are Christ's sufferings, because he and Christ are one. We should accordingly take **τ. θλ. τ. Χ.** with **ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου** as a single idea, "Christ's sufferings in my flesh".—**ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου.** There is a delicate contrast between the flesh of Paul and the body of Christ. If these words were connected with **ἀνταναπλ.** they would probably have immediately followed.—**ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ**: "on behalf of His body". This may simply mean that the sufferings of Paul advanced the interests of the Church (*cf.* Phil. i. 12-14). But, taking into account Paul's strong feeling of the solidarity of the Church, he probably means that apart from any furthering of the Church's interests which his imprisonment may bring about, the suffering of one of the members must benefit the whole body; just as in a higher and fuller sense the suffering of the Head had procured salvation for the Church. Paul rejoices, not, as Abbott says the view taken of **τ. θλ. τ. Χ.** would involve, "because they went to increase the afflictions of Christ," but because his afflictions, which were those of Christ also in the necessity of the case, were a blessing to Christ's body.—**ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία**: "that is, the Church," perhaps added because **σάρξ** and **σῶμα** occur together here, and the readers might be confused as to the precise meaning of **σώματος.**

Ver. 25. **ἧς ἐγενόμην ἐγὼ διάκονος.** With these words Paul returns to ver. 23, speaking of himself here, however, as a minister of the Church, there of the Gospel. Because he is a minister of the Church, it is a joy to suffer for its welfare. He proceeds to explain what his peculiar (**ἐγὼ** emphatic) ministry is.—**κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν**: *cf.* Eph. iii. 2. **οἰκ.** is "stewardship" rather than "dispensation" (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 17). **τ. Θεοῦ** indicates that this office is held in the house of God, or that it has been entrusted to him by God.—**εἰς ὑμᾶς**: to be taken with **δοθ.** as in Eph. iii. 2, not with **πληρ.** (as by Chrys. and Hofm.). It means towards you Gentiles, that is for your benefit. The context shows that the Gentiles are uppermost in his thought. —**πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ**: "to fulfil the word of God". **πλ.** is taken by some of the completion by this letter of the teaching already given to the Colossians. But Paul is speaking of the function specially entrusted to him. Generally this is explained of the geographical extension of the Gospel. Haupt thinks the geographical point of view is not present here. An essential characteristic of the Gospel is its universality. Paul's special mission is to bring this to realisa-

27. οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς γνωρίσαι τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅ[1] ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπὶς

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V. with ABFGP 17. ος: T., Ws. with ℵCDEKL, by attraction to gender of Χριστος.

tion. This he does by proclaiming the Gospel to the Gentiles, thus making clear the true nature of the Gospel. This suits the context better, for Paul proceeds to define the mystery entrusted to him as the universality of salvation, not the wide extension of the Gospel. Other interpretations may be seen in Meyer or Eadie.

Ver. 26. Partially parallel to Eph. iii. 9. How great the honour conferred on Paul is, appears from the fact that he is entrusted with the duty of declaring the long concealed secret which is the distinguishing mark of his Gospel.—τὸ μυστήριον. Lightfoot thinks that the term is borrowed by Paul from the Greek mysteries, and that it is intentionally chosen to point the contrast between those secret mysteries and the Gospel which is offered to all. But for the mysteries the plural was employed. And there would be more justification for this interpretation in Matt. xiii. 11 = Luke viii. 10, where the disciples are told by Jesus that to them it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but not to others. But it will not be seriously supposed that Christ borrowed the term from the Greek mysteries. A mystery is a truth which man cannot know by his natural powers, so that if it is known it must be revealed.—τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν. Usually ἀπὸ is taken as temporal, and this agrees with the fact that similar references in Paul are temporal (1 Cor. ii. 7, Rom. xvi. 25), and with the use of ἀπὸ as in ἀπ' αἰῶνος and ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Matt. xxv. 34). ἀπὸ καταβολῆς occurs with κρύπτω (Matt. xiii. 35). But elsewhere ἀπὸ after κρύπτω or ἀποκρύπτω indicates those from whom a thing is concealed. In favour of this meaning here is the order, for if ἀπὸ τ. αἰ. were temporal ἀπὸ τ. γεν. would be included as a matter of course. It has been so taken here, not by Klöpper, who suggests it as possible, but does not accept it, but by Franke. He thinks both are terms for angels, and in itself such a reference is not improbable, for it is through the Church that the principalities and powers come to learn the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 9, where just before the mystery is said to have been concealed ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων). But we have no evidence that γενεαί was ever used in this way, and no parallel for this use of αἰῶνες in N.T. Without identifying the terms with personal existences, we may with Haupt (*cf.* also Soden) take αἰῶνες of the ages before the world, and γενεαί of the generations of human history. This will be practically the same as saying that the mystery was concealed from angels and men. This is probably the meaning of Bengel's note: "Aeones referuntur ad angelos; generationes, ad homines". Theodoret, followed by Klöpper, thinks that there is a polemical reference here to the antiquity of the Gospel and its consequent superiority to the Law. Abbott thinks the point of the reference to the long concealment and recent disclosure is that the acceptance of the false teaching is thus explained. But the non-polemical character of parallel passages makes these suggestions very uncertain.—νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη. The construction here changes, and the perfect participle is continued by the aorist indicative (Winer-Moulton, p. 717). The anacoluthon is caused by Paul's intense joy that the long silence has been broken; he is content with nothing short of a definite statement of the glorious fact. νῦν is equally appropriate whether ἀπὸ is temporal or not, for the antithesis of past and present lies in the nature of the case.—τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ: *i.e.*, to Christians generally, not to the Jewish Christians (Hofm.), who certainly were not specially enlightened on this matter, nor the Apostles and prophets of the New Covenant, even though in the parallel Eph. iii. 5 they are chosen for mention, nor the angels, in spite of Eph. iii. 10. The words must be taken in their obvious sense.

Ver. 27. *Cf.* for a partial parallel Eph. i. 18.—οἷς ἠθέλησεν ὁ Θεὸς: "inasmuch as to them God willed"; ἠθέλ. is chosen to express the idea that the revelation had its source solely in God's will.—τί τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης.: *cf.* Rom. ix. 23, Phil. iv. 19, Eph. i. 18, iii. 16. The expression does not mean the glorious riches, but rather how rich is the glory. The use of "glory" immediately after

τῆς δόξης, 28. ὃν ἡμεῖς καταγγέλλομεν, [r] νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ· 29. εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ, ἀγωνιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν δυνάμει.

r Paul only in N.T.

in the sense of the Messianic kingdom favours the adoption of that meaning here. But as it is an attribute of the mystery it probably expresses its glorious character.—**ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** is generally taken with **τί τὸ πλ. κ.τ.λ.**, and this gives an excellent sense, for it was as manifested in the Gentile mission that the glory of the Gospel was especially displayed. There is a little awkwardness, since the definition **Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν** seems to make **ἐν τ. ἔθν.** unnecessary. The glory of the mystery was itself **Χ. ἐν ὑμ.** if we take **ἐν ὑμῖν** to mean among you Gentiles. This hardly justifies us in connecting the words with **γνωρίσαι** (Haupt), for it already has the recipients of knowledge attached to it (**οἷς**).—**ὅ ἐστι** answers **τί τὸ πλοῦτος κ.τ.λ.** The riches of the glory of the mystery consist in **Χ. ἐν ὑμ. ἡ ἐλπ. τ. δ.** Usually **ὅ** is taken to refer to **μυστηρίου** alone. Perhaps the practical difference is not great.—**Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς δόξης.** Haupt thinks no comma should be placed after **ὑμῖν**, and that the meaning is that the special glory of the Gospel is that Christ among them is the hope of glory. But the usual view which makes, not the fact that Christ among them guarantees their future blessedness, but the presence of Christ itself, the great glory of the mystery seems much finer. **Χ. ἐν ὑμ.**, and not what **Χ. ἐν ὑμ.** is, constitutes the riches of the glory. The context shows that **ὑμῖν** must mean "you Gentiles". It does not necessarily follow from this that **ἐν** must be translated "among," though this is favoured by **ἐν τ. ἔθν.** It may refer to the indwelling of Christ in the heart, and this is rendered probable by the addition of **ἐλπὶς τ. δόξης.** The indwelling Christ constitutes in Himself a pledge of future glory. For this combination of the indwelling Christ with the Christian hope, *cf.* Rom. viii. 10.

Ver. 28. **ὃν**: *i.e.*, **Χριστὸν ἐν ὑμῖν.**—**ἡμεῖς**: (emphatic) we in contrast to the false teachers. But the reference seems to be simply to Paul, not to Timothy and Epaphras as well. For throughout the section he is speaking of his own special mission.—**νουθετοῦντες.** Meyer points out that admonishing and teaching correspond to the two main elements of the evangelic preaching, repent and believe. Haupt thinks on the ground of the order that Paul is not referring to elementary Christian teaching, but has this epistle in his mind. The order might, however, suggest warning to non-Christians followed by teaching of new converts. But the addition of **ἐν π. σοφίᾳ** and **τέλειον** support the view that it is warning against error, and advanced teaching that he has in view.—**πάντα ἄνθρωπον**: emphatically repeated here. The Gospel is for all men, in opposition to any exclusiveness, and for each individual man in particular. And the ideal is only attained when each individual has reached completeness. The exclusiveness might be, as with the Judaisers, of a sectarian type, or, as with the Gnostics, and possibly here, of an intellectual, aristocratic type. Since such is the Apostle's task, he addresses a Church the members of which are unknown to him.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ** is taken by some to express the content of the teaching, everyone may be fully instructed in the whole of Christian wisdom. This forms a good contrast to the probable practice of the false teachers of reserving their higher teaching for an inner circle. But for this we should have expected the accusative. Probably the words express the manner of teaching. If the phrase is taken with both participles the content of the teaching is excluded.—**παραστήσ.**: probably to present at the judgment.—**τέλειον.** Here also allusion to the mysteries is discovered by Lightfoot. The term is said to have been employed to distinguish the fully initiated from novices. But, even if this be correct, the word is used in Matt. v. 48, xix. 21, where such a reference is out of the question. Probably Paul is contrasting the completeness he strives to secure with that promised by the false teachers.

Ver. 29. **εἰς ὅ**: to achieve which end.—**κοπιῶ** expresses toil carried to the point of weariness.—**ἀγωνιζόμενος**: a metaphor from the arena. Meyer takes the reference to be to inward striving against difficulties and hostile forces.

a Only here, Gal. vi. 11 (B 17); Jas. iii. 5 in N.T.
b Only here, 1 Thess. i. 5; Heb. vi. 11, x. 22 in class. or Bib. Gk.

II. 1. ΘΕΛΩ γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι [a] ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ καὶ ὅσοι οὐχ ἑόρακαν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί, 2. ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συνβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ καὶ εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς [b] πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν

Perhaps both inward and outward struggle are referred to (De W.).—**κατὰ.** The struggle is carried on in proportion not to his natural powers, but to the mightily working energy of Christ within him.—**ἐνεργουμένην**: a dynamic middle (*cf.* ver. 6).

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-3. PAUL'S DEEP CONCERN FOR THE COLOSSIANS AND OTHER CHRISTIANS UNKNOWN TO HIM, THAT THEY MAY BE UNITED IN LOVE, AND ATTAIN FULL KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST, IN WHOM RESIDE ALL THE TREASURES OF WISDOM AND KNOWLEDGE.—**θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι**: for the formula *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 3, and for a similar formula Phil. i. 12. More frequently the negative is used, **οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν. γὰρ** introduces the proof of what he has just said, by the illustration from the case of his readers, and thus prepares the way for the warning that follows in ver. 4.—**ἀγῶνα**: the inward struggle of Paul will embrace his prayers, his anxiety and his earnest meditation on the implications of the false teaching and the best manner of refuting it. Added to this are the difficulties caused by his imprisonment and the fact that the Colossians were personally unknown to him.—**Λαοδικίᾳ.** The members of this Church were probably exposed to the same dangers as their neighbours.—**καὶ ὅσοι κ.τ.λ.** So far as the words themselves go, they may mean that the Colossians and Laodiceans did belong to the number of those who had not seen him or that they did not. But the latter alternative is very improbable, for Paul would not have joined a general reference to Churches unknown to him to a special mention of two Churches that were known to him. Further, Paul continues with **αὐτῶν**, which refers to **καὶ ὅσοι**, but must include the Colossians, since in ver. 4 he says, "This I say that no one may delude *you*". This also corresponds to the use of **καὶ ὅσοι** after an enumeration. The narrative in Acts favours this view, as does the absence of any hint in the Epistle that Paul had visited Colossæ. We may therefore safely assume with almost all commentators that the Apostle was personally unknown to both of these Churches.—**ἐν σαρκί**: to be taken with **τὸ πρ. μου**, not with **ἑόρ.**

Ver. 2. **παρακληθῶσιν.** It is disputed what meaning should be attached to this. Meyer, Ellicott and others translate "may be comforted". This seems to be the more usual sense in Paul, and is supported by the addition "knit together in love," which favours an emotional reference. It is more probable, however, that we should translate "may be strengthened" (De W., Alf., Kl., Ol., Sod.), for this was more needed than consolation in face of heresy. Oltramare quotes Rom. i. 12 (where, however, **συμπαρ.** is used), 1 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 17, where this verb is joined to **στηρίζειν** to show that this sense is Pauline, and in the latter we have **παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τ. καρδίας καὶ στηρίξαι.** Haupt, following Luther, thinks it means "may be warned," but this does not suit **καρδίαι**, especially in iv. 8.—**αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν.** We might have expected **ὑμῶν**, but **καὶ ὅσοι**, while not excluding the Colossians, includes other Churches as well. **καρδία** implies more than our word "heart," it embraces also the intellect and the will.—**συνβιβασθέντες** agrees with **αὐτοί**, understood as the equivalent of **αἱ κ. αὐτῶν.** In the LXX the word means "to instruct" (so in 1 Cor. ii. 16, which is a quotation from Isa. xl. 14). But joined to **ἐν ἀγ.** it must have its usual sense, "knit together," as in ver. 19 and Eph. iv. 16. There may be a reference to the divisive tendencies of the false teaching.—**καὶ εἰς πᾶν πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως**: "and unto all riches of the fulness of understanding". **καὶ εἰς** is to be taken with **συνβιβ.**, "knit together in order to attain". **συνβιβ.** is a verb implying motion, and therefore is followed here by **εἰς.** It is usual to take **πληροφ.** as "full assurance," but the expression "all the riches of full assurance of understanding" has a strange redundance, which seems scarcely to be met, as Klöpper thinks, by De Wette's remark that **πλοῦτ.** is a quantitative but **πληρ.** a qualitative expression. Accordingly it seems better, with Grimm and Haupt, to translate "fulness," a sense which is possible everywhere in N.T. except 1 Thess. i. 5.

τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ,[1] 3. ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως [c] ἀπόκρυφοι.

c Only here, Mark iv. 22; Luke viii. 17 in N.T.

[1] So edd. with B, Hil. του Θεου ο εστιν Χριστος: D, by explanation; του Θεου του εν Χριστω: 17, by explanation: του Θεου: DbP 37, 67**, 71, by omission to remove difficulty; του Θεου πατρος Χριστου: ℵ, by insertion of πατρος to remove difficulty; του Θεου και Χριστου: Cyr., by insertion of και with similar object.

For συν. see on i. 9. Insight into Christian truth is meant here.—εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ. Probably this is in apposition to the previous clause, εἰς πᾶν κ.τ.λ., and further explains it; all the rich fulness of insight, which he trusts may be the fruit of their union in love, is nothing else than full knowledge of the Divine mystery, even Christ. The false teachers bid them seek knowledge in other sources than Christ, Paul insists on the contrary that full knowledge of the mystery of God is all the wealth of fulness of understanding, and is to be found in the knowledge of Christ alone. This makes it probable that the correct interpretation of the true reading is to take Χριστοῦ as in apposition to μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ (so Ell., Lightf., Findl., Hofm., Holtzmann, Haupt). It is true that this is curt and harsh, and that we should have expected ὅ ἐστιν, but it suits the context better than the translation "the mystery of the God of Christ" (Mey., Gess, Kl., Sod., Weiss and apparently Abb.). It is true that Paul uses a similar expression in Eph. i. 17. But here it would emphasise the subordination of Christ, which is precisely what is out of place in a passage setting forth His all-sufficiency, and against a doctrine the special peril of which lay in its tendency to under-estimate both the Person and the Work of Christ. The grammatically possible apposition of Χ. with Θεοῦ (Hilary) is out of the question. Christ is the mystery of God, since in Him God's eternal purpose of salvation finds its embodiment. Hort's conjecture that the original reading was τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ does not find sufficient support in the textual or exegetical difficulties of the clause.

Ver. 3. ἐν ᾧ may refer to μυστηρίου (Beng., Mey., Alf., Ol., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) or to Χριστοῦ (Ell., Hofm., Lightf., Holtzmann, Findl., Moule). The former is defended on the ground that ἀπόκρ. corresponds to μυστ. It is also urged that μυστ. is the leading idea. On the other hand, if Christ is rightly identified with the mystery, there is no practical difference between the two views, and it is simpler to refer ᾧ to Χ. as the nearer noun.—εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. Bengel, Meyer and Alford take ἀπόκρ. as an ordinary adjective with θησαυροί, "in whom are all the hidden treasures". For this we should have expected οἱ ἀπόκρ., and there is no stress on the fact that the hidden treasures are in Christ, yet the position of the word at the end of the sentence is explained as due to emphasis. Generally Chrysostom has been followed in taking it as the predicate to εἰσίν, "in whom are hidden all the treasures". But this is excluded by its distance from the verb. Accordingly it should be taken as a secondary predicate, and thus equivalent to an adverb, "in whom are all the treasures . . . hidden," *i.e.*, in whom all the treasures are, and are in a hidden manner (Hofm., Ell., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). The force of the passage then is this: all, and not merely some of, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are contained in Christ, therefore the search for them outside of Him is doomed to failure. But not only are they in Christ, but they are contained in a hidden way. Therefore they do not lie on the surface, but must be sought for earnestly, as men seek for hidden treasure. They are not matters of external observances, such as the false teachers enjoined, but to be apprehended by deep and serious meditation. If Lightfoot is right in thinking that ἀπόκρ. is borrowed from the terminology of the false teachers, there is the added thought that the wisdom they fancied they found in their secret books was really to be found in Christ alone. But it is hardly likely that there is any such reference here. Even if the allusion to literature were more plausible than it is, there is no evidence that the word was used in this sense so early. Besides it occurs twice with θησ. in the LXX. The distinction between σοφίας and γνώσεως is not easy to make here; the former is general, the latter special. Lightfoot says: "While γνῶσις applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, σοφία super-

d Class. only here and Jas. i. 22 in N.T.
e Only here in Bib. Gk.

4. τοῦτο [1] λέγω ἵνα μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [d] παραλογίζηται ἐν [e] πιθανολογίᾳ. 5. εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί, χαίρων καὶ βλέπων ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ [n] στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν

[1] So T., W.H., R.V. with ℵAB. δε: inserted after τουτο by Ln., [Tr.], Ws. with most other authorities.

adds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations". Moule thinks it is God's wisdom and knowledge that are here attributed to Christ, but this seems uncertain.

Vv. 4-15. Paul urges his readers not to be beguiled by plausible words, but to hold Christ fast as the principle of moral conduct. They must let no one take them captive by deceitful philosophy and human tradition, with the elements of the world and not Christ for its content. In Him alone dwells the whole fulness of the Godhead, and their completeness is in Him. They have died, been buried and raised with Him, God has quickened them with Him, while they were dead in sins, has cancelled the hostile law on the cross, and spoiled and led in triumph the principalities and powers.—Ver. 4. τοῦτο λέγω. Haupt thinks the reference is only to ver. 3, but this verse looks back as far as 2b, and ver. 5 to ver. 1. Generally the reference of τοῦτο is thought to be vv. 1-3, though Soden thinks it is to i. 24-ii. 3.—παραλογίζηται means to deceive by false reckoning, then, as here, by false reasoning. — πιθανολογίᾳ: "persuasive speech". The word has no bad sense in itself, and what bad sense it has here it gets from παραλογ. Classical writers use it with the meaning of probable argument as opposed to strict demonstration.

Ver. 5. γὰρ is difficult. Meyer thinks that the fact of his spiritual presence is mentioned, in contrast to his bodily absence, as a reason why they should not let themselves be deceived. Ellicott (after Chrysostom) thinks that he is explaining why he can advise them, it is because he thus knows their need. Lightfoot, Soden, Findlay and Haupt think he explains his warning by his personal interest in them.—καὶ goes closely with τῇ σαρκί. The dative is one of reference, and τῇ σαρκὶ is equivalent to "in the body". There is not the least ground for the inference that Paul had ever been to Colossæ.—τῷ πνεύματι: not "by the Holy Spirit," but "in spirit". Paul's own spirit is meant as in 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.—σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί: not simply among you, but "united with you through the warmest community of interest" (Sod.).—χαίρων καὶ βλέπων. Many take this as if it were equivalent to "rejoicing to see," but it is questionable if the words can mean this. If the object of his joy is the condition of the Church, we should have expected an inversion of the order, first seeing and then rejoicing at what he saw. Lightfoot explains the order as indicating that he looked because it gave him joy to look. Ellicott assumes a continuation of the words σὺν ὑμῖν, "rejoicing with you and beholding". Meyer thinks χαίρων means rejoicing to be thus present with you in spirit. It is very difficult to decide as to the meaning, possibly Ellicott's view is best.—τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα. A military sense is often found in both of these nouns, though sometimes (as by Ol.) it is restricted to the latter. Meyer and Abbott deny the military reference altogether. Both words are used in a military sense, but this is suggested by the context, and it is said that "here the context suggests nothing of the kind" (Abb.). Haupt decides for it on the ground of the connexion. If the terms had been general, Paul would not have placed his joy over their order before his mention of their faith. But in representing them as a well-ordered army, and then expressing the same idea under the image of a bulwark which consists in their faith, the order is correct. It is, however, very questionable if an argument from order of this kind is to be pressed. Lightfoot translates στερέωμα "solid front". It may have simply the sense of firm foundation. Whatever the precise force of the words, it is clear that the Church as a whole remained true to the doctrine it had been taught.—πίστεως: *cf.* Acts xvi. 5, 1 Pet. v. 9.

Ver. 6. ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε. Oltramare translates "since," and interprets, "since ye have received Christ . . . it is in Him you must walk". But probably the usual interpretation "as" is right, meaning the form in which they had

πίστεως ὑμῶν. 6. ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον, ἐν αὐτῷ περιπατεῖτε, 7. ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε, περισσεύοντες[1] ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. 8. βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται[2] ὁ [f] συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς

[f] Only here in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So T., Tr., R.V., Ws. with ℵAC 17. εν αυτη: added after περισσευοντες, Ln., [Tr.], [W.H.] with BD^cEKL, by assimilation to iv. 2.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BCKLP. εσται υμας: Ln., W.H. mg. with ℵADE. to connect more closely with συλαγωγων.

received (= καθὼς ἐμάθετε, i. 7). The sense is, in that case, live in accordance with what you received, and the emphasis is on περιπ., not on ἐν αὐτῷ.—παρελάβετε is practically equivalent to ἐμάθετε, received by instruction, rather than received into the heart.—τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον. This is frequently translated "the Christ, even Jesus the Lord" (Hofm., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). In favour of this is the fact that ὁ Χ. Ἰ. is not a Pauline expression, but neither is Ἰ. ὁ Κύριος. A further argument in its favour is that ὁ Χριστός is very frequent in this Epistle, and especially prominent in this section of it. If this is so we must suppose that Paul has chosen the form of words to meet some false view at Colossæ. A reference to a Judaistic conception of the Messiah, held by the false teachers, which failed to rise to the Christian conception of His Person as Lord, is supposed by Haupt to be intended. This is possible, but the other possible view "ye received Christ Jesus as Lord" is no more inconsistent with Pauline usage, and emphasises still more the Lordship of Christ, which it was the chief aim of the Apostle to assert. There seems to be no hint that the Messiahship of Jesus was challenged; at most there was the question what Messiahship involved. More probably there is no reference to the Messiahship at all.

Ver. 7. ἐρριζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι: "rooted and built up". The metaphor changes from περιπατ., and again from ἐρριζ., though Lightfoot points out that the term "to root" is not infrequently applied to buildings. More important is the change in tense, the perfect participle expressing an abiding result, the present a continuous process. ἐν αὐτῷ probably belongs to both. We should not (with Schenkel, Hofm.) place a full stop at περιπ. and take the participles with βλέπετε, which would be intolerably awkward.—βεβαιούμενοι τῇ πίστει: "stablished in faith," also the present of continuous process. Meyer and Lightfoot take the dative as instrumental, but it seems best with most recent commentators to take it as a dative of reference (*cf.* ver. 5).—καθὼς ἐδιδάχθητε: *cf.* καθὼς ἐμάθετε, i. 7. The words define τῇ πίστει.—περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. Oltramare notes that "thankfulness is a preservative against the new doctrines," since they remove Christ from His true place. The emphasis on thankfulness is very marked in this Epistle.

Ver. 8. Paul once more (previously in ver. 4) begins to attack the false teachers, but turns aside in ver. 9 from the direct attack to lay the basis for the decisive attack in vv. 16-23.—τις. It is not clear that we can infer from the singular that only one false teacher had appeared in the Colossian Church.—ὑμᾶς is placed in an emphatic position, and its force is "you whose Christian course has been so fair, and who have received such exhortations to remain steadfast".—ἔσται: the future indicative after μή implies a more serious estimate of the danger than the subjunctive. For the construction, τις followed by a participle with the article, *cf.* Gal. i. 7, Luke xviii. 9.—συλαγωγῶν. The sense is disputed. Several of the Fathers and some modern writers think it means "to rob". It is used in this sense with οἶκον (Aristaen., 2, 22), and Field (*Notes on the Translation of the N.T.*, p. 195) says "there can be no better rendering than 'lest any man *rob* you'". But, as Soden points out, that of which they were robbed should have been expressed. It is better to take it with most commentators in the more obvious sense "lead you away as prey". The verb is so used in Heliod., Æth., x., 35 (with θυγατέρα), Nicet., Hist., 5, 96 (with παρθένον), and it may be chosen with the special sense of seduction in mind.—διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης. The second noun is explanatory of the first, as is shown by the absence of the article and preposition before it and the

g ii. 20; Gal. iv. 3, *cf.* ver. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12; Heb. v. 12.

ⁿ φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ ᵍ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· 9. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ

lack of any indication that Paul had two evils to attack. The meaning is "his philosophy, which is vain deceit". The word has, of course, no reference to Greek philosophy, and probably none to the allegorical method of Scripture exegesis that the false teachers may have employed. Philo uses it of the law of Judaism, and Josephus of the three Jewish sects. Here, no doubt, it means just the false teaching that threatened to undermine the faith of the Church. There is no condemnation of philosophy in itself, but simply of the empty, but plausible, sham that went by that name at Colossæ. Hort thinks that the sense is akin to the later usage of the word to denote the ascetic life.—**κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: "according to human tradition" as opposed to Divine revelation. Meyer, Ellicott and Findlay connect with **συλαγ.** It is more usual to connect with **ἀπ.** or **τ. φιλ. κ. κεν. ἀπ.** The last is perhaps best. It indicates the source from which their teaching was drawn.—**κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου.** [On this phrase the following authorities may be referred to: Hilgenfeld, *Galaterbrief*, pp. 66 *sq.*; Lipsius, *Paul. Rechtf.*, p. 83; Ritschl, *Rechtf. u. Vers*,[2] ii., 252; Klöpper, *ad loc.*; Spitta, 2 *Pet. u. Jud.*, 263 *sq.*; Everling, *Paul. Angel. u. Däm.*, pp. 65 *sq.*; Haupt, *ad loc.*; Abbott, *ad loc.* The best and fullest account in English is Massie's article "Elements" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. To these may now be added St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, pp. 163-170, and Deissmann's article "Elements" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.] Originally **στ.** meant the letters of the alphabet, then in Plato and later writers the physical elements, and lastly (but only from the first century A.D.) the rudiments of knowledge. It has been frequently taken in this sense as the A B C of religious knowledge (so recently Mey., Lightf., Ol., Cremer and many others). This explanation had, however, been attacked by Neander with powerful arguments in his discussion of the parallel passage Gal. iv. 3. (*Planting and Training*, i., 465, 466, *cf.* 323 [Bohn's ed.].) He pointed out that if **στ.** meant first principles we should have had a genitive of the object, as in Heb. v. 12, **στ. τ. ἀρχῆς τ. λογίων.** Such an omission of the leading idea is inadmissible. Further, Paul regarded the heathen as enslaved under **στ. τ. κόσ.** and their falling away to Jewish rites as a return to this slavery. Therefore the expression must apply to something both had in common, and something condemned by Paul, which cannot be the first principles of religion (to which also **ἀσθενῆ** would be inappropriate), but the ceremonial observances, which were so called as earthly and material. It has been further pointed out by Klöpper that following **κατὰ τ. παρ. τ. ἀνθρ.** this term introduced by **κατὰ** and not connected by **καὶ** must express the content of the teaching, which is not very suitable if "religious rudiments" is the meaning. Nor is it true that the false teachers gave elementary instruction. If this view be set aside, as suiting neither the expression in itself nor the context in which it occurs, the question arises whether we should return to the interpretation of several Fathers, that the heavenly bodies are referred to. These were called **στοιχεῖα** (examples are given in Valesius on *Eus. H. E.*, v., 24, Hilg. *l.c.*). This is favoured by the reference to "days, and months, and seasons, and years" in Gal. iv. 11, immediately following the mention of **στ.** in ver. 10, for these were regulated by the heavenly bodies. But it is unsatisfactory, for the context in which the expression occurs, especially in Galatians, points to personal beings. In this passage the contrast of **στ. τ. κ.** with **Χριστόν** is fully satisfied only if the former are personal. In Gal. iv. 3 Paul applies the illustration of the heir under "guardians and stewards" to the pre-Christian world under the **στ. τ. κ.**, and here again a personal reference is forcibly suggested. Still more is this the case with Gal. iv. 8, 9. In ver. 8 Paul says **ἐδουλεύσατε τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς.** In the next verse he asks "how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly **στ.**, to which you wish to be in bondage (**δουλεῦσαι**) over again?" This clearly identifies **τ. στ.** with **τ. φύσ. μὴ οὖσι θεοῖς**, and therefore proves their personality, which is suggested also by **ἐδουλ.**; accordingly they cannot be the heavenly bodies or the physical elements of the world. Hilgenfeld, followed

by Lipsius, Holsten and Klöpper, regards them as the astral spirits, the angels of the heavenly bodies. That the latter were regarded as animated by angels is certain, for we find this belief in Philo and Enoch (*cf.* Job xxxviii. 7, Jas. i. 17). But it is strange that the spirits of the stars should be called **στ. τ. κόσμου**. And while they determine the seasons and festivals, they have nothing to do with many ceremonial observances, such as abstinence from meats and drinks. Spitta (followed by Everling, Sod., Haupt, and apparently Abb.) has the merit of giving the true interpretation. According to the later Jewish theology, not only the stars but all things had their special angels. The proof of this belongs to a discussion of angelology, and must be assumed here. **στ. τ. κόσ.** are therefore the elemental spirits which animate all material things. They are so called from the elements which they animate, and are identical with the **ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι**, who receive this name from their sphere of authority. Thus all the abstinence from material things, submission to material ordinances and so forth, involve a return to their service. We need not, with Ritschl, limit the reference to the angels of the law, though they are included. Thus interpreted the passage gains its full relevance to the context, and to the angel worship of the false teachers which Paul is attacking. The chief objection to this explanation is that we have no parallel for this usage of the word, except in the *Test. Sol.*, **ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν τὰ λεγόμενα στοιχεῖα, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**. But this is late. The term is used in this sense in modern Greek. In spite of this the exegetical proof that personal beings are meant is too strong to be set aside. So we must explain, "philosophy having for its subject-matter the elemental spirits".—**καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν** must be taken similarly, not having Christ for its subject-matter. **Χ.** means the person of Christ, not teaching about Christ, and is opposed simply to **στ.**, not to **παρ. τ. ἀνθρ.** The false teachers put these angels in the place of Christ.

Ver. 9. **ὅτι** is connected by Bleek and Meyer with **οὐ κατὰ Χ.**, but it is much more probable that it should be connected with the whole warning introduced by **βλέπετε**. The false teachers represented the fulness of the Godhead as distributed among the angels, and thus led their victims captive. Paul's warning against the false doctrine thus rests on the fact that it was in Christ that the whole fulness dwelt.—**ἐν αὐτῷ** is emphatic, in Him and in Him alone.—**κατοικεῖ**: "permanently dwells". The reference is to the Exalted State, not only on account of the present, but of the context and Paul's Christology generally.—**πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος**: "all the fulness of the Godhead". **πᾶν** is emphatic, the whole fulness dwells in Christ, therefore it is vain to seek it wholly or partially outside of Him. **πλ. τ. θ.** is not to be taken (as by Ol.) to mean the perfection of Divinity, *i.e.*, ideal holiness. Nor can it mean the Church, for which Eph. i. 23 gives no support, nor yet the universe, either of which must have been very differently expressed. The addition of **θεότητος** defines **πλ.** as the fulness of Deity. The word is to be distinguished from **θειότης** as Deity, the being God, from Divinity, the being Divine or Godlike. The passage thus asserts the real Deity of Christ.—**σωματικῶς**. This word is very variously interpreted. The reference is usually taken to be to the glorified body of Christ, or (as by Lightf.) to the Incarnation, and the word is translated "in bodily fashion". Apart from the question whether the word naturally expresses this, there is the difficulty caused by the contrast implied in its emphatic position. This contrast is sometimes thought to be to the pre-incarnate state, but this has no relevance here. A contrast to the angels might be in point, but they were closely connected with bodies, so the contrast in this respect did not exist. But neither is Soden's view that while the angels have bodies what is expressed in them is only **θειότης** (Rom. i. 20) not **πλ. τ. θεότητος**, a tenable explanation, since this is just read into the words, not elicited from them; nor could such a distinction have occurred to the readers. This interpretation of **σωμ.**, then, as expressing the indwelling of the fulness in a body, although said by Abbott to be "the only one tenable," is encumbered with grave difficulties, and has been rejected by several commentators. Many have taken it to mean "really" (recently Bleek, Kl., Everling, Cremer). This is supported by the contrast of **σῶμα** with **σκιά** in ver. 17, the indwelling is real and not shadowy or typical. But **σωματικῶς** could hardly express this shade of meaning unless the antithesis was expressed. Oltramare translates "personally, in His person". But he quotes no instances of the adverb, but only of **σῶμα**. And Haupt's criticism is just, that this sense might suggest that in God Himself it dwelt impersonally. After an elaborate examination of the

h Only here, 2 Cor. v. 1; Mark xiv. 58 in class. or Bib. Gk.

κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς °θεότητος °σωματικῶς, 10. καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς[1] ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, 11. ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ [h] ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ [i] ἀπεκδύσει

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵACKLP. ο: Ln., Tr. mg. with BDFG 47*, by dropping out of ς before εσ.

various views, Haupt puts forward the explanation that **σωματ.** relates to **τ. πλ. τ. θ.**, and is to be translated "in the form of a body". The meaning he takes to be that the fulness exists in Christ as a body, that is as a complete and organic whole. This suits the context and the general argument better than the reference to Christ's own body. In contrast to the distribution of the fulness among the angels, or to the view that it dwelt only partially in Him, Paul insists that all the fulness dwells in Him, and not fragmentarily but as an organic whole. This view, like Oltramare's, is supported only by references to the use of **σῶμα.** This is not a fatal objectiön, and its harmony with the context makes it the most probable interpretation.

Ver. 10. **καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι.** This still depends on **ὅτι. ἐστὲ** is obviously not an imperative. We should, perhaps, reject the view of Ellicott and Lightfoot that there are two predicates. The thoughts thus obtained that they are in Him, and that they are made full, are true in themselves. But, as Abbott points out, the context requires the emphasis to be thrown on the **ἐν αὐτῷ**, so that the sense is "and it is in Him that ye are made full". **πεπλ.** is chosen on account of **πλήρωμα** in ver. 9, but we cannot explain it as filled with the Godhead, because such an equalising of Christians with their Lord would have been impossible to Paul, and would have required **καὶ ὑμεῖς** to express it. This meets Oltramare's objection to the translation adopted. He says that if **πεπλ.** means filled, they must be filled with something, but since the most obvious explanation that they are filled with the fulness of the Godhead is so largely rejected, it is clear that the translation breaks down. He translates "in Him you are perfect," and urges that this also overthrows the usual interpretation of **πλήρ. τ. θεότ.** But apart from the fact that **πλήρωμα** does not mean moral perfection, **τῆς θεότ.** cannot be supplied. What Paul means is that in Christ they find the satisfaction of every spiritual want. It therefore follows of itself that they do not need the angelic powers.—**ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας**: *cf.* i. 18. That Christ is the Head of every principality and power is a further reason why they should not seek to them. All they need they have in Christ. Paul does not mention here the thrones or lordships as in i. 16. But it is a questionable inference that they, unlike the principalities and powers, had no place in the false teaching. The latter are probably adduced only as examples.

Ver. 11. The reference to circumcision seems to come in abruptly. But probably it stands in close connexion with what has gone before. For the return to the principalities and powers in ver. 15 shows that Paul is not passing here to a new section of his subject. Judaism, of which circumcision was the most characteristic feature, was regarded as under angelic powers, and the removal of them meant its abolition. It seems probable that the false teachers set a high value on circumcision, and urged it on the Colossians, not as indispensable to salvation, in which case Paul would have definitely attacked them on this point, but as conferring a higher sanctity. There seems to be no suggestion that it was regarded as a charm against evil spirits. The Apostle does not merely leave them with the statement that they have been made full in Christ, which rendered circumcision unnecessary, but adds that they have already received circumcision, not material but spiritual, not the removal of a fragment of the body, but the complete putting off of the body of flesh.—**ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε.** A definite historical fact is referred to, as is shown by the aorist. This was their conversion, the inward circumcision of the heart, by which they entered on the blessings of the New Covenant. The outward sign of this is baptism, with which Paul connects it in the next verse. But it cannot be identified with it, for it is not made with hands. The circumcision of the heart is a prophetic idea (Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6, Jer. iv. 4, ix. 25, Ezek. xliv. 7, 9). In Paul it occurs Rom. ii. 28, 29, Phil. iii. 3.—**περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ**: "with a

τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 12. [i] συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ,[1] ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως

i Only here and Rom. vi. 4 in Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln. mg., Tr., Lft., Ws. with ℵcBD*FG 47, 71. **βαπτισματι**: T., W.H. with ℵ*ACDcEKLP, by alteration to more usual form.

circumcision not wrought by hands," *i.e.*, spiritual, ethical (*cf.* Eph. ii. 11, **οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου**).—**ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός**: "in the stripping from you of the body of the flesh". The expression **σῶμα τ. σαρκὸς** is unusual. It means the body which consists of flesh, and of flesh as the seat of sin. By the removal of the home in which sin dwelt sin itself was removed. It is one of those cases in which the sense of **σῶμα** approximates to that of **σάρξ**. This body of flesh is removed from the Christian at his conversion.—**ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.** This cannot be the circumcision endured by Christ in His infancy, for that was wrought by hands, and such a reference would be most unfortunate for the polemic against ceremonies and altogether un-Pauline. Usually it is explained as the circumcision of our hearts which comes from Christ. But this has no parallel in the N.T.; further, it practically repeats **ἐν ᾧ κ. περιετ.**; and, coming between the removal of the body of the flesh and the burial with Christ, breaks the connexion. Accordingly Schneckenburger (followed by Kl., Sod., Haupt) suggested that it was really an expression for the death of Christ. (His view that **ἀπεκ. τ. σ. τ. σ.** was to be taken similarly has met with no acceptance.) In favour of this it may be said that in the immediate context Paul goes on to speak of burial and resurrection with Christ, and a reference to the death would naturally precede. And circumcision is a happy metaphor for Christ's death to sin (Rom. vi. 10). Meyer's objection that it is inappropriate since Christ endured actual circumcision is not serious, for, if sound, it should have excluded the choice of these ambiguous words altogether, which naturally suggest a circumcision suffered by Christ. But what creates a grave difficulty is that the thought does not seem to run on connectedly. There is a transition from the death of Christ on the cross to the burial of Christians with Him in their own personal experience. Perhaps this interpretation involves taking **περιετμήθητε** of the death of Christians with Christ on the cross (2 Cor. v. 14), for it doubles the difficulty if Paul passes from the personal experience of the Christian to the cross, and from the cross back to personal experience. This suggests the possibility that **περ. Χ.** might be interpreted on the analogy of **θλίψεων τ. Χριστοῦ** (i. 24) as the circumcision of Christ in the believer. This would give a good connexion, and one that would suit the apparent identification of the circumcision of Christ with the putting off of the body of the flesh. The phrase, however, is so strange, and the idea that Christ dies with us so questionable (we die with Him), that it seems unsafe to adopt it. It is, therefore, best to mitigate the difficulty by the view that in these words Paul interpolates, in a concise and obscure expression, a reference to the great fact which underlay the spiritual experiences of which he is speaking. This circumcision, he would say, that is the removal of the flesh, was first experienced by Christ on the cross, and what happened to you ideally then is realised though union with Him now.

Ver. 12. **συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ.** This refers to the personal experience of the Christian. The rite of baptism, in which the person baptised was first buried beneath the water and then raised from it, typified to Paul the burial and resurrection of the believer with Christ. Burial seems to imply a previous death, but Rom. vi. 3, 4 perhaps shows that the metaphors must not be rigidly pressed. **συνταφ.** is to be joined closely with **περιετμήθητε.** If any distinction in meaning is to be made between **βαπτισμός** and **βάπτισμα,** it is that the former expresses the process, the latter the result.—**ἐν ᾧ** may refer either to **Χρ.** or to **βαπ.** The former view is taken by Chrysostom (followed by Luther, Meyer and many others). The latter is taken by Calvin and most recent commentators (De W., Hofm., Alf., Ell., Lightf., Kl., Sod., Haupt, Abb.). In favour of the former it is urged that the parallelism with **ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμ.** requires it. But the real parallel is with "buried with Him in baptism," and this requires "raised with Him in baptism". Since baptism is not the mere plunging into the water, but emersion from it too, **ἐν** is not against this interpretation,

k Not class., only Paul in N.T., exc. Acts xi. 3.
l Only here and Eph. ii. 5 (par.) in class. or Bib. Gk.

τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν[1] νεκρῶν· 13. καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας τοῖς παραπτώμασιν[2] καὶ τῇ k ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν l συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς[3] σὺν αὐτῷ, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν

[1] So Ln., Tr. [Lft.], R.V., Ws. with BDEFG 17. των: omitted by T., W.H. with ℵACKLP, in conformity with more common usage.

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵBL 17. εν τοις παραπτωμασιν: Ln. with ℵaACDEFGKP.

[3] So edd. with ℵ*ACKL. υμας: omitted by ℵcDEFGP, to avoid repetition. ημας: W.H. mg. with B 17, 37, under influence of ημιν.

and διά or ἐξ is not necessary to express it.—συνηγέρθητε expresses the positive side of the experience. That death with Christ, which is the putting off of the body of flesh, has for its counterpart the putting on of Christ (Gal. iii. 27), which is followed by a walk with Him in newness of life. It is true that our complete redemption is attained only in the resurrection of the body (Rom. viii. 23, 2 Cor. v. 2-4). But there is clearly no reference here to the bodily resurrection at the last day, as some have thought; for that is altogether excluded by the whole tenor of the passage, which refers to an experience already complete. Nor can we, with Meyer, think of the bodily resurrection as already ideally accomplished in baptism. For the preceding context speaks only of a spiritual experience, and it is impossible to pass thus violently to one that is physical. Haupt agrees with this, but thinks the reference is not ethical, but religious, that is forensic. The rest of the passage, he argues, shows that it is not moral transformation, but justification, that Paul has in mind. But however true this may be of χαρισάμενος . . . σταυρῷ, it is at least questionable for the immediately succeeding context. And since the union covers both ethical renewal and justification, it is natural to find both mentioned in connexion with it, and to hold fast the former here as the more natural interpretation of the words.—διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας: "through faith in the working". Klöpper (following Luth., Beng., De W. and others) makes τῆς ἐνερ. genitive of cause, "faith produced by the working". He argues that it is strange that in the experience already referred to the faith which proves itself in baptism must be thought of as directed towards the Person of Christ, and so cannot now be spoken of as faith in the working of God; and further, that the whole context has referred to a passive experience, and so this is fitly continued by the assertion that even the faith, which appropriates the death and resurrection of Christ, is the creation of God. But these arguments are insufficient to overthrow the force of Pauline usage, according to which elsewhere the genitive after πίστις, unless it refers to the person who believes, expresses the object of faith. The view of Hofmann that τ. ἐνερ. is a genitive of apposition, and that what is meant is "faith, that is the working of God," is quite out of the question. For faith directed towards the working of God who raised Christ from the dead, *cf.* Rom. iv. 24. God is so characterised, since the working by which He raised Christ will also be effective in our own spiritual experience. Our baptism is therefore not a sign of nothing, but of a real spiritual burial and resurrection with Christ.

Ver. 13. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 1, 5.—καὶ ὑμᾶς: "and you". Frequently this is taken to mean "you also," *i.e.*, you Gentiles. But since Paul has been using the second person before, he can hardly be introducing a contrast. We should therefore take καὶ as simply copulative. It means "you as well as Christ," as is shown also by the verbal parallel between ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν and νεκροὺς ὄντας.—νεκρούς. Here Paul varies the sense of death. In the preceding verses it is death to the old life, here the old life itself is described as a condition of spiritual death. It is not of liability to eternal death (Mey.), or to physical death as the certain consequence of sin that he is speaking, but of a state of actual death, which can only be spiritual (*cf.* "sin revived and I died," Rom. vii. 9).—τοῖς παραπτώμασιν: "by your trespasses". The dative is probably one of cause, but it could be translated by

πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα, 14. ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν [m] χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν, ὃ ἦν [n] ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου,

m Only here and Tob. v. 3, ix. 5 in Bib. Gk.

n Only here and Heb. x. 27 in N.T.

"in". **παραπτ.** are individual acts of transgression, of which **ἁμαρτία** is the principle.—**τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ της σαρκὸς ὑμῶν**: "by the uncircumcision of your flesh". This is often supposed to refer to literal uncircumcision, *i.e.*, to the fact that they were Gentiles. But we have already seen that there is no emphasis on this fact. And the implied contrast that Jews were not, while Gentiles were, spiritually dead, is impossible in Paul. He cannot have said that they were dead by reason of uncircumcision, and, if the dative is taken otherwise, yet the coupling of **τῇ ἀκρ.** with **τ. παραπτ.** shows that physical uncircumcision is not referred to, but an ethical state. And this would not, as Abbott thinks, be unintelligible to Gentile readers, for he had already explained the metaphor in ver. 11. **τ. σαρκὸς** is accordingly to be taken as an epexegetical genitive, "the uncircumcision which consisted in your flesh".—**συνεζωοποίησεν**: to be taken in the same sense as **συνηγέρθητε**, not in any of the senses wrongly attributed to that word, which are reintroduced here. Chrysostom (followed by Ew., Ell.) makes Christ the subject. This is defended by Ellicott on the ground of the prominence of Christ through the passage, of the difficulty of supplying **Θεός** from **Θεοῦ**, and of referring the acts in vv. 14, 15 to the Father. But this last difficulty, urged also by Lightfoot, rests on a probably wrong interpretation of ver. 15. Neither of the others is of any weight against the argument from Pauline usage, which always refers such actions to God. This view would also involve the awkwardness of making Christ raise Himself and us with Him, whereas in ver. 12 His resurrection is referred to God. It is therefore best to regard **ὁ Θεός** as the subject, as in the parallel Eph. ii. 4, 5.—**χαρισάμενος**: "forgiving". Forgiveness is contemporary with quickening.—**ἡμῖν**: the change from the second person may be due to Paul's wish gratefully to acknowledge his own participation in this blessing. It must not (with Hofm.) be referred to Jewish Christians.

Ver. 14. Partially parallel to Eph. ii. 15. Apparently Paul now passes to the historic fact which supplied the ground for the forgiveness. **χαρισ.** therefore refers to the subjective appropriation of the objective blotting out of the bond in the death of Christ.—**ἐξαλείψας**: "having blotted out," *i.e.*, having cancelled.—**τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν.** The original sense of **χειρόγ.** is handwriting, but it had come to mean a bond or note of hand. It is generally agreed that the reference here is to the Law (*cf.* Eph. ii. 15, **τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν**). That those under the Law did not write the Law has been pressed against this. It is true that **χειρόγ.** means strictly a bond given by the debtor in writing. It is not necessary, with Chrysostom and many others, to meet the objection by reference to the promise of the people in Exod. xxiv. 3. There is no need to press rigidly this detail of the metaphor. It is disputed in what sense we are to take the reference to the Law. Some (including Lightf., Ol., Sod., Abb.) think it embraces the Mosaic Law and the law written in the hearts of Gentiles. It is quite possible, however, that **καθ' ἡμῶν** means simply against us Jews. But, apart from this, the addition of **τ. δογ.** points to formulated commandment. This is confirmed by Eph. ii. 15, where the similar expression is used, not of what Jews and Gentiles had in common, but that which created the separation between them, *viz.*, the Jewish Law. Whether, with Calvin, Klöpper and Haupt, we should still further narrow the reference to the ceremonial Law is very questionable. It is true that circumcision and laws of meat and drink and sacred seasons are the chief forms that the "bond" takes. And it might make the interpretation of ver. 15 a little easier to regard the ceremonial as that part of the Law specially given by angels. But this distinction between the moral and ceremonial Law has no meaning in Paul. The Law is a unity and is done away as a whole. And for Paul the hostile character of the Law is peculiarly associated with the moral side of it. The law which slew him is illustrated by the tenth commandment, and the ministry of death was engraved on tablets of stone. It was the moral elements in the Law that made it the strength of sin. It is not certain how **τοῖς δόγμασιν** should be taken. Frequently it is interpreted "consisting in decrees". For this we ought

[o] προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, 15. [p] ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας [q] ἐδειγμάτισεν [1] ἐν παρρησίᾳ [r] θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ.

o Only here in N.T.
p Only here and iii. 9 in class. or Bib. Gk.
q Only here and Matt. i. 19 in class. or Bib. Gk.
r Only here and 2 Cor. ii. 14 in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with all authorities except B. **και εδειγματισεν**: Ws. with B.

to have had **τὸ ἐν δόγ.** Ellicott says this construction "seems distinctly ungrammatical". Others (including Mey., Lightf., Sod., Haupt, Abb.) connect closely with **χειρόγ.**, in such a way that the dative is governed by **γεγραμμένον** implied in **χειρόγ.** This is questionable in point of grammar. Winer says: "Meyer's explanation, *that which was written with the commandments* (the dative being used as in the phrase *written with letters*), is the more harsh, as **χειρόγραφον** has so completely established itself in usage as an independent word that it is hardly capable of governing (like **γεγραμμένον**) such a dative as this". (Winer-Moulton, p. 275; *cf.* also Ellicott *ad loc.*) It seems best then (with De W., Ell., Kl., Ol.) to translate "the handwriting which was against us by its ordinances". For this we should have expected **τ. καθ' ἡμ. τ. δόγ. χειρόγ.** or **τ. τοῖς δόγ. καθ' ἡμ. χειρόγ.**; but this seems to be the best way of taking the text as it stands, and perhaps the position of **τ. δόγ.** is for emphasis. The Greek commentators, followed by Bengel, explained the passage to mean having blotted out the Law by the doctrines of the Gospel. But **δόγ.** is a most un-Pauline, because legalist, expression for the Gospel, and by itself could not mean Christian doctrines. Nor is the sense it gives Pauline, for it was not by the teaching of the Gospel, but by the death of Christ, that the Law was done away. Erasmus' view (followed by Hofm.) that **τ. δόγ.** should be connected with what follows is very improbable.—**ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν**: stronger than **καθ' ἡμῶν**, asserting not merely that the bond had a claim against us, but that it was hostile to us, the suggestion being that we could not meet its claim. No idea of secret hostility is present.—**καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου.** "And it He hath taken out of the midst." The change from aorist to perfect is significant, as expressing the abiding character of the abolition. Lightfoot thinks that a change of subject takes place here, from God to Christ. His reason is that Christ must be the subject of **ἀπεκδ.**, since "no grammatical meaning can be assigned to **ἀπεκδυσάμενος**, by which it could be understood of God the Father". Since, however, no change of subject is hinted at in the passage, and would involve great difficulty, it is more reasonable to conclude that an interpretation which requires Christ to be the subject of **ἀπεκδ.** is self-condemned.—**προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ**: "having nailed it to the cross". When Christ was crucified, God nailed the Law to His cross. Thus it, like the flesh, was abrogated, sharing His death. The bond therefore no longer exists for us. To explain the words by reference to a custom of driving a nail through documents to cancel them, is not only to call in a questionable fact (see Field, *Notes on Transl. of the N.T.*, p. 196), but to dilute in the most tasteless way one of Paul's most striking and suggestive phrases. Quite on a level with it is Field's own suggestion as to "this seemingly superfluous addition" (!) that the reference is to the custom of hanging up spoils of war in temples. Zahn (*Einl. in das N.T.*, i., 335) draws a distinction between what was written on the bond and was blotted out by God, and the bond itself which was nailed to the cross and taken out of the way. We thus have two thoughts expressed: the removal of guilt incurred by transgression of the Law, and the abolition of the Law itself. It is questionable if this distinction is justified. The object is the same, **αὐτὸ** simply repeats **χειρόγραφον.**

Ver. 15. In this difficult verse the meaning of almost every word is disputed. It is therefore imperative to control the exegesis by strict regard to the context. The main question relates to the character of the principalities and powers. Subordinate questions are raised as to the subject of the sentence and the meaning of **ἀπεκδ.** The context before and after (**οὖν**, ver. 16) requires us to bring the interpretation into close connexion with the main thought, the abolition of the Law.—**ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας.** Till recently the

principalities and powers have been explained as hostile demoniacal spirits, and this view is held by Meyer, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Oltramare and Weiss. In its favour is the impression made by the verse that a victory over the powers is spoken of. How far this is so can be determined only by an examination of the terms employed. Against this view the following objections seem decisive. ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. occur several times in the Epistle, but nowhere in this sense. In Eph. vi. 12 the reference to evil spirits is definitely and repeatedly fixed by the context. This is not so here. Further, the connexion with the context is difficult to trace. Bengel says: "Qui angelos bonos colebant, iidem malos timebant: neutrum jure". Weiss expresses a somewhat similar idea: "It seems that the Colossian theosophists threatened the readers that they would again fall under the power of evil spirits if they did not submit to their discipline". But not only have we no evidence for this, but this interpretation cuts the nerve of the passage, which is the abolition of the Law by the cross. Meyer's view is more relevant: the Law is done away in Christ, and since it is the strength of sin, sin's power is thus broken, and so is the devil's power, which is exercised only through sin. Gess interprets that the Law through its curse created separation between men and God, and thus gave a point of support for the dominion of evil spirits. "Of this handwriting have they boasted. Our guilt was their strength. He who sees the handwriting nailed to the cross can mock these foes." But these views are read into the passage, and do not lead up to ver. 16. And where the Jewish Law was absent, as in the heathen world, sin was rampant. Ellicott and Lightfoot do not attempt to trace a connexion with the context, nor on their view of ἀπεκδ. is one possible. All this strongly suggests that we should give another sense to ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. And this is secured if we identify them with ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. already mentioned (i. 16 and ii. 10). In favour of this are the following considerations: (1) Unless we are warned to the contrary it is natural to keep the same meaning throughout. (2) We thus get a thought that perfectly suits the context. This law that has been abolished was given by angels, its abolition implies their degradation. To them was also subject the whole of the observances of eating, drinking, etc. (3) It is a powerful polemic against the worship of angels (ver. 18), which is lost on the other view. In effect Paul says, "You are worshipping angels who were degraded when Christ was crucified". We may therefore take ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ, as in the rest of the Epistle, as angelic powers, identical with στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου, and holding a special relation to the Law. The next question is as to the meaning of ἀπεκδ. The translation "having put off His body" may be safely set aside, for Paul must have said this if he had meant it. The Greek commentators, followed by Ellicott and Lightfoot, interpret "having put off from Himself". The word is used in this sense in iii. 9. They explain that Christ divested Himself of the powers of evil that gathered about Him, since He assumed our humanity with all its temptations. But (apart from the change of subject) the change of metaphor is very awkward from stripping off adversaries, like clothes, to exhibiting and triumphing over them. More cogent is the objection caused by the strangeness of the idea. Christ wore our human nature with its liability to temptation. But that He wore evil spirits is a different and indeed most objectionable idea. The same translation is adopted by some who take the other view of ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ., and the explanation given is that God in the death of Christ divested Himself of angelic mediators. This is free from the impropriety of the other view, but shares its incongruity of metaphor. The more usual translation is "spoiled". The middle can mean "stripped for Himself," and this again suits either view of ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. If evil spirits, they are stripped of their dominion; but if angels of the Law, they are despoiled of the dominion they exercise. This view, though stigmatised by Zahn as "an inexcusable caprice," is probably best. They are fallen potentates. There is no need to worship them, or to fear their vengeance, if their commands are disobeyed. With the true interpretation of this passage, every reason disappears for assuming that Christ is the subject.—ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ. "He made a show of them openly." No exhibition in disgrace is necessarily implied. The principalities and powers are exhibited in their true position of inferiority, as mediators of an abolished Law and rulers of elements to which Christians have died. ἐν παρ. is not to be translated "boldly," for courage is not needed to exhibit those who are spoiled. The word is contrasted with "reserve," and indicates the frank, open exhibition of the angels in their true position when the bond was cancelled and

16. Μὴ οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω ἐν βρώσει καὶ ἐν [s] πόσει [1] ἢ ἐν μέρει [t] ἑορτῆς ἢ [o] νεομηνίας ἢ [u] σαββάτων, 17. ὅ [2] ἐστιν [v] σκιὰ τῶν μελ-

s Only here and Rom. xiv. 17; John vi. 55 in N.T. t Only here in Paul. u Only here and 1 Cor. xvi. 2 in Paul. v Heb. x. 1; only here in Paul.

[1] So Tr. mg., W.H., Ws. with B cop., Or. η εν ποσει: Ln., T., W.H. mg. with ℵACDEFGKLP, through assimilation to following words.

[2] So Ln., W.H. mg., Ws. with BFG. α: T., W.H., R.V. with ℵACDEKLP, on account of enumeration in ver. 16.

Christ was manifested as the final revelation of God.—θριαμβεύσας. This seems to express most definitely that the ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. are hostile powers. Alford, referring to 2 Cor. ii. 14, says the true victory is our defeat by Him. Findlay thinks the reference in the verb (which is not earlier than Paul) is not to the Roman military triumph, but to the festal procession (θρίαμβος) of the worshippers of Dionysus. In this case God is represented as leading the angels in procession in His honour; in other words, bringing them to acknowledge His greatness and the revelation of Himself in Christ. It is perhaps safest to translate "triumphing over". This is favoured by other passages in Paul, which imply that the ἀρχ. κ. ἐξ. needed an experience of this kind.—ἐν αὐτῷ may refer to Χριστ. or σταυρ. or χειρόγ. The second is best, for there has been no reference to Christ since ver. 13, and it is the cancelling of the bond, not the bond itself, that is the cause of the triumph. It is in the death of Christ that this triumph takes place. Zahn explains the passage to mean that God has stripped away the principalities and powers which concealed Him, not from the Jews, to whom He had revealed Himself, but from the heathen world. Thus He has revealed Himself and these apparent deities in their true character. He has triumphed over them in Christ, and led them vanquished in His train. But this was not accomplished on the cross, but through the preaching of the Gospel among the Gentiles, accompanied with such signs and wonders as in the story of the maid with the spirit of divination and the exorcists at Ephesus. But this is not what is required by the argument, which has the Jewish Law in view.

Vv. 16-23. SINCE THE LAW HAS BEEN CANCELLED AND THE ANGELS DESPOILED, RITUAL OR ASCETIC ORDINANCES HAVE NO LONGER ANY MEANING FOR THOSE WHO IN CHRIST POSSESS THE SUBSTANCE, OF WHICH THESE ARE BUT THE SHADOW. THEY MUST NOT BE INTIMIDATED BY ANGEL WORSHIPPERS, WHO ARE PUFFED UP BY FLESHLY CONCEIT, AND ONLY LOOSELY HOLD THE HEAD, FROM WHOM THE BODY DRAWS ALL ITS SUPPLY. SINCE THEY HAVE DIED TO THE ELEMENTAL SPIRITS, THEY MUST NOT SUBMIT TO THE PRECEPTS OF ASCETICISM, WHATEVER REPUTATION FOR WISDOM THEY MAY CONFER.—Ver. 16. The connexion with the preceding argument is this: Since the bond written in ordinances has been abolished, and the angelic powers spoiled and led in triumph, allow no one to criticise your action on the ground that it is not in harmony with the precepts of the Law, or cuts you off from communion with the angels. You have nothing to do with Law or angels. At best they were but the shadow, and in Christ you possess the substance.—κρινέτω ἐν: "judge you in," ἐν meaning on the basis of. Whether a man eats or drinks or not his conduct in this respect supplies no fit ground for a judgment of him. κρ. is not to "condemn," though the context shows that unfavourable judgment is in Paul's mind.—βρώσει καὶ ἐν πόσει: "eating and in drinking," not food and drink, for which Paul would have used βρῶμα and πόμα. The question is not altogether between lawful and unlawful food, but between eating and drinking or abstinence. Asceticism rather than ritual cleanness is in his mind. The Law is not ascetic in its character, its prohibitions of meats rest on the view that they are unclean, and drinks are not forbidden, save in exceptional cases, and then not for ascetic reasons. But these injunctions stand along with ordinances of the Law itself, partly, because they may have been regarded as extensions of its principles, partly, we may suppose, because, like the Law, they were attributed to the angels by the false teachers. In Heb. ix. 10 regulations as to drinks seem to be referred to as part of the Jewish Law. That the false teachers were ascetics is clear from ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος in ver. 23.—ἐν μέρει: "in the matter of," μέρ.

-λόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18. μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς [w] καταβραβευέτω θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ [x] θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἃ [1] ἑόρακεν [a] ἐμβατεύων, εἰκῇ [y] φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ,

w Dem., *Mid.*, 544 (quotation from witnesses); Eustath., *ad Il.*, i., 402 ff. x Only here and Acts xxvi. 5; Jas. i. 26, 27 in N.T. y Only here and 1 Cor. (six times) in class. or Bib. Gk.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ℵ*ABD* 17, 28, 67**. **μη**: inserted after **a** by [Ln.] with CKLP. **ουκ**: FG.

expressing the category. Chrysostom and some others have taken it strangely to mean "in the partial observance of".—**ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων**: the Jewish sacred seasons enumerated as they occur yearly, monthly and weekly. The Sabbath is placed on the same footing as the others, and Paul therefore commits himself to the principle that a Christian is not to be censured for its non-observance. **σαββ.**, though plural in form, means a single Sabbath day.

Ver. 17. This verse contains a hint of the fundamental argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews (*cf.* esp. Heb. viii. 5, x. 1).—**ὅ ἐστιν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων.** Whether **ὅ** or **ἅ** be read, the reference is to the whole of the ceremonial ordinances just mentioned. **σκιὰ** is "shadow," not "sketch" (as Calvin and others). It is cast by the body, and therefore implies that there is a body, and while it resembles the body it is itself insubstantial. **τ. μελλ.** means the Christian dispensation, not (as Mey.) the still future Messianic kingdom, for, if so, the substance would still lie in the future, and the shadow would not be out of date. It is future from the point of view of Judaism.—**τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: "but the body belongs to Christ". **σῶμα** is that which casts the shadow, therefore it existed contemporaneously with its manifestation, and, of course, according to the Jewish view, in heaven. It practically means what we should call "the substance," and is chosen as the counterpart to **σκιὰ**, and with no reference to the Church or the glorified body of Christ. Since the substance belonged to Christ, it was foolish for Christians to hanker after the shadow. All that the most sanguine hoped to attain by asceticism and ceremonialism was possessed immediately in the possession of Christ.

Ver. 18. This verse gives us our only definite information, apart from which it would have been a highly probable inference, that the false teachers practised angel-worship. — **ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω.** This is commonly translated "rob you of your prize". The judge at the games was called **βραβεύς** or **βραβευτής**, and the prize **βραβεῖον.** But the verb **βραβεύω** apparently lost all reference to the prize, and meant simply "to decide". In the two cases in which **καταβραβεύω** occurs it means to decide against or condemn. It is best therefore to take it so here, "let no one give judgment against you"; it is thus parallel to, though stronger than, **κρινέτω** (ver. 16). (Field, *Notes on Transl. of the N.T.*, pp. 196, 197, discusses the word; *cf.* also Ol. and Abb. *ad loc.*)—**θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ.** This phrase is very variously interpreted. Some assume a Hebraism, and translate "taking pleasure in humility" (Winer, Lightf., Findl., Haupt). The LXX uses this not infrequently (but usually with persons, though otherwise in Ps. cxi. 1, cxlvi. 10); but there is no N.T. parallel for it, and Paul does not employ Hebraisms. For this idea he uses **εὐδοκεῖν.** Moreover it yields no relevant sense here. Others translate "wishing to do so in (*or* by) humility" (Mey., Ell., Sod., Weiss). But for this **τοῦτο ποιεῖν** should have been added, and on this interpretation **θέλων** has really little point. The rendering of Alford, Moule and others is not very different from this in sense, but more forcible. It connects **θέλ.** with **καταβραβ.**, and translates "wilfully," "of set purpose". 2 Pet. iii. 5 is referred to for the construction. Oltramare's view is similar, but he translates "spontaneously," so apparently the R.V. mg. and Abbott. The unsatisfactoriness of these interpretations suggests that the text may be corrupt. Hort thinks that for **θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ** we should read **ἐν ἐθελοταπεινοφροσύνῃ.** This word is used by Basil, and a similar compound occurs in ver. 23. It is, of course, as Haupt says, difficult to understand how the copyists should have altered it into the very strange expression in the text. But this is not a fatal objection, and the conjecture is very possibly correct. It would mean "gratuitous humility," a humility that went beyond what was

[z] Only here and Eph. iv. 16 (par.) in N.T.

19. καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν [z] ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον αὔξει

required. ταπεινοφροσύνῃ is frequently explained as ironical. By a display of humility they beguiled their dupes. But the connexion with the following words makes this improbable. Their humility found an expression in angel worship. It is therefore that lowliness which causes a man to think himself unworthy to come into fellowship with God, and therefore prompts to worship of the angels. Such humility was perverted, but not therefore unreal. It was compatible with vanity towards others.—καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων: "and worship of angels". The genitive is objective, though some have taken it as subjective. This has been done most recently and elaborately by Zahn. He takes τ. ἀγγ. with ταπειν. as well as with θρησκείᾳ. The former noun is used, he argues, in a non-Pauline sense, therefore it needs a definition, and that τ. ἀγγ. is intended to define it is made probable by the fact that it is not repeated before θρησκ. What is meant is a mortification and devotion suitable for angels, but not for men who live in bodies, an attempt to assimilate themselves to angels, who do not eat or drink. The chief ground urged for this view is that Judaism was too strenuously monotheistic to admit of angel worship, and Paul could only have regarded it as idolatry. Against this what is said in the *Introduction*, section ii., may be referred to. The angels worshipped by the false teachers are the στοιχεῖα τ. κόσμου, ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι.—ἃ ἑόρακεν ἐμβατεύων. If μὴ is inserted after ἃ, we may translate with Ellicott, in his earlier editions, "intruding into the things which he hath not seen". This should probably be explained with reference to the invisible world, with which they professed to hold communion, but which really was closed to them. Ellicott still thinks this reading gives the better sense, though adopting the other in deference to the external evidence. But Paul could hardly have brought it against them that they had fellowship with what they could not see. For this was so with all who walked by faith. The negative, therefore, is not helpful to the sense, and is definitely excluded by the external evidence. The text without the negative is very variously explained. ἐμβατεύειν means "to stand upon," then "to come into possession of" a thing, "to enter upon," "to invade," then in a figurative sense "to investigate". Since ἃ ἑόρακεν also lends itself to diametrically opposite interpretations, the exegesis becomes doubly uncertain. It may mean the things which can be seen with the bodily eye, or it may refer to visions; they may be condemned as deluded visionaries, or for their materialism. Alford and Ellicott translate "taking his stand on the things which he hath seen," and explain that he becomes an inhabitant of the world of sight rather than of faith. But the use of the perfect is against any reference to the circumstances of ordinary life, and the thought would have been far more simply and clearly expressed by τὰ ὁρατά. Generally it is supposed that "the things which he has seen" means his visions. Various views are then taken of ἐμβατεύων. Meyer translates "entering upon what he has beheld," and explains that, instead of holding fast to Christ, he enters the region of visions. Several translate "investigating" (Beng., Grimm, Findl., Ol., Haupt). This is probably the best translation of the words as they stand, for the translation "parading his visions" (Sod. and ? Abb.) seems not to be well established. The harshness of the combination, and uncertainty of the exegesis, give much probability to the view that the text has not been correctly transmitted. After it had been conjectured that we should read ἃ ἑώρα κενεμβατεύων, Lightfoot independently suggested the latter word, but for ἃ ἑώρα suggested ἑώρᾳ or αἰώρᾳ. [Sod. incorrectly quotes the emendation as αἰῶρα; and in Abb. by a misprint we have αἰώρα. Ellicott not only misreports Lightfoot's emendation, but does not even mention Taylor's.] ἑώρα is used sometimes of that which suspends a thing, sometimes of the act of suspension. "In this last sense," Lightfoot says, "it describes the poising of a bird, the floating of a boat on the waters, the balancing on a rope, and the like. Hence its expressiveness when used as a metaphor." κενεμβατεύειν does not actually occur, but the cognate verb κενεμβατεῖν is not uncommon. A much better emendation, however, is that of Dr. C. Taylor (*Journal of Philology*, vii., p. 130), ἀέρα κενεμβατεύων, "treading the void of air". In his *Pirqe Aboth*,[2] p. 161, he says that the Rabbinic expression

τὴν [a] αὔξησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 20. εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου, τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ [b] δογματίζεσθε,

"fly in the air with nothing to rest upon" may have suggested the phrase to Paul. This emendation is accepted by Westcott and Hort, and regarded as the most probable by Zahn, who says that the text as it stands yields no sense. It involves the omission of a single letter, and although the province of conjectural emendation in the New Testament is very restricted, yet such a slip as is suggested may very easily have been made by Paul's amanuensis or a very early copyist. Field urges as a fatal objection that "κενεμβατεύων is a *vox nulla*, the inviolable laws regulating this class of composite verbs stamping κενεμβατεῖν as the only legitimate, as it is the only existing, form" (*loc. cit.*, p. 198). Lightfoot, on the contrary, asserts that it is unobjectionable in itself. Even if Field's criticism be admitted, it would be better to read ἀέρα κενεμβατῶν than to retain the text. If the emendation is correct, Paul is asserting the baseless character of the false teaching; and all reference to visions disappears.—εἰκῇ should probably, in accordance with Pauline usage, be connected with the following rather than the preceding words. It may mean "groundlessly" (Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.) or "without result" (Sod. and others). The latter is the sense in Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 2, Rom. xiii. 4, but, since it does not suit φυσ., the former is to be preferred here.—φυσιούμενος: *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1 ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, xiii. 4. They were puffed up by a sense of spiritual and intellectual superiority.—ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ: "by the mind of his flesh". The mind in this case is regarded as dominated by the flesh. Soden, followed by Abbott, says that the νοῦς as a natural faculty is ethically indifferent in itself, and so may stand just as well under the influence of σάρξ as of πνεῦμα. But in the most important passage, Rom. vii. 22-25, it is the higher nature in the unregenerate which wages unsuccessful conflict with the σάρξ. At the same time we see from Eph. iv. 17 that it could become vain and aimless and even (Rom. i. 28) reprobate. The choice of the phrase here is probably dictated by Paul's wish to drive home the fact that their asceticism and angel worship, so far from securing as they imagined the destruction of the flesh, proved that it was by the flesh that they were altogether controlled, even to the mind itself, which stood farthest from it.

Ver. 19. Largely parallel to Eph. iv. 15, 16. Paul proceeds to point out that so far from securing spiritual growth of a higher order, the false teaching, by loosening the hold on Christ, prevented any growth at all, since it obstructed or severed the very channel of spiritual life.—καὶ οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλήν: "and not holding fast the head". For this sense of κρ. with the accusative *cf.* Song of Songs iii. 4, ἐκράτησα αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα αὐτόν. It is clear from this that the false teachers were Christians. They did not profess to have no hold upon Christ, but their hold was not firm. All the supplies of life and energy flow from the Head, so that loose connexion with it involves serious loss and not progress in the spiritual life. It is significant that here each member is recognised as having an immediate relation to the Head.—ἐξ οὗ: not neuter, referring to κεφ., for ἐξ ἧς would have been more natural, but "from whom". It should be connected with both participles.—πᾶν τὸ σῶμα: "the whole body". Alford takes it "the body in its every part," but Ellicott denies that any distinction between τὸ πᾶν σῶμα and πᾶν τὸ σῶμα can be safely drawn. It is the body as a whole that increases, and thus Paul condemns the tendencies to intellectual or spiritual exclusiveness, which cripple alike the body and the members who exhibit such tendencies. As this increase continues each member shares in the body's progress.—διὰ τῶν ἁφῶν καὶ συνδέσμων. Lightfoot gives a very full discussion of these terms and their use in medical writers. He translates "through the junctures and ligaments". No doubt Paul's language is popular, not technical. He is speaking of the means by which the various parts of the body are supplied and knit together. Meyer takes ἁφ. to mean sensations or nerve impulses, but we have no evidence for this meaning; nor is it suitable here, for there is no reason for referring ἁφ. to ἐπιχορ. and συνδ. to συνβιβ. No explanation is given of ἁφ. κ. συνδ. Some think of the Holy Spirit, others of brotherly love, others of ministers. But probably in Paul's mind they did not correspond to anything definitely.—ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συνβιβαζόμενον:

21. Μὴ ἅψῃ μηδὲ γεύσῃ μηδὲ [a] θίγῃς, 22. (ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ [b] ἀποχρήσει), κατὰ τὰ [c] ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων;

a Only here and Heb. xi. 28, xii. 20 (quot.) in N.T.

b Only here in Bib. Gk.

c Not class., only here and Matt. xv. 9 = Mark vii. 7 (quot. also with διδ.) in N.T.

"being supplied and united". Often the supply is thought to be of nourishment, but perhaps we should interpret more generally of life. **ἀφ. κ. συν.** are thus the media through which life is communicated and the unity of the organism secured.—**αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: "increaseth with the increase of God". Generally **αὔξ. τ. Θ.** is explained to mean the growth which God gives (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 6). Against this is the fact that Christ is referred to as the source of growth. We may better take it "a growth such as God requires" (Ol., Haupt).

Ver. 20. The Apostle, recalling them to the time of their conversion, points out how inconsistent with a death to the elemental spirits any submission to ordinances belonging to their sphere would be. The death of the believer with Christ is a death to his old relations, to sin, law, guilt, the world. It is a death which Christ has Himseif undergone (Rom. vi. 10). Here it is specially their death to the angels, who had ruled their old life, and under whose charge the Law and its ceremonies especially stood. They had died with Christ to legalism, how absurd then for ordinances to be imposed upon them.—**εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ**: "if, as is the case, you died in union with Christ". The aorist points to the definite fact, which took place once for all. It was in union with Christ, for thus they were able to repeat Christ's own experience.—**ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου.** The use of **ἀπὸ** with **ἀποθν.** expresses more strongly than the dative (as in Rom. vi. 2) the completeness of the severance, and adds the idea of escape from the dominion of the personal powers. On **στ. τ. κ.** see note on ver. 8.—**ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ.** For the death of the Christian with Christ includes his crucifixion to the world (Gal. vi. 14). The world is ruled by these angels; but Christians belong to the world to come (*cf.* **τ. μελλόντων,** ver. 17), which, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, has not been made subject to the angels. Since they were still living in the physical world **κόσ.** has evidently an ethical sense.—**δογματίζεσθε** may be middle, "subject yourselves to ordinances," or passive. Since Paul nowhere says that the readers had accepted the false teaching, the latter is better: "Why are ye prescribed to?" (Mey., Winer, Hofm., Findl., Haupt.) Alford also takes it as a passive, but thinks it implies a keener rebuke than the middle. The middle asserts rather that they had submitted, the passive need only imply, not their submission, but that their resistance might have been more energetic. If there is blame it seems to be slighter. The verb **δογματ.** is chosen with reference to **τοῖς δόγμασιν** in ver. 14.

Ver. 21. The precepts here quoted are those of the false teachers, and are, of course, quoted to be condemned, though their meaning is frequently misunderstood. It is not said what things are thus prohibited, but the context supports the reference to meats and drinks, and is confirmed by **μηδὲ γεύσῃ.** There is no reason whatever to suppose that there is any reference to a prohibition of sexual relations.—**μὴ ἅψῃ μηδὲ γεύσῃ μηδὲ θίγῃς.** "Handle not, nor taste, nor even touch." There is perhaps a gradation in the order from coarser to more refined contact.

Ver. 22. **ἅ ἐστιν πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει.** Augustine and Calvin took **ἅ** as meaning the ordinances referred to in ver. 20, and explained the words as Paul's refutation, "all which ordinances lead in their use to spiritual destruction". But **ἀποχ.** means much more than use, it means abuse or using up; and **ἅ** refers more naturally to the prohibited things than to the prohibitions; while the sense would be complete if **τῇ ἀποχ.** were omitted. A much more attractive interpretation is that of De Wette (followed by Grimm, Ol. and others). He regards the words as a continuation of the injunctions of the false teachers, "all which things tend to spiritual destruction in the abuse". The sense will then be that certain meats and drinks are forbidden, because the abuse of them leads to spiritual destruction. Lightfoot says "this interpretation, however, has nothing to recommend it". This is perhaps too strong, for on the usual view **κατὰ . . . ἀνθρώπων** comes in awkwardly, as its place is at the end of the prohibitions. But it must be rejected. The translation is a little strained, and it would have been much simpler to say "the use of these things is destructive". It is there-

23. ἅτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν [d] ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ[1] [b] ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινί, πρὸς [e] πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.

d Only here in class. or Bib. Gk.
e Only here in N.T.

[1] So [Ln.], T., Tr. [W.H.], R.V., Ws. with all Greek MSS. except B. καὶ: omitted by B, m, Or. (Lat.), Hil.

fore best to adhere to the common view, and translate "all which things are to perish with the using". The meaning is, then, that with consumption the forbidden meats and drinks were destined to perish. This interpretation has the advantage of being forcible, for it throws one side of Paul's refutation into a terse parenthesis. His argument is, these meats and drinks, on which the false teachers lay such stress, are of no such importance, for in the nature of things they perish in their very use. If we can annihilate them they cannot rule us. The words should be included in brackets.—**κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: to be taken with **δογματίζεσθε**. This states the other side of Paul's refutation. The precepts are not only concerned with things destined to perish, they have their source in human commandments. Lightfoot aptly points out the striking parallel between these words of Paul and those of Christ on defilement (Mark vii.). Both argue from the perishableness of meats, both treat these things as indifferent in themselves, and both quote Isaiah. Even though these precepts are partially found in the O.T., they are rightly called precepts of men, partly because they went beyond what it enjoined, partly because their object is different.

Ver. 23. **ἅτινα**: *i.e.*, which commandments and teachings.—**λόγον σοφίας**. This may be taken in the sense of "a word of wisdom," but with no inner truth. Others translate "appearance of wisdom" (Beng., De W. and others). But this seems not to be a meaning of **λόγ.** Klöpper's translation, "reason" or "ground," yields no very good sense. It is best, with most recent commentators, to translate "a reputation for wisdom". **μέν** is not followed by **δε**, but this is not uncommon (see Winer-Moulton, pp. 719-721).—**ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος**. It is impossible to connect **σώμ.** with all three datives (Hofm.), it can belong only to **ἀφειδίᾳ**, with which it is connected as an objective genitive, "severity to the body". If **καὶ** is retained before **ἀφ.** the sense of the earlier datives is not affected. If, however, it is omitted their sense may be affected. It is possible to take **ἀφ.**, then, as an instrumental dative with **λόγον ἔχοντα**. But it is also possible to take it, with Haupt, as an explanatory apposition to the earlier datives. In this case **ἐθελ.** and **ταπ.** have both an ascetic meaning. Against this, however, is the fact that the words cannot be separated from the parallel expressions in ver. 18. This seems to fix the sense of **ἐθελ.** as a worship of angels, which was not required of them, and **ταπ.** will mean what it meant in ver. 18. **ἐθελοθρ.** occurs nowhere else, and was probably coined by Paul. Similar compounds were not unusual, and generally, though not invariably, had a bad sense. This is commonly supposed to attach to this word, but in any case it gets a bad sense from its context. **ἀφ. σώμ.** is the clearest assertion we have of the ascetic character of the false teachings.—**οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τινί, πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός**. These words, which constitute this verse one of the most difficult in the New Testament, have received very various explanations. It is disputed whether **οὐκ ἐν τιμῇ τ.** should be connected with the preceding or following words, and also with what **πρ. πλησ. τ. σαρκός** should be connected. Sumner, followed by Conybeare and Evans on 1 Cor. vii. 2, interpreted **πρὸς** as meaning "to check," and translated "not in any value to check the indulgence of the flesh," connecting **οὐκ ἐν τ. τ.** with the following words. This view was adopted by Lightfoot, and has been accepted by Moule and now by Ellicott. It has been inserted, with altogether insufficient warning, in R.V. It is a new explanation, and since propounded has found comparatively little favour. Lightfoot quotes numerous examples to prove that **πρός** after words denoting value, utility, sufficiency, etc., is used in the sense "to check" or "to prevent". But in these cases the meaning does not lie in **πρός**, but in **πρός** after some word which imposes this sense upon it (*e.g.*, **φάρμακον**), and there is nothing of the kind here. Abbott, in his valuable criticism of this interpretation, points out that **πρός** means

III. 1. Εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος· 2. τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε μὴ

"with a view to," and if the object is a word signifying action or the production of an effect it will mean with a view to (producing). "Hence it seems to follow that unless **πλησμονή** be taken in the sense of 'a state of repletion,' which would be unsuitable, **πρὸς πλησμονήν** could only mean to produce **πλ.**" A further question relates to the use of **τιμῇ**. Our word "value" is ambiguous, and **τιμή** may mean "value" in the sense of "price". But in this interpretation it is used in the sense of "efficacy," and this sense needs to be established. It seems necessary to reject this explanation on linguistic grounds. But the sense it yields is less good than appears at first sight. For what would be said would be that these things had a reputation for wisdom in "will-worship," etc., but they had not a reputation for wisdom in any value against the indulgence of the flesh. But obviously this cannot be the meaning. The sense imposed "but have not any value" can only be got out of the words by straining them. Another view, which keeps the same connexion of words, is that the translation should be "not in any honour to it [*i.e.*, the body] to satisfy the [reasonable] wants of the flesh". This must be rejected because **πλ.** is not used in this good sense, and **σαρκός** cannot be used as equivalent to **σώματος** in a context where **σώμ.** has been used just before, for the terms must stand in emphatic contrast. Soden and Abbott translate "not in any honour for the full satisfaction of the flesh". This means that there is no real honour, but what there is, is such as to satisfy the carnal nature. So Meyer, not in any honour, but serving to satiate the flesh. The objection to this view is that **ἀλλά** at least is required before **πρὸς πλ. τ. σαρκός**. Alford connects **οὐκ ἐν τ. τ.** with the preceding words, but **πρ. πλ. τ. σ.** with **δογματίζεσθε**. This gives a fairly good sense, and requires no necessary words to be supplied, but the parenthesis is incredibly long. A less lengthy parenthesis is involved in the interpretation of Bähr, Eadie and Weiss: "Which things, having indeed a reputation of wisdom in will-worship and humility and severity to the body, not in any honour, are for the indulgence of the flesh". If the contrast is between severity to the body and honour to it, we should have expected **αὐτοῦ** after **τιμῇ**. It is also strange that **ἐν** should be placed before **τιμῇ** and not before **ἀφειδ.** And the meaning is not probable, for it is implied that Paul thought that a reputation for wisdom ought to rest on honour to the body, which is absurd. Findlay's view, "not in any honour, against surfeiting of the flesh," not only yields a thought most obscurely expressed, but must be rejected because of its translation of **πρός**. All these interpretations are open to serious if not fatal objections. It is therefore not unlikely that Hort is right in the suspicion, shared also by Haupt, that we have to do here with a primitive corruption, for which no probable emendation has been suggested. He thinks that the text of the Epistle, and especially of the second chapter, was badly preserved in ancient times.

CHAPTER III.—VV. 1-17. RESURRECTION WITH CHRIST MUST BE COMPLETED BY PARTICIPATION IN HIS HEAVENLY LIFE, WHICH THOUGH AT PRESENT CONCEALED, WILL NOT ALWAYS REMAIN SO. THIS LIFE WITH CHRIST IN HEAVEN DEMANDS THE DEATH OF THE MEMBERS ON THE EARTH, THE HEATHEN VICES OF IMPURITY AND COVETOUSNESS, WHICH BRING DOWN THE WRATH OF GOD. ALL SINS OF MALICE, ANGER AND ABUSE AND ALL LYING MUST BE GIVEN UP, FOR THESE BELONG TO THE OLD NATURE, AND ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE NEW, WITH ITS EVER-GROWING CONFORMITY TO THE DIVINE IMAGE, AND THE CANCELLING OF ALL THOSE DISTINCTIONS WHICH MAKE MEN ALIENS TO EACH OTHER.—With iii. 1 Paul passes to the hortatory portion of the Epistle, the attack on the false teachers ending with ii. 23, and there is no break between vv. 1-4 and ver. 5. The ethical exhortation has its basis in the dogmatic exposition already given, and is therefore connected with it by **οὖν**.—Ver. 1. **εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ**: "if then [as is the case] you were raised together with Christ". It is not their resurrection when Christ rose of which he speaks, but their personal resurrection with Him at the time of their conversion and baptism. This is the counterpart to death with Him, and as that breaks off the old relations, so this initiates them into the new. They must now work out to its consequences that which they then received in union with Christ. Alford denies that there is any ethical element

τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 3. ἀπεθάνετε γάρ, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ Θεῷ· 4. ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν,[1] τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ. 5. [a] νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη[2] τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, [b] πάθος, ἐπι-

a Only here and Rom. iv. 19, Heb. xi. 12 (both of Abr.), in class. or Bib. Gk.

b Only here and 1 Thess. iv. 5; Rom. i. 26 in N.T.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H., R.V., Ws. with BD[bc]KL. υμων: T., Tr., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵCD*FGP, by assimilation to η ζωη υμων (ver. 3).

[2] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*BC* 17, 71. υμων inserted after μελη by Ln. with ℵ[c]AC[3]DEFGHKLP.

in this resurrection, on the ground that if there were there would be no need to exhort to ethical realisation. But this is to misunderstand Paul's idealistic language. Resurrection implies that the death has already taken place, and the death is ethical.—**τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε.** The reference is not, as Meyer characteristically makes it, eschatological. It is present fellowship with the exalted Lord, a life in heaven, of which he speaks. The true explanation is suggested by Eph. ii. 6, **συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ** (*cf.* **καθήμενος**). Those who have risen with Christ must realise ascension with Him. —**οὗ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος**: "where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God". Two statements are made: Christ is in the region of the things above, and He is seated at the right hand of God. These facts supply the motive for **τ. ἄνω ζ.** Our home with Him is not simply in the region of the things above, but in the highest position there, at God's right hand.

Ver. 2. **τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε.** "Set your mind on the things above." **φρ.** is wider in its sense than **ζητ.** It embraces, as Meyer says, "the whole practical bent of thought and disposition".—**μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** "The things on the earth" are not in themselves sinful, but become so if sought and thought on in preference to the things above (*cf.* Matt. vi. 19-21). There seems to be no reference to the false teachers here.

Ver. 3. **ἀπεθάνετε γάρ**: "for ye died," that is to their old life, at the time of their conversion. It gives the reason for ver. 2. The exhortation is justified because they have died with Christ.—**καὶ ἡ ζωὴ . . . ἐν τῷ Θεῷ.** This risen life (**ζωή** not **βίος**) which they now enjoy through union with Christ is concealed with Him in God. By the fact that it is hidden is not meant that it is secure (Kl.), for the contrast to **κέκ.** is **φαν.** (ver. 4), but that it belongs to the invisible and eternal, to which Christ belongs; perhaps not precisely "shrouded in the depths of inward experiences and the mystery of its union with the life of Christ" (Ell.). **ἐν Θεῷ** asserts Christ's own union with God, and emphasises our union with God in Him. Meyer thinks **ζωὴ** is the "eternal life," now hidden, but to be manifested at the second coming (ver. 4). But this does not suit so well the language of the verse. Our life in God is opposed to life in the world (ii. 20). The transition from the aorist to the perfect is to be noticed.

Ver. 4. This life is not always to remain hidden, it will be manifested at the second coming. And that not merely in union with Christ, for it is Christ Himself who is our Life. This is not to be toned down to mean that Christ is the possessor and giver of eternal life. Paul means quite literally what he says, that Christ is Himself the essence of the Christian life (*cf.* Phil. i. 21, **ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός,** also Gal. ii. 20). His manifestation therefore includes that of those who are one with Him. And this can only be a manifestation in glory (*cf.* Rom. viii. 17).

Ver. 5. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 3-5.—**νεκρώσατε οὖν.** "Put to death, therefore" (*cf.* Rom. viii. 13). The aorist implies a single decisive act. Perhaps **νεκ.** is chosen as a weaker word than **θανατόω** (Cremer, Haupt), implying the cessation of functions during life. **οὖν** is interesting. It seems strange that the assertions in the previous verses, of their death and resurrection with Christ and hidden life with Him in God, should be followed by the exhortation to put their members to death. Clearly these assertions are idealistic. The death and resurrection potentially theirs are to be realised in the putting to death of their members, —**τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** The mem-

c Only here and Gal. v. 20; 1 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 3 in class. or Bib. Gk.

θυμίαν κακήν, καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν [c] εἰδωλολατρία, 6. δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] 7. ἐν οἷς καὶ ὑμεῖς περιεπατήσατέ ποτε ὅτε ἐζῆτε ἐν τούτοις. 8. νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., R.V. mg., Ws. with B, Sah., Eth. [Rom.], and probably archetype of D. επι τους υιους της απειθειας: added by all other MSS. and almost all other authorities. Added from Eph. v. 6.

bers are referred to in so far as they are the instruments of the σάρξ, and are included in the "things on the earth," with which the Christian has no more concern (ver. 2). Lightfoot places a stop at γῆς, and regards πορνείαν κ.τ.λ. as governed by ἀπόθεσθε (ver. 8). He thinks Paul intended to make these accusatives directly dependent on ἀπ., but, owing to the intervening clauses, changed the form of the sentence. It is true that the apposition of μέλη and the list of sins that follows is strange, but not so strange as to make this very forced construction preferable. We should have expected ἀπ. at the beginning of the sentence.—καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν: "and covetousness," not "impurity". It comes fitly here, for gold provided the means for indulging these lustful passions. For the noun with the article at the end of a series without it, see Winer-Moulton,[9] p. 145.—ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρία: "inasmuch as it is idolatry". ἥτις refers simply to πλ., not to the whole series of vices enumerated, nor to μέλη, by attraction for ἅτινα. The lust for wealth sets riches in the place of God (*cf.* Matt. vi. 24).

Ver. 6. Parallel to Eph. v. 6, from which ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας has been added in most MSS. The sentence is abrupt without them, and ver. 7 is more easily explained if they are retained (as by Mey., Kl., Ol.), yet their omission in B, combined with their presence in the parallel Eph. v. 6, is too strong to admit of their retention. The verse may refer to a general principle which acts in human life, or the reference may be eschatological. The latter seems to be more in accordance with Paul's usage. ὀργὴ is here the outward manifestation of the anger which God even now feels at sin.

Ver. 7. ἐν οἷς: in which vices. If τ. υἱοὺς τ. ἀπ. be retained, the probable translation is "in whom". Lightfoot thinks in any case the reference to the vices is to be preferred, the chief reason being that Paul could not blame his readers for living among the Gentiles. But, as Meyer points out, περιεπ. implies participation in conduct.—καὶ ὑμεῖς: you as well as those who still practise these vices. — περιεπατήσατέ: a Hebraistic metaphor expressing moral conduct.—ἐζῆτε ἐν τούτοις: "ye were living in them," *i.e.*, in these vices. The reference is to their pre-Christian state, in which sin was the atmosphere of their lives. The change of tense should be noticed.

Ver. 8. Vv. 8-10 are largely parallel to Eph. iv. 22-24, 25, 31.—νυνὶ δὲ: "but now," emphatic contrast to ποτε, now that you have passed from that life of sinful conduct, see that you strip yourselves of these vices.—ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα: "do ye also put away all of them".—κ. ὑμ.: obviously not you as well as the Ephesians (Holtzm.), but you as well as other Christians. It is not clear whether τὰ π. refers exclusively to the preceding sins, to which then ὀργ. κ.τ.λ. forms a loose apposition, or whether it includes the latter also. It seems less harsh to give the injunction a forward as well as a backward reference.—ὀργήν, θυμόν: usually the former is regarded as the settled anger, of which the latter is the sudden and passionate outburst. Cremer, however, followed by Haupt, regards θ. as the inner emotion, of which ὀρ. is the external expression. ὀρ. is certainly used of the external manifestation of wrath in ver. 6.—κακίαν: "malignity," the feeling which prompts a man to injure his neighbour.—βλασφημίαν: as the other sins are against men, so this, "slander" not "blasphemy". — αἰσχρολογίαν. The word may mean "filthy speech" or "abusive speech". Here the context decides for the latter. Lightfoot, combining both senses, translates "foul-mouthed abuse," but such combinations are generally to be distrusted.—ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν: probably this should be connected both with βλ. and αἰσχρ. Whether it is dependent on ἀποθ., "banish from your mouth" (Mey., Ol., Abb.), is more doubtful, since the interpolation of sins which are not sins of speech makes such a connexion awkward. Prob-

ὑμῶν. 9. μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους, [d] ἀπεκδυσάμενοι [e] τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, 10. καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν [f] ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, 11. ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἕλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ [g] ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, [h] Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος, ἀλλὰ τὰ [1] πάντα καὶ ἐν

d ii. 15.
e Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 22.
f Only here and 2 Cor. iv. 16 in class. or Bib. Gk.
g ii. 13.
h Only here in N.T.

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., Lft., R.V., Ws. with ℵcBDEFGKLP. **τα**: omitted by W.H. with ℵ*AC.

ably, then, the meaning is "proceeding out of your mouth". **ὑμ.** is emphatic, and recalls the readers to their Christian profession.

Ver. 9. **μὴ ψεύδεσθε εἰς ἀλλήλους**: "lie not to one another". The imperative changes its tense from aorist to present, the exhortation to the decisive act being followed by a rule for their daily life. **εἰς** expresses the direction of the utterance. It should not be translated "against" (Kl., Fr.).—**ἀπεκδυσάμενοι . . . ἐνδυσάμενοι.** These participles may be translated as part of the exhortation, "lie not one to another putting off . . . and putting on," in other words, "put off . . . and put on . . . and lie not". Or they may give a reason for the exhortation, "lie not, seeing ye have put off . . . and put on". In favour of the former is the addition **σὺν τ. πρ. αὐτ.**, for if the practices had been put off at conversion the warning might seem superfluous. **ἀνακαιν.** (pres.) also points to a continuous process. Either view harmonises with Paul's theology, for he speaks of death to the old and life to the new either as ideally complete in the moment of conversion or as realised gradually in actual experience. But the latter, which is taken by most commentators, is preferable; for the reference is much wider than in the foregoing words. They refer only to the discarding of vices. Paul now emphasises the positive side also, the putting on the new as well as casting off the old.—**τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον**: *i.e.*, the old non-Christian self (*cf.* Rom. vi. 6, Eph. iv. 22).—**πράξεσιν**: "practices," such as those already enumerated.

Ver. 10. **τὸν νέον.** In Eph. iv. 24 we have **καινός**, "fresh" (as opposed to "worn out"); **νέος** is new as opposed to old. The idea contained in **κ.** is here expressed by **ἀνακ.** Some (including Sod.) regard "the new man" as Christ, according to which "the old man" will be Adam. But this is negatived by the next verse, for if the new man is Christ, **Χριστός** would be a strange tautology. **κτίσ.** is also against it, though we have **μορφωθῇ Χ.**, Gal. iv. 19. It is the regenerate self, regenerate, of course, because united with Christ.—**ἀνακαινούμενον**: "being renewed," the present expressing the continuous process of renewal (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16). There is no reference to a restoration to a former state.—**εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν**: not to be connected (as by Mey. and Hofm.) with **κατ' εἰκόνα**, which would give a strange and obscure thought, but to be taken as the object of the renewal. The knowledge is ethical rather than theoretical in this connexion.—**κατ' εἰκόνα**: to be taken with **ἀνακαιν.** There is a clear allusion to Gen. i. 26-28, the new self grows to be more and more the image of God. There may perhaps be a side reference to "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil" in **εἰς ἐπίγ.**—**τοῦ κτίσαντος**: *i.e.*, God, not (as Chrys. and others) Christ. Some take **κατ' εἰκ. τ. κτ. α.** to mean "according to Christ". It is true that Christ is the image of God, but the parallel **κατὰ Θεὸν**, in Eph. iv. 24, makes this improbable, and we should have expected the article before **εἰκ.**

Ver. 11. *Cf.* Gal. iii. 28. He has been speaking of sins inconsistent with brotherly love, anger and falsehood. Such sins are incompatible with Christianity, which has abolished even those deep distinctions that divided mankind into hostile camps. In the splendid sweep of the great principle, which has cancelled the most radical differences of nationality, ceremonial status, culture and social position, all minor causes of strife are necessarily included. The solvent of national, racial and even religious hate cannot be powerless before the petty strifes of a Christian church. — **ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι**: "where there cannot be". **ὅπ.** seems to refer to "the new man," not to "knowledge" or "the image". In the new man created by God all these dis-

πᾶσιν Χριστός. 12. ἐνδύσασθε οὖν ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραΰτητα, μακροθυμίαν, 13. ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων καὶ χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς, ἐάν τις πρός τινα ἔχῃ [i] μομφήν· καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος[1] ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς· 14. ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγά-

i Only here in Bib. Gk.

[1] So Ln., Tr., W.H., R.V., Ws. with ABD*FG. Χριστος: T., W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵ^ac CD^bc EKLP. Θεος: ℵ*.

tinctions vanish. ἔνι seems not to be for ἔνεστι, as used to be said, but, as Buttmann maintained, a form of ἐν. Winer-Schmiedel says "ἔνι is the older form of ἐν, and has the significance of ἔνεστιν".—Ἕλλην κ.τ.λ. The first two pairs contain opposites, in race and then in religion. For the third pair Paul cannot employ an antithesis, since Ἑλλ., the contrast to βάρ., has already been used in the sense of Gentile. He therefore adds to barbarian the Scythian as the extreme example—Scythae barbaris barbariores (Beng.)—but reverts to the method of opposition in the last pair. The order Ἑλλ. κ. Ἰουδ. is unusual, and perhaps due to the fact that he is writing to Gentiles, but in Gal. iii. 28 he is writing to Gentiles too. The usual order is resumed in περ. κ. ἀκρ. In δοῦλ. ἐλεύθ. he may have a reference to Philemon and Onesimus, but the terms occur also in the Galatian list.—πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός. This expresses the thought that Christ is all, and that He is in all the relations of life; πᾶσιν is neuter, and Χ. is placed at the end for emphasis. Since He is all, and all things are one in Him, He is the principle of unity, through whom all the distinctions that mar the oneness of mankind are done away.

Ver. 12. This verse and ver. 13 are parallel to Eph. iv. 2, 32. The ethical consequences of having put on the new man are now drawn out in detail.—ἐνδύσασθε οὖν: not since Christ has become all and in all to you (Lightf.), but since you have put on the new man.—ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ: *i.e.*, as conformity to your position as God's elect demands. The election is God's choice of them in Christ before creation (Eph. i. 4).—ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι qualify ἐκλ., and are not vocatives. ἠγ. means, as elsewhere in N.T., beloved of God; he is speaking of their position as Christians.—σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ: "a heart of compassion," the σπλ. being regarded as the seat of emotion.—χρηστότητα: almost "sweetness of disposition". It is opposed to "severity" (of God) in Rom. xi. 22.—ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραΰτητα: both virtues towards fellow-men, and quite different from ταπ. in ii. 18. Neither has reference to man's relation to God. Each is a specifically Christian virtue.

Ver. 13. χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς: "forgiving yourselves," but while the variation from ἀλλήλ. is probably intentional, the practical difference is verv slight. The thought that Christians are members one of another may underlie the choice of expression (*cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 8). It may be chosen to correspond to ὑμῖν.—μομφήν may have reference to the case of Philemon and Onesimus.—ὁ Κύριος: whether this or ὁ Χριστὸς be read the reference is to Christ. In the parallel Eph. iv. 32 we have "God in Christ," which is Paul's usual way of putting it. But that is no reason for referring Κύρ. to God, for Jesus when on earth forgave sins. The forgiveness they have received is used to enforce the duty of forgiving others. The best illustration is the parable in Matt. xviii. 23-25.

Ver. 14. ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην: probably "over all these," carrying on the metaphor of clothing, not "in addition to all". These virtues are manifestations of love, but may be conceivably exhibited where love is absent, so that the mention of it is not superfluous.—ὅ ἐστιν: probably "that is," though for criticism of Lightfoot's examples see Abbott. The relative cannot mean τὸ ἐνδύσασθαι τ. ἀγ., for love itself is the σύνδ. — σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. Generally σύνδ. is explained as that which binds together all the virtues. The genitive is variously interpreted. It has been taken as genitive of the object, but the objection (Luther, Ol., Haupt) that the bond binds the virtues into a unity but does not bind together the unity itself is forcible. It has also been taken as a genitive of quality, "the perfect bond," which Paul would have said if he had meant it. Ellicott regards it as a subjec-

τητι, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος. 15. καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ [h] βραβευέτω ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι· καὶ [h] εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε. 16. ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [1] ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς, [k] ὕμνοις, ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἐν τῇ [2]

[k] Only here and Eph. v. 19 (par.) in N.T.

[1] So edd. with ℵ^cBC^2DEFGL. του Θεου: R.V. mg. with AC* 17. του Κυριου: W.H. mg., R.V. mg. with ℵ* cop.

[2] So L., T., Tr., Lft., W.H. mg., Ws. with ℵ^cBD*E*FG 67**. τῃ: omitted by W.H. with ℵAKL.

tive genitive, the bond possessed by perfectness; but this seems unlikely. Again, it is explained as the bond which produces perfection in these virtues (Ol.), or as the bond which binds these virtues together and so produces Christian perfection (Sod). If, however, we do not take τελ. as an objective genitive, there is no ground for assuming that the bond is that which binds the virtues together. The function of love as a bond is to bind Christians together, and Haupt explains the word in this way. The genitive he regards as one of apposition, the bond in which perfection consists. When love binds all Christians together, the ideal of Christian perfection is attained. This gives a natural and appropriate sense, and is probably right. The view that σύνδ. is the sum total gives a sense to the word which it does not bear; nor does it suit the context.

Ver. 15. **ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: "the peace which Christ gives". It might be the peace between the members of the Church bestowed by Christ (Calv., Ol., Sod.). This suits the preceding, but not the following words so well, especially, perhaps, εὐχ. γίν.—**βραβευέτω**: "rule" (*cf.* ii. 18). The word has lost its old sense "to act as umpire," and there is no reference to a contest or a prize. The meaning is: in deciding on any course of action, let that be chosen which does not ruffle the peace within you.—**εἰς ἣν καὶ ἐκλήθητε**: *i.e.*, to the enjoyment of which ye were called.—**ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι**: "so that ye are in one body," result rather than aim being expressed. Disunion in the body is incompatible with the peace of individual members. — **καὶ εὐχάριστοι γίνεσθε**: "and become thankful," *i.e.*, to God for calling you, or more probably for the peace in your hearts, which is the main thought. εὐχ. might mean "gracious" (a rare sense), but this would not be weighty enough to end these exhortations.

Vv. 16, 17. Partially parallel to Eph. v. 19, 20.—Ver. 16. **ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: probably, as usually explained, "the Gospel," so called because He proclaimed it and speaks it through His messengers. Lightfoot interprets it as "the presence of Christ in the heart as an inward monitor". The phrase occurs only here, but *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1.—**ἐν ὑμῖν**: according to Pauline usage must mean within you, and probably not collectively (Mey., Alf., Abb.) "in you as a Church," but individually.—**ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ**: to be taken with the following words (Beng., Mey., Alf., Ell., Ol., Haupt, Abb.), since ἐνοικ. is sufficiently qualified by πλουσίως, and σοφ. suits διδάσκ. much better than ἐνοικ. The balance is better preserved, as ἐν π. σ. is then parallel to ἐν χάρ. Lightfoot meets the last point by taking ἐν χάρ. with διδάσκ., but even if this were probable the other arguments are decisive for the connexion with the following words.—**διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες**: *cf.* i. 28. Lightfoot regards the participles as used for imperatives, which Ellicott thinks impossible. There is a slight, but quite intelligible, anacoluthon here.—**ἑαυτοὺς**, as in ver. 13.—**ψαλμοῖς, ὕμνοις, ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς**: to be connected with διδ. κ. νουθ., not with ᾄδοντες (Hofm., Kl., Weiss), with which the accusative should have been used. The precise distinctions intended are not certain, and perhaps they should not be sharply drawn. The meaning is, whatever kind of song it may be, let it be made the vehicle of religious instruction and admonition. ψαλ. may be restricted to the Old Testament Psalms, but this is improbable. ὕμν. are songs of praise to God. ᾠδ. has a wider sense, and was used of any class of song. Hence πν. is added to it, and not to the others, for ψαλ. is used exclusively and ὕμν. usually in a religious sense. The word of Christ is to dwell in them so richly that it finds spontaneous expression in religious song

χάριτι ᾄδοντες ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν τῷ Θεῷ· 17. καὶ πᾶν ὅτι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ πατρὶ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ.

18. Αἱ γυναῖκες, ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὡς [l] ἀνῆκεν [m] ἐν Κυρίῳ. 19. οἱ ἄνδρες, ἀγαπᾶτε τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ μὴ [n] πικραίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς. 20. τὰ τέκνα, ὑπακούετε τοῖς γονεῦσιν κατὰ πάντα, τοῦτο γὰρ εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 21. οἱ πατέρες, μὴ [o] ἐρεθίζετε

l Only here and Eph. v. 4; Philm. 8 in N.T.
m Only in Paul, exc. Rev. xiv. 13.
n Only here and Rev. viii. 11, x. 9, 10 in N.T.
o Only here and 2 Cor. ix. 2 in N.T.

in the Christian assemblies or the home.—**ἐν τῇ χάριτι.** Not with sweetness or acceptableness (iv. 6), which does not suit **τ. Θεῷ** or the emphatic position. It may be "by the help of Divine grace," but more probably the meaning is "with thankfulness" (De W., Sod., Haupt, Abb.), on account of the reference to thankfulness in vv. 15 and 17. Thankfulness finds expression in song.—**ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις.** The reference is to the inner song of praise, which is to be the counterpart of the audible singing. What is meant is probably not singing from the heart, though *cf.* Matt. xxii. 37.

Ver. 17. **πᾶν...ἔργῳ**: a nominative absolute.—**πάντα** is governed by **ποιεῖτε** (not **ποιοῦντες**, as Sod.), supplied from **ποιῆτε**.—**εὐχαριστοῦντες.** This is not something additional to actions done in the name of Christ; but these actions are themselves expressions of thankfulness.

Ver. 18-iv. 1. ENFORCEMENT OF THE RECIPROCAL DUTIES OF WIVES AND HUSBANDS, CHILDREN AND PARENTS, SLAVES AND MASTERS, WITH FREQUENT REFERENCE TO THESE DUTIES AS INVOLVED IN THEIR DUTY TO CHRIST.—In this section the reference to the subject precedes that to the ruling parties, and the duty of obedience is emphasised to prevent false inferences from the doctrine that natural distinctions are done away in Christ. Holtzmann, Oltramare and Weiss think these precepts are added in protest against the false teachers' asceticism. The fact that we have similar, and fuller, injunctions in *Ephesians* tells against this. Eph. v. 22 *sq.* and 1 Pet. iii. 6 may be compared.—Ver. 18. **ἀνῆκεν** has been taken as a perfect in sense of present (Luther, Bleek, Ol.), a view said by Winer to be "as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible" (Winer-Moulton,[9] p. 338). Usually it is taken as an imperfect, "as was fitting," and is thought (but this is very dubious) to imply a reproach. Probably **ἐν Κυρ.** is to be joined to it, not to **ὑποτ.** (*cf.* ver. 20).

Ver. 19. **μὴ πικραίνεσθε**: *i.e.*, do not be harsh or irritable. Bengel defines **πικρία** as "odium amori mixtum," which is acute, but "odium" is too strong.

Ver. 20. **κατὰ πάντα** is omitted in Eph. vi. 1.

Ver. 21. **ἐρεθίζετε**: *i.e.*, irritate by exacting commands and perpetual fault-finding and interference for interference' sake. The consequence of such foolish exercise of authority is that the child becomes discouraged; in other words, his spirit is broken, and since what he does leads to constant blame, he loses hope of ever being able to please. "Fractus animus pestis juventutis" (Beng.).

Ver. 22. The case of slaves is treated at greater length than that of the other family relations, probably on account of Onesimus. But Paul was much possessed with the need for keeping Christianity free from the suspicion it naturally created of undermining the constitution of society. So while **δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος** is a distinction which has vanished for Christianity, in the interests of Christianity as a spiritual power social freedom had to be cheerfully foregone till the new religion was able to assert its principle with success. An instructive parallel is the exhortation to submission to constituted authority in Rom. xiii. In Paul's time slaves probably made up the larger part of the population of the empire.—**τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις**: opposed to their spiritual Lord.—**ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις**: acts of eye-service (singular in Eph. vi, 6), *i.e.*, service which is most zealous when the eye of the master or overseer is upon them. The word was perhaps coined by Paul.—**ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι.** It is the Christian's first duty to please the Lord, and this he can do only by conscientious performance of his tasks quite apart from the recognition he receives from men. If the principle of his conduct is the pleasing of men, he will neglect his duty where this motive cannot operate.—**ἁπλότητι καρδίας**: "singleness of heart," opposed to the

τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἵνα μὴ [h] ἀθυμῶσιν. 22. οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, μὴ ἐν [p] ὀφθαλμοδουλείαις,[1] ὡς [q] ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ' ἐν [r] ἁπλότητι καρδίας, φοβούμενοι τὸν Κύριον. 23. ὃ ἐὰν ποιῆτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε, ὡς τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώποις, 24. εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπὸ Κυρίου ἀπολήμψεσθε τὴν [h] ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας· τῷ Κυρίῳ Χριστῷ δουλεύετε· 25. ὁ γὰρ ἀδικῶν

p Only here and Eph. vi. 6 (par.) in class. or Bib. Gk.
q Not class. only here, Eph. vi. 6 (par.); Ps. liii. 5 in Bib. Gk.
r Only Paul in N.T.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵCKL. ὀφθαλμοδουλεια: Ln., Lft. with ABDEFG, by assimilation to Eph. vi. 5.

double-dealing of eye-service. — **τὸν Κύριον**: in significant contrast to the masters according to the flesh.

Ver. 23. Not only must the slave's work be done in the fear of the Lord, but done as if it were actually for the Lord that he was doing it, and not for a mere human master. And this principle is to govern every detail of his varied service. — **ἐκ ψυχῆς**: heartily and with good will.—**οὐκ ἀνθρώποις**: their service, Paul would say, is not to be rendered at all (**οὐκ** not **μὴ**) to their earthly master, but exclusively to Christ.

Ver. 24. However their earthly master may reward their service, there is a Master who will give them a just recompense; although they cannot receive an earthly, He will give them a heavenly inheritance.—**ἀπὸ Κυρίου**: in Eph. vi. 8 **παρὰ Κ.** The absence of the article is noteworthy. It emphasises the position rather than identifies the Person of Him who gives the reward (*cf.* the anarthrous **ἐν υἱῷ**, Heb. i. 1). Haupt thinks that there is no significance to be attached to its omission; but, as Lightfoot says, "it is studiously inserted in the context".—**ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρονομίας**: the "just recompense consisting in the inheritance". **κλ.** is a genitive of apposition.—**δουλεύετε.** This may be taken as an indicative (Lightf., Findl., Moule, Haupt) or as an imperative (Mey., Ell., Alf., Abb.). The indicative is defended on the ground that it is needed to explain who is meant by **ἀπὸ Κυρίου** (but this was surely obvious), and that the imperative seems to require **ὡς τῷ Κ.** But Lightfoot himself quotes Rom. xii. 11, where **ὡς** is absent. On the other hand the indicative gives a somewhat flat sense, and the imperative seems to yield a better connexion with ver. 25. It is best then to take it as an imperative.

Ver. 25. This verse provides the reason (**γὰρ**) for **δουλεύετε.** It is disputed whether **ὁ ἀδ.** means the master who treats his slave unjustly, or the slave who by his idleness wrongs his master. To include both (Lightf., Findl., Ol.) is highly questionable, not only because a double reference is on principle to be avoided in exegesis, but because the connexion with **δουλ.** implies that one side of the relation only is being dealt with. It is commonly thought that the verse is an encouragement to the slave, based on the assurance that the master who ill treats him will receive his recompense in due course. In favour of this **οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπ.** is urged, since it implies that they are in a social position which might influence earthly courts, but cannot mitigate the judgment of God. But while a Christian writer could dissuade from vengeance by the thought that vengeance belonged to God alone, it is not credible that Paul should console the slave or encourage him in his duty by the thought that for every wrong he received his master would have to suffer. And, as Haupt says, we should have expected **ὑμᾶς** after **ἀδικῶν** and **δὲ** instead of **γάρ.** There is also a presumption in favour of an exhortation to the slave here. If it referred to the masters it would have come more naturally after iv. 1. Nor does **προσωπ.** necessarily imply that the wrongdoer is socially more highly placed. It equally well applies to favouritism that might be expected from God on the ground of religious position. So we should interpret the verse (with Weiss and Haupt) as a warning to the Christian slave not to presume on his Christianity, so as to think that God will overlook his misdeeds or idleness.

CHAPTER IV.—Ver. 1. **ἰσότητα.** The literal meaning is "equality," and Meyer takes it so here (so Ol., Haupt), explaining not of equality conferred by emancipation, but of the treatment of the slave by his master as a brother in Christ. It may,

a Only here and Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Jas. ii. 1 in class. or Bib. Gk.
a Only here and 2 Cor. viii. 13, 14 in N.T.

κομίσεται ὃ ἠδίκησεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ᵃ προσωποληψία. IV. 1. Οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ᵃ ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, εἰδότες ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔχετε Κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ.

2. Τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε, γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, 3. προσευχόμενοι ἅμα καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου, λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[1] δι' ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι, 4. ἵνα φανερώσω αὐτὸ ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι. 5. ἐν σοφίᾳ

[1] So Ln., T., Tr., W.H., R.V. with most authorities, possibly by assimilation to Eph. iii. 4. **του Θεου**: Ws. with BL 4, 41, 238, Eth., probably under influence of ii. 2.

in spite of Oltramare's denial, mean "equity," and the combination with **δίκ.** suggests this meaning here. The master should regulate his treatment of his slave not by caprice, but by equity.—**παρέχεσθε**: "supply on your part," a dynamic middle.

Vv. 2-6. Exhortations to prayer, especially for the furtherance of the Apostle's work, to wisdom towards those without and to fitness of speech.—Vv. 2-4 partially parallel to Eph. vi. 18-20.—Ver. 2. **προσκαρτερεῖτε**: *cf.* Rom. xii. 12, Acts i. 14. Steadfastness in prayer is opposed to "fainting" in it, the best illustration being the importunate widow and the importunate friend.—**γρηγοροῦντες** may mean that they are to watch against growing weary so that the prayer becomes mechanical, or, as Soden takes it, against confused thought. But perhaps it is not so much alertness in prayer that is meant as the watchfulness which manifests itself in the form of prayer (so Hofm., Haupt). In favour of this is the use of **γρηγ.** in the religious sense for watchfulness against temptation.—**ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ**: thanksgiving is added, because it springs from the heart thankful for God's gifts, and therefore watchful against losing them.

Ver. 3. **ἡμῶν**: perhaps including all his fellow-workers, probably not Paul alone, on account of the singular (**δέδεμαι**).—**θύραν τοῦ λόγου**: *i.e.*, a removal of whatever obstructs its progress, possibly liberation from prison, to which he was looking forward (Philm. 22). For the metaphor, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12.—**λαλῆσαι**: "so as to speak," infinitive of the consequence.—**τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: the mystery which has Christ for its content. On account of his proclamation of it, and especially of the truth that the Gentiles were admitted freely to its blessings, he is now a prisoner.

Ver. 4. **ἵνα** is variously connected. The usual way is best which connects it with **ἀνοίξῃ**. This is better than going back to **προσευχ.**, while the connexion with **λαλ.** is strained. It may be taken (as Beng., Hofm., Sod.) with **δέδεμαι**, "bound in order that I may manifest," but if so why should Paul have desired liberty? Soden gives a peculiar turn to the thought. He thinks Paul is bound in order that he may manifest to his judges how he can do no other (**δεῖ** emphatic) than preach. This seems to be met by Haupt's criticism that for this we must have had **φανερώσω ὅτι δεῖ με λαλῆσαι αὐτό**.—**φανερώσω**. Soden urges in favour of his interpretation that **φαν.** is never used of Paul's preaching, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be. It is a stronger word than **λαλ.**, he wants to "make it clear".—**ὡς δεῖ με λαλῆσαι** refers to the mode of preaching, but the precise sense is uncertain. Some think it means boldly, others in a way suited to the peculiar circumstances, others in a way that shall be equal to the greatness of the message. Or, again, a reference is assumed by many to the Judaising opposition. But probably the feeling that prompts the words is that in prison his activity was curbed, and he wished to be free that he might preach the Gospel without restriction.

Ver. 5. *Cf.* Eph. v. 15. An exhortation to wise conduct in relation to non-Christians.—**τοὺς ἔξω**: those outside the Church; the reference is suggested by the mention of **θύραν τ. λόγου**. They must be wise in their relations with them so as not to give them an unfavourable impression of the Gospel.—**τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι**: "making your market fully from the occasion" (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 149). They are to seize the fitting opportunity when it occurs to do good to "those without," and thus promote the spread of the Gospel.

περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω, τὸν καιρὸν [b] ἐξαγοραζόμενοι. 6. ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι [c] ἠρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι.

7. Τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ πάντα γνωρίσει ὑμῖν Τυχικός, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἀδελφὸς καὶ πιστὸς διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος ἐν Κυρίῳ, 8. ὃν ἔπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἵνα γνῶτε [1] τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν [1] καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, 9. σὺν Ὀνησίμῳ τῷ πιστῷ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ ἀδελφῷ, ὅς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν· πάντα ὑμῖν γνωρίσουσιν τὰ [d] ὧδε.

10. Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἀρίσταρχος ὁ [e] συναιχμάλωτός μου, καὶ Μᾶρκος ὁ [f] ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα, περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς, (ἐὰν ἔλθῃ

b Only here and Eph. v. 16 (par.); Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5 in N.T.
c Only here and Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34 in N.T.
d Only here and 1 Cor. iv. 2 in Paul.
e Only here and Rom. xvi. 7; Philm. 23 in class. or Bib. Gk.
f Only here in N.T.

[1] So edd. with ABD*GP. γνω. . . . υμων: ℵcCDbcEKL; γνωτε . . . υμων: ℵ*, but corrected to γνωτε . . . ημων by ℵc, who re-corrected into γνω. . . . υμων.

Ver. 6. **ἐν χάριτι**: probably "gracious," "pleasant" is the meaning; by the sweetness and courtesy of their conversation they are to impress favourably the heathen. Some (most recently Haupt) think Divine grace is meant, but this does not suit **ἅλατι** so well.—**ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος.** In classical writers "salt" expressed the wit with which conversation was flavoured. Here wisdom is probably meant on account of **εἰδέναι.** There may be the secondary meaning of wholesome, derived from the function of salt to preserve from corruption.—**εἰδέναι**: "so as to know".—**πῶς κ.τ.λ.**: they must strive to cultivate the gift of pleasant and wise conversation, so that they may be able to speak appropriately to each individual (with his peculiar needs) with whom they come in contact.

Vv. 7-18. COMMENDATION OF THE BEARERS OF THE LETTER, WITH SALUTATIONS FROM HIS FELLOW-WORKERS AND HIMSELF.—Vv. 7, 8 parallel to Eph. vi. 21, 22.—Ver. 7. **Τυχικός** is mentioned in Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, Tit. iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 12. He belonged to the province of Asia, and was sent at this time not only with this letter but with the Epistle to the Ephesians.—**ἀδελφὸς** is usually taken to express his relation to the members of the Church, though Haupt thinks it means Paul's brother.—**πιστὸς διάκονος**: "faithful minister," probably to Paul, not to Christ. **πισ.** goes also with **σύνδουλος,** and since this expresses a relation to Paul it is probable that **διάκ.** does so too.—**ἐν Κυρίῳ**: to be taken with all three nouns on account of the single article.

Ver. 8. **ἔπεμψα**: "I am sending" (epistolary aorist).—**γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν.** This is not only the better attested reading but yields the better sense, because both before (ver. 7) and after (ver. 9) Paul says that Tychicus will acquaint them with matters at Rome. He wishes to relieve the anxiety of the Colossians as to his welfare.—**παρακαλέσῃ**: see on ii. 2. This function is not ascribed to Onesimus, who was not a **σύνδουλος.**

Ver. 9. **Ὀνησίμῳ.** Philemon's runaway slave, who was rescued by Paul and converted to Christianity. Paul sent him back to his master, with the exquisite Epistle to Philemon despatched at the same time as this letter. He speaks of him in the most affectionate terms, to secure a welcome for him at Colossæ. He seems from this passage to have belonged to Colossæ, and we may infer that this was the home of Philemon. If the author of Colossians learnt his name from the Epistle to Philemon, it is strange that he should have contented himself with this bald reference, and made no allusion to his desertion, conversion and return to his master. Such omission here is characteristic of Paul's delicacy.—**τὰ ὧδε** is wider than **τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ** (ver. 7). It means all that is happening to the Church in Rome.

Ver. 10. **Ἀρίσταρχος**: a native of Thessalonica, mentioned in Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, xxvii. 2, Philm. 24. In Philm. Epaphras is mentioned as Paul's fellow-prisoner. Fritzsche suggested that his friends took turns in voluntarily sharing his captivity, and explained the difference between the two Epistles in this way. The divergence between the two Epistles testifies to authenticity, for an imitator would not have created a difficulty of

πρὸς ὑμᾶς δέξασθε αὐτόν,) 11. καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰοῦστος, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς οὗτοι μόνοι συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἵτινες ἐγενήθησάν μοι [f] παρηγορία. 12. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν, δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, πάντοτε ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, ἵνα σταθῆτε [1] τέλειοι καὶ πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ. 13. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅτι ἔχει πολὺν [g] πόνον ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει. 14.

g Only here and Rev. xvi. 10, 11, xxi. 4 in N.T.

[1] So T., Tr., W.H., Ws. with ℵ*B 23, 71. στητε: Ln., R.V. with ℵcACDGKLP.

this kind. Μᾶρκος (so accented by Blass and Haupt, who refers to Dittenberger in confirmation), the cousin (ἀνεψιὸς) of Barnabas, who may by this time have been dead. He is no doubt the John Mark of the Acts and the evangelist.—ἐλάβετε ἐντολάς. We do not know what these commands were. ἐλάβ. cannot be an epistolary aorist (2nd person), therefore the commands must have been sent previously. ἐὰν ἔλθῃ κ.τ.λ. may express the substance of them.—δέξασθε. Paul may have feared that Mark's defection from him, which led to the sharp quarrel between him and Barnabas, might prejudice the Colossians against him. The mention of his relationship to Barnabas was probably intended as a recommendation to their kindness. He seems to have been unknown to the Colossians.

Ver. 11. Ἰησοῦς: otherwise unknown to us. Zahn has well pointed out that the mention of this name, in addition to those mentioned in Philemon, creates difficulties for the impugners of the authenticity. If Philemon was authentic why should an imitator venture to add an unknown person, and especially to give him the name Jesus, that so soon became sacred among Christians? If not authentic, why should he not have copied himself?—οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς: to be taken with the following words, in spite of the awkwardness of the construction. What is meant is that these are the only ones of the circumcision who have been a help to him. If a stop is placed at περ., we get the sense that these who have just been mentioned are his only fellow-workers, which is not true. Aristarchus is probably not included, for he went as one of the deputation sent by the Gentile Christians with the collection or the Church at Jerusalem.—οὗτοι μόνοι: for the attitude of Jewish Christians in Rome towards Paul *cf.* Phil. i. 15-17, ii. 19-24. This is more natural in a letter from Rome than from Cæsarea.—βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. The phrase is intentionally chosen; the Jews were devoted to the kingdom; Paul should have found in the Jewish Christians his best helpers. —ἐγενήθησαν: the aorist seems to point to some special incident.

Ver. 12. Ἐπαφρᾶς: see on i. 7. He was either a native of Colossæ or had settled there.—δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Paul uses this term often of himself, but of no one else except here and Phil. i. 1, where he calls himself and Timothy δοῦλοι Χ. Ἰ. Meyer and Alford connect with ὁ ἐξ ὑμ., but it is better to place a comma after ὑμῶν.—πεπληροφορημένοι: see on ii. 2. Usually it is translated here "fully assured". Haupt thinks that after τέλειοι this is unsuitable. But if we translate "complete" or "filled," this is tautological, and it is not clear that τέλ. covers full assurance.—ἐν παντὶ θελήματι Θεοῦ: "in everything that God wills". Meyer and Alford connect with σταθῆτε (or as they read στῆτε), but it is better to connect with the two participles.

Ver. 13. The anxiety of Epaphras for these Churches was probably due to his connexion with them, either as founder or teacher.

Ver. 14. Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς: "Luke the physician, the beloved," no doubt to be identified with the evangelist Luke. His writings have been shown to exhibit a considerable use of medical terms. The name was originally Lucanus. He was clearly not one "of the circumcision" (ver. 11), and this, as often pointed out, seems to exclude the possibility that he wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews.—Δημᾶς: mentioned last and without commendation. This is commonly explained as due to a foreboding of Paul that he would turn out badly, suggested by the reference to him in 2 Tim. iv. 10 as having left him. But in Philm. 24 he is placed before Luke and numbered among Paul's fellow-workers.

ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, καὶ Δημᾶς. 15. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς[1] ἐκκλησίαν. 16. καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῇ, καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικίας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε. 17. καὶ εἴπατε Ἀρχίππῳ, Βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς.

18. [h] **Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. μνημονεύετέ μου τῶν δεσμῶν. ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.**

h 2 Thess iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21.

[1] So Ln., Tr. mg., W.H., R.V. mg., Ws. with B 67[2]. **αυτου**: DEFGKL; **αὐτῶν**: T., Tr., Lft., R.V. with ℵACP 17, 47.

Possibly he wrote the Epistle, and is thus mentioned last and without praise.

Ver. 15. **Νυμφαν** may be masculine (**Νυμφᾶν**) or feminine (**Νύμφαν**). The Doric form, **Νύμφαν**, is improbable; on the other hand the contracted form, **Νυμφᾶν**, is rare. If **αὐτῶν** is read, either is possible. Otherwise the decision is made by the choice between **αὐτοῦ** and **αὐτῆς**. It seems probable that **αὐτῶν** was due to change by a scribe who included **ἀδελφ.** in the reference. And a scribe might alter the feminine, assuming that a woman could not have been mentioned in this way. The attestation of **αὐτῆς** is very strong, though numerically slight. The Church in her house was a Laodicean Church, distinct apparently from the chief Church of the town.

Ver. 16. **τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικίας**: clearly a letter sent by Paul to Laodicea, which the Colossians are instructed to procure and read. It may be a lost letter, or it may be our so-called Epistle to the Ephesians, to which Marcion refers as the Epistle to the Laodiceans, and which was probably a circular letter. Weiss argues that it cannot be the Epistle to the Ephesians, for that was sent at the same time as this, and therefore Paul could not have sent salutations to Laodicea in this letter. But this is really natural, if Ephesians was a circular letter (and the absence of salutations is difficult to explain otherwise), and if this letter was to be passed on to Laodicea.

Ver. 17. Archippus may have been at Laodicea, but more probably not, for we should have expected the reference to him in ver. 15. The Church is entrusted with the duty of exhorting one of its ministers. There is no need to infer any slackness on his part.—**ἐν Κυρίῳ** is added to emphasise its importance, and the need that it should be zealously fulfilled.

Ver. 18. **τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ**: the rest of the letter would be written by an amanuensis. As he writes, his chain, fastened on his left hand, would impress itself on his notice. Hence the touching request "Remember my bonds," which may bear the special sense "remember in your prayers".—**ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν**: so without any defining addition in Eph. and 1 and 2 Tim. It is not so in the earlier letters, but neither is it so in Phil. (or Titus).

THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS LIMITED.

THE EXPOSITOR'S
GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC.

VOLUME IV.

NEW YORK

DODD, MEAD AND CO.

FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH STREET

1910

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS

BY

JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.

II

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY

AND

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS

BY

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, D.D.

III

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

BY

W. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., B.D.

IV

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

BY

MARCUS DODS, D.D.

V

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

BY

W. E. OESTERLEY, M.A., B.D.

NEW YORK
DODD, MEAD AND CO.
FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH STREET
1910

THE FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

TO THE

THESSALONIANS

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Mission to Thessalonica.*—The Christian inhabitants of Thessalonica were mainly Greeks by birth and training (i. 9, *cf.* ii. 14; Acts xiv. 15, xv. 19), who had been won over from paganism by the efforts of Paul, Silvanus (Silas), and Timotheus (Timothy), during an effective campaign which lasted for a month or two. It had opened quietly with a three weeks' mission in the local synagogue. Luke, who by this time had left the trio, enters into no details about its length or methods, adding merely that some of the Jews believed, while a host of devout Greeks and a considerable number of the leading women threw in their lot with the apostles. Luke is seldom interested in the growth or fortunes of individual churches. But, as the subsequent membership of the church, its widespread influence and fame, its inner condition, and the resentment caused by the success of the Pauline mission (continued from the house of Jason, Acts xvii. 5) all imply, a considerable interval must have elapsed before the time when the apostles were forced prematurely to quit the place. Their stay was prolonged to an extent of which Acts gives no idea; for Paul not only supported himself by working at his trade but had time to receive repeated gifts of money [1] from his friends at Philippi, a hundred miles away, as well as to engage perhaps in mission work throughout Macedonia (i. 7) if not as far west as Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19, *cf.* Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, 237 f.). Two or three months possibly may be allowed for this fruitful mission at Thessalonica.

When the local πολιτάρχαι, at the instigation of Jews who were nettled at the Christians' success, finally expelled Paul and his companions, the subsequent movements of the latter were governed by a desire to keep in touch with the inexperienced and unconsolidated Christian community which they had left behind them. The summary outline of Acts xvii. 10-15 requires to be supplemented and

[1] Probably this was one of the reasons which led to the imputation of mercenary motives (ii. 5, 9).

corrected at this point by the information of 1 Thess. ii. 17-iii. 6. According to Luke, Silas and Timotheus remained at Beroea, under orders to rejoin Paul as soon as possible. They only reached him at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5), however. Now since Timotheus, as we know from Paul, visited Thessalonica in the meantime, we must assume one of two courses. (*a*) Leaving Silas at Beroea, Timotheus hurried on to Paul at Athens, was sent back (with a letter ?) to Thessalonica, and, on his return, picked up Silas at Beroea; whereupon both joined their leader, who by this time had moved on suddenly to Corinth. This implies that the plural in iii. 1 is the *pluralis majestaticus* or *auctoris* (see on iii. 5), since Silas was not with Paul at Athens. But the possibility of that plural meaning both Paul and Silas, together with the silence of Acts, suggests (*b*) an alternative reconstruction of the history, *viz.*, that Timotheus and Silas journeyed together from Beroea to Athens, where they met Paul and were despatched thence on separate missions, Silas[1] perhaps to Philippi, Timotheus at an earlier date to Thessalonica, both rejoining Paul eventually at Corinth. In any case the natural sense of iii. 1, 2 is that Paul sent Timotheus from Athens, not (so *e.g.*, von Soden, *Studien u. Kritiken,* 1885, 291 f.) that he sent directions from Athens for his colleague to leave Beroea and betake himself to Thessalonica (*E. Bi.*, 5076, 5077).

From no church did Paul tear himself with such evident reluctance. His anxiety to get back to it was not simply due to the feeling that he must go on with the Macedonian mission, if at all possible, but to his deep affection for the local community. The Macedonian churches may almost be termed Paul's favourites. None troubled him less. None came so near to his heart. At Thessalonica the exemplary character of the Christians,[2] their rapid growth,

[1] This mission, or a mission of Silas (*cf.* iii. 5) after Timotheus to Thessalonica itself, though passed over both by Luke and Paul, must be assumed, if the statement of Acts xviii. 5 is held to be historical, since the latter passage implies that Paul was not accompanied by Silas from Athens to Corinth. The alternative is to suppose that he left Silas behind in Athens, as at Beroea. A comparison of 1 Thess. with Acts bears out the aphorism of Baronius that *epistolaris historia est optima historia;* Luke's narrative is neither clear nor complete.

[2] Renan (*S. Paul*, 135-139) praises the solid, national qualities of the Macedonians, "un peuple de paysans protestants; c'est une belle et forte race, laborieuse, sédentaire, aimant sons pays, pleine d'avenir". It was their very warmth of heart which made them at once so loyal to Paul and his gospel, and also so liable to unsettlement in view of their friends' death (iv. 15 f.). Compare the description of the Macedonian churches in von Dobschütz's *Christ. Life in the Primitive Church*, pp. 81 f.

their exceptional opportunities,[1] and their widespread reputation, moved him to a pardonable pride. But, as he learnt, they had been suffering persecution since he left, and this awakened sympathy as well as concern for its effects on their faith. Unable to return himself, he had at last sent Timotheus to them; it was the joyful tidings (iii. 6) just brought by him which prompted Paul to send off this informal letter, partly (i.) to reciprocate their warm affection, partly (ii.) to give them some fresh instructions upon their faith and conduct.

§ 2. *The First Epistle.*—This two-fold general object determines the course of the letter, which was written from Corinth[2] (Acts xviii. 11). It begins with a hearty thanksgiving for the success of the mission at Thessalonica (i. 2-10), and this naturally passes into an *apologia pro vita sua* (ii. 1-12) against the insinuations which he had heard that local outsiders were circulating vindictively against the character of the apostles. The Thessalonian church knew better than to believe such sordid calumnies! The second reason for thanksgiving is (ii. 13 f.) the church's brave endurance of hardship at the hands of their townsmen. "Would that we could be at your side! Would that we could uphold you and share the good fight! But we cannot. It is our misfortune, not our fault." Paul now gives a detailed *apologia pro absentia sua* (ii. 17 f.), which ends with praise for the staunchness of his friends during his enforced absence. The latter part of the letter (iv. 1 f.) consists of a series of shrewd, kindly injunctions for the maintenance of their position: περὶ ἁγιασμοῦ (iv. 3-8), περὶ φιλαδελφίας (9 f.) περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων (13-18), περὶ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν (v. 1-11). With a handful of precepts upon social and religious duties, and an earnest word of prayer, the epistle then closes. Its date depends on the view taken of Pauline chronology in general; that is, it may lie between 48 and

[1] "Nature has made it the capital and seaport of a rich and extensive district" (Finlay, *Byzantine Empire*, book ii., chap. i. 2). One of its great streets was part of the famous Via Egnatia, along which Paul and his companions had travelled S.W. from Philippi; thus Thessalonica was linked with the East and with the Adriatic alike (*cf.* i. 7, 8), while its position at the head of the Thermaic Gulf made it a busy trading centre for the Egean. Hence the colony of Jews with their synagogue. It was a populous, predominantly Greek town, of some military importance, with strong commercial interests throughout Macedonia (*cf.* i. 8) and even beyond. On the far horizon, south-west, the cloudy height of Mount Olympus was visible, no longer peopled by the gods, but, as Cicero put it, occupied merely by snow and ice (*cf.* i. 9).

[2] This is proved not by ἐν Ἀθήναις (iii. 1, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 8) but by the reference to Achaia in 1 Thess. i. 7, 8.

53 A.D., probably nearer the latter date than the former. The epistle itself contains no reference to any year or contemporary event, which would afford a fixed point of time. An ingenious attempt has been made by Prof. Rendel Harris (*Exp.*[5] viii. 161 f., 401 f.; *cf.* B. W. Bacon's *Introd. to N.T.*, 73 f. and his *Story of St. Paul*, 235 f.) to show that Timotheus had previously taken a letter from Paul to the church, and that the canonical epistle represents a reply to one sent from the church to Paul; the hypothesis is tenable, but the evidence is rather elusive. The use of καὶ, *e.g.*, in ii. 13, iii. 5, is not to be pressed into a proof of this: οἴδατε is not an infallible token of such a communication (= "you have admitted in your letter," which Timotheus brought), and ἀπαγγέλλετε[1] is an unsupported conjecture in i. 9.

§ 3. *The Position of the Local Church.*—The occasion and the significance of this epistle to the Christians of Thessalonica thus become fairly clear.

(*a*) Paul and his friends had left them the memory and inspiration of a Christian character. The epistle came to be written because the legacy had been disputed.

The insinuations of some local Jews and pagans[2] against Paul's character were like torches flung at an unpopular figure; they simply served to light up his grandeur. Had it not been for such attacks, at Thessalonica as at Corinth, we should not have had these passages of indignant and pathetic self-revelation in which Paul opens his very heart and soul. But this is the compensation derived by a cool and later age. At the moment the attack was more than distasteful to Paul himself. He resented it keenly on account of his converts, for his enemies and theirs were trying to strike at these inexperienced Christians through him, not by questioning his apostolic credentials but by calumniating his motives during the mission and his reasons for not returning afterwards. To discredit him was to shake their faith. To stain his character was to upset their religious standing. The passion and persistence with which he finds it needful to repudiate such misconceptions, show that he felt them to be not simply

[1] The ordinary reading gives quite a good sense: ἃ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἐχρῆν παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκούειν, ταῦτα αὐτοὶ προλαβόντες λέγουσι (Chrysostom). It is both arbitrary and fanciful of Zahn (*Einleitung*, § 13) to mould such allusions into a theory that the news had reached Asia, and that Paul was now in personal touch with envoys from the churches of Galatia, to whom he wrote Galatians before Silvanus and Timotheus rejoined him at Athens.

[2] It is unreal to confine the calumnies to the one or to the other, particularly to the pagans (so *e.g.*, von Soden, pp. 306 f.; Clemen, *Paulus*, ii. 181 f.).

a personal insult but likely to prove a serious menace to the interests of his friends at Thessalonica. The primary charge against the Christian evangelists had been treason or sedition; they were arraigned before the local authorities for setting up βασιλέα ἕτερον (Acts xvii. 6-8). But during his enforced absence (thanks to the success of this manœuvre), further charges against Paul's personal character were disseminated. He was just a sly, unscrupulous, selfish fellow! He left his dupes in the lurch! And so forth. Naturally, when he comes to write, it is the latter innuendoes which occupy his mind. The former charge is barely mentioned (ii. 12, *God's own kingdom*, *cf.* II., i. 5).

Paul's vindication of his character and conduct, which occupies most of the first part of the epistle, is psychologically apt. He was the first Christian the Thessalonians had ever seen. He and his friends practically represented the Christian faith. It had been the duty of the apostles to give not only instruction but a personal example of the new life to these converts; thus their reputation formed a real asset at Thessalonica. καὶ ὑμεῖς μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε καὶ τοῦ κυρίου.[1] If the local Christians were to lose faith in their leaders, then, with little or nothing to fall back upon, their faith in God might go (*cf.* iii. 5). It was this concern on their behalf[2] which led Paul to recall his stay among them and to go over his actions since then, with such anxious care (see notes on i. 4 f., ii. 1-11, 17 f., iii. 1-13).

(*b*) In addition to this, the Thessalonian community possessed definite παραδόσεις, in the shape of injunctions or regulations as to the faith and conduct of the Christian life (ii. 11, iv. 1, 12; *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 5, 15, iii. 6). These were authoritative regulations,[3] as the other epistles indicate (*cf. e.g.*, 1 Cor. iv. 17) which had the sanc-

[1] On the ethical function of this self-assertion, as a means of inspiration and education, see *Exp. Ti.*, x. 445 f. The young Italian patriots who died, as they had lived, confessing their faith in "God, Mazzini, and Duty," are a modern case in point. The example of τοῦ κυρίου implies that the Thessalonians were familiar with the earthly trials and temptations of Jesus.

[2] The language of ii. 1-10 must not be taken as if Paul had been blaming himself for having appeared to leave his friends in the lurch. It is not the sensitiveness of an affectionate self-reproach but the indignant repudiation of local slanders which breathes through the passage. The former would be a sadly *post factum* defence.

[3] The epistle itself (*cf.* v. 27) takes its place in the series; this verse (see note) is perfectly intelligible as it stands and need not be suspected as the interpolation of a later reader to emphasise the apostolic authority of the epistle (so Schmiedel and others), much less taken (as *e.g.*, by Baur, van der Vies, 106 f., and Schräder, *der Apostel Paulus*, 36) to discredit the entire epistle. There is no hint of any clerical organisation such as the latter theory involves.

tion of apostolic tradition, and must have been based, in some cases, upon definite sayings of Jesus. It is the Christian halacha of which the later epistles give ample if incidental proof.

This suggests a further question. To what extent do the Thessalonian epistles reveal (*c*) an acquaintance on the part of Paul and the local church with the sayings of the Lord? The evidence cannot be estimated adequately except in the light of the corroborative facts drawn from an examination of the other epistles, but it is enough to bear the general consideration in mind, that no preoccupation with the risen Christ and his return could have rendered Paul absolutely indifferent to the historical data of the life of Jesus.[1] When he told the Thessalonians that Jesus was the Christ, they could not believe without knowing something of Jesus. The wrath of God they might have reason to fear. But ὁ ῥυόμενος? Who was He to exercise this wonderful function? Where had He lived? Why had He died? Had He risen? And when was He to return? Some historical content[2] had to be put into the name Jesus, if faith was to awaken, especially in people who lived far from Palestine. The Spirit did not work in a mental vacuum, or in a hazy mist of apocalyptic threats and hopes. Hence, *a priori*, it is natural to assume that such historical allusions to the life and teaching of Jesus may be reflected in Paul's letters, as they must have been present in his preaching. This expectation is justified.

The coincidence of ii. 7 and Luke xxii. 27 is not indeed sufficient to warrant any such inference, while the different meanings of καλεῖν in ii. 12 and in the parable of Luke xiv. 15 f. (*cf.* ver. 24) prevent any hypothesis of a connection. On the other hand ii. 14-16 certainly contains a reminiscence of the logia preserved in a passage like Luke xi. 48 f. = Matt. xxiii. 32-34 (see the full discussion in Resch's *Parallel Texte*, ii. 278 f., iii. 209 f.), and, while the thought of iii. 3*b*-4 (*cf.* i. 4-6) only resembles that of Luke ix. 22-24, just as iii. 13 may be derived from an O.T. background instead of, necessarily, from synoptic logia like those of Mark viii. 38 = Matt. xvi. 27, a sentence such as that in iv. 8 distinctly echoes the saying in Luke x. 16 ("l'allusion

[1] This idea dominates von Soden's brilliant essay in *Theol. Abhandlungen C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet* (1892), pp. 113-167. More balanced estimates are to be found in Keim's *Jesus of Nazara*, i., pp. 54 f.; Titius, *der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit* (1900), pp. 10-18, and M. Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus Christus* (1904), pp. 67-99. The English reader may consult Sabatier's *Paul*, pp. 76 f., and Dr. R. J. Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles* (1892) where, as in his *Testimony of St. Paul to Christ* (1905), the shallows as well as the depths of the relevant literature are indefatigably dredged.

[2] *Cf.* Prof. Denney in *DCG*, ii. 394 f.

est d'une netteté parfaite," M. Goguel, p. 87). The well-known λόγος Κυρίου of iv. 16 f. cannot be adduced in this connection without hesitation (see note). But no possible doubt attaches to the evidence of v. 1-3. The saying of Jesus which is echoed here has been preserved in Luke xii. 39 (ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται)[1] and xxi. 34 (μή ποτε . . . ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ὡς παγίς), but the common original seems to have been in Aramaic or Hebrew (so Prof. Marshall, *Exp.*[4] ii. 73 f.), since Paul's ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδίν and Luke's ὡς παγίς must reflect a phrase like (כ)חבל, which might be rendered either as חֶבֶל (snare) or as חֵבֶל (travail), the latter echoing the well-known conception of ἀρχὴ ὠδινῶν (*cf.* Mark xiii. 8). A further echo of the primitive evangelic tradition is to be heard possibly in v. 6 (Matt. xxiv. 42), certainly in v. 13 (*cf.* Mark ix. 50). But the connection of v. 21 with the agraphon, γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, is curious rather than vital.

In the second epistle, apart from coincidences like i. 5 (= Luke xx. 35) and iii. 3 (= Matt. vi. 13), the allusions to the teaching of Jesus are less numerous, although Resch hears the echo of a logion in iii. 10 (*Paulinismus*, 409 f.), on most inadequate grounds. The apocalyptic passage, ii. 1-10, contains several striking parallels to the language of Matt. xxiv. (*cf.* H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, 55 f., 96 f.), but no literary relationship can be assumed.

(*d*) Finally, before Paul left, he arranged for a kind of informal organisation. An ordination of πρεσβύτεροι is not to be thought of, but probably the earliest converts, or at any rate those who had natural gifts, assumed an unofficial superintendence of the community, arranged for its worship and internal management, and were careful that the sick and poor and young were looked after. Otherwise, the movement might have been dissipated. Wesley, in his journal (Aug., 1763), writes: "I was more convinced than ever that the preaching like an apostle, without joining together those that are awakened, and training them up in the ways of God, is only begetting children for the murderer. How much preaching has there been for these twenty years all over Pembrokeshire! but no regular societies, no discipline, no order or connection; and the consequence is, that nine in ten of the once-awakened are now faster asleep than ever." Paul was alive to the same need. He was a practical missionary,

[1] With Luke's πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι (45) and μέθη (xxi. 34) compare the οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι of 1 Thess. v. 7. Contrast also the ἐκφυγεῖν of xxi. 36 with Paul's οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν (v. 3). The phrase *sons of light* may well have been common among the early Christians (*cf.* Abbott's *Johannine Vocabulary*, 1782-1783).

and, as these epistles show (*cf.* I., v. 12 f., II., iii. 6 f.), he knew better than to leave his young societies with nothing more than the vague memory of pious preaching. The local organisation was, as yet, primitive, but evidently it was sufficient to maintain itself and carry on the business of the church, when the guiding hand of the missionary was removed (*cf.* Clem. Rom. xlii.), though the authority of the leaders still required upon occasion the support and endorsement of the apostles (see on v. 12).

§ 4. *The Character and Setting of the Second Epistle.*—In the second and shorter epistle, after congratulating the local Christians especially on their patient faith (i. 1-4), Paul explains that the trials and troubles which called this virtue into exercise were but the prelude to a final relief and vindication at the ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (4-12). As the ardent expectation of this had, however, produced a morbid excitement in some quarters, he sets himself (ii. 1-12) to weed out such mistakes and mischiefs by reminding the church of his previous warning that the end could not come until the μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας attained its climax in a supernatural and personal embodiment of evil, which would vainly challenge the authority and provoke the interposition of the Lord. He then concludes (ii. 13-17) with an expression of confidence in them, an appeal for loyalty to his teaching, and a brief prayer on their behalf. Asking their prayers, in return, for himself, he renews his expression of confidence and interest (iii. 1-5); whereupon, with a word upon the maintenance of discipline and industry, the epistle ends (iii. 6-18).

Assuming both epistles to have come from Paul,[1] we may unhesitatingly place 2 Thess. after 1 Thess. The evidence for the opposite order, advocated by Grotius in his *Annotationes* (ii. 715 f., based on an antiquated chronology), Ewald (*Jahrb. für bibl. Wiss.* 1861, 249 f., *Sendschreiben des Paulus*, 19 f.), Laurent (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1864, pp. 497 f., *N.T. Studien*, 49 f.), and J. S. Chamberlain (*The Epp. of Paul the Apostle*, 1907, 5 f.), breaks down upon examination. It is unnatural to find a reference to II. iii. 6-16 in I. iv. 10-11; besides, as Bornemann points out (p. 495), if 2 Thess. is held to betray all the characteristics of a first letter (Ewald), what about II. ii. 15? There is no reason why such a criterion of genuineness

[1] On the hypothesis that both are post-Pauline, Baur (*Paulus*, Eng. tr., ii. 336 f., and van der Vies (*de beiden brieven aan de Th.*, 1865, pp. 128-164) argue for the priority of 2 Thess., the latter separating the two by the fall of Jerusalem; van Manen (*Onderzoek naar de Echtheid van P. tweeden Brief an die Thess.*, 1865, pp. 11-25) refutes both critics. The arguments for the canonical order are best stated by von Hofmann (365), Lünemann (160 f.), and Bornemann (492 f.) in their editions.

as that of II. iii. 17, should have occurred in the earliest of Paul's letters; in view of ii. 3, its appearance, after the composition of 1 Thess. and even of other letters, is psychologically valid. The comparative absence of allusions in 2 Thess. to 1 Thess. (*cf.* however, II. ii. 1 = I. iv. 17, etc.) is best explained by the fact that in the second letter Paul is going back to elaborate part of his original oral teaching in the light of fresh needs which had emerged since he wrote the first epistle. In this sense, and in this sense only, 2 Thess. anticipates the other letter. Finally, while I. ii. 17-iii. 6 does not absolutely exclude the possibility of a previous letter, it cannot be taken to presuppose one of the character of 2 Thess., least of all when the letter is dated from Beroea (Acts xvii. 10, Ewald and Laurent).

§ 5. *Its Authenticity.*—Since Paul Schmidt's edition (see below) and von Soden's essay (*Studien u. Kritiken*, 1885, pp. 263-310), with which the English reader may compare Jowett's proof (vol. i., pp. 4-17), it is no longer necessary to discuss the authenticity of the first epistle, or even its integrity. Almost the only passage where a marginal gloss may be reasonably conjectured to have crept into the text is ii. 16.[1] The second epistle, however, starts a real problem, both on the score of its resemblance to the first epistle and of its divergence from the style and thought of that or indeed of any other Pauline letter. Paul is still with Silvanus and Timotheus (i. 1) at Corinth (iii. 2, reff.; 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.), writing presumably not long after the despatch of the former epistle (ii. 15). Fresh information has reached him (iii. 11),[2] and his aim is to repudiate further misconceptions of his teaching upon the Last Things, as well as to steady the church amid its more recent anabaptist perils. Hence he writes in substantially the same tone and along the same lines as before; anything he has to communicate is practically a restatement of what he had already taught orally (ii. 5, 15), not a discussion of novel doubts and principles. If any change has taken place in the local situation, it has been in the

[1] The *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the epistle, if it is genuine, is his next visit to Thessalonica (Acts xx. 1, 2); most probably it was despatched before Acts xviii. 12. Corinth is the only place where we know the three men were together at this period.

[2] How, we are not told. Possibly Paul had been asked by the local leaders to exert his influence and authority against pietistic developments in the community (iii. 14). The situation demanded an explicit written message; probably no visit of Silvanus or Timotheus would have sufficed, even had they been able to leave Corinth. Spitta's theory (see below) implies that Timotheus had been in Thessalonica since 1 Thess. was written (ἔτι, ii. 5), but of this there is no evidence whatever.

direction of shifting the centre of gravity from fears about the dead to extravagant ideas entertained by the living. Hence, for one thing, the general similarity of structure and atmosphere in both epistles, and, upon the other hand, the sharper emphasis in the second upon Paul's authority.

Both features have raised widespread suspicion and elicited a variety of reconstructions of the epistle's date and object (*cf. Historical New Testament*, 142-146). The common ground of all such theories is the postulate that 2 Thess. is the work of a later Paulinist, during the age of Nero or of Trajan, who has employed 1 Thess. in order to produce a restatement of early Christian eschatology, under the aegis of the apostle, or to claim Paul's sanction for an onslaught upon Gnostic views. This is a fair hypothesis, which at first sight seems to account adequately for several of the variations and resemblances between the two writings. When it is worked out in detail, however, it becomes rather less convincing. Some chastening facts emerge. Why, *e.g.*, should such a writer fix on 1 Thess., and laboriously work on it? Then (i.) one serious preliminary obstacle is that while pseudonymous epistles addressed ostensibly to individuals (*e.g.*, the pastorals) or to Christendom in general (*e.g.*, 2 Peter) are intelligible enough, the issue of such an epistle, addressed to a definite church which had already a genuine letter of the apostle, involves very serious difficulties. These are not eased by the light-hearted explanation (so Schmiedel and Wrede[1]) that the epistle was really meant not for Thessalonica at all, but for some other community! This is to buttress one hypothesis by another. Furthermore (ii.) the style and vocabulary offer no decisive proof of a post-Pauline origin. *Of* the **ἅπαξ εὑρημένα**, which are comparatively few, one or two, like **ἀποστασία** (ii. 3), **δίκη** (= punishment, i. 9, *cf.* Sap. xviii. 11, etc. Jude 7), **ἐνδοξάζομαι** (i. 10, 12), **ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι** (i. 4 Pss.), **τίνω** (i. 9), **περιεργάζομαι** (iii. 2, *cf.* Sir. iii. 23), **σέβασμα** (ii. 4, *cf.* Sap. xiv. 20), and **σημειοῦσθαι** (iii. 14), may be fairly ascribed to the influence of the LXX[2] upon

[1] In pp. 38 f. of his able pamphlet on *Die Echtheit des zweiten Th.* (1903). Wrede knocks on the head (pp. 96 f.) the earlier theories (best represented by Schmiedel) which dated the epistle in the seventh decade of the first century, but he does not succeed better than Holtzmann or Hollmann in presenting any very satisfactory theory of its origin *c.* 100 A.D. His essay is carefully reviewed by Wernle (*Gött. Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1905, 347 f.), who adheres to the Pauline authorship, as does Clemen (*Paulus*, i., pp. 115-122). Klöpper's article in defence of the epistle against the older attacks (*Theol. Studien u. Skizzen aus Ostpreussen*, 1889, viii., pp. 73-140) is almost as difficult to read as it is to refute.

[2] The absence of any explicit quotation from the LXX only throws into relief the extent to which, especially in i. 5 f., O.T. language and ideas have been woven into the tissue of the epistle (Acts xvii. 2, 3, **ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν**).

the writer's mind. Similarly with εἵλατο (ii. 13) and ἰσχύς (i. 9). The occurrence of ἐπιφάνεια (ii. 8), elsewhere only in the pastorals, is certainly striking, and were there more of these words, the case for a later date would be reinforced. But there are not. Besides, the construction of ἐπιφ. here is different from those which occur in the pastorals, and the latter are as likely to have copied 2 Thess. as *vice-versa*, if any literary relationship has to be assumed. The vocabulary thus, as is generally recognised, permits of no more than a *non liquet* verdict. The style, upon the whole, has quite a Pauline ring about it; and, while this may be due to imitation, it would be uncritical to assume this result without examining (iii.) the internal relation of the two epistles. It is on this aspect of the problem that recent critics are content to rest their case (so *e.g.*, Wrede, 3-36, H. J. Holtzmann, in *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1901, 97-108, and Hollmann, *ibid.*, 1904, 28-38). The so-called (*a*) discrepancies need not detain us long. The different reasons given by Paul for having supported himself (*cf.* on I. ii. 9; II. iii. 7) are not contradictory but correlative; both are psychologically credible, as expressions of a single experience. Greater difficulty attaches to the apparent change of front towards the second advent. In I. v. 2, the advent is unexpected and sudden;[1] in II. ii. 3 f., it is the climax of a development. But this discrepancy, such as it is (*cf.* on I. v. 3), attaches to almost all the early Christian views of the end; to be instantaneous and to be heralded by a historical prelude were traits of the End which were left side by side not only by Jesus (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 3 f., 23 f., 32 f.)[2] but by later prophets (*cf.* Rev. iii. 3 = vi. 1 f.). In any case, Paul was more concerned about the practical religious needs of his readers than about any strict or verbal consistency in a region of thought where Christian expectation, like the Jewish tradition to which it generally went back, was as yet far from being homogeneous or definite. The inconsistencies of the two Thessalonian epistles are at least as capable of explanation when they are taken to be variations of one man's mind at slightly different periods as when they are

[1] Not simply for unbelievers, but for Christians. It is hardly fair to explain the difference between the two epis.les by confining the suddenness of the advent to the former. Hollmann is right in maintaining this against Jülicher and others, but the pseudonymity of 2 Thess. is by no means a necessary inference from it (see note on v. 3).

[2] This argument is not affected by the recognition of a small synoptic apocalypse in this chapter; even so, the primitive and genuine tradition of the words of Jesus on the end presents the same combination as the Thessalonian letters show. On the general attitude of Paul to the political and retributory elements in the current or traditional apocalyptic, *cf.* Titıus, *der Paulinisimus* (1900), pp. 47 f.

held to denote the revision and correction of Paul's ideas by a later writer who had to reconcile the apparent postponement of the Advent with the primitive hope. This Baur himself is forward to admit (*Paulus*, Eng. Tr., ii. 93). "It is perfectly conceivable that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the παρουσία as the two epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." This verdict really gives the case away. Such variations are hardly conceivable if both epistles emanated from a later writer, but they are intelligible, if Paul, living in the first flush and rush of the early Christian hope is held to be responsible for them. (*b*) The numerous and detailed similarities between the two epistles might be explained by the hypothesis that Paul read over a copy of 1 Thess. before writing 2 Thess., or that his mind was working still along the lines of thought voiced in the former epistle, when he came to write the latter. The first hypothesis is not to be dismissed lightly. The second can be illustrated from any correspondence. It is true that apart from ii. 1-12 the fresh material of 2 Thess. consists mainly in i. 5-12, ii. 15, iii. 2, 13, 14 f., and that there is throughout the letter a certain poverty of expression, a comparative absence of originality, a stiffness in parts, and a stereotyped adherence to certain forms.[1] But in the treatment of a subject like this it was inevitable that some phrases of self-repetition should recur, *e.g.*, the θλῖψις-group (i. 4-6), the πίστις-group (i. 4, 10, 11, ii. 11-13, iii. 2, 3), ἐργάζεσθαι, etc. Parts of the letter are unlike Paul. That is practically all we can say. But parts are fairly characteristic of him, and these not only outweigh the others, but dovetail into the corresponding data of 1 Thess. Such incidental agreements are too natural and too numerous to be the artificial mosaic of a later writer.

The internal evidence of ii. 3-12 is no longer adduced as a crucial proof of the un-Pauline origin of 2 Thess. Indeed most recent critics have given up this argument as primary. Fresh investigations into the origins of gnosticism and of the semi-political variations in primitive eschatology have undermined the older hypothesis which relegated this prophecy to the latter part of the first or the opening part of the second century, and it is only necessary to determine which of the possible reconstructions is most suitable to the age of Paul himself. On the whole, no solution of the apocalyptic prophecy

[1] The severer tone (iii. 6-15), as well as the more official tinge, of the letter were as necessary now for the Thessalonians as they were soon to be for the Corinthians (1 Cor. iv. 21, v. 3-5).

in ii. 3 f. fits in with the data so well as the early theory that ὁ κατέχων and τὸ κατέχον denote, not the episcopate as a restraint against gnosticism (Hilgenfeld and others), but the Emperor and imperial power of Rome ("quis nisi Romanus status?" Tertullian, *de Resurr.*, xxiv.). Paul had ample experience of the protection afforded by the polity of the empire against the malevolence of the Jews, and he apparently anticipated that this would continue for a time, until the empire fell. But how could the fall of the empire be expected? The answer lies not so much in any contemporary feelings of panic and dismay, as in the eschatological tradition, derived from a study of Daniel, which was evidently becoming current in certain Jewish and early Christian circles, that the empire represented the penultimate stage in the world's history. "And when Rome falls, the world." Hence the tone of reserve and cryptic ambiguity with which Paul speaks of its collapse, "ne calumniam incurreret, quod Romano imperio male optauerit, cum speraretur aeternum" (Aug., *Civ. Dei.*, xx.; so Jerome on 2 Thess. ii. 6). The idea of Rome's downfall could not be spoken of, or at least written about, openly. All that a Christian prophet could do was to hint that this future Deceiver or pseudo-Messiah would prove too strong even for the Restraining Empire, and that King Jesus would ultimately intervene to meet and to defeat him. An entire change came over the spirit of the dream, when, nearly half a century later the imperial cultus in Asia Minor stirred the prophet John to denounce Rome as the supreme antagonist of God. The empire, on this view, was no providential restraint on τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας, but was herself μυστήριον (Rev. xvii. 5), loathsome and dangerous and doomed. This altered prospect lay far beyond the horizon of Paul. The imperial worship had not yet become formidable, and to him the empire, with its administrative justice, stood for a welcome, even though a temporary, barrier against the antagonistic forces of Judaism. The kingdom of God was not the opponent of the empire, but simply the final conqueror of a foe who would prove too strong even for the restraining control of Roman civilisation.

This interpretation of the restraining power[1] implies that the supernatural antagonist issues from Judaism (so especially Weiss, *N.T. Theologie*, § 63). Here again patristric tradition seems to cor-

[1] *Cf.* Neumann's *Hippolytus von Rom* (Leipzig, 1902), pp. 4 f. The κατέχων is not to be associated with any special emperor, not even with Claudius, whose name has a curious resemblance to it. The theories which identify the Restrainer with Vespasian (as a check on Nero Redivivus), Antichrist, or Domitian, depend on *a priori* conceptions of the epistle's origin and aim.

roborate it. Both Irenæus (*adv. Haer.*, v. 25, i. 30, 2) and Hippolytus (*de Antichristo*, vi., xiv.) expressly state that antichrist is to be of Jewish descent, and the later echoes of the tradition are as pronounced (*cf.* Bousset's *Antichrist*, pp. 24 f., 127 f., 182 f.; *E. Bi.*, 179 f.).[1] Antichrist is to set up his kingdom in Judah; his reign is from Jerusalem, and the Jews are the dupes of his miraculous influence.[2] The ἀποστασία, which Paul anticipates, implies a relationship to God which could not be postulated of Christians, much less of pagans in general who, *ex hypothesis*, "knew not God" (i. 8). The only deliberate anti-Christian movement, which Paul and his friends had already experienced (ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται), was Jewish fanaticism; its professed zeal for the Law was really ἀνομία, as the apostle puts it with a touch of scathing irony.

Paul is plainly operating with a Beliar(l)-saga[3] in this passage. If one could only be certain that Sibyll. iii. 63-73 represented a pre-Christian Jewish fragment, as its context indicates, or that any Christian interpolations were confined to minor phrases like ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν, we should have one clear trace of this saga. Belial there works many signs (as in Sibyll. ii. 37, καὶ βελίαρ θ' ἥξει καὶ σήματα πολλὰ ποιήσει ἀνθρώποις), seduces many even of elect believers within Judaism (πολλοὺς πλανήσει, πιστούς τ' ἐκλεκτούς θ' Ἑβραίους, ἀνόμους τε καὶ ἄλλους ἀνέρας, οἵτινες οὔπω Θεοῦ λόγον εἰσήκουσαν), and is finally burned up, together with his adherents. The suspicions of this passage's Jewish character seem unjustified; it may be taken, without much hesitation, as one reflection of the tradition which was in

[1] Bousset often exaggerates the independence of patristic eschatological tradition; he fails to allow enough for the luxuriant fancies of a later age, which applied the N.T. text arbitrarily to contemporary life. But on this point the evidence is fairly decisive, *viz.*, that the early fathers were not merely building on the text of 2 Thess. ii. 3-6, when they spoke of Antichrist being a seducer whose false worship was set up within a reconstructed temple at Jerusalem.

[2] Professor Warfield (*Expos.*[3] iv. 40 f.) regards the Jewish state as the divine restraint upon the revelation of Rome's self-deification. This view is more sensible than that of the Restrainer as Christianity or the church (*cf.* Reimpell, *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1887, 711-736), but it is difficult to see how Judaism could be said to impose any check upon the imperial cultus; besides, is it likely that Paul would have subtly combined a polemic against the obstinate antagonism of the Jews with a theory of their unconscious protective services to the church?

[3] See R. H. Charles' edition of *Ascensio Isaiae* (pp. lxii.-lxiii.) and M. Friedländer's *Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu* (1905, pp. 50 f.). This would be corroborated if Beliar were shown to be, as the latter writer argues (in his *Der Antichrist*, 1901), a pre-Christian embodiment of the Jewish antinomian sect מינים. For a possible source of such traditions in Paul's case *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 8.

Paul's mind when he wrote 2 Thess. ii. 2 f. Belial is not indeed named here, as he is in 2 Cor. vi. 15. But he is the opponent of Jesus the true messiah. He appears in human form (*cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 2: "Beliar the great ruler, the king of this world will descend . . . in the likeness of a man, a lawless king") as the arch-emissary or agent of Satan. The latter, whom Paul here as elsewhere (in consonance with Jewish tradition) keeps in the background, is the supreme opponent of God; but as God's representative is the Lord Jesus Christ, so Satan's active representative is this mysterious figure, whose methods are a caricature of the true messiah's (see notes below on the passage). This is borne out by the contemporary sense of **Βελίαλ** as **ἄγγελος τῆς ἀνομίας** (*Asc. Isa.*, ii. 4, etc.) or **ἀνομία** (**ἀποστασία**) in LXX. The man of lawlessness, whom Paul predicts, is thus one of whom Belial is a prototype. Only, the apostle fuses this **παράνομος** with the false messiah, originally a different figure, who is represented as the incarnation of Satan, the devil in human embodiment. That he expected this mysterious opponent to rise within Judaism is not surprising under the circumstances. He was in no mood, at this moment of tension, to think hopefully of the Jews. They were a perpetual obstacle and annoyance to him, **ἄτοποι καὶ πονηροί**. He had already denounced them as **θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων** (I., ii. 15), and from this it was but a step to the position, suggested by the tradition perhaps, that their repudiation of God's final revelation in Jesus would culminate in an **ἀποστασία**, which welcomed the last rival of Jesus as God's messiah. His prophecy thus embodies a retort.[1] "You Jews hate and persecute us as apostates from God; you denounce our Jesus as a false messiah. But the

[1] In Dan. viii. 23 f. when the cup of Israel's guilt is full (**πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν**), the climax of their punishment came in the person of Antiochus Epiphanes, the presumptuous (**ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ὑψωθήσεται**, *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 4) and astute (**τὸ ψεῦδος ἐν χερσὶν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ δόλῳ ἀφανιεῖ πολλούς**, *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 9, 11). Paul, like the rest of the early Christians, still looked for some immediate fulfilment of this prophecy. In the contemporary malevolence of the Jews towards the gospel he saw a sign of its realisation, as the allusion in 1 Thess. ii. 16 (**εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας**) indicates. The penal consequence of this attitude must have also formed part of his oral teaching at Thessalonica, but he does not mention it till local circumstances drew from him a reminder of the final Deluder who must soon come (2 Thess. ii. 3 f.). It is important to notice this underlying tradition, or application of tradition, in the apostle's mind, on account of its bearing upon the general harmony of the eschatology in the two epistles. Furthermore, since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, the book of Daniel had made self-deification a note of the final enemy. Any vivid expectation of the End, such as that cherished by a Jewish Christian of Paul's temperament, instinctively seized upon this trait of the false messiah.

false messiah will come from you, and his career will be short-lived at the hands of our Christ." To the Christian the prophecy brought an assurance that, while the coldest and darkest hour must precede the dawn, the dawn was sure to come, and to come soon. Thus in both epistles, but particularly in the second, the reader can see the torch of apocalyptic enthusiasm, streaming out with smoke as well as with red flame, which many early Christians employed to light up their path amid the dark providences of the age. Paul is prophesying—none the less vividly that he does so ἐκ μέρους.

Attempts have also been made, from various sides, to solve the literary problem of the writing by finding in it (*a*) either a Pauline nucleus which has been worked over, (*b*) or a Pauline letter which has either suffered interpolation or (*c*) incorporated some earlier apocalyptic fragment, possibly of Jewish origin. (*a*) According to Paul Schmidt (*Der erste Thess. nebst einem Excurs über den zweiten gleichn. Brief*, 1885, pp. 111 f.), a Paulinist in 69 A.D. edited and expanded a genuine letter = i. 1-4, ii. 1-2*a*, ii. 13-iii. 18. But, apart from other reasons, the passages assigned to Paul are not free from the very feature which Schmidt considers fatal to the others, *viz.*, similarity to 1 Thess. And the similarities between ii. 3-12 and the apocalypse of John are very slight. The activity assigned to the editor is too restricted; besides, ii. 3-12 is so cardinal a feature of the epistle, that the latter stands or falls with it—so much so that it would be easier, with Hausrath, to view the whole writing as a scaffolding which rose round the original Pauline nucleus of ii. 1-12. Finally, the literary criteria do not bear out the distinction postulated by both theories. (*b*) The strongly retributive cast, the liturgical swing, and the O.T. colouring, of i. 6-10 have suggested the possibility of interpolation in this passage (McGiffert, *E. Bi.*, 5054, Findlay, p. lvii.), either as a whole or in part. This is at any rate more credible than the older idea that ii. 1-12 embodies a Montanist interpolation (J. E. C. Schmidt, *Bibliothek für Kritik u. Exegese der N.T.*, 1801, 385 f.) or ii. 1-9 a piece of Jewish Christian apocalyptic (Michelsen, *Theol., Tijdschrift*, 1876, 213 f.). Finally (*c*) the large amount of common ground between the Jewish and the primitive Christian conceptions of eschatology is enough (see on ii. 5) to invalidate Spitta's lonely theory (*Offenbarung des Joh.*, 497 f., and *Zur Gesch. und Litt. des Urchristentums*, i. 139 f.) of a Caligula-apocalypse, due in part to Timotheus,[1] in ii. 2-12, or the idea of Pierson

[1] *Cf.* Prof. G. G. Findlay's refutation in *Expos.*[6] ii. 255 f., and Bornemann's paragraphs (pp. 492, 529 f.).

and Naber (*Verisimilia*, 1886, 21 f.) that a pre-Christian apocalypse (i. 5-10, ii. 1-12, iii. 1-6, 14, 15) has been worked up by the unknown Paul of the second century whom the Holland critics find so prolific and indispensable.

The second epistle is inferior, in depth and reach, to the first, whatever view be taken of its origin, but both are especially valuable as indications of the personal tie between Paul and his churches, and as samples of the new literary form which the religious needs of early Christianity created in the epistle. Dryden has hit this off in his well-known lines upon the apostles and their communities :—

> As charity grew cold or faction hot,
> Or long neglect their lessons had forgot,
> For all their wants they wisely did provide,
> And preaching by epistles was supplied.
> So great physicians cannot all attend,
> But some they visit and to some they send.
> Yet all those letters were not sent to all,
> Nor first intended, but occasional—
> Their absent sermons.

The Thessalonian epistles were written to supply the lack of further personal intercourse and to supplement instruction already given. They were not treatises designed to convey the original teaching of the apostles ; they imply that, and they apply it along special lines, but they are not protocols of doctrine (*cf.* note on 1 Thess. iv. 4). At the same time, "occasional" must not be taken to mean casual or off-hand. Paul dictated with some care. His ideas are not impromptu notions, nor are they thrown out off-hand; they represent a prolonged period of thought and of experience. Even these, the least formal of his letters, though written for the moment's need, reflect a background of wide range and fairly matured beliefs. Nevertheless, they are hardly "absent sermons". "Letters mingle souls," as Donne remarked, and 1 Thessalonians in particular is the unpremeditated outpouring of a strong man's tender, firm, and wise affection for people whom he bore upon his very heart. It is the earliest of Paul's extant letters, and it delivers the simpler truths of the Christian faith to us with all the dew and the bloom of a personal experience which not only enjoined them but lived to impart them. Both epistles show, as Jowett puts it, how Paul was "ever feeling, if haply he may find them, after the hearts of men". "He is not a bishop administering a regular system, but a person dealing with other persons out of the fulness of his own mind and nature. . . . If they live, he lives; time and distance never snap the cord of

sympathy. His government of them is a sort of communion with them; a receiving of their feelings and a pouring forth of his own."

§ 6. *External Evidence, Text, and Literature of both Epistles.*— As both epistles are included not only in the Muratorian canon but in Marcion's strictly Pauline collection (Tert. *adv. Marc.* v. 15; Epiph., *Haer.* xlii. 9), they must have been known and circulated by the first quarter of the second century, although quotations (mainly of the eschatological sections) do not emerge till Irenæus and Tertullian. Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen used them, and other evidence of their existence will be found in any text book of the N.T. Canon. But the so-called allusions to 1 Thess. in the earlier apostolic fathers are, for the most part, scanty and vague; *e.g.*, of i. 5 and iv. 2 in Clem., Rom. xlii. 3. Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 9, 10 (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν αὐτοῖς) might go back to Mark as easily as to Paul (*cf.* on v. 13), though there is a similarity of context, while the general correspondence of outline between iv. 14-16 and Did. xvi. 6 (revelation of the Lord, trumpet, resurrection) may imply no more than a common use of tradition, if not of Matt. xxiv. The use of the epistle in the correspondence of Ignatius is probable, but far from certain; *e.g.*, i. 6 in Eph. x. 3 (μιμηταὶ δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου σπουδάζωμεν εἶναι, different context); ii. 4 in Rom. ii. 1 (οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀνθρωπαρεσκῆσαι, ἀλλὰ Θεῷ), and v. 17 in Eph. x. 1 (ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε, *si vera lectio*). There is but one parallel in Barnabas, iv. 9 = Barn. xxi. 6 (γένεσθε δὲ θεοδίδακτοι, different context). This scarcity of allusions is not surprising. The comparative lack of doctrinal interest in the first epistle, and its personal, intimate contents, would prevent it from being so often read and cited as the other Pauline letters. The second epistle, however, was evidently known to Justin Martyr (*Dial.* xxxii., cx., cxvi.) as well as to Polycarp who not only alludes to iii. 15 (in xi. 4, "et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis") but misquotes i. 4 (in quibus laborauit beatus Paulus, qui estis in principio epistulae eius, de uobis enim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis) as if it were addressed to the Philippians (*cf.* Wrede, 92 f.); and such data prove the circulation of 1 Thess. as well. The echoes of 2 Thess. in Barnabas (2 Thess. ii. 6 = Barn. xviii. 2; ii. 8, 12 = xv. 5) indicate rather more than a common basis of oral tradition (so Rauch in *Zeitschrift für die Wissensch. Theologie*, 1895, 458 f.), and, like the apocalypse of John, it appears to have been circulated in Gaul before the end of the second century (*cf.* letter from churches of Lyons and Vienne, Eus. *H. E.*, v. 1).

The text printed in this edition agrees generally with that of most critical editors. To save space, all textual notes have been cut out,

except where a variant reading bears directly on the exposition, or possesses some independent interest. Since Alford published his edition, the chief foreign commentaries have been those of von Hofmann (1869), Reuss (1878-9), Lünemann (Eng. tr., 1880) and Bornemann (1894) in Meyer's series, Schäfer (1890), Zöckler (1894), Zimmer's *Theologischer Commentar* (1891), Schmiedel (*Hand Commentar*, second edition, 1892, incisive and thorough), S. Goebel (second edition, 1897), B. Weiss (second edition, 1902), Wohlenberg (in Zahn's *Kommentar*, 1903; sec. ed. 1908), and Lueken (in *Die Schriften des N.T.*, 1905); in English, those of Eadie (1877), Alexander (*Speaker's Comm.*, 1881), Dr. Marcus Dods (*Schaff's Comm.*, iii., 1882), Dr. John Hutchinson (1884), Dr. J. Drummond (*Internat. Hdbk. to N.T.*, ii., 1899), and Dr. Adeney (*Century Bible*, n. d.), with three recent and able editions of the Greek text by Lightfoot (*Notes on Epp. of St. Paul*, 1895, pp. 1-92), Prof. G. G. Findlay (*Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1904), and Dr. G. Milligan (1908). Of the older works, the editions of L. Pelt (1830), H. O. Schott (1834), and A. Koch (on the first epistle, second edition, Berlin, 1855), in German, together with those of Ellicott (fourth edition, 1880) and Jowett (third edition, 1894), deserve special notice. Dr. Denney's terse exposition (*Expositor's Bible*, 1892), Lightfoot's essay (*Biblical Essays*, 251-269), and E. H. Askwith's *Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles* (1902), together with the articles of Lock (Hastings' *D.B.*, iv. 743-749) and A. C. McGiffert (*E. Bi.*, 5036-5046), and Dr. W. Gunion Rutherford's translation (1908), will furnish the English student with all necessary material for a general study of the epistles. Zimmer's monograph (*Der Text der Thess. Briefe*, 1893) and article on 2 Thess. (*Zeits. f. wiss. Theol.*, xxxi. 322-342) give a competent survey of the textual data.

The abbreviations are for the most part familiar and obvious; *e.g.*, Blass = *Neutest. Grammatik*, Burton = *Moods and Tenses* (1894), Deissmann = D.'s *Bible Studies* (Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1901), DCG = Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (1907-1908), *E. Bi.* = *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Field = *Otium Norvicense*, part iii. (1899), Moulton = J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, vol. i. (1906), Viteau = Viteau's *Étude sur le grec du N.T.* (1893, 1896), Win. = Schmiedel's edition of G. B. Winer's *Grammatik* (Göttingen, 1894 f.). With regard to the references to Sap. (*i.e.*, The Wisdom of Solomon), it must be remembered that Paul in all likelihood knew this writing at first hand.

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Α̅.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ [a] Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν [b] Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· [c] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη.

2. [d] Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ [e] πάντοτε περὶ [e] πάντων ὑμῶν, [f] μνείαν ποιούμενοι [f] ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν 3. [g] ἀδιαλείπτως, μνημονεύ-

a Cf. on 2 Cor. i. 19.
b On absence of article, see Blass, §§ 46. 6, 47. 10.
c See on 1 Cor. i. 3 and Eph. i. 2.
d So Col. i. 3.
e Eph. v. 20.
f Eph. i. 16.
g v. 17; Rom. i. 9

Chapter I.—Ver. 1. *Greeting*.—As any trouble at Thessalonica had arisen over Paul's character more than his authority, or rather as his authority had been struck through his character, he does not introduce his own apostolic rank or that of his colleagues (ii. 6) in the forefront of this letter, which is intimate and unofficial throughout. Silvanus is put before Timothy as an older man and colleague, and also as Paul's special coadjutor in the local mission. Acts never mentions Timothy in the Macedonian mission till xvii. 14, where he appears beside Silvanus. This does not mean (Bleek) that Timothy took no part in the work at Thessalonica; his intimate relations with the church forbid this supposition. Probably he is left unnoticed as being a junior subordinate, till the time comes when he can act as an useful agent of his leaders.—**ἐκκλ.** a pagan term appropriated by Christianity. An implicit contrast lies in the following words (so in ii. 14): there were **ἐκκλησίαι** at Thessalonica and elsewhere (*cf.* Chrysostom and Orig., *Cels.* III. xxix.-xxx.) which had not their basis and being **ἐν . . . Χριστῷ.** The latter phrase is a suggestive and characteristic periphrasis for "Christian," and the omission of the **ἐν** before **κυρίῳ**, as of **τῇ** before **ἐν**, is enough to show that the seven words form a unity instead of a double antithesis to "pagan" and "Jewish" respectively.—**κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ**, a new **κύριος** (= dominus) for people like the Thessalonians who were hitherto familiar with the title as applied to Claudius (*cf.* Wilcken's *Griechische Ostraka*, 1899, s.v.) the emperor, or to the God of the Jews (*cf.* Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, 260 f.). See the ample discussion in Kattenbusch, *das Apost. Symbol*, ii. 596 f., with his note (pp. 691 f.) on **ἐκκλησία.** The hope and help of God implied that Christians must hold together, under their **κύριος.** "No Christian could have fought his way through the great dark night of idolatry and immorality as an isolated unit; the community was here the necessary condition for all permanent life" (Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 189).

Vv. 2-10. *Thanksgiving for the origin and achievements of the church*.—Ver. 2. Whenever Paul was at his prayers, he remembered his friends at Thessalonica; and whenever he recalled them his first feeling was one of gratitude to God (see iii. 9) for the Christian record which, as individuals and as a church (**πάντων**), they displayed of active faith (i. 4-10, ii. 13-16), industrious love (iv. 9 f.), and tenacious hope (v. 1-11). And not Paul alone. The plural implies that all three missionaries prayed together.—**εὐχαριστοῦμεν.** The greeting is followed, as in ordinary letters of the period, by a word of gratitude and good wishes. **εὐχ.** is common in votive inscriptions, in connection with thanksgiving to a god. But while Paul, in dictating his letter, starts with a conventional epistolary form, the phrase immediately expands loosely into **μνημ . . . θεοῦ** (**μνείαν π.** as frequently in ethnic phraseology).

Ver. 3. **ἀδιαλ.** Neither distance nor fresh interests make any difference to his

οντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς [h] ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς [h] ἐλπίδος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [i] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· 4. [k] εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ [l] ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν· 5. ὅτι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ [m] ἐγενήθη [n] εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν [o] λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν [o] δυνάμει καὶ [p] ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ [q] πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ, καθὼς οἴδατε οἷοι ἐγενήθημεν ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ὑμᾶς. 6. καὶ ὑμεῖς [r] μιμηταὶ ἡμῶν ἐγενήθητε [s] καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, [r] δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν [r] θλίψει πολλῇ μετὰ [t] χαρᾶς

h See on 2 Cor. ii. 4 and Heb. vi. 10-11. With gen. as Rom. v. 2; cf. Win. § 30. 12, e.
i Cf. iii. 9, 13 and other side in II. i. 4.
k Cf. iii. 5.
l II. ii. 13. See Col. iii. 12 and Deut. xxxiii. 12.
m Blass, § 20, 1.
n Gal. iii. 14.
o Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 1-4, iv. 19-20.
p "At most of rhetorical value" (Sx. *Lang. N.T.* 158).
q Clem. Rom. xlii. 3.
r Cf. Introd. § 1, 1; ii. 13-14, and on 2 Cor. xi. 4.
s 1 Cor. xi. 1.
t Rom. xiv. 17; Gal. v. 22.

affection; his life is bound up with their welfare; his source of happiness is their Christian well-being (*cf.* ii. 17-20, iii. 7-10). The adverb (a late Greek formation, *cf. Expos.*, 1908, 59) goes equally well with the preceding or with the following words; better with the former, on the whole, as the participles then open the successive clauses in 2, 3 and 4.—**ὑμῶν** is prefixed for emphasis to the three substantives which it covers, while the closing **ἔμπροσθεν . . . ἡμῶν** (*cf.* ii. 19) gathers up the thought of **μνημον.**—Faith in one sense is a work, but Paul here (as in Gal. v. 6) means faith that does work (*opus* opponitur sermoni *inani*, Bengel), by producing a change of life and a cheerful courage under trials. It would be no pleasure to recall a merely formal or voluble belief, any more than a display of Christian love (*cf.* Col. i. 4) which amounted simply to emotions or fitful expressions of goodwill, much less a hope which could not persist in face of delay and discouraging hardships.

Ver. 4. The practical evidence of the Spirit in their lives showed that God had willed to enrol them among His chosen people (note the O.T. associations of *beloved by God* and *election*), just as the same consciousness of possessing the Spirit gave them the sure prospect of final entrance into the Messianic realm—an assurance which (ver. 6) filled them with joy amid all their discomforts. The phenomenon of the Spirit thus threw light backwards on the hidden purpose of God for them, and forwards on their prospect of bliss.—Recollections depend on knowledge; to be satisfied about a person implies settled convictions about his character and position. The apostles feel certain that the Thessalonian Christians had been truly chosen and called by God, owing to (*a*) the genuineness and effectiveness of their own ministry at Thessalonica, where they had felt the gospel going home to many of the inhabitants, and (*b*) the genuine evidence of the Thessalonians' faith; (*a*) comes first in ver. 5, (*b*) in vv. 6 f. In ii. 1 f. Paul reverts to (*a*), while in ii. 13-16 (*b*) is again before his mind. As the divine **ἐκλογή** manifested itself in the Christian qualities of ver. 3, Paul goes back to their historical origin.

Ver. 5. **ὅτι** = "inasmuch as".—**τὸ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν,** the gospel of which the apostles, and by which their hearers, were convinced. As the **καθὼς** clause indicates, **πληροφ.** must here denote personal conviction and unfaltering confidence on the part of the preachers. The omission of the **ἐν** before **πληρ.** throws that word and **πνεύματι** together into a single conception, complementary to **δυνάμει,** which here has no specific reference to miracles, but to the apostles' courage (ii. 2), honesty and sincerity (4, 5), devotion (7, 8), earnestness (9), and consistency (10). The effect of the Spirit on the preachers is followed up (in ver. 6) by its effect on the hearers; and this dual aspect recurs in ver. 9 (we and you). **ἐν** (om. Blass) **ὑμῖν** = "among you".

Ver. 6. **θλίψει . . . χαρᾶς,** *cf.* for this paradox of experience, Mazzini's account of his comrades in the Young Italy movement: "We were often in real want, but we were light-hearted in a way and smiling because we believed in the future". The gladness of the primitive Christian lay in the certainty of possessing soon that full salvation of which the Spirit at present was the pledge and foretaste. In view of Ps. li. 13, 14 it is hardly correct to say, with Gunkel (*Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 71), that this connection of joy and the Spirit was entirely foreign to Judaism.

Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, 7. ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς [u] τύπον [1] πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ. 8. ἀφ᾿ ὑμῶν γὰρ [v] ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ [w] ἀλλὰ ἐν [x] παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ [y] πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελήλυθεν, ὥστε μὴ [z] χρείαν ἔχειν ἡμᾶς λαλεῖν τι. 9. [a] αὐτοὶ γὰρ περὶ [b] ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ὁποίαν [c] εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ πῶς [d] ἐπεστρέψατε [e] πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, δουλεύειν Θεῷ [f] ζῶντι καὶ [g] ἀληθινῷ 10. καὶ [h] ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ [i] ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦν, τὸν [k] ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς [l] ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης.

u 1 Pet. v. 3. *Cf.* Phil. iii. 17.
v ἅπ. λεγ., *cf.* Joel iii. 14 (LXX); 3 Macc. iii. 2.
w Blass, § 77, 13.
x *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 2; Acts xviii. 1 f.
y Rom. i. 8; Clem. Rom. xxxv. 5, Philemon 5: = "the fact of your faith in God".
z iv. 9, v. 1.
a "people, wherever we go".
b *i.e.*, us, apostles.
c *Cf.* Ps. cxx. (cxxi.) 8; LXX.
d See on Acts xiv. 15. *Cf.* Jer. iii. 22 (LXX).
e *Cf.* Eph. ii. 12.
f See on Rev. vii. 2.
g See on John vi. 57; Rev. iii. 7, etc. Only here in Paul.
h Isa. lix. 11, 20; Æsch., *Eum.*, 243.
i Phil. iii. 20.
k *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 429, and on 2 Cor. i. 10.
l Rom. v. 9; *cf.* below, v. 9 (negat. side of ἐκλογή).

[1] For **τυπους** (ℵACGKLP, g, syr.p, Chrys., Theod., etc., Calvin, Schott, Alexander, Koch, Wohl., Zim.), conformed to **υμας**, read **τυπον** with BD* vss., edd.

Ver. 8. **ἡ πίστις . . . ἐξελ.** (Rom. x. 18), by anacoluthon, reiterates for emphasis **ἀφ᾿ ὑμῶν . . . κυρίου** (**ὁ λόγος τ. K.** depending for its effectiveness on the definite testimony of Christians). Paul is dictating loosely but graphically. The touch of hyperbole is pardonable and characteristic (*cf.* Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. i. 6); but the geographical and commercial position of Thessalonica see Introd., p. 5) must have offered ample facilities for the rapid dissemination of news and the promulgation of the faith, north and south, throughout European Greece (*Encycl. Bibl.*, i. 32). The local Christians had taken full advantage of their natural opportunities. Through their imitation of the apostles (see Introd., p. 7) and of Christ (here as in 1 Peter ii. 19-21, in his sufferings), they had become a pattern for others. The **ἐν τῇ** is omitted before **Ἀχαΐᾳ** here because **M.** and **A.** are grouped together, over against **π. τ.—ὥστε . . . γάρ**, the reputation of the apostles rested upon solid evidence.

Ver. 9. The positive and negative aspects of faith: "Videndum est ut ruinam errorum sequatur aedificium fidei" (Calvin).—**ἀληθινῷ** = "real" as opposed to false in the sense of "counterfeit".—**ζῶντι**, as opposed to dead idols (see above, p. 5) impotent to help their worshippers. Elsewhere the phrase (*cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 12) "implies a contrast with the true God made practically a dead deity by a lifeless and rigid form of religion" (Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, 173). Nothing brings home the reality of God (*i.e.*, as Father, vv. 1-3) to the Christian at first so much as the experience of forgiveness.

Ver. 10. In preaching to pagans, the leaders of the primitive Christian mission put the wrath and judgment of God in the forefront (*cf.* Sabatier's *Paul*, 98 f.), making a sharp appeal to the moral sense, and denouncing idolatry (*cf.* Sap., xiv., 12 f., 22 f.). Hence the revival they set on foot. They sought to set pagans straight, and to keep them straight, by means of moral fear as well as of hope. Paul preached at Thessalonica as he did at Athens (Acts xvii. 29-31; see Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 108 f.) and the substance of his mission-message on the wrath of God is preserved in Rom. i. 18—ii. 16. The *living* God is manifested by His raising of Jesus from the dead, His awakening of faith in Christians, and His readiness to judge human sin in the hereafter. Seeberg (*der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 82-85) finds here an echo of some primitive Christian formula of faith, but his proofs are very precarious.—**τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.** This marked them out from Jewish proselytes, who might also be said to have turned from idols to serve the living God. The quiet combination of monotheism and a divine position of Jesus is striking (*cf.* Kattenbusch, *op. cit.*, ii. 550 f.).—**ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν . . . ἐκ τ. νεκρῶν**, both the hope and the historical fact lay outside the experience of the Thessalonians, but both were assured to them by their experience of the Spirit which the risen Jesus had bestowed, and which guaranteed His final work. Were it not for touches like the

II. 1. Αὐτοὶ γὰρ [a] οἴδατε, ἀδελφοί, τὴν εἴσοδον ἡμῶν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὅτι [b] οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν· 2. ἀλλὰ προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες, καθὼς οἴδατε, ἐν [c] Φιλίπποις, [d] ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ Θεῷ [e] ἡμῶν λαλῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν πολλῷ [f] ἀγῶνι. 3. ἡ γὰρ [g] παράκλησις ἡμῶν [h] οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης, οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, οὐδὲ [1] ἐν δόλῳ, 4. ἀλλὰ καθὼς [k] δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ [l] πιστευθῆναι

a = "remember," as 1 Cor. i. 16 (*cf.* Field, 187).
b *Cf.* i. 5, and 1 Cor. xv. 10.
c See on Acts xvi. 19 f.
d See on Eph. vi. 20 and Acts ix. 26; on form *cf.* Win. § 5. 26 b.
e iii. 9; II. i. 11-12.
f *Cf.* Phil. i. 30.
g "appeal" (*cf.* Polyb. iii. 109, 6).
h Sc. ἐστίν, *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 8.
i 2 Cor. iv. 2 and xii. 16.
k 2 Macc. iv. 3.
l *Cf.* Gal. ii. 7.

[1] The second **ουδε** (ℵABCD*GP, min., etc., edd.) [*cf.* II. iii. 7-8] is preferable to the v. 1. **ουτε** (Pelt, Hofm., Wohl.); for **ακαθαρσιας**, Bentl. conj. "forte **εξ αν. αρεσκιας**" [*i.e.* **ανθρωπαρεσκιας**].

deeper sense of **δουλεύειν**, the celestial origin of Jesus, and the eschatological definition of **ὀργή**, one might be tempted to trace a specious resemblance between this two-fold description of Christianity at Thessalonica and the two cardinal factors in early Greek religion, *viz.*, the service of the Olympian deities (**θεραπεύειν**) and the rites of aversion (**ἀποπομπαί**) which were designed to deprecate the dark and hostile powers of evil. Paul preached like the Baptist judgment to come. But his gospel embraced One who baptised with the Spirit and with the fire of enthusiastic hope (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 7).

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-12. An *apologia pro vita et labore suo*.

Ver. 1. **αὐτοί**, as opposed to the **α.** of i. 9.—**γέγονεν κ.τ.λ.**, our mission was a vital success, as its results still show. For its motives and methods were genuine (2-12).

Ver. 2. "Though we had suffered—aye and suffered outrage" in one town, yet on we went to another with the same errand; a practical illustration of Matt. x. 23.

Ver. 3. **γάρ**: Our mission (whatever that of others may be) is not the outcome of self-seeking, otherwise it would readily be checked by such untoward circumstances. Our confidence is in *God*, not in ourselves; our work is not self-appointed but a sacred trust or commission, for which we are responsible to Him (4). Hence, discouragement and hesitation are impossible. Paul argues that the very fact of their cheerful perseverance at Thessalonica, after their bad treatment at Philippi, points to the divine source and strength of their mission; what impelled them was simply a sense of lasting responsibility to God, upon the one hand, and an overpowering devotion to men upon the other (*cf.* the **δι' ὑμᾶς** of i. 5), for the gospel's sake. Had the apostles yielded to feelings of irritation and despondency, giving up their task in Macedonia, after the troubles at Philippi, or had they conducted themselves at Thessalonica in such a way as to secure ease and profit; in either case, they would have proved their mission to be ambitious or selfish, and therefore undivine. As it was, their courage and sincerity were at once the evidence and the outcome of their divine commission.—**πλάνης**, "error" (*cf.* Armitage Robinson on Eph. iv. 14). Their preaching did not spring from some delusion or mistake. Paul was neither fool nor knave, neither deceived nor a deceiver (**δόλῳ**). Nor was his mission a sordid attempt (**ἀκαθαρσίας**) to make a good thing out of preaching, the impure motive being either to secure money (*cf.* **πλεονεξίας** ver. 5, and ver. 9), or to gain a position of importance (ver. 6) and popularity. *Cf.* Tacit., *Annal.*, vi, 21 (of Tiberius' attitude to astrologers) "si uanitatis aut fraudum suspicio incesserat". Both features were only too familiar in the contemporary conduct of wandering sophists, **ἀρεταλόγοι**, and thaumaturgists (*e.g.*, Acts xiii. 10, and Clemen's article in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, 1896, 151 f.) whose practices would also explain the literal interpretation of **ἀκ.** (= sensuality). But the context favours the associations of greed (*cf.* Eph. v. 3), as in the case of **πλεονεξία**. On the persuasiveness of sincerity in a speaker, *i.e.*, the extent to which his effectiveness depends upon his hearers' conviction of his own earnestness and honesty, see Aristotle's analysis of **ἠθικὴ πίστις** (*Rhet.*, ii. 1) and Isocrates' description of **εὐνοίας δύναμις** (*Orat.*, xv. 278, 279).

Ver. 4. "As God, who tests our hearts, has attested our fitness to be

τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὕτω λαλοῦμεν, οὐχ [m] ὡς ἀνθρώποις [n] ἀρέσκοντες, ἀλλὰ [o] Θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν. 5. οὔτε γάρ ποτε ἐν λόγῳ [p] κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, καθὼς οἴδατε, οὔτε ἐν [q] προφάσει πλεονεξίας· Θεὸς μάρτυς· 6. οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων [r] δόξαν, οὔτε ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν οὔτε [s] ἀπ᾽ ἄλλων, [t] δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι· 7. ἀλλ᾽ ἐγενήθημεν [u] ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς [v] ἐὰν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα·[1] 8. οὕτως ὁμειρόμενοι ὑμῶν [w] εὐδοκοῦμεν [x] μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν [y] οὐ μόνον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς,

m Causal (*see* Viteau, i. 304).
n Gal. i. 10; for οὐ with ptc. *see* Moult. i. 231.
o Contrast ver. 15, and *cf.* Sap. i. 5-6.
p Here only (N.T.), Win.-Schm. § v. 13c.
q "any pretext," *cf.* on 2 Cor. xi. 12, ii. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 3.
r *Cf.* John viii. 50, v. 41-44.
s *e.g.* i. 9.
t *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1 f.
u of a father (ver. 11) in *e.g.* Hom. *Iliad*, xxiv. 770, *Odyssey*, ii. 234.
v = ὅταν (Viteau, i. 217).
w iii. 1; see on Rom. xv. 26; = "we were right willing".
x Rom. i. 11. So. 2 Cor. viii. 5 (force of this example).
y *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 481.

[1] The important variant **νηπιοι**, which is even better attested (*cf.* WH ii. 128), and is adopted, *e.g.*, by Bentley, Lachm., Schrader, Jowett, Zimmer, Bisping, WH, Lgft., and Wohl., probably arose from a not uncommon dittography of the final N in the preceding word: **ηπιος** "properly implies the kindness of a superior" (Liddell and Scott s.v.), whereas **νηπιος** has usually associations of immaturity in Paul.

entrusted with the gospel," a characteristic play on the word. The definite commission of the gospel excluded any weak attempt to flatter men's prejudices or to adapt oneself to their tastes. Hence the thought of the following verse.

Ver. 5. "Never did we resort to words of flattery" (in order to gain some private end); *cf.* Arist., *Eth. Nik.*, iv. 6. As self-interest is more subtle than the desire to please people (which may be one form of self-interest), the appeal is changed significantly from **κ. ο.** to **θεὸς μάρτυς** (Rom. i. 9): "auaritia aut ambitio, duo sunt isti fontes ex quibus manat totius ministerii corruptio" (Calvin). *Cf.* Introduction, § 1—on **θεός** and **ὁ θεός**, *cf.* Kattenbusch, *das Apost. Symbol*, ii. 515 f.

Ver. 6. To put a full stop after **ἄλλων**, and begin a new sentence with **δυνάμενοι** (so *e.g.*, Vulgate, Calvin, Koppe, Weizsäcker, H. J. Gibbins, *Exp. Ti.*, xiv. 527), introduces an awkward asyndeton, makes **ἀλλὰ** follow a concessive participle very awkwardly, and is unnecessary for the sense.

Ver. 7. **ἐν βάρει εἶναι** = "be men of weight," or "be a burden" on your funds. Probably both meanings are intended, so that the phrase (*cf.* Field, 199) resumes the ideas of **πλεον.** and **ἀνθ. δόξαν** (self-interest in its mercenary shape and as the love of reputation) which are reiterated in vv. 7-12, a defence of the apostles against the charges, current against them evidently in some circles (probably pagan) at Thessalonica, of having given themselves airs and unduly asserted their authority, as well as of having levied or at any rate accepted contributions for their own support.—**ἀπόστολοι** were known to any of the local Christians who had been Jews (*cf.* Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*, i. 66 f., 409 f.), since agents and emissaries (**ἀπόστολοι**) from Jerusalem went to and fro throughout the synagogues: but **ἀ. Χριστοῦ** was a new conception. The Christian **ἀπόστολοι** had their commission from their heavenly messiah.—**ἤπιοι** (2 Tim. ii. 24); as Bengel observes, there was nothing *ex cathedra* about the apostles, nothing selfish or crafty or overbearing. All was tenderness and devotion, fostering and protecting care, in their relations to these Thessalonian Christians who had won their hearts. To eschew flattery (5) did not mean any indifference to consideration and gentleness, in their case; they were honest without being blunt or masterful.—**τροφός**, a nursing mother (*cf.* Hor., *Ep.* i. 4, 8). "In the love of a brave and faithful man there is always a strain of maternal tenderness; he gives out again those beams of protecting fondness which were shed on him as he lay on his mother's knee" (George Eliot). Rutherford happily renders: "On the contrary, we carried ourselves among you with a childish simplicity, as a mother becomes a child again when she fondles her children".

Ver. 8. **ὁμειρόμενοι** (*cf.* Job iii. 21, LXX; Ps. lxii. 2, Symm.) = "yearning

διότι [z] ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε. 9. μνημονεύετε γάρ, ἀδελφοί, τὸν [a] κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν [a] μόχθον· νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας [b] ἐργαζόμενοι [c] πρὸς τὸ μὴ [d] ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν, ἐκηρύξαμεν εἰς ὑμᾶς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. ὑμεῖς [e] μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ Θεός, ὡς [f] ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ [g] ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐγενήθημεν, 11. καθάπερ οἴδατε, ὡς [h] ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν, ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ, [i] παρακαλοῦντες ὑμᾶς καὶ [i] παραμυθούμενοι 12. καὶ [k] μαρτυρόμενοι [1] εἰς τὸ [l] περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς [l] ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ [m] καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ [n] δόξαν.

13. Καὶ διὰ [o] τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Θεῷ [p] ἀδιαλείπτως, ὅτι παραλαβόντες [q] λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν [r] τοῦ Θεοῦ [s] ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθώς ἐστιν ἀληθῶς λόγον Θεοῦ, [t] ὃς καὶ

z *Cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 5.
a *Cf.* II. iii. 8 and 2 Cor. xi. 27.
b *Cf.* Acts xviii. 3.
c *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 13 for constr.
d *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 5.
e 1 Sam. xii. 3; Num. xvi. 15; Acts xx. 23.
f Only here in N.T., = "piously". *Cf.* Eph. iv. 24.
g *Cf.* v. 23 (Clem. Rom. xliv. 4). h See on Acts xx. 31. i *Cf.* iv. 1 and on 1 Cor. xiv. 3, with 2 Macc. xv. 8-9. k Eph. iv. 17; see on Acts xx. 26 and Gal. v. 3. l See on Phil. i. 27; ethnic phrase (Deissm. 248). m See on Rom. viii. 28. ix. 11 and Gal. v. 8. n *Cf.* II. ii. 14. o As well as i. 2 f. p i. 3. q *Cf.* Heb. iv. 2. ἀκ. = id quod auditur. r With λόγον, *cf.* Win. § 30. 12d. s *Cf.* i. 6. t *i.e.* the word.

[1] **μαρτυρομενοι** (ℵBD[bc]HKL, 17, 47, Chrys., Dam., etc., edd.) is preferable to the passive variant **μαρτυρουμενοι**, a corrupt western reading which has been conformed to **παραμ.**

for, or, over". **εὐδοκ.**, for absence of augment *cf.* W. H., ii. 161, 162.—**διότι** causal ("for as much as"), almost = **γάρ** (as in Modern Greek).

Ver. 9. "Paul means by the phrase, *night and day*, that he started work before dawn; the usage is regular and frequent. He no doubt began so early in order to be able to devote some part of the day to preaching" (Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 85). Paul, to the very last (*cf.* Acts xx. 29 f.), seems to have been sensitive on this point of independence.

Ver. 10. "We made ourselves yours" (*cf.* 8), the dative going closely (as Rom. vii. 3) with the verb, which is qualified (as in 1 Cor. xvi. 10) by the adverbs; so Born., Findlay.– **ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.** (dative of possession). Paul had met other people at Thessalonica, but only the Christians could properly judge his real character and conduct.

Ver. 11. **καθάπερ,** sharper than **καθώς.** Viteau (ii. 111) suggests that **κ. ο.** is a parenthesis, and **ὡς** a causal introductory particle for the participles ("heartening," "encouraging," "adjuring") which in their turn depend on **ὑμῖν . . . ἐγενήθημεν,** but the likelihood is that in the rush of emotion, as he dictates, Paul leaves the participial clause without a finite verb (so *e.g.*, 2 Cor. vii. 5).—**ὡς πατὴρ κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* **ὡς ἐὰν τροφός,** 7). The figure was used by Jewish teachers of their relationship to their pupils. *Cf. e.g.*, the words of Eleazar b. Azarja to his dying master, "Thou art more to Israel than father or mother; they only bring men into this world, whereas thou guidest us for this world and the next". Catullus, lxxii. 4 (dilexi tum te non tantum ut uulgus amicam, sed pater ut natos diligit et generos).

Ver. 12. **ἀξίως** in this connection (see references) was a familiar ethnic phrase. C. Michel (in his *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, 1900, 266, 413) quotes two pre-Christian instances with **τῶν θεῶν.**—**εἰς τὸ, κ.τ.λ.,** grammatically meaning either the object or the content of the solemn charge (*cf.* Moulton, 218 f.). The ethic is dominated by the eschatology, as in iii. 13, v. 23.

Vv. 13-16. *Further thanksgiving for their endurance of trial.*

Ver. 13. "And for this we also render thanks, *viz.*, that;" the **καί,** by a loose but not unusual (*cf.* iii. 5; Rom. iii. 7, v. 3, etc.) construction, goes not with the pronoun but with the verb, or simply emphasises the former (*e.g.*, Soph., *Oed. Col.*, 53, 520, etc.).—**τοῦ θεοῦ** comes in so awkwardly that one is tempted to regard it, with Baljon and some other Dutch critics, as a scribal gloss.

[u] ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. 14. ὑμεῖς [v] γὰρ μιμηταὶ ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, [w] τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ [w] Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων [x] συμφυλετῶν, [y] καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 15. τῶν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς [z] προφήτας [1] καὶ ἡμᾶς [a] ἐκδιωξάντων καὶ Θεῷ μὴ [b] ἀρεσκόντων καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων, 16. [c] κωλυόντων ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἔθνεσι λαλῆσαι [b] ἵνα σωθῶσιν, [d] εἰς τὸ [e] ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάντοτε[· [f] ἔφθασε δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ [g] ὀργὴ [h] εἰς τέλος].

17. Ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, [i] ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας ([k] προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ) [l] περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσ-

u "Is made operative" (*cf.* Robinson's *Ephes.* pp. 241 f.).
v Proof and result of ἐνεργεῖται.
w Gal. i. 22; 2 Cor. i. 1.
x Only here in N.T., = "compatriots".
y = ἄπερ.
z Matt. v. 12, xxiii. 34, etc.
a So Lk. xi. 49 (Acts xvii. 5-14). *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 24, 26. b 1 Cor. x. 33. *Cf.* on Eph. ii. 12. c Lk. xi. 52; Acts xvii. 5, xxii. 22. d *Cf.* Burton, M.T. 411 and Moult. i. 219. e 2 Macc. vi. 14. *Cf.* Sap. xii. 27 and Gen. xv. 16. f *Cf.* Phil. iii. 16, etc. g Lk. xiv. 21, xxi. 23. *Cf.* on Rom. i. 18. h "Utterly, completely" (Ps. Sol. i. 1, ii. 5; Joseph. *B. J.* vii. 8, 1), alm. = "to the bitter end" (Abbott, *Joh. Gramm.* 2322). i Here only (N.T.): = "bereft," *cf.* Field 199 f. k 1 Cor. v. 3; 2 Cor. v. 12. l Gal. i. 14; 2 Cor. i. 12.

[1] Om. the Syrian interpolation ιδιους with ℵABD*GP (min.), sah., cop., arm., aeth., Orig., Euth., edd., as an insertion by Marcion (Tert., *cf.* Nestle's *Einf.* 253) before προφητας.

Ver. 14. **μιμηταί**, and soon helpers (Rom. xv. 26). The fact that they were exposed to persecution, and bore it manfully, proved that the gospel was a power in their lives, and also that they were in the legitimate succession of the churches. Such obstacles would as little thwart their course as they had thwarted that of Jesus or of his immediate followers. **συμφ.** might include Jews (Acts xvii. 6), but Gentiles predominate in the writer's mind.—The **καί** after **καθώς** simply emphasises the comparison (as in iv. 5, 13). As Calvin suggests, the Thessalonians may have wondered why, if this was the true religion, it should be persecuted by the Jews, who had been God's people. **σ.** is racial rather than local, but the local persecution may have still been due in part to Jews (*cf.* Zimmer, pp. 16 f.).

Ver. 15. "The Lord, even Jesus" (*cf.* Acts ii. 36). **προφ.** may go either with **ἀποκτ.** or with **ἐκδιωξάντων**.

Ver. 16. **κωλυόντων κ.τ.λ.**, defining (Luke xi. 52) from the Christian standpoint that general and familiar charge of hatred to the human race (**ἐναντίων κ.τ.λ.**) which was started by the exclusiveness of the ghetto and the synagogue. —**ἔφθασε κ.τ.λ.**, "the Wrath has come upon them," apparently a reminiscence of Test. Levi. vi. 11. This curt and sharp verdict on the Jews sprang from Paul's irritation at the moment. The apostle was in no mood to be conciliatory. He was suffering at Corinth from persistent Jewish attempts to wreck the Christian propaganda, and he flashes out in these stern sentences of anger. Later on (Rom. ix.-xi.) he took a kinder and more hopeful view, though even this did not represent his final outlook on the prospects of Judaism. Consequently, it is arbitrary to suspect vv. 14 (15)-16 as a later interpolation, written after 70 A.D. (*cf.* the present writer's *Hist. New Testament*, pp. 625, 626). But the closing sentence of ver. 16 has all the appearance of a marginal gloss, written after the tragic days of the siege in 70 A.D. (so *e.g.*, Spitta, Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity*, i. 128, 129, Schmiedel, Teichmann, *die Paul. Vorstellungen von Auferstehung u. Gericht*, 83, Drummond, etc.). The Jews, no doubt, had recently suffered, and were suffering, as a nation in a way which might seem to Paul, in a moment of vehement feeling, a clear proof of condign punishment (so *e.g.*, Schmidt, 86-90). But neither the edict of Claudius nor the bloody feuds in Palestine quite bear out the language of this verse. And **ὀργή** is surely more than judicial hardening (*cf.* Dante's *Paradiso*, vi. 88-93); its eschatological significance points to a more definite interpretation.

Ver. 17-CHAPTER III. Ver. 13. Paul's *apologia pro absentia suâ*.

Ver. 17. **πρὸς κ. ὥ.**, as we both expected, but, as it turned out, for much longer. **προσ. οὐ κ.**, "not where I

ωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ. 18. [m] διότι ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ [n] μὲν Παῦλος καὶ [o] ἅπαξ καὶ [o] δίς, καὶ [p] ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς. 19. τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπὶς ἢ [q] χαρὰ ἢ [q] στέφανος [r] καυχήσεως [s] (ἢ οὐχὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς) ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ [t] Κυρίου ἡμῶν [t] Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ; 20. ὑμεῖς γάρ ἐστε [u] ἡ [v] δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά.

m Win. § 5, 7, d, *cf.* on ii. 8.
n = "For my part"; on absence of δέ, *cf.* Blass, § 77, 12.
o = "More than once" (Phil. iv. 16).
p *Cf.* Gal. v. 7; Rom. xv. 22.
q Phil. iv. 1.
r *Cf.* Prov. xvi. 31 (LXX).
s Blass, § 77, 11.
t *Cf.* Kattenbusch: *das Apost. Symbol*, ii. 597 f.
u Win. § 18, 8, d.
v 2 Cor. viii. 23, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 14.

breathe; but where I love, I live" (Southwell, the Elizabethan Jesuit poet, echoing Augustine's remark that the soul lives where it loves, not where it exists); *cf.* Eurip., *Ion*, 251. The next paragraph, ii. 17-iii. 13, starts from a fresh imputation against the apostles' honour. Paul, it was more than hinted by calumniators at Thessalonica, had left his converts in the lurch (*cf.* 18); with him, out of sight was out of mind; fresh scenes and new interests in the South had supplanted them in his affections, and his failure to return was interpreted as a fickle indifference to their concerns. The reply is three-fold. (*a*) Paul's continued absence had been unavoidable (17 f.); he had often tried to get back. In proof of this anxiety (*b*) he had spared Timothy from his side for a visit to them (iii. 1-5), and (*c*) Timothy's report, he adds (iii. 6 f.) had relieved a hearty concern on his part for their welfare; he thus lets them see how much they were to him, and still prays for a chance of re-visiting them (11). He was not to blame for the separation; and, so far from blunting his affection, it had only whetted (**περισσοτέρως**) his eagerness to get back.

Ver. 18. "We did crave to reach you," **διότι** (= because) not being required with the English stress on *did.* The whole verse is parenthetical, syntactically.—**καὶ . . . Σατανᾶς.** The mysterious obstacle, which Paul traced back to the ultimate malice of Satan, may have been either (*a*) an illness (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 7, so Simon, *die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus*, 63, 64), (*b*) local troubles, (*c*) the exigencies of his mission at the time being (Grotius), or (*d*) a move on the part of the Thessalonian politarchs who may have bound over Jason and other leading Christians to keep the peace by pledging themselves to prevent Paul's return (Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller*, 230 f., Woodhouse, *E. Bi.*, 5047, Findlay). Early Christian thought referred all such hindrances to the devil as the opponent of God and of God's cause. The words **ἐν Ἀθήναις** (iii. 1) rule out Zimmer's application of (*b*) to the emergency at Corinth, while the silence of Acts makes any of the other hypotheses quite possible, though (*d*) hardly fits in with the ordinary view of the Empire in II. ii. 2 f. and renders it difficult to see why the Thessalonians did not understand at once how Paul could not return. The choice really lies between (*a*) and (*c*). Kabisch (27-29), by a forced exegesis, takes ver. 20 as the explanation of this satanic manœuvre. Satan prevented us from coming, in order to rob us of our glory and praise on the last day, by wrecking your Christian faith; he was jealous of our success among you.

Ver. 19. Of course we wanted to come back, for (**γάρ**), etc. The touch of fine exaggeration which follows is true to the situation. Paul's absence from the young church was being misinterpreted in a sinister way, as if it implied that the Achaian Christians had ousted the Thessalonians from his affections. *You it is*, he protests, *who but you* (**καὶ** superfluous after **ἤ**, as in Epict. i. 6, 39; Rom. xiv. 10, but really heightening the following word, as in Rom. v. 7; almost = "indeed" or "even")—*you are my pride and delight!*—**στέφανος**, of a public honour granted (as to Demosthenes and Zeno) for distinguished public service. The metaphor occurs often in the inscriptions (*cf.* also Pirke Aboth, iv. 9). Paul coveted no higher distinction at the arrival of the Lord than the glory of having won over the Thessalonian church. *Cf.* Crashaw's lines to St. Teresa in heaven:

"Thou shalt look round about, and see
Thousands of crown'd souls throng to be
Themselves thy crown".

Παρουσία = royal visit (*cf.* Wilcken's *Griech. Ostraka*, i. 274 f.), and hence applied (*cf.* Matt. xxiv.) to the arrival of the messiah, though the evidence for the

III. 1. Διὸ μηκέτι στέγοντες, [a] ηὐδοκήσαμεν [b] καταλειφθῆναι ἐν Ἀθήναις μόνοι 2. καὶ ἐπέμψαμεν Τιμόθεον τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ [c] συνεργὸν [c] τοῦ Θεοῦ [1] ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ [d] στηρίξαι ὑμᾶς καὶ [d] παρακαλέσαι [e] ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, 3. [f] τὸ μηδένα [g] σαίνεσθαι [2] ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι ταύταις· αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε ὅτι εἰς [h] τοῦτο [i] κείμεθα· 4. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε [k] πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν, προελέγομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι [l] μέλλομεν θλίβεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ ἐγένετο καὶ οἴδατε· 5. διὰ τοῦτο [m] κἀγώ μηκέτι στέγων ἔπεμψα [n] εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μή πως [o] ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ [p] εἰς κενὸν [q] γένηται ὁ κόπος

a *i.e.* Paul and Silvanus, *cf.* ii. 8.
b Acts xxv. 14.
c 2 Macc. viii. 7, etc., 1 Cor. iii. 9.
d II. ii. 17; *cf.* below, ver. 13.
e = περί (*cf.* II. ii. 1; Rom. i. 8; Plato's *Apol.* xxxix. e).
f *Cf.* Viteau, i. 272; Blass, § 71, 2, opposition to preceding clause (*cf.* iv. 6).
g Here only (N.T.), = "allured, beguiled" or "disturbed" (Diog. Laert. viii. 43: οἱ δὲ σαινόμενοι τοῖς λεγόμενοις ἐδάκρυον).
h *i.e.* τὸ θλίβεσθαι, *cf.* i. 6, II. i. 5.
i Phil. i. 16.
k = "with" II. iii. 1, 10, etc.
l "We Christians."
m *Cf.* on ii. 13.
n *Cf.* on ii. 16.
o Unrealised purpose, see Gal. ii. 2, iv. 11, for mood; also Burton, M.T. 227.
p Win. § 29, 2, b.
q deliberative conjunctive.

[1] For ημων και διακονον τ.θ. και συνεργον ημων (DcKL, syr.sch, Chrys., Theod., Dam., etc.), or ημων και δ.τ.θ. (ℵAP, min., vg., cop., syr.ptxt, arm., aeth., Euth., etc., Ti., Tr., Bj., Zim.) read the original and harder Western text ημων και συνεργον τ.θ. (D*, d, e, 17, Amb. [B om. τ.θ. so Weiss, Findlay], Lach., Al., Ell., WH marg., Born., Schm., Wohl., Feine), from which the variants seem to have sprung. Later scribes are more likely to have stumbled at τ.θ. after συνεργον than to have inserted it by a reminiscence of 1 Cor. iii. 9.

[2] For μ. σαινεσθαι (*cf.* Zahn, *Einl.* § 14, 2), Lach., Ernesti, and Verschuis (so Alexander) conj. μηδεν ασαινεσθαι (= χαλεπῶς φέρειν), a more than dubious passive form of ασαω, Beza and Bentley μηδενα σαλευεσθαι (v.l. σευεσθαι, Bentl.), and Holwerda μηδεν αναινεσθαι (= repent or be ashamed of); if any change is required (but *cf.* Koch's full note, 233-237), it would be in the direction of σιεινεσθαι (=σιαινεσθαι, to be disheartened, unnerved), the attractive reading of FG which is preferred by Sophocles (Lex., s.v.), Reiske, and Nestle (*Exp. Ti.* xviii. 479, Preuschen's *Zeitschrift*, vii. 361-62, *cf.* Mercati, *ibid.* viii. 242). G elsewhere (*cf.* Rom. xi. 26, xii. 17) confuses ει and αι.

use of the term in pre-Christian Judaism is scanty (Test. Jud. xxii. 3; Test. Levi. viii. 15; for the idea of the divine "coming" *cf. Slav. En.*, xxxii. 1, xlii. 5). This is the first time the term is used by Paul, but it was evidently familiar to the readers. Later on, possibly through Paul's influence, it became an accepted word for the second advent in early Christianity.

Chapter III.—Ver. 1. μηκ., instead of οὐκ., to bring out the personal motive.—στέγοντες "able to bear" (*cf.* Philo, *Flacc.*, § 9, μηκέτι στέγειν δυνάμενοι τὰς ἐνδείας), sc. the anxiety of ii. 11 f.—ἐν Ἀ. μόνοι. Paul shrank from loneliness, especially where there was little or no Christian fellowship; but he would not gratify himself at the expense of the Thessalonians. Their need of Timothy must take precedence of his.

Ver. 3. *Cf.* Artemid., *Oneirocritica* ii. 11, ἀλλότριοι δὲ κύνες σαίνοντες μὲν δόλους καὶ ἐνέδρας ὑπὸ πονηρῶν ἀνδρῶν [*cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 2] ἢ γυναικῶν [*cf.* Acts xvii. 4] σημαίνουσιν.

Ver. 4. *Cf.* Acts xvii. 3, 6, 13 f.

Ver. 5. Resuming the thought of iii. 1-3*a*, after the parenthetical digression of 3*b*, 4, but adding a fresh reason for the mission of Timothy, *viz.*, the apostle's desire to have his personal anxiety about the Thessalonians relieved. It is needless to suppose (with Hofmann and Spitta) that iii. 5 refers to a fresh messenger or a letter (Wohl.) despatched by Paul on his own account. As in ii. 18, Paul passes to the singular, to emphasise his personal interest in the matter; the change of number, especially after the generic use of the plural in 3, 4, does not necessarily prove that the plural of ver. 1 means Paul alone. The dominating anxiety of Paul was about their faith (5-10). He was overjoyed to hear that they retained "a kindly remembrance" of himself, and he reciprocates their desire for another meeting; but, while this undoubtedly entered into their general Christian position, it is the former on which unselfishly he dwells (*cf.* the transition in 10*a* and 10*b*).—πίστιν

ἡμῶν. 6. [r] ἄρτι δὲ ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν καὶ [s] εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν καὶ ὅτι ἔχετε μνείαν ἡμῶν ἀγαθὴν πάντοτε, ἐπιποθοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἰδεῖν, [t] καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς, 7. [u] διὰ τοῦτο παρεκλήθημεν, ἀδελφοί, [v] ἐφ' ὑμῖν ἐπὶ πάσῃ [w] τῇ ἀνάγκῃ καὶ [w] θλίψει ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως· 8. ὅτι νῦν [x] ζῶμεν, [y] ἐὰν ὑμεῖς [z] στήκετε ἐν Κυρίῳ. 9. τίνα γὰρ [a] εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ Θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι' ὑμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, 10. νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας [b] ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ δεόμενοι [c] εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν [d] ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν; 11. [e] Αὐτὸς δὲ [f] ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς [g] κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 12. ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ Κύριος [h] πλεονάσαι καὶ [i] περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας (καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς [k] εἰς ὑμᾶς) 13. εἰς τὸ [l] στηρίξαι [m] ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας [n] ἀμέμπτους ἐν [o] ἁγιωσύνῃ, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ [p] πάντων τῶν [q] ἁγίων αὐτοῦ.

r = "A moment ago," "just".
s *Cf.* Lk. i. 19; in untechnical classical sense of "bringing good news".
t *Cf.* ii. 11, 17.
u resumptive = "by this good news".
v *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 7.
w Job xv. 24 (LXX), "we were suffering (*cf.* ver. 3.) as well as you".
x Intensive (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 9, xiii. 4: "uiuimus, hoc est recte ualemus" (Calvin).
y = ὅταν, ii. 7.
z II. ii. 15, late form, *cf.* Blass § 65, 4; Win. § 5, 19; Burton, *M.T.* 247, and Moult. i. 168.
a *Cf.* on Acts xxiv. 3.
b *Cf.* Dan. iii. 23 (Theod.) and v. 13 below.
c II. ii. 2; constr. as in ii. 12.
d See note on v. 23.
e *Cf.* iv. 16, and contrast ii. 18.
f *Cf.* Win. § 18, 7, Moult. i. 179.
g II. iii. 5, Lk. i. 79.
h Transit. as Num. xxvi. 54 (LXX), etc.
i Transit. as 2 Cor. ix. 8; *cf.* for thought Phil. i. 9.
k *Sc.* "abound in love".
l *Cf.* above, ver. 2.
m See note on v. 23.
n Proleptic (*cf.* Viteau, II. 275), as v. 23; *cf.* Phil. ii. 15, Clem. Rom. xliv. 6, Sap. ii. 22.
o *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 1.
p *Cf.* iv. 17, ἡμεῖς . . . σὺν αὐτοῖς.
q Jude 14, *cf.* Everling: *die paul. Angelologie* (78-79).

κ.τ.λ. "Initium omnium malarum tentationum inconstantia animi est et parua ad Deum confidentia" (*De Imit. Christi*, i. 13, 5).—**ἐπείρασεν,** with success, it is implied.

Ver. 8. The news put life and spirit into him.—**στήκετε,** for construction *cf.* Mark xi. 25 and Abbott's *Johan. Gramm.*, 2515 (i).

Ver. 10. Another adaptation of ethnic phraseology, *cf. Griechische Urkunden*, i. 246, 12, **νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐντυγχάνω τῷ θεῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** (a pagan papyrus from second or third century, A.D.). The connection of **δεόμενοι κ.τ.λ.** with the foregoing words is loose, but probably may be found in the vivid realisation of the Thessalonians called up before his mind as he praised God for their constancy. Timothy had told him of their loyalty, but had evidently acquainted him also with some less promising tendencies and shortcomings in the church; possibly the Thessalonians had even asked for guidance on certain matters of belief and practice (see below). Hence Paul's eagerness to be on the spot again, not merely for the sake of happy fellowship (Rom. i. 11), but to educate and guide his friends, supplying what was defective in their faith. As this was impracticable in the meantime, he proceeds to write down some kindly admonitions. Thus 10*b* forms the transition to the second part of the letter; Paul, as usual, is wise enough to convey any correction or remonstrance on the back of hearty commendation. In the prayer which immediately follows, 10*a* is echoed in 11, 10*b* in 12, 13, for the maturing of the Thessalonian's faith does not depend on the presence of their apostles. Whatever be the answer to the prayer of 11, the prayer of 12, 13 can be accomplished.

Ver. 11. **κατευθύναι** (optative), as already (Acts xvi. 8-10, xvii. 1). The singular (*cf.* II., ii. 16, 17) implies that God and Jesus count as one in this connection. The verb is common (*e.g.*, Ep. Arist., 18, etc.) in this sense of providence directing human actions.

Vv. 12, 13. The security and purity of the Christian life are rested upon its brotherly love (so Ep. Arist., 229); all breaches or defects of **ἁγιωσύνη,** it is implied, are due to failures there (*cf.* iv. 3, 6); even sensuality becomes a form of selfishness, on this view, as much as impatience or resentment. This profound **ἀγάπη** "is an ever-fixed mark That looks

IV. 1. [a] **Λοιπὸν οὖν, ἀδελφοί, [b] ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα καθὼς παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν [c] τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν [d] καὶ [e] ἀρέσκειν Θεῷ, καθὼς καὶ περιπατεῖτε, ἵνα περισσεύητε μᾶλλον· 2. οἴδατε γὰρ τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 3. [f] τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι [f] θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ**

a "Locutio properantis ad finem" (Grotius), Test. Reub. v. 5; *cf.* on 2 Cor. xiii. 11, and Jannaris in *Exp.*[6] viii. 429 f. b Phil. iv. 3. c On article in indir. questions, see Blass, § 47. 5, Viteau, I. 132, Win. § 18, 2. d And so (result). e Contr. ii. 15. f v. 18, Ps. xxix. 5, etc.

on tempests and is never shaken;" it fixes the believing man's life in the very life of God, by deepening its vital powers of growth; no form of **ἁγιωσύνη** which sits loose to the endless obligations of this **ἀγάπη** will stand the strain of this life or the scrutiny of God's tribunal at the end.—**ὑμᾶς δέ,** whatever becomes of us.—**ἁγίων,** either (*a*) "saints" (as II., i. 10, De Wette, Hofmann, Zimmer, Schmidt, Everling, Kabisch, Findlay, Wohl.), or (*b*) "angels" (Ex. i. 9; Ps. Sol. xvii. 49, etc. Hühn, Weiss, Schrader, Titius, Schmiedel, Lueken), or (*c*) both (*cf.* 4 Esd. vii. 28, xiv. 9; Bengel, Alford, Wohl., Askwith, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Milligan). The reminiscence of Zech. xiv. 5 (LXX) is almost decisive for (*b*), though Paul may have put another content into the term; **πάντων** must not be pressed to support (*c*). In any case, the phrase goes closely with **παρουσίᾳ.** The **ἅγιοι** are a retinue.

CHAPTER IV.-Ver. 1-CHAPTER V.-Ver. 11. *Special instructions* (iv. 1-12) *on chastity, etc.*

Ver. 1. Resuming the thought of ii. 11, 12 as well as of iii. 10-13. *Cf.* a pre-Christian letter in Oxyrh. Papyri, iv. 294 (13 **ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν ἵνα μή,** 6 f. **ἐρωτῶ σε καὶ παρακαλῶ σε**). The **ἵνα,** repeated often for the sake of clearness, is sub-final (so II., iii. 12) = infinitive, *cf.* Moulton, i. 206 f. Paul meant to write **οὕτως καὶ περιπατῆτε,** but the parenthesis of praise (**κ. καὶ π.**) leads him to assume that and to plead for fresh progress along the lines already laid down by himself.

Ver. 2. Almost a parenthesis, as Bahnsen points out in his study of 1-12 (*Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 1904, 332-358). The injunctions (**παραγγελίαι** in semi-military sense, as 1 Tim. i. 18) relate to chastity (3-8) and charity, (9, 10), with a postscript against excitement and idleness (11, 12).—**παραγγ.** for the cognate use of this term (*cf.* ver. 8) in the inscriptions of Dionysopolis (**παραγγέλλω πᾶσιν μὴ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ**) *cf. Exp. Ti.*, x. 159.—**διὰ κ.τ.λ.,** the change from the **ἐν** of ver. 1 does not mean that the Thessalonians before their conversion got such injunctions from Paul on the authority of Christ, while afterwards they simply needed to be reminded of the obligations of their union (**ἐν**) with the Lord. No strict difference can be drawn between both phrases (*cf.* Heitmüller's *Im Namen Jesu*, 71 f.), though the **διά** lays rather more stress on the authority. For Jesus to command **διά** the apostles seems to us more natural than to say that the apostles issue commands **διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου,** but the sense is really the same. The apostles give their orders on the authority of their commission and revelations from the Lord whom they interpret to His followers (*cf.* Rom. xv. 30, xii. 2). But this interpretation must have appealed to the sayings of Jesus which formed part of the **παράδοσις** (*cf.* Weizsäcker's *Apostolic Age*, i. 97, 120, ii. 39). Thus 8*a* is an echo of the saying preserved in Luke x. 16.

Ver. 3. **ἁγιασμός** (in apposition to **τοῦτο, θέλημα** without the article being the predicate) = the moral issue of a life related to the **Ἅγιος** (*cf.* ver. 8), viewed here in its special and negative aspect of freedom from sexual impurity. The gospel of Jesus, unlike some pagan cults, *e.g.*, that of the Cabiri at Thessalonica (*cf.* Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, pp. 257 f.), did not tolerate, much less foster, licentiousness among its worshippers. At Thessalonica as at Corinth Paul found his converts exposed to the penetrating taint of life in a large seaport. As the context indicates, **ἁγ. ὑμῶν** = "the perfecting of you in holiness" (**ἁγ.** in its active sense, **ὑμῶν** genitive objective: so Lünemann, Ellicott, Bahnsen). The absence of any reference to **δικαιοσύνη** is remarkable. But Paul's dialectic on justification was occasioned by controversies about **ὁ νόμος** which were not felt at Thessalonica. Besides, the "justified" standing of the believer, even in that synthesis of doctrine, amounted practically to the position assured by the possession of the Spirit to the Christian. In his uncontroversial and eschatological mo-

ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, [g] ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς [g] πορνείας· 4. [g] εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ [h] σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν [i] ἁγιασμῷ καὶ [k] τιμῇ, 5. μὴ ἐν [l] πάθει [k] ἐπιθυμίας, καθάπερ [m] καὶ τὰ ἔθνη [n] τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν Θεόν· 6. [o] τὸ [p] μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν [q] ἐν τῷ [q] πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· διότι [r] ἔκδικος Κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων,

g Acts xv. 20; infin. of apposition, as Acts xv. 28; Sap. ii. 16.
h 1 Pet. iii. 7.
i See Tob. viii. 4-9, and 1 Cor. vii. 39.
k See Heb. xiii. 4 and Ignat. *ad Polyk.* v. 2.
l 4 Macc. i. 35.
m *Cf.* on ii. 14.
n From Jer. x. 25; *cf.* II. i. 8: "whose characteristic is ignorance of God" (Win. § 20, 3 b).
o *sc.* *τινα* from ἕκαστον (4).
p *Cf.* iii. 3, for the accus. infin. with neg. to denote purpose.
q *Cf.* on 2 Cor. vii. 11.
r Ps. xciv. 1, *cf.* Sir. v. 3; Rom. xii. 19, and xiii. 4.

ments, Paul taught as here that the experience of the Spirit guaranteed the believer's vindication at the end (*cf.* i. 9, 10) and also implied his ethical behaviour during the interval. The comparative lack of any allusion to the forgiveness of sins (*cf. e.g.*, iii. 5, 10, 13) does not mean that Paul thought the Thessalonians would be kept sinless during the brief interval till the parousia (so Wernle, *der Christ u. die Sünde bei Paulus*, 25-32); probably no occasion had called for any explicit teaching on this commonplace of faith (1 Cor. xv. 3, 11).

Ver. 4. Paul demands chastity from men; it is not simply a feminine virtue. Contemporary ethics, in the Roman and Greek world, was often disposed to condone marital unfaithfulness on the part of husbands, and to view prenuptial unchastity as **ἀδιάφορον** or at least as a comparatively venial offence, particularly in men (*cf.* Lecky's *History of European Morals*, i. 104 f., ii. 314 f.). The strict purity of Christ's gospel had to be learnt (**εἰδέναι**). — **σκεῦος** (lit. "vessel") = "wife;" the rendering "body" (*cf.* Barn. vii. 3) conflicts with the normal meaning of **κτᾶσθαι** ("get," "acquire;" of marriage, LXX. Ruth iv. 10; Sir. xxxvi. 29, Xen., *Symp.*, ii. 10). Paul views marriage on much the same level as he does in 1 Cor. vii. 2, 9; in its chaste and religious form, it is a remedy against sensual passion, not a gratification of that passion. Each of you (he is addressing men) must learn (**εἰδέναι** = know [how] to, *cf.* Phil. iv. 12) to get a wife of his own (when marriage is in question), but you must marry **ἐν ἁγιασμῷ** (as a Christian duty and vocation) **καὶ τιμῇ** (with a corresponding sense of the moral dignity of the relationship). The two latter words tend to raise the current estimate, presupposed here and in ver. 6, of a wife as the **σκεῦος** of her husband; this in its turn views adultery primarily as an infringement of the husband's rights or an attack on his personal property. Paul, however, closes by an emphatic word on the religious aspect (6-8) of the question; besides, as Dr. Drummond remarks, "is it not part of his greatness that, in spite of his own somewhat ascetic temperament, he was not blind to social and physiological facts?" It is noticeable that his eschatology has less effect on his view of marriage here than in 1 Cor. vii. Even were **κτᾶσθαι** taken as = "possess," a usage not quite impossible for later Greek (*cf.* Field, 72), it would only extend the idea to the duties of a Christian husband. The alternative rendering ("acquire mastery of," Luke xxi. 19) does not justify the "body" sense of **σκεῦος**.

Ver. 6. Compare the saying of rabbi Simon ben Zoma (on Deut. xxiii. 25): "Look not on thy neighbour's vineyard. If thou hast looked, enter not; if thou hast entered, regard not the fruits; if thou hast regarded them, touch them not; if thou hast touched them, eat them not. But if thou hast eaten, then thou dost eject thyself from the life of this world and of that which is to come" (quoted in Bacher's *Agada der Tannaiten*, 2nd ed., 1903, i. 430). There is no change of subject, from licentiousness to dishonesty. The asyndeton and the euphemistic **ἐν τῷ πράγματι** (not **τῳ** = **τινί**, Win. § 6 4*d*) show that Paul is still dealing with the immorality of men, but now as a form of social dishonesty and fraud. The metaphors are drawn from trade, perhaps as appropriate to a trading community. While **ὑπερβαίνειν** may be intransitive (in its classical sense of "transgress"), it probably governs **ἀδελφόν** in the sense of "get the better of," or "overreach;" **πλεονεκτεῖν** similarly = "overreach," "defraud," "take advantage of" (2 Cor. vii. 2, xii. 17, 18; Xen., *Mem.*, iii. 5, 2; Herod. viii. 112). Compare **ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ** (Eph. iv. 19). The passage (with ver. 8) sounds almost like a vague reminiscence of Test. Asher, ii. 6: **ὁ πλεονεκτῶν τὸν**

καθὼς καὶ [s] προείπαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ [t] διεμαρτυράμεθα. 7. οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς [u] ἐπὶ [v] ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλ' [w] ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 8. [x] τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν διδόντα τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἅγιον [y] εἰς ὑμᾶς. 9. περὶ δὲ τῆς [z] φιλαδελφίας οὐ [a] χρείαν ἔχετε [a] γράφειν ὑμῖν·[1] αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς [b] θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε [c] εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους· 10. καὶ γὰρ ποιεῖτε αὐτὸ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς [d] ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ. παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [e] περισσεύειν μᾶλλον 11. καὶ [f] φιλοτιμεῖσθαι [g] ἡσυχάζειν καὶ [h] πράσ-

s Cf. Win. § 13, 13.
t = "Solemnly testified" (cf. 1 Tim. v. 21).
u "With a view to" (cf. Eph. ii. 10): object and terms.
v "Sexual vice" (as Col. iii. 5, Eph. v. 3), Test. Jos. iv. 6.
w = εἰς (1 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. iv. 4; Win. § 50, 5).
x Heb. xii. 1.
y As in Ezek. xxxvii. 14 (LXX).
z See on Rom. xii. 10.
a Blass, § 69, 5; 2 Cor. ix. 1; Heb. v. 12.
b Elaborated in Rom. v. 5; 2 Cor. v. 14, cf. Barn. xxi. 6; Isa. liv. 13; Ps. Sol. xvii. 35.
c Epexegetic infinitive, (Moult. 218-219) of object.
d Philippi, Berea, etc.
e Active side of ii. 12.
f See on 2 Cor. v. 9 and Rom. xv. 20 = "be distinguished for a quiet life," "strive to be quiet".
g Cf. II. iii. 12.
h = "attend to your own business," cf. Dem. *Olynth.* ii. 16.

[1] **ου χ. εχετε γραφειν υμιν** (ℵ*ADc, etc., edd.), an irregular but not uncommon turn ("you have no need of anyone to write you"), corrected in ℵcD*G, vg., Chrys., etc., to **εχομεν κ.τ.λ.** (so Lünem., Lachm., Blass, *cf.* i. 8), and in B to **ειχομεν κ.τ.λ.** (Weiss, Bahnsen), as in H to **γραφεσθαι κ.τ.λ.** (from v. 1).

πλησίον παροργίζει τὸν Θεόν . . . τὸν ἐντολέα τοῦ νόμου Κύριον ἀθετεῖ. Only **τὸν ἀνθ.** here is not the wronged party but the apostles who convey God's orders.—**διότι κ.τ.λ.** = "since (*cf.* ii. 8) the Lord is the avenger (from Deut. xxxii. 35; *cf.* Sap. xii. 12; Sir. xxx. 6; 1 Macc. xiii. 6, **ἐκδικήσω περὶ**; 4 Macc. xv. 29) in all these matters" (of impurity). How, Paul does not explain (*cf.* Col. iii. 5, 6). By a premature death (1 Cor. xi. 30)? Or, at the last judgment (i. 10)? not in the sense of Sap. iii. 16, iv. 6 (illegitimate children evidence at last day against their parents) at any rate.

Ver. 8. Elsewhere (i. 5, 6) **ἅγιον** simply denotes the divine quality of **πνεῦμα** as operating in the chosen **ἅγιοι** of God, but here the context lends it a specific value. Impurity is a violation of the relationship established by the holy God between Himself and Christians at baptism, when the holy Spirit is bestowed upon them for the purpose of consecrating them to live His life (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 19). The gift of the Spirit here is not regarded as the earnest of the future kingdom (for which immorality will disqualify) so much as the motive and power of the new life.—**διδόντα** = "the giver of," not implying continuous or successive impartation; present as in ch. v. 24; Gal. v. 8. He not only calls, but supplies the atmosphere and energy requisite for the task.—**ἀθετῶν κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* ii. 13) = contemns by ignoring such injunctions (2-6) in practical life, deliberately sets aside their authority. *Cf.* Isa. xxiv. 16, 17 f., **οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν· οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον, φόβος καὶ βόθυνος καὶ παγὶς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς** (nor shall any escape: *cf.* below on v. 3). In 2 Sam. xii. 9 f. Nathan fixes on the selfishness of David's adultery and charges him especially with *despising the commandment of the Lord.*

Vv. 9-10. **περὶ φιλαδελφίας.** One might have expected that adultery, especially when viewed as selfish greed (*cf.* ver. 6), would have come under **φ.**, but the latter bears mainly here on charity and liberality, a Christian impulse or instinct which seems to have come more naturally to the Thessalonians than ethical purity. "A new creed, like a new country, is an unhomely place of sojourn, but it makes men lean on one another and join hands" (R. L. Stevenson).

Ver 10. Their **ἀγάπη** was no parochial affection, but neither was it to be fussy or showy. much less to be made an excuse for neglecting their ordinary business (11 12); this would discredit them in the eyes of the busy outside public (**πρὸς** = in intercourse or relations with) and sap their own independence. Such seems the least violent way of explaining the transition in **καὶ φιλοτιμεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.** The church was apparently composed, for the most part, of tradesmen and working people (**χερσὶν ὑμῶν**, *cf.* Renan's *S. Paul*, 246 f.) with their families, but there may have been some wealthier members, whose charity was in danger of being abused. *Cf.* Demos., *Olynth.*, iii. 35: **οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου μηδὲν ἐγὼ ποιοῦσιν τὰ τῶν ποιούντων εἶπον ὡς δεῖ νέμειν, οὐδ' αὐτοὺς μὲν ἀργεῖν καὶ σχολάζειν καὶ ἀπορεῖν.**

Ver. 11. **φιλοτ. ἡσυχάζειν** (oxy-

σειν τὰ ἴδια καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν, καθὼς ὑμῖν παρηγγείλαμεν· 12. ἵνα περιπατῆτε [i] εὐσχημόνως πρὸς [k] τοὺς ἔξω καὶ [l] μηδενὸς χρείαν ἔχητε.

13. οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων, ἵνα μὴ λυπῆσθε καθὼς [m] καὶ οἱ [n] λοιποὶ [o] οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα. 14. εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη, [p] οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς

i See on 1 Cor. xiv. 40.
k See on 1 Cor. v. 12.
l Neuter (Heb. v. 12, etc.).
m *Cf.* note on ii. 14.
n *i.e.* pagans as in Eph. ii. 3, *cf.* Sap. ii. 1 f.
o *Cf.* Theogn. 567, *Iph. Aul.* 1250, Sap. ii. 22, iii. 18.
p *i.e.* "then it follows that".

moron). The prospect of the second advent (iv. 13 f., v. 1-10) seems to have made some local enthusiasts feel that it was superfluous for them to go on working, if the world was to be broken up immediately. This feverish symptom occupies Paul more in the diagnosis of his second letter, but it may have been present to his mind here. For instances of this common phase in unbalanced minds compare the story of Hippolytus (*Comm. Dan.*, iv. 19) about a Pontic bishop in the second century who misled his people by prophesying the advent within six months, and also a recent outburst of the same superstition in Tripoli (*Westminster Gazette*, Nov., 1899) where "the report that the end of the world will come on November 13" produced "an amazing state of affairs. The Israelites are sending their wives to pray in the synagogues, and most workmen have ceased work. Debtors refuse to pay their debts, so that trade is almost paralysed."—**καὶ πράσσειν τὰ ἴδια.** Plato uses a similar expression in his *Republic*, 496 D (**ἡσυχίαν ἔχων καὶ τὰ αὑτοῦ πράττων**); but of the philosopher who withdraws in despair from the lawlessness of a world which he is impotent to help (see also Thompson's note on *Gorg.*, 526*c*).

Vv. 13-18. **περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων.**

Ver. 13. **δὲ,** after **οὐ θέλομεν** as a single expression.—Affection for the living has another side, *viz.*, unselfish solicitude for the dead. Since Paul left, some of the Thessalonian Christians had died, and the survivors were distressed by the fear that these would have to occupy a position secondary to those who lived until the advent of the Lord, or even that they had passed beyond any such participation at all. At Corinth some of the local Christians felt this anguish so keenly, on behalf of friends and relatives who had died outside the church, that they were in the habit of being baptised as their representatives, to ensure their final bliss (1 Cor. xv. 29). The concern of the Thessalonians, however, was for their fellow-Christians, in the intermediate state of Hades. As the problem had not arisen during Paul's stay at Thessalonica, he now offers the church a reasonable solution of the difficulty (13-18).—**οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν,** contrast the **οἴδατε** of iv. 2, v. 2, and compare the ordinary epistolary phrases of the papyri (*Expos.*, 1908, 55) such as **γεινώσκειν σε θέλω** (commonly at the beginning of a letter, *cf.* Col. ii. 1; Phil. i. 12; 2 Cor. i. 8, and with **ὅτι,** but here, as in 1 Cor. xii. 1, with **περί**).—**τῶν κοιμωμένων** = *the dead in Christ* (16), a favourite Jewish euphemism (Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conc. of Last Things*, 247 f., and *cf.* Fries in *Zeitschrift für neutest. Wiss.* i. 306 f.), not unknown to Greek and Roman literature.—**οἱ λοιποί, κ.τ.λ.,** *cf.* Butcher's *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, pp. 153 f., 159 f. Hope is the distinguishing note of Christians here as in Eph. ii. 12; Col. i. 22, etc.

Ver. 14. Unlike some of the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 17, 18), the Thessalonians did not doubt the fact of Christ's resurrection (**εἰ** of course implies no uncertainty). Paul assumes their faith in it and argues from it. Their vivid and naïve belief in Christ's advent within their own lifetime was the very source of their distress. Paul still shares that belief (17).—**διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is an unusual expression which might, so far as grammar is concerned, go either with **τ. κ.** (so. *e.g.*, Ellic., Alford, Kabisch, Lightfoot, Findlay, Milligan) or **ἄξει.** The latter is the preferable construction (so most editors). The phrase is not needed (*cf.* 15) to limit **τ. κ.** to Christians (so Chrys., Calvin), for the unbelieving dead are not before the writer's mind, and, even so, **ἐν** would have been the natural preposition (*cf.* 16); nor does it mean martyrdom. In the light of v. 9 (*cf.* Rom. v. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 21), it seems to connect less awkwardly with **ἄξει,** though not = "at the intercession of Jesus"

[q] τοὺς κοιμηθέντας διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [r] ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. 15. τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν [s] ἐν λόγῳ [s] Κυρίου, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ [t] περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου [u] οὐ μὴ [v] φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμη-

q = "those who have fallen asleep" (Moult. i. 162). r Cf. Heb. i. 6 and Asc. Isa. iv. 16. s LXX of 1 Kings xx. 35, "Domini nomine et quasi eo loquente" (Beza). t 2 Macc. i. 31, viii. 14, etc. u "by no means" (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 13). v Sap. vi. 13, etc.

(Rutherford). Jesus is God's agent in the final act, commissioned to raise and muster the dead (*cf.* Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deut. Theol.*, 1874, 189 f., and Schettler, *Die paul. Formel "Durch Christus,"* 1907, 57 f.). The divine mission of the Christ, which is to form the climax of things, involves the resurrection of the dead who are His (v. 10). Any general resurrection is out of the question (so Did., xvi. 6: **ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· οὐ πάντων δέ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐρρέθη, ἥξει ὁ Κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ**).

Ver. 15. **κυρίου.** On the tendency of the N.T. writers to reserve **κύριος**, with its O.T. predicates of divine authority, for Jesus, *cf.* Kattenbusch, *op. cit.*, ii. 522. Paul's use of the term goes back to Christ's own claim to **κύριος** in the higher sense of Mark xii. 35 f.—**λέγομεν.** Contrast the **οἴδατε** of v. 2 and the language of iv. 1. Evidently Paul had not had time or occasion to speak of such a contingency, when he was with them.—**ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου** may mean either (*a*) a quotation (like Acts xx. 35) from the sayings of Jesus, or (*b*) a prophetic revelation vouchsafed to Paul himself, or to Silvanus (*cf.* Acts xv. 32). In the former case (so, among modern editors, Schott, Ewald, Drummond, Wohl.), an **ἄγραφον** is cited (Calvin, Koch, Weizsäcker, Resch, *Paulinismus*, 238 f.; Ropes, *die Sprüche Jesu*, 153 f.; M. Goguel; van der Vies, 15-17; O. Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, 10; von Soden) but it is evidently given in a free form, and the precise words cannot (even in ver. 16) be disentangled. Besides we should expect **τινι** to be added. Unless, therefore, we are to think of a primitive collection (Lake, *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, 1906, 108 f.) or of some oral tradition, (*b*) is preferable. The contents of Matt. xxiv. 31 (part of the small apocalypse) are too dissimilar to favour the conjecture (Pelt, Zimmer, Weiss) that Paul was thinking of this saying as current perhaps in oral tradition, and the O.T. analogy of **λόγος Κυρίου** (= God's prophetic word), together with the internal probabilities of the case (Paul does not remind them of it, as elsewhere in the epistle) make it on the whole more likely that Paul is repeating words heard in a vision (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 9; so Chryst., Theod., etc., followed by Alford, de Wette, Ellicott, Dods, Lünemann, Godet, Paret: *Paulus und Jesus*, 53 f., Simon: *die Psychologie des Ap. Paulus*, 100, Findlay, Lightfoot, Milligan, Lueken). *Cf.* the discussion in Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles*, 408 f., and Feine's *Jesus Christus u. Paulus*, 178, 179. Later in the century a similar difficulty vexed the pious Jew who wrote Fourth Esdras (v. 41, 42: *I said, But lo, O Lord, thou hast made the promise to those who shall be in the end: and what shall they do that have been before us . . . ? And He said to me, I will liken my judgment to a ring; as there is no slackness of those who are last, so shall there be no swiftness of those who are first*). His theory is that the previous generations of Israel will be as well off as their posterity in the latter days. Further on (xiii. 14 f.) he raises and answers the question whether it was better to die before the last days or to live until they came (the phrase, *those that are left*, "qui relicti sunt," vii. 28 = Paul's **οἱ περιλειπόμενοι**). His solution (which Steck, in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1883, 509-524, oddly regards as the **λόγος κ.** of 1 Thess. iv. 15; see Schmidt's refutation, pp. 107-110) is the opposite of Paul's: *those who are left are more blessed than those who have died.* If this difficulty was felt in Jewish circles during the first half of the century, it may have affected those of the Thessalonian Christians who had been formerly connected with the synagogue, but the likelihood is that Paul's language is coloured by his own Jewish training (*cf.* Charles on *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 15). The misunderstanding of the Thessalonians, which had led to their sorrow and perplexity, was evidently due to the fact that, for some reason or another, Paul had not mentioned the possibility of any Christians dying before the second advent (so sure was he that all would soon survive it), coupled with the fact that Greeks found it hard to grasp what exactly resurrection meant (*cf.* Acts xvii. 32) for Christians.

θέντας· 16. ὅτι [w] αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ [x] ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν [y] σάλπιγγι Θεοῦ, καταβήσεται ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ [z] οἱ νεκροὶ [a] ἐν [a] Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον· 17. [b] ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι, [c] ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς [d] ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν [e] τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα, καὶ οὕτω πάντοτε σὺν Κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα. 18. [f] ὥστε [g] παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους [h] ἐν τοῖς λόγοις [i] τούτοις.

w *Cf.* iii. 11; not angels as in Mt. xxiv. 31.
x Jude 9: to summon the angels? (iii. 13).
y 1 Cor. xv. 52, from Joel ii. 1 (LXX); *cf.* 4 Esd. vi. 23, etc.
z 1 Cor. xv. 15.
a Blass, § 47, 7.
b 1 Cor. xv. 7, 23.
c v. 10, II. i. 7; 2 Cor. iv. 14.
d Post-classical form, Win. § 13, 10 *cf.* Sap. iv. 10.
e Genitive as in Mt. xxv. 1.
f Burton, M.T. 237.
g v. 11., ii. 11.
h Instrumental, as 1 Cor. iv. 21, etc.
i *i.e.* 15-17.

Ver. 16. **κελεύσματι** = the loud summons which was to muster the saints (so in Philo, *De praem. et poen.*, 19: **καθάπερ οὖν ἀνθρώπους ἐν ἐσχατιαῖς ἀπῳκισμένους ῥᾳδίως ἑνὶ κελεύσματι συναγάγοι ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς ὅ τι ἂν θελήσῃ χωρίον**), forms, as its lack of any genitive shows, one conception with the **φ. α.** and the **σ. θ.** (*cf. DCG*, ii. 766). The archangel is Michael, who in Jewish tradition not only summoned the angels but sounded a trumpet to herald God's approach for judgment (*e.g.*, in *Apoc. Mosis*, xxii.). With such scenic and realistic details, drawn from the heterogeneous eschatology of the later Judaism, Paul seeks to make intelligible to his own mind and to that of his readers, in quite an original fashion (*cf.* Stähelin, *Jahrb. f. deut. Theol.*, 1874, pp. 199-218), the profound truth that neither death nor any cosmic crisis in the future will make any essential difference to the close relation between the Christian and his Lord. **Οὕτω πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα** (*cf.* v. 11; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 20): this is all that remains to us, in our truer view of the universe, from the naïve **λόγος κυρίου** of the apostle, but it is everything. Note that Paul says nothing here about any change of the body (Teichmann, 35 f.), or about the embodiment of the risen life in its celestial **δόξα**. See *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 14-15: "And the Lord will come with His holy angels and with the armies of the holy ones from the seventh heaven . . . and He will give rest to the godly whom He shall find in the body in this world."

Ver. 17. **ἐν νεφέλαις**, the ordinary method of sudden rapture or ascension to heaven (Acts i. 9, 11; Rev. xi. 12; Slav. En. iii. 1, 2).—**ἁρπαγησόμεθα.** So in Sap. iv. 11, the righteous man, **εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ** (1 Thess. iv. 1) **γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη** (1 Thess. i. 4), is caught up (**ἡρπάγη**).—**ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς . . . σὺν Κυρίῳ**, the future bliss is a re-union of Christians not only with Christ but with one another.—**εἰς ἀπάντησιν**, a pre-Christian phrase of the *koinê* (*cf. e.g.*, *Tebtunis Papyri*, 1902, pt. i., n. 43, 7. **παρεγενήθημεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν, κ.τ.λ.**, and Moulton, i. 14), implying welcome of a great person on his arrival. What further functions are assigned to the saints, thus incorporated in the retinue of the Lord (iii. 13; *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10),—whether, *e.g.*, they are to sit as assessors at the judgment (Sap. iii. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; Luke xxii. 30)—Paul does not stop to state here. His aim is to reassure the Thessalonians about the prospects of their dead in relation to the Lord, not to give any complete programme of the future (so Matt. xxiv. 31; Did. x., xvi.). Plainly, however, the saints do not rise at once to heaven, but return with the Lord to the scene of his final manifestation on earth (so Chrysost., Aug., etc.). They simply *meet* the Lord in the air, on his way to judgment—a trait for which no Jewish parallel can be found.—**καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα** (no more sleeping in him or waiting for him).

Ver. 18. **ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις.** Paul had an intelligible word upon the future, unlike the Hellenic mysteries which usually made religion a matter of feeling rather than of definite teaching (Hardie's *Lect. on Classical Subjects*, pp. 53 f.). A pagan letter of consolation has been preserved from the second century (*Oxyrh. Papyri*, i. 115): "Eirene to Taonnophris and Philon good cheer! I was as grieved and wept as much over Eumoiros as over Didymas, and I did all that was fitting, as did all my family. . . . But still we can do nothing in such a case. So comfort yourselves. Good-bye." One of Cicero's pathetic letters (*ad. Fam.*, xiv. 2), written from Thessalonica, speaks doubtfully of any re-union after death ("haec non sunt in manu nostra").

V. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῶν [a] χρόνων καὶ τῶν [a] καιρῶν, ἀδελφοί, οὐ [b] χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι· 2. [b] αὐτοὶ γὰρ [c] ἀκριβῶς οἴδατε ὅτι [d] ἡμέρα Κυρίου [e] ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται· 3. [f] ὅταν [1] λέγωσιν, "[g] Εἰρήνη καὶ ἀσφάλεια," [f] τότε [h] αἰφνίδιος αὐτοῖς [i] ἐπίσταται [k] ὄλεθρος [l] ὥσπερ ἡ [m] ὠδὶν τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσῃ, καὶ [n] οὐ μὴ ἐκφύγωσιν. 4. ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν [o] σκότει [p] ἵνα ἡ ἡμέρα [q] ὑμᾶς ὡς κλέπτας [2] καταλάβῃ· 5. πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς [r] υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ

a See on Acts i. 7.
b Cf. iv. 9.
c Cf. on Acts xviii. 25.
d Without article as in Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16.
e Reminiscence of saying in Lk. xii. 39; cf. Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15.
f Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 54.
g Ezek. xiii. 10.
h Lk. xxi. 34.
i Win. § 5, 10, c.; Sap. vi. 5.
k "Destruction" (II. i. 9).
l Cf. En. lxii. 4.
m On form, cf. Win. § 9, 10.
n iv. 15; cf. Ps. Sol. xv. 9, and above on iv. 8.
o Rom. ii. 19; cf. Hom. *Iliad*, iii. 10, κλέπτῃ δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω.
p Conceived result (cf. Burton, M.T., 218-219) = "so that".
q Emphatic.
r From Lk. xvi. 8 (cf. En. cviii. 11)?

[1] To the original asyndeton of οταν (ℵ*AG, 17, 44, 47, 179, d, e, f, g, Syr.sch, arm., aeth., Tert., Cyp., Jer, Orig., etc.; so edd.), either γαρ (KLP, vg. Euthal., Dam.), or δε (ℵcBD, cop., Syr.p, Eus., Chrys., Theod., Schott, Findlay, WH marg.) has been subsequently added. For ωσπερ η ωδιν, Bentl. conj. ωσπερει ωδινες.

[2] κλεπτας (AB cop., so Bentl., Grot., Koch, Ewald, Renan, Jowett, Rutherford, Lach., WH, Lgft.), seems to be smoothed away in the strongly attested variant and correction κλεπτης (from ver. 2). Field (200-201) cites instances from Plutarch (*e.g.*, *Vit. Crassi*, xxix., τον δε Κρασσον ημερα κατελαβεν) and Pausanias, to illustrate nocturnal operations being surprised by the advent of the dawn. "The echo of the word (κλεπτης) is still in his ears; to avoid repetition, he changes its use. Lastly, the reading κλεπτας gives a point to υιοι φωτος" (Jowett). For another instance of AB preserving the original reading, *cf.* Eph. i. 20.

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-11. **περὶ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν.**

Ver. 1. The *times and periods* are not "simply the broad course of time, of which the ἡμέρα Κυρίου constitutes the closing scene" (Baur); **καιρός** denotes a section of time more definitely than **χρόνος**, in Greek usage. "No nation has distinguished so subtly the different forms under which time can be logically conceived. **Χρόνος** is time viewed in its extension, as a succession of moments, the external framework of action. . . . **Καιρός**, a word, which has, I believe, no single or precise eqivalent in any other language . . . is that immediate present which is what we make it; time charged with opportunity" (Butcher, *Harvard Lect. on Gk. Subjects*, pp. 117-119). In the plural, especially in this eschatological outlook, the phrase is little more, however, than a periphrasis for "when exactly things are to happen". Paul thought he needed to do no more than reiterate the suddenness of the Last Day. But, not long afterwards, he found that the Thessalonians did require to have the **χρόνοι καὶ καιροί** explained to them in outline (II., ii. 2 f.).

Ver. 2. **οἴδατε**, referring to the teaching of Jesus on this crucial point, which Paul had transmitted to them (see Introduction).

Ver. 3. **ὅταν, κ.τ.λ.**, when the very words, "All's well," "It is all right," are on their lips.—**ἐπίσταται**, of an enemy suddenly appearing (Isocrat., *Evag.*, § 58 ἐπὶ τὸ βασίλειον ἐπιστάς, Herod. iv. 203).—**αὐτοῖς**, *i.e.*, while the Day comes suddenly to Christians and unbelievers alike, only the latter are surprised by it. Christians are on the alert, open-eyed; they do not know when it is to come, but they are alive to any signs of its coming. Thus there is no incompatibility between this emphasis on the instantaneous character of the advent and the emphasis, in II., ii. 3 f., on the preliminary conditions.

Ver. 4. From the sudden and unexpected nature of the Last Day, Paul passes, by a characteristic inversion of metaphor in **κλέπτας**, to a play of thought upon the day as light. A double symbolism of **ἡμέρα**, as of **κοιμᾶσθαι**, thus pervades 4-8. Lightfoot cites a very striking parallel from Eur., *Iph. Taur.*, 1025-1026.

Ver. 5. The present age is utter night (שֶׁכֻּלּוֹ לַיְלָה), as contemporary rabbis taught; the age to come is all day. Meantime faith is to be held fast through this night (*cf.* passages quoted in Schlatter's *die Sprache u. Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*, 17, 18). **υἱοὶ φ. καὶ ἡ.**

ἡμέρας· οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς [s]οὐδὲ σκότους. 6 [t]Ἄρα [t]οὖν μὴ [u]καθεύδωμεν ὡς οἱ [v]λοιποί ἀλλὰ [w]γρηγορῶμεν καὶ [x]νήφωμεν. 7. οἱ γὰρ καθεύδοντες νυκτὸς καθεύδουσι· καὶ οἱ [y]μεθυσκόμενοι νυκτὸς μεθύουσιν· 8. [z]ἡμεῖς δὲ [a]ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν, [b]ἐνδυσάμενοι [c]θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας· 9. ὅτι οὐκ [d]ἔθετο [e]ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς [f]ὀργὴν ἀλλ᾽ εἰς [g]περιποίησιν σωτηρίας διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 10. τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα [h]εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν, εἴτε καθευδῶμεν, [i]ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν. 11. διὸ [k]παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε [l]εἷς τὸν ἕνα, καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε.

s ii. 3.
t Cf. II. ii. 15; cf. 1 Rom. v. 18, etc.
u Cf. on Eph. v. 14.
v iv. 13.
w Cf. on 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Mt. xxiv. 42.
x See on 1 Pet. v. 8.
y Win. § 15.
z Eph. vi. 14, 17; Rom. xiii. 11 f.
a Constr.; cf. Win. § 30, 11, b.
b Isa. lix. 17.
c Cf. on Eph. vi. 14 = "coat of mail".
d 1 Pet. ii. 8.
e Emphatic, as opposed to οἱ λοιποί.
f i. 10.
g Cf. on Eph. i. 14; here active (= possess.) as in II. ii. 14. Heb. x. 39.
h Cf. for syntax, Rom. xiv. 8; Burton, M.T., 252-253.
i iv. 17.
k iv. 18.
l unclassical, Blass, § 45, 2; cf. 1 Cor. v. 6.

ἡμέρας is a stronger and Semitic way of expressing the thought of "belonging to" (*cf.* ver. 8).

Ver. 6. To be alert, in one's sober senses (**νήφειν**), is more than to be merely awake. Here, as in verse 8, the Christians are summoned to live up to their privileges and position towards the Lord. "There are few of us who are not rather ashamed of our sins and follies as we look out on the blessed morning sunlight, which comes to us like a bright-winged angel beckoning us to quit the old path of vanity that stretches its dreary length behind us" (George Eliot). In one of the Zoroastrian scriptures (*Vendidad*, xviii. 23-25) the cock, as the bird of the dawn, is inspired to cry, "Arise, O men! . . . Lo here is Bushyasta coming down upon you, who lulls to sleep again the whole living world as soon as it has awoke, saying, 'Sleep, sleep on, O man [and live in sin, *Yasht*, xxii. 41]! The time is not yet come.'"

Ver. 7. *Cf.* Plutarch, *De Iside*, vi., **Οἶνον δὲ οἱ μὲν ἐν Ἡλίου πόλει θεραπεύοντες τὸν θεὸν οὐκ εἰσφέρουσιν τοπαράπαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ὡς οὐ προσῆκον ἡμέρας πίνειν, τοῦ κυρίου καὶ βασιλέως ἐφορῶντος.**

Ver. 8. **ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα κ.τ.λ.**, the thought of ii. 12, 13; the mutual love of Christians, which forms the practical expression of their faith in God, is their true fitness and equipment for the second advent. Faith and love are a unity; where the one goes the other follows. They are also not merely their own coat of mail, requiring no extraneous protection, but the sole protection of life against indolence, indifference and indulgence. They need simply to be used. If they are not used, they are lost, and with them the Christian himself. The transition to the military metaphor is mediated (as in Rom. xiii. 12, 13) by the idea of the sentry's typical vigilance.

Ver. 9. The mention of the future **σωτηρία** starts Paul off, for a moment, on what it involves (9, 10).

Ver. 10. Life or death makes no difference to the Christian's union and fellowship with Jesus Christ, whose death was in our eternal interests (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 7-9). For this metaphorical use of **γρηγ. εἴτε καθ.** (different from that in 6), Wohl. cites Plato, *Symp.*, 203a: **διὰ τούτου** (i.e. Eros) **πᾶσά ἐστιν ἡ ὁμιλία καὶ ἡ διάλεκτος θεοῖς πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ ἐγρηγορόσι καὶ καθεύδουσιν**, as a possible basis.

Ver. 11. The modification in the primitive attitude of Christians to the Parousia of Jesus is significant. Instead of all expecting to be alive at that blessed crisis, the inroads of death had now forced men to the higher consolation that "it did not make the least difference whether one became partaker of the blessings of that event in the ranks of the dead or of the living. The question whether the Parousia was to happen sooner or later was no longer of paramount importance. The important thing was to cultivate that attitude of mind which the writer of this epistle recommended" (Baur).—**οἰκοδομεῖτε**, the term sums up all the support and guidance that a Christian receives from the fellowship of the church (*cf.* Beyschlag's *N.T. Theology*, ii. 232).—**καθὼς καὶ ποιεῖτε**, another instance (*cf.* iv. 1, 10) of Paul's fine courtesy and tact. He is careful to recognise the Thessalonians' attainments,

12. [m] Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [n] εἰδέναι τοὺς [o] κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ [p] προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν ἐν Κυρίῳ καὶ [q] νουθετοῦντας ὑμᾶς, 13. καὶ [r] ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ὑπερεκπερισσῶς ἐν ἀγάπῃ διὰ τὸ ἔργον αὐτῶν. [s] εἰρηνεύετε ἐν [t] ἑαυτοῖς. 14. [u] παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, νουθετεῖτε τοὺς [v] ἀτάκτους, [w] παραμυθεῖσθε τοὺς [x] ὀλιγοψύχους, ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν, [y] μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας. 15. ὁρᾶτε [z] μή τις [a] κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ τινὶ ἀποδῷ· ἀλλὰ πάντοτε τὸ [b] ἀγαθὸν διώκετε εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας. 16. πάντοτε [c] χαίρετε, 17. [d] ἀδια-

m iv. 1, II. ii. 2.
n *Cf.* Ps. cxliv. 3; 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Ign. *Smyrn.* ix.
o Gal. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 10.
p *Cf.* on Rom. xii. 8.
q See on Acts xx. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 14.
r Phil. ii. 3; *cf.* Thuc. iv. 5, etc.
s Mk. ix. 50; 2 Cor. xiii. 11.
t = ἀλλήλοις. (so Plato, *Gorg.* 465 c).
u *Cf.* ii. 11.
v Xen. *Mem.* III. i. 7.
w ii. 11; Joh. xi. 19. 31.
x Exod. vi. 9; Isa. lvii. 15; Sir. vii. 10, and Ps. Sol. xvi. 11.
y See on 1 Cor. xiii. 4.
z Object. clause (Burton, M.T. 209).
a Prov. xx. 22 (Matt. v. 44); Rom. xii. 17.
b = "What is kind and helpful."
c Paul's pr.ctice, 2 Cor. vi. 10; *cf.* Phil. iv. 4; Rom. xii. 12, and Col. i. 11.
d i. 3; *cf.* Ign. *Eph.* x.; Herm. *Sim.* ix. 11, 7; Ep. Arist. 226 (τὸν Θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦ διαπαντός).

even while stirring them up to further efforts.

Vv. 12-22. General instructions for the church.

Ver. 12. These **προϊστάμενοι** are not officials but simply local Christians like Jason, Secundus, and perhaps Demas (in whose houses the Christians met), who, on account of their capacities or position, had informally taken the lead and made themselves responsible for the welfare and worship of the new society. The organisation is quite primitive, and the triple description of these men's functions is too general to permit any precise delineation of their duties (*cf.* Lindsay's *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, pp. 122 f). **κοπιῶντας** denotes the energy and practical interest of these people, which is further defined by **προϊσταμένους** (a term with technical associations, to which **ἐν κυρίῳ** is added in order to show that their authority rests on religious services) and **νουθετοῦντας** (= the moral discipline, perhaps of catechists, teachers and prophets). An instinct of rebellion against authority is not confined to any one class, but artisans and tradesmen are notorious for a tendency to suspect or depreciate any control exercised over them in politics or in religion, especially when it is exercised by some who have risen from their own ranks. The community at Thessalonica was largely recruited from this class, and Paul, with characteristic penetration, appeals for respect and generous appreciation towards the local leaders.

Ver. 13. "Regard them with a very special love for their works' sake" (so thorough and important it is). "Be at peace among yourselves" (instead of introducing divisions and disorder by any insubordination or carping).

Ver. 14. The particular form of insubordination at Thessalonica was idleness (for the contemporary use of **ἀτ.** in this sense, see *Oxyrh. Papyri*, ii. 1901, p. 275). Similarly, in *Olynth.* iii. 11, Demosthenes denounces all efforts made to shield from punishment **τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας**, *i.e.*, those citizens who shirk active service and evade the State's call for troops.—**ὀλιγοψύχους** = "faint-hearted" (under trial, i. 6, see references), **ἀντέχεσθε** (cleave to, put your arm round), **ἀσθενῶν** (*i.e.*, not in health only but in faith or position, Acts xx. 35), **μακ. π. πάντας** = do not lose temper or patience with any (of the foregoing classes) however unreasonable and exacting they may be (*cf.* Prov. xviii. 14, LXX). The mutual services of the community are evidently not to be left to the **προϊστάμενοι**, for Paul here urges on the rank and file the same kind of social duties as he implies were incumbent upon their leaders (*cf.* **νουθετ.** 12, 14). If **ἀδελφοί** here meant the **προϊστάμενοι**, it would have been more specificially defined. An antithesis between 12 and 14 would be credible in a speech, not in a letter.

Ver. 15. The special circumstances which called for forbearance (ver. 14) were likely to develop a disposition to retaliate upon those who displayed an ungenerous and insubordinate spirit (*e.g.*, the **ἄτακτοι**); but the injunction has a wider range (**εἰς πάντας**, including their fellow-countrymen, ii. 14).

Ver. 16. To comment adequately upon these diamond drops (16-18) would be to outline a history of the Christian experience in its higher levels. **π. χαίρετε**, *cf.* Epict., i. 16 ("Had we understanding, ought we to do anything but sing hymns and bless the Deity and tell of His benefits? . . . What else can I do, a lame

λείπτως προσεύχεσθε, 18. [e] ἐν παντὶ [f] εὐχαριστεῖτε· [g] τοῦτο γὰρ [g] θέλημα Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [h] εἰς ὑμᾶς. 19. τὸ πνεῦμα [i] μὴ [k] σβέννυτε, 20. προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε· 21. πάντα [1] δὲ [l] δοκιμάζετε, τὸ [m] καλὸν κατέχετε· 22. [n] ἀπὸ παντὸς [o] εἴδους πονηροῦ [p] ἀπέχεσθε. 23. [q] Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς [r] ὁλοτελεῖς· καὶ

e *Cf.* on 2 Cor. iv. 8.
f 2 Cor. vi. 10; Phil. iv. 6; Clem. Rom. xxx.-viii. 4.
g iv. 3.
h For absence of article in this constr. see Field, 59-60 on the similar usage in Lk. vii. 30.
i "Give over": μὴ with pres. imper. implies action already begun Moult. i. 122 f.
k Contrast 2 Tim. i. 5, and *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 1.
l ii. 4; 1 Jo. iv. 1.
m 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Phil. i. 10.
n Like Job (Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3).
o = "form" or "sort" (so Jos. *Ant.* x. 3).
p iv. 3; *cf.* Did. iii. 1.
q iii. 11, iv. 16.
r Only here (N.T.), = ὅλους (through and through).

[1] After παντα edd. add the disjunctive δε (with almost all MSS. and vss., also Clem., Alex., *Paed.* iii. 12, 95, exc. ℵ*A, cop., syr.sch), which became absorbed by the first syllable of the following word. Blass (after K, min., etc.) δοκιμαζοντες.

old man, than sing hymns to God? . . . I exhort you to join in this same song.") There is a thread of connection with the foregoing counsel. The unswerving aim of being good and doing good to all men, is bound up with that faith in God's unfailing goodness to men which enables the Christian cheerfully to accept the disappointments and sufferings of social life. This faith can only be held by prayer, *i.e.*, a constant reference of all life's course to God, and such prayer must be more than mere resignation; it implies a spirit of unfailing gratitude to God, instead of any suspicious or rebellious attitude.

Ver. 17. "*Pray always*, says the Apostle; that is, have the habit of prayer, turning your thoughts into acts by connecting them with the idea of the redeeming God" (Coleridge, *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*), cp. iii. 11, v. 23.

Ver. 18. Chrysostom, who wrote: τὸ ἀεὶ δηλονότι εὐχαριστεῖν, τοῦτο φιλοσόφου ψυχῆς, gave a practical illustration of this heroic temper by repeating, as he died in the extreme hardships of an enforced and painful exile, δόξα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκα. For thanksgiving even in bereavement, *cf.* Aug., *Conf.*, ix. 12; and further, *ibid.*, ix. 7 (tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur, secundum morem Orientalium partium, ne populus maeroris taedio contabesceret, institutum est).

Ver. 19. τοῦτο κ.τ.λ. The primary reference is to εὐχαριστεῖτε, but the preceding imperatives are so closely bound up with this, that it is needless to exclude them from the scope of the θέλημα.—ἐν X. 'I. This glad acceptance of life's rain and sunshine alike as from the hand of God, Jesus not only exemplified (*cf.* context of μιμηταὶ . . . τοῦ Κυρίου, i. 6) but also enabled all who keep in touch with him to realise. The basis of it is the Christian revelation and experience; apart from the living Lord it is neither conceivable nor practicable (*cf.* R. H. Hutton's *Modern Guides of English Thought*, pp. 122 f.).

Ver. 20. As εὐχαριστεῖν was a special function of the prophets in early Christian worship (*cf.* Did. x. 7), the transition is natural. The local abuses of ecstatic prophecy in prediction (2 Thess. ii. 2) or what seem to be exaggerated counsels of perfection (ver. 16 f.) must not be allowed to provoke any reaction which would depreciate and extinguish this vital gift or function of the faith. Paul, with characteristic sanity, holds the balance even. Such enthusiastic outbursts are neither to be despised as silly vapouring nor to be accepted blindly as infallible revelations. The true criticism of προφητεία comes (ver. 21) from the Christian conscience which is sensitive to the καλόν, the συμφέρον, the οἰκοδομή, or the ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως (*cf.* Weizsäcker's *Apost. Age*, ii. 270 f.). But this criticism must be positive. In applying the standard of spiritual discernment, it must sift, not for the mere pleasure of rejecting the erroneous but with the object of retaining what is genuine.

Ver. 22. A further general precept, added to bring out the negative side of κατέχετε, κ.τ.λ.—πονηροῦ neut. abstract = "of wickedness," as Gen. ii. 9 (τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ).—παντὸς κ.τ.λ., perhaps an allusion to the manifold ways of going wrong (Arist., *Nik. Eth.*, ii. 6 14, τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτάνειν πολλαχῶς ἐστίν . . . τὸ δὲ κατορθοῦν μοναχῶς).

Ver. 23. εἰρήνης, with a special allusion to the breaches of harmony and charity produced by vice (*cf.* connection of iii. 12, 13 and iv. 3 f.), indolence, impatience of authority or of defects in one

[s] ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ [t] σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τηρηθείη. 24. [u] πιστὸς ὁ [v] καλῶν ὑμᾶς, ὃς καὶ [w] ποιήσει.

25. Ἀδελφοί, [x] προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. 26. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πάντας ἐν [y] φιλήματι [z] ἁγίῳ.

27. ἐνορκίζω[1] ὑμᾶς [a] τὸν Κύριον, [b] ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν [c] ἐπιστολὴν πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς.

28. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν.

s Adj. put first for emphasis, agreeing with first of subst. which it precedes.
t *Cf.* Phil. iii. 21.
u See above on iii. 13, and ii. 10.
v See on 1 Cor. i. 9.
w As Num. xxiii. 19; Ps. xxxvii. 5 (LXX).
x Ver. 17, II. iii. 1.
y See on Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; and Justin's Apol. i. 65.
z Clem. Alex. *Paed.* III. ii. 81.
a For constr. *cf.* Acts xix. 13.
b Lk. iv. 16; Acts xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 15; Col. iv. 16.
c II. ii. 15.

[1] Read **ενορκιζω** [only here N.T., = "adjure," strengthened form of **ορκιζω**] with ABD*, min., Euth., Dam. (edd.). But om. **αγιοις** before **αδελφοις** with ℵ*BDG, min., d, e, f, g, aeth., Euth., Amb., Cassiod. (edd., exc. de Wette, Koch, Ellic., Weiss); the addition of **αγιοις**, like the omission of **πασι**, "entspringt vielleicht dem hierarchischen Interesse, die Bibel nicht Allen zugänglich zu machen" (Zimmer).

another (v. 13 f.), retaliation (v. 15), and differences of opinion (v. 19 f.) Such faults affect the **σῶμα**, the **ψυχή** and the **πνεῦμα** respectively, as the sphere of that pure and holy consciousness whose outcome is **εἰρήνη**.—**ὑμῶν**, unemphatic genitive (as in iii. 10, 13, *cf.* Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, 2559*a*) throwing the emphasis on the following word or words. **πνεῦμα** is put first, as the element in human nature which Paul held to be most directly allied to God, while **ψυχή** denotes as usual the individual life. The collocation of these terms is unusual but of course quite untechnical.—**ἀμέμπτως** has almost a proleptic tinge = "preserved entire, (so as to be) blameless at the arrival of," which has led to the substitution, in some inferior MSS., of **εὑρεθείη** for **τηρηθείη** (*cf.* textual discussion in *Amer. Jour. Theol.*, 1903, 453 f.). The construction is rather awkward, but the general sense is clear. With the thought of the whole verse compare Ps. Sol. xviii. 6: **καθαρίσαι ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ . . . εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκλογῆς ἐν ἀνάξει Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ**, also the description of Abraham being preserved by the divine **σοφία** in Sap. x. 5 (**ἐτήρησεν αὐτὸν ἄμεμπτον θεῷ**).

Ver. 24. The call implies that God will faithfully carry out the process of **ἁγιάζεσθαι** and **τηρεῖσθαι** (*cf.* Phil. i. 6), which is the divine side of the human endeavour outlined in the preceding verse.

Vv. 25-27. Closing words of counsel and prayer.

Ver. 26. Neither here, nor above at ver. 14, is there any reason to suppose that Paul turns to address the leaders of the local church (so *e.g.*, Bornemann, Ellicott, Alford, Askwith, Zimmer, Lightfoot, Weiss, Findlay) as though they were, in the name of the apostle(s), to convey the holy (*i.e.* not of convention or human passion) kiss, which betokened mutual affection (*cf.* Renan's *S. Paul*, 262, *DCG.* i. 935, and *E. Bi.* 4254) in the early Christian worship. This greeting by proxy is not so natural as the ordinary sense of the words; the substitution of **τ. ἀ. π.** for the more common **ἀλλήλους** is intelligible in the light, *e.g.*, *cf.* Phil. iv. 21; and it would be harsh to postulate so sharp a transition from the general reference of v. 25 and v. 28. Even in ver. 27 it is not necessary to think of the local leaders. While the epistle would naturally be handed to some of them in the first instance, it was addressed to the church; the church owned it and was held responsible for its public reading at the weekly worship.—**πᾶσιν**, like the **πάντας** of ver. 26, simply shows Paul's desire to prevent the church from becoming, on any pretext, a clique or coterie. But the remarkable emphasis of the injunction points to a period when such public reading of an apostolic epistle was not yet a recognised feature in the worship of the churches. Paul lays stress upon the proper use of his epistle, as being meant not for a special set, but for the entire brotherhood (*i.e.*, at Thessalonica, not, as Flatt thinks, in Macedonia). See that every member gets a hearing of it at some meeting or other (**ἀναγ.**, timeless aor.), and thus knows exactly what has been said. So *Apoc. Bar.* lxxxvi.: "when therefore ye receive this my epistle, read it in your congregations with care. And meditate thereon, above all on the days of your fasts."

ΠΡΟΣ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΕΙΣ Β̄.

I. 1. [a] ΠΑΥΛΟΣ καὶ Σιλουανὸς καὶ Τιμόθεος τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ [a] εἰρήνη [b] ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς [1] καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ [b] Χριστοῦ.

3. [c] εὐχαριστεῖν [c] ὀφείλομεν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, (καθὼς [d] ἄξιόν ἐστιν) ὅτι [e] ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καὶ [f] πλεονάζει ἡ [g] ἀγάπη ἑνὸς ἑκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους· 4. ὥστε αὐτοὺς [h] ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν [i] ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς [k] ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ

a *Cf.* I. i. 1. b *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 3, etc. c ii. 13; Clem. Rom. xxxviii. 4. *Cf.* 1 John iii. 16, iv. 11. d See on 1 Cor. xvi. 4 and Phil. i. 7. e Only here in N.T. f 2 Pet. i. 8. g In answer to prayer of I. iii. 12, iv. 9-10. h As well as others (I. i. 8); ὥστε with inf. as in I. i. 7. i See 2 Cor. ix. 2. k *i.e.* of Achaia, etc. *Cf.* I. i. 3.

[1] Om. ημων after πατρος with BDP, 17, 49, 71, d, e, Theoph., Pelag. (Al., Lachm., WH, Findlay, Milligan, etc.), as a scribal addition from ver. 1.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-8. The address (i. 1, 2) is followed first by a thanksgiving (3-10) which passes into a prophetic piece of consolation, and then by a brief prayer (11, 12).

Ver. 3. περὶ ὑμῶν: Your thankless situation (4 f.) only throws into more brilliant relief your personal character and bearing under adverse circumstances. ὅτι is best represented by our colloquial "because," which includes both the causal and the objective senses of the word; what forms matter for thanksgiving is naturally the reason for thanksgiving. ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ., a period of strain tires mutual gentleness (see on Rev. ii. 4) as well as patience towards God (ver. 4), since irritation and lack of unselfish consideration for others (*cf.* iii. 6 f.) may be as readily produced by a time of tension and severe anxiety as an impatient temper of faith. Paul is glad and grateful that suffering was drawing his friends together and binding them more closely to their Lord, instead of stunting the growth of their faith and drying up the flow of their mutual charity. Praise comes as usual before blame. Paul is proud of his friends, because suffering has not spoiled their characters, as suffering, especially when due to oppression and injustice, is too apt to do.—ὀφείλομεν (so Cic. *ad. Fam.*, xiv. 2, gratiasque egi, ut debui; Barn. v. 3, vii. 1), the phrase is unexampled in Paul, but not unnatural (*cf.* Rom. xv. 1, etc.); "the form of duty is one which all thoughts naturally take in his mind" (Jowett).

Ver. 4. The single article groups ὑπομονὴ and πίστις as a single conception = faith in its special aspect of patient endurance (*cf.* on Rev. xiii. 10), faithful tenacity of purpose. M. Gebhardt, in his *L'Italie Mystique* (pp. 318 f.), observes that "the final word of Dante's belief, of that 'religion of the heart' which he mentions in the *Convito*, is given in the 24th canto of the *Paradiso*. He comes back to the very simple symbol of Paul, faith, hope and love; for him as for the apostle faith is at bottom simply hope." Faith is more than that to Paul, but sometimes hardly more. The Thessalonians are not to fear that they are holding a forlorn outpost. Neither man nor God overlooks their courage (*cf.* Plato's *Theaet.*, xxv., ἀνδρικῶς ὑπομεῖναι καὶ μὴ ἀνάνδρως φεύγειν). Their founders and friends at a distance are watching with pride their resolute faith; while in God's

ταῖς θλίψεσιν [l] αἷς ἀνέχεσθε, 5. [m] ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, [n] εἰς τὸ [o] καταξιωθῆναι ὑμᾶς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε· 6. [p] εἴπερ [q] δίκαιον παρὰ Θεῷ [r] ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν 7. καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις [s] ἄνεσιν [t] μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ [u] ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ 8. [v] ἐν πυρὶ φλογός, διδόντος [w] ἐκδίκησιν [x] τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι Θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ [y] ὑπακούουσι τῷ [y] εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου

l Attract. fr. ἃς or ὧν (Win. § 24, 4e).
m Only here in N.T.; for idea, see Phil. i. 27-28 and Sap. iii. 5 f.
n Cf. I. ii. 12.
o See on Acts v. 41 and xiv. 22.
p See on Rom. iii. 30, viii. 9, 17 = "since".
q Exod. xxiii. 22; see on Rom. ii. 5-6, 9, viii. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 17 f.
r From Isa. lxvi. 2 (LXX).
s Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 13; Asc. Isa. iv. 15 (quoted on I. iv. 16).
t 1 Thess. ii. 15; see below, iii. 2. "We need it too, God knows!"
u 1 Cor. i. 7; Rom. ii. 5.
v Cf. LXX of Exod. iii. 2; Isa. xxix. 6, lxvi. 6, 15 f. and on 1 Cor. iii. 13. A Hebraism.
w Ezek. xxv. 14 (LXX); Jer. xxv. 12; Deut. vii. 9.
x Cf. I. iv. 5 (Jer. x. 25; Ps. lxxviii. 6).
y Cf. Rom. x. 16. Acts vi. 7; Clem. Rom. xlii. 4.

sure process of providence that faith has a destiny of its own, since it is bound up with His eternal designs. Hope is only mentioned once (ii. 16, *cf.* iii. 5) in this epistle, for all its preoccupation with the future. Faith covers almost all its contents here.—**θλίψεσιν** more general than **διωγμοῖς**.—**ὑπὲρ**, as in I., iii. 2, is equivalent to **περί**, with a touch of personal interest (Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*, p. 559; Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attischen Inschriften*, 182).

Ver. 5. **ἔνδειγμα**, in apposition to the general thought of the preceding clause; it does not matter to the sense whether the word is taken as an elliptic nominative or an appositional accusative. "All this is really a clear proof of (or points to) the equity of God's judgment," which will right the present inequalities of life (Dante, *Purg.*, x. 109 f.). **Δικαία κρίσις** is the future and final judgment of 6-10, whose principle is recompense (Luke xvi. 25); there is a divine law of compensation which will operate. This throws back light upon the present sufferings of the righteous. These trials, it is assumed, are due to loyalty and innocence of life; hence, in their divine aspect (ver. 5), they are the necessary qualification or discipline for securing entrance into the realm of God. They are significant, not casual. Paul begins by arguing that their very infliction or permission proves that God must be contemplating a suitable reward and destiny for those who endured them in the right spirit. **εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ.**, is thus a loose expansion (from the common rabbinic phrase, *cf.* Dalman's *Worte Jesu*, 97 f.; E. Tr., 119) of one side of the **δικ. κρίσις**. The other side, the human aspect of **θλῖψις**, then emerges in ver. 6. Since the Thessalonians were suffering at the hands of men (**τοὺς θλίβοντας**, Isa. xix. 20), the two-handed engine of retribution (so Lam. iii. 64 f.; Obad. 15; Isa. lix. 18, for **ἀνταποδ.**) must in all fairness punish the persecutors (*cf.* Sap. xi. 9, 10). This is the only passage in which Paul welcomes God's vengeance on the enemies of the church as an element in the recompense of Christians.—**ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε**: to see an intelligible purpose in suffering, or to connect it with some larger movement and hope, is always a moral stay. "God gave three choice gifts to Israel—the Torah, the Land of Promise, and Eternal Life, and each was won by suffering" (*Berachoth*, 5*a*).

Ver. 7. After noting the principle of recompence (5-7*a*), Paul proceeds (7*b*-10) to dwell on its time and setting, especially in its punitive aspect. He consoles the Thessalonians by depicting the doom of their opponents rather than (9*c*, 10) their own positive relief and reward. The entire passage breathes the hot air of the later Judaism, with its apocalyptic anticipation of the *jus talionis* applied by God to the enemies of His people; only, Paul identifies that people not with Israel but with believers in Christ Jesus. He appropriates Israel's promises for men and women whom Israel expelled and persecuted.—The **ἄγγελοι** are the manifestation of Christ's **δύναμις**, as the **ἅγιοι** (saints not angels) are of his **δόξα** (ver. 10); the position of **ἀγγ.** (*cf.* Win., § 80, 12*b*) tells against Hofmann's interpretation of **δυν.** = "host" (צָבָא, so LXX). Here and in the following verses the divine prerogatives (*e.g.*, fiery manifestation and judicial authority) are carried over to Jesus.

Ver. 8. *Those who know not God* are of course not pagans as such but immoral pagans, in the sense of Rom. i. 28 f. *Those who refuse obedience to the*

ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ· 9. οἵτινες δίκην τίσουσιν, [z]ὄλεθρον [z]αἰώνιον, [a]ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, 10. ὅταν [b]ἔλθῃ [c]ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ καὶ [d]θαυμασθῆναι ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύσασιν (ὅτι ἐπιστώθη[1] τὸ [e]μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς) [f]ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. 11. [g]εἰς ὃ καὶ προσευχόμεθα πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, [h]ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ πληρώσῃ πᾶσαν

z 4 Macc. x. 15.
a From Isa. ii. 10, 19, 21 (LXX). *Cf.* Ps. li. 11; Lk. xiii. 27, etc.
b = fut. perf. (Moult. 186).
c Only here in N.T., *cf.* Ex. xiv. 4; Sir. xxxviii. 6, etc.; Isa. iv. 2 f., xlix. 3.
d Reminiscence of Ps. lxviii. 36; lxxxix. 8 (LXX). *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 3; 4 Macc. xviii. 3.
e *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 6.
f From Isa. ii. 11 (17).
g *Cf.* Col. i. 29. "It is to this our thoughts turn as we pray, etc." (Rutherford).
h Equivalent, as *e.g.* in LXX of Exod. ix. 16.

[1] For **επιστευθη** Markland and Hort conj. **επιστωθη** (so 31, 112), as if "the Christian testimony (vv. 4-5) of suffering for the faith had been confirmed and sealed upon the Thessalonians" (*cf.* Ps. xcii. 4 f, LXX, **θαυμαστος εν υψηλοις ο κυριος· τα μαρτυρια σου επιστωθησαν σφοδρα**). **πιστωθητω** is used (as here with **επι**) of the divine word in 1 Chron. xvii. 23 (*cf.* 2 Chron. ii. 9). The MSS. reading throws **επιστευθη** to the front for emphasis, but it must go with **εφ ημας**. The point of the sentence, as Lgft. admits, leads us to expect "a direct connexion between the Thessalonians and a *belief* in the gospel rather than between the Thess. and the *preaching* of the gospel," so that **μαρτυριον** is less vital to **εφ ημας**. No satisfactory parallel can be quoted for either construction of **επιστευθη**, however, and the likelihood upon the whole is that it represents a primitive and natural corruption of **επιστωθη**.

gospel are, as the repetition of the article suggests, a different class of people, perhaps drawn both from Jews and pagans. But as Paul never seems to contemplate the idea of any Jew failing to hear the gospel (*cf.* Rom. x. 16 f.), the description here applies principally to them.—**ἐν πυρὶ φλογός**, one of the most favourite realistic traits of the last judgment, in apocalyptic Judaism (*cf.* passages in Volz's *Jüdische Eschatologie*, 285, 286); here it is simply a descriptive touch, which Paul does not pause to elaborate (*cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 13). The rather "broad and inflated" language (Weizsäcker) of the whole passage is probably due to the subject, more than to Paul's employment of Silvanus, himself a prophet (*cf.* Acts xv. 32 and 1 Thess. ii. 12-16), as his amanuensis.

Ver. 9. The overwhelming manifestation of the divine glory sweeps from before it (pregnant **ἀπὸ**) into endless ruin the disobedient (Ps. lxxvi. 7) *men who* (see Moulton, 91 f.) *shall pay the penalty of* (see Prov. xxvii. 12, LXX) *eternal destruction* (the common apocalyptic belief, see Volz, *Jüd. Eschat.*, 286 f.).

Ver. 10. **ἐπιστώθη**, like the variant **ἐπιστεύθη**, is suggested by **πιστεύουσιν** (*cf.* a similar instance in iii. 3). The abrupt parenthesis ("you included—for") shows how Paul was thinking of the Thessalonians especially, while he depicted the bliss of the saints in general.—**ἐνδοξ.**, in one sense they were to be a credit and honour to their apostles (I., ii. 19 f.); in another, they were a glory to Christ Himself, by their ripened character—a Johannine touch (*cf.* John xvii. 10, and ver. 12 of this chapter; the parallel between **ἔργον πίστεως** and John vi. 29 is verbal).—**θαυμ.** = *to be wondered at* (by whom? *cf.* Ezek. xxxix. 21, Eph. iii. 10?) *in* (*i.e.*, by reason of, on account of) *believers*; for a partial parallel to the phrase see Isa. lxii. 6 (**καὶ ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν θαυμασθήσεσθε**). If **ὅτι . . . ὑμᾶς** had been meant to give the reason for **θαυμασθῆναι** (so Zimmer, Wohl.), Paul would probably have put *God's witness* instead of *our witness*, and expressed the idea unambiguously; the transition from the **πᾶσιν** to the special case of the Thessalonians becomes, on this construction, an anti-climax. The rhythmical swing of 7*b*-10 suggests a reminiscence or quotation of some early Christian liturgical hymn, perhaps one of the prophetic **ψαλμοί** which he had heard at Corinth (1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26).

Ver. 11. **καὶ κ.τ.λ.**, we pray as well as render thanks (ver. 3) for you. Unable any longer to give the Thessalonians their personal example and instructions—the time for that had passed (**ἐπιστώθη**)—Paul and his colleagues can still pray for them. The duties of a preacher or evangelist do not cease with the utterance of his message. **ἀξιώσῃ**: one proof that God deemed them worthy of His kingdom lay in the discipline of

[i] εὐδοκίαν [k] ἀγαθωσύνης καὶ ἔργον πίστεως [l] ἐν δυνάμει· 12. [h] ὅπως [m] ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ [n] ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν, [o] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν [o] αὐτῷ, κατὰ τὴν χάριν [p] τοῦ Θεοῦ [p] ἡμῶν καὶ [q] Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

II. 1. Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [a] ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου [1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ [b] ἡμῶν [c] ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν, 2. [d] εἰς τὸ μὴ [e] ταχέως [f] σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς μηδὲ [g] θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος, μήτε διὰ λόγου, μήτε δι' [h] ἐπιστολῆς (ὡς [i] δι'

i Contrast ii. 12; cf. on Rom. x. 1; Eph. i. 5.
k See on Rom. xv. 14 and Eph. v. 9.
l Col. i. 29.
m Cf. LXX of Isa. xxiv. 15, lxvi. 5; Mal. i. 11; Ezek. xxxix. 21.
n = Person or character (cf. on Phil. ii. 9-10).
o John xvii. 1, 10, 21 f.
p So ver. 11.
q For κ. without article, cf. Win. § 19. 13 d, § 18. 7.
a "with regard to," = περί (an Ionism, cf. Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attisch. Inschrift.* 182).
b See on i. 7.
c Cf. Matt. xxiv. 31; 2 Macc. ii. 7, etc.
d I. iii. 10.
e Gal. i. 6 = "hastily".
f See Acts xvii. 13; Sap. iv. 4.
g Elsewhere in N.T., only in Matt. xxiv. 6 (= Mk. xiii. 7).
h Forged? cf. Jos. *Vit.* xi., xxxv.
i Sc. γεγραμμένης.

[1] Om. ημων after Κυριου, with B, syr. (WH, Weiss, Findlay).

suffering by means of which He developed their patient faith (4, 5), but Paul here finds another proof of it in their broader development of moral character and vital religion (*cf.* 10). **πᾶσαν** includes **ἔργον** as well as **εὐδοκίαν**; the prayer is for success to every practical enterprise of faith as well as for the satisfaction of every aspiration and desire after moral excellence. Compare Dante's *Paradiso*, xviii. 58-60. **κλῆσις** is "the position you are called to occupy," "your vocation," as heirs of this splendid future—a not unnatural extension (*cf.* Phil. iii. 14) of its ordinary use (= 1 Cor. i. 26, etc.). This implies that a certain period of moral ripening must precede the final crisis. In ii. 1-iii. 5, Paul proceeds to elaborate this, in order to allay the feverish excitement at Thessalonica, while in iii. 6 f., he discusses the further ethical disorders caused by the church's too ardent hope. The heightened misery of the present situation must neither break down their patience (4 f.), nor on the other hand must it be taken as a proof that the end was imminent.

Ver. 12. Here at any rate it is impossible to take **χάριν** in a universalistic sense (so Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 225 f.), as though it implied that Christians were put on the same level as O.T. saints. The idea is the merciful favour of God, to the exclusion of human merit. The main topic of the letter is now brought forward; ii. 1-2 gives the occasion for the **λόγος παρακλήσεως** (3-12) which follows.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. **ἐπισυν.**, a term whose verb was already in use for the muster of saints to the messianic reign. —**σαλ.** "get unsettled". Epictetus uses **ἀποσαλεύεσθαι** for the unsettling of the mind by sophistries (iii. 25), and the nearest equivalent for **νοῦς** here is our "mind". This mental agitation (aor.) results in **θροεῖσθαι** = nervous fear (Wrede, 48 f.) in prospect of the imminent end.

Ver. 2. **ὡς δι' ἡμῶν**, "purporting to come from us," goes with **ἐπιστολῆς** alone, for, while **λόγος** (Lünemann) might be grouped under it, **πνεῦμα** cannot. A visionary would claim personal, not borrowed, authority for his revelation. If **ὡς δ. ἡ.** went with the preceding verbs (so Dods, Askwith, 92 f., Wohl. = "we are the true interpreters of Paul's meaning"), an active (as in ver. 3) not a passive turn might have been expected to the sentence.—**ἐνέστηκεν** = "were already present". The cry was, **ὁ κύριος πάρεστι.** The final period had already begun, and the Thessalonians were probably referred to their sufferings as a proof of this. Paul could only guess the various channels along which such a misconception had flowed into the local church; either, *e.g.*, **πνεύματος**, the hallucination of some early Christian prophet at Thessalonica; or **λόγου**, oral statement, based in part perhaps on some calculation of contemporary history or on certain *logia* of Jesus; or **ἐπιστολῆς**, *i.e.*, the misinterpretation of some passage in 1 Thess. or in some lost letter of Paul. Possibly Paul imagined an epistle had been forged purporting to come from him or his companions, but we have no means of knowing whether his suspicion was well-founded or not. In any case the allusion is quite credible within his lifetime. Such expectations may have been excited in a more or less innocent fashion, but Paul peremptorily (ver. 3) ranks them all as dishonest; he is concerned not with their origin but with their mis-

ἡμῶν),[1] [k] ὡς [k] ὅτι [l] ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου. 3. Μή τις ὑμᾶς [m] ἐξαπατήσῃ κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον· ὅτι [n] ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ [o] ἡ ἀποστασία [p] πρῶτον καὶ [q] ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας,[2] ὁ υἱὸς [r] τῆς ἀπωλείας, 4. ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ [s] πάντα λεγόμενον[3] [s] θεὸν ἢ [t] σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν [u] εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσαι, [v] ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶ θεός. 5. οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὢν

k *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 21, "to the effect that". l Rom. viii, 38, etc. m Aor. conj. as in 2 Cor. xi. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 11. n Sc. "it shall not come" (ellipsis, as in. ver. 7). o "The well known." p = πρότερον (I. iv. 16). q Matt. xxiv. 12. r Win. § 30, 6, b; *cf.* Deissm. 163; Jub. x. 3. s 1 Cor. viii. 5. t Elsewhere in N.T., only in Acts xvii. 23 (Sap. xv. 17). u Matt. xxiv. 15. v By deeds as well as words, *cf.* Acts ii. 22; here = "proclaim".

[1] On ως δι ημων Field (202) writes: "Perhaps the apostle wrote ως δη ημων, as pretending to be ours," adding instances from Ast. *Lex. Plat.* to justify the latter's statement that "cum irrisione quadam plerumque ponitur ως δη".

[2] The ανομιας of ℵB min., cop., arm., Euth., Dam., Tert., Amb. (Ti., Tr., WH, Zim., Bj., Findlay, Lgft.), is preferable to the Western paraphrastic αμαρτιας (Alford, Ellic., Wohl., Weiss).

[3] Bentl. conj. επι παν το λεγομενον.

chievous effects upon the church (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 4). Probably his suspicions of misinterpretation were due to his recent experiences in Galatia, though the Macedonian churches seem to have escaped any infusion of the anti-Pauline propaganda which soured Corinth not long afterwards.

Ver. 3. **καὶ ἀποκ.**, the apostasy and the appearance (so of Beliar, *Asc. Isa.*, iv. 18) of the personal anti-Christ or pseudo-Christ form a single phenomenon. From the use of **ἡ ἀποστασία** as a Greek equivalent for Belial (LXX of 1 Kings xxi. 13, A, and Aquila), this eschatological application of the term would naturally flow, especially as איש בליעל might well be represented by **ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας** on the analogy of 2 Sam. xxii. 5 (LXX) = Ps. xvii. (xviii.). 4. Lawlessness was a cardinal trait in the Jewish figure of Belial, as was persecution of the righteous (i. 4, ii. 7, see *Asc. Isa.*, ii. 5, etc.). The very order of the following description (**ἀπωλείας** set between **ἀνομίας** and **ὁ ἀντικείμενος**, etc., unchronologically, but dramatically) suggests that this incarnation of lawlessness was a doomed figure, although he challenged and usurped divine prerogatives. He is another Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. xi. 36, **καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν ἔξαλλα λαλήσει**, though Paul carefully safeguards himself against misconception by inserting **λεγόμενον** in his quotation of the words). This conception of a supernatural antagonist to Jesus Christ at the end is the chief element of novelty introduced by Paul, from Jewish traditions, into the primitive Christian eschatology. The recent attempt of Caligula to erect a statue of himself in the Temple at Jerusalem may have furnished a trait for Paul's delineation of the future Deceiver; the fearful impiety of this outburst had sent a profound shock through Judaism, which would be felt by Jewish Christians as well. But Paul does not identify the final Deception with the Imperial cultus, which was far from a prominent feature when he wrote. His point is that the last pseudo-Messiah or anti-Christ will embody all that is profane and blasphemous, every conceivable element of impiety; and that, instead of being repudiated, he will be welcomed by Jews as well as pagans (*cf.* Acts xii. 21, 22).

Ver. 5. It was no after-thought, on Paul's part (the singular rules out Spitta's idea that Timothy wrote this apocalyptic piece). Nor was it an idiosyncrasy of his teaching. Especially since the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. vii., xi.; *cf.* Gunkel's *Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 221 f.), a more or less esoteric and varied Jewish tradition had pervaded pious circles, that the last days would be heralded by a proud uprising against God. The champion of this movement was no longer the Dragon or cosmic opponent of God, as in the older mythology (though traces of this belief still linger), but an individual (**ὁ ἄνομος**) who incorporates human wickedness (**τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας**) and infernal cunning in his own person, and who essays to supplant and suppress the worship of the true God, by claiming divine honours for himself.

πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν; 6. καὶ νῦν τὸ [w] κατέχον [x] οἴδατε εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ [y] καιρῷ. 7. τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται [z] τῆς ἀνομίας, [a] μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται· 8. [b] καὶ τότε ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς [c] ἀνελεῖ [d] τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος [d] αὐτοῦ καὶ [e] καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ· 9. οὗ ἐστιν ἡ παρουσία κατ᾽ ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ [f] σημείοις καὶ τέρασι [f] ψεύδους 10. καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ [g] ἀδικίας [h] τοῖς [i] ἀπολλυμένοις, [k] ἀνθ᾽ ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ [l] ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι

w = κωλύον (Chrys.). x Matt. xiii. 11, etc. y "Appointed season" (as Dan. xi. 29, 35). z Epexeg. genit. a Gal. ii. 10. b Common eschat. formula (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 5, etc.). c Post-classical, Win. § 13, 5. d From Isa. xi. 4 (LXX), copied in Ps. Sol. xvii. 27, 41; *cf.* Job iv. 9, 4 Esd. xiii. 38. e See on 1 Cor. i. 28. f *Cf.* on 2 Cor. xii. 12; Matt. xxiv. 24. g Gen. of origin. h Dat. incommodi (Blass, § 37, 2), as in 1 Cor. i. 18; *cf.* Moulton, 114-115 ("strongly durative though the verb is, we see perfectivity in the fact that the goal is *ideally* reached"). i *Cf.* on 2 Cor. ii. 15. k See on Acts xii. 23. l Contrast I. i. 6, ii. 13.

He is Satan's messiah, an infernal caricature of the true messiah. *Cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 6, where it is said that Belial "will do and speak like the Beloved and he will say, I am God and before me there has been none".

Ver. 6. *Well now, you know what restrains him from being manifested* (coming fully into play and sight) *before his appointed season.* **Νῦν** probably goes with **οἴδατε**, not with **τὸ κατέχον** (as *e.g.*, in John iv. 18, so Olshausen, Bisping, Wieseler, Zahn, Wrede), and **καὶ νῦν** is not temporal, but "a mere adverb of passage" (Lünemann, Alford) in the argument (so with **οἶδα** in Acts iii. 17). Were **νῦν** temporal, it would mean (*a*) that during the interval between Paul's teaching and the arrival of this letter fresh circumstances (so Zimmer) had arisen to throw light on the thwarting of the adversary. But of this there is no hint whatsoever in the context. Or (*b*), preferably, it would contrast with the following **ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ**, as an equivalent for "already" (Hofmann, Wohl., Milligan, etc.).

Ver. 7. **γὰρ**, explaining **οἴδατε**. The **κατέχων** is a fact of present experience and observation, which accounts for the **ἀνομία** being as yet a **μυστήριον**, operating secretly, and not an **ἀποκάλυψις**. Paul does not say by whom (the **ἄνομος** himself?) the restraint is removed.—**μόνον**, the hiatus must be filled up with some phrase like "it cannot be manifested". Its real character and full scope are not yet disclosed. For **ἄρτι** = **νῦν**, *cf.* Nägeli's note in *der Wortschätz des Apostels Paulus* (36, 37), and for omission of **ἂν**, Blass, § 65, 10.

Ver. 8. **ὃν, κ.τ.λ.**, his career is short and tragic. The apparition (*cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 14, etc., Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia*, 34 f.) of Jesus heralds his overthrow.—**ἐπιφανείᾳ** = sudden appearance of a deity at some crisis (*cf.* Diod., *Sicul.*, i. 25), as the god in 2 Macc. ii. 21, iii. 24, etc. "In hieratic inscriptions the appearing of the god in visible form to men is commonly expressed by the same word" (Ramsay, *Exp. Ti.*, x. 208). This passage, with its fierce messianic anticipation of the adversary's doom interrupts the description of his mission which is resumed (in ver. 9) with an account of the inspiration (**κατὰ**), method (**ἐν**) and results (ver. 10), of this evil advent. Galen (*de facult. nat.*, 1. 2, 4-5) physiologically defines **ἐνέργεια** as the process of activity whose product is **ἔργον**. The impulse to **ἐνέργεια** is **δύναμις**. The **δύναμις** of this supernatural delusion is specially manifested in *signs and wonders.* The power of working miracles in order to deceive people (ver. 11) was an accepted trait in the Jewish and early Christian ideas of such eschatological opponents of God (*cf.* on Rev. xiii. 13, and Friedländer's *Geschichte d. jüd. Apolog.*, 493 f.).

Ver. 10. **ἀγάπη** (*cf.* ver. 12) here, as Luke xi. 42, with obj. gen. *Cf. Asc. Isa.*, iv. 15, 16: "And He will give rest [above, ch. i. 7] to the godly whom He shall find in the body in this world, and to all who because of their faith in Him have execrated Beliar and his kings". **ἀλήθεια**, not = "truth" in the general sense of the term (Lünemann, Lightfoot, Zimmer) but = "the truth of the gospel" (as usual in Paul) as against **ἀδικία** and **ψεῦδος** (Rom. i. 15 f., ii. 8). The apostle holds that the refusal to open one's mind and heart to the gospel leaves life a prey to moral delusion; judicial infatua-

αὐτούς· 11. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο [m] πέμπει αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνέργειαν [n] πλάνης, εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει· 12. ἵνα [o] κριθῶσι πάντες οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ [p] ἀληθείᾳ ἀλλ' [q] εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ [p] ἀδικίᾳ. 13. Ἡμεῖς δὲ [r] ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, [s] ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ὅτι [t] εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς [u] ἀπαρχὴν [1] εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν [v] ἁγιασμῷ [v] πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας, 14. εἰς [w] ὃ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς διὰ τοῦ [x] εὐαγγελίου [x] ἡμῶν, εἰς [y] περιποίησιν δόξης τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 15. [z] ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, [a] στήκετε καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς [b] παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε, εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι',

m See Ezek. xx. 24-25, and Rom. i. 24, 26, 28, etc.
n Sap. v. 6-7.
o = κατακρ. (as Heb. xiii. 4, etc.).
p See on Rom. i. 18, and 1 Cor. xiii. 6.
q Contrast i. 11.
r i. 3. s *Cf.* I. i. 4 (in similar connexion). t Alexandrian form (Win. § 13, 13); *cf.* Deut. xxvi. 18. u Rom. xi. 16, xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.; v I. iv. 7-8. w *i.e.*, general position reflected in ver. 13. x *Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 3. y *Cf.* I. v. 9. z *Cf.* I. v. 6; resumes thought of ii. 1-2. a *Cf.* I. iii. 8 and 1 Cor. xvi. 13. b See iii. 6 and 1 Cor. xi. 2.

[1] The singular variant **απαρχην**, adopted by Lach., WH marg., Weiss (Lgft.?) from BGgrP, min., f. vg., syr.p, Euth., Dam., etc., is preferable to the strongly supported **απ αρχης** (Pauline **απ. ευρ.**, in historical sense of Phil. iv. 15, Ac. xv. 7, etc.). The Thessalonians or Macedonians are *first-fruits*, as contrasted with others yet to follow (*cf.* iii. 1, and i. 4).

tion is the penalty of disobedience to the truth of God in Christ.

Ver. 11. An echo of the primitive Semitic view (still extant, *cf.* Curtis's *Prim. Sem. Religion To-Day*, pp. 69 f.), that God may deliberately lead men astray, or permit them to be fatally infatuated, as a penal discipline (*cf.* Ps. Sol. viii. 15; Test. XII. Patr. Dan. ix.). A modern would view the same phenomenon as wilful scepticism issuing in superstition, or in inability to distinguish truth from falsehood. Delusions of this kind cannot befall believers (*cf.* Mark xiii. 22; Test. Issach. iii.). In Test. Napht. iii. 3. idols are **πνεύματα πλάνης** (*cf.* Test. Levi. iii. 3, etc.).

Ver. 12. Like the prophet John half a century later (xiii. 2 f.), Paul distinguishes his anti-Christ or antitheistic hero from the Satan whose campaign he executes; but, unlike John, the apostle has nothing to say about the fate of Satan. The tools and the victims of Satan are destroyed, and they alone.—**εὐδοκ.** not with **ἐν** as usual, but with the less common (*cf. e.g.*, 1 Macc. i. 43, **καὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ηὐδόκησαν τῇ λατρείᾳ αὐτοῦ**) dative. "And the greater number of those who shall have been associated together in order to receive the Beloved he [*i.e.*, Beliar] will turn aside after him" (*Asc. Isa.*, iv. 9).

Ver. 13-Chapter III.-Ver. 5. Thanks, prayers and counsels.

Ver. 13. God has chosen you (**εἵλατο**, another LXX expression, implying that Christians had now succeeded to the cherished priviliges of God's people) to be saved, instead of visiting you with a deadly delusion (10, 11) which ends in judgment (12); your discipline is of sanctification (contrast 12*b*) and belief in what is true (contrast 11, 12*a*), these forming the sphere and the scope (*cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 15, and for **ἐν ἁγιασμῷ** in this sense Ps. Sol. xvii. 33) for salvation being realised. Those who are sanctified and who truly believe shall be saved. *Cf.* ver. 14 and *Apoc. Bar.*, liv. 21: "in fine enim saeculi uindicta erit de iis qui improbe egerunt, iuxta improbitatem eorum. et glorificabis fideles iuxta fidem eorum".—**πνεύματος** may be either (*a*) = "wrought by the (holy) Spirit" (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 2), the divine side of the human **πίστει**, or (*b*) = "of the spirit" (*cf.* I. v. 23; 2 Cor. vii. 1), as of the heart (I., iii. 13). The absence of the article is not decisive against the former rendering, but the latter is the more probable in view of the context; the process of **ἁγιασμός** involves a love of the truth and a belief in it (*i.e.*, in the true gospel) which is opposed to religious delusions (*cf.* ii. 2).

Ver. 14. To be saved ultimately (12) is to possess or rather to share the glory of Christ (*cf.* I., ii. 12).

Ver. 15. The divine purpose does not work automatically, but implies the co-operation of Christians—in this case, a resolute stedfastness resting on loyalty to the apostolic gospel. In view of passages like 1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 5, it is gratuitous to read any second-century passion for oral apostolic tradition into these words or into those of iii. 6.

[c] ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν. 16. [d] αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ [d] ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς [e] καὶ δοὺς [f] παράκλησιν [g] αἰωνίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν [h] ἐν χάριτι, 17. [i] παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας καὶ [i] στηρίξαι [k] ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ [l] λόγῳ [l] ἀγαθῷ.

III. 1. [a] Τὸ λοιπὸν, [b] προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ [b] ἡμῶν, ἵνα [c] ὁ λόγος τοῦ [c] Κυρίου [d] τρέχῃ καὶ [e] δοξάζηται καθὼς καὶ [f] πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 2. καὶ ἵνα [g] ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν [h] ἀτόπων καὶ [h] πονηρῶν [i] ἀνθρώπων· [k] οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. 3. [l] πιστὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος, ὃς [m] στηρίξει ὑμᾶς καὶ [n] φυλάξει ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. 4. [o] πεποίθαμεν δὲ ἐν Κυρίῳ [o] ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ἃ παραγγέλλομεν ποιεῖτε [p] καὶ ποιήσετε. 5. ὁ δὲ

c I. v. 27. d For order, *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 13. e *Cf.* Rom. v. 5, 8. f See on 2 Cor. i. 3-7. g Contrast i. 9. h = "graciously." i *Cf.* I. iii. 11, 13. k 1 Cor. i. 5. l *Cf.* Lk. xxiv. 19; Thuc. i. 139, 4; Test. Gad, vi. 1.

a I. iv. 1; Eph. vi. 10. b I. v. 25. c I. i. 8. d Ps. cxlvii. 15, etc. (LXX), contrast 2 Tim. ii. 9. e In sense of Acts xiii. 48. f I. iii. 4. g *Cf.* Rom. xv. 31; 2 Ti. iv. 17; Ps. Sol. iv. 27. h See on Acts xxviii. 6; Isa. xxv. 4 (LXX); and on I. iii. 3, "misguided and unprincipled" (Rutherford). i *e.g.*, in Corinth; *cf.* Acts xviii. 6 f. 2 Ti. iii. 13. k *Cf.* Rom. x. 16 with Acts xvii. 12, 34. l *Cf.* i. 10, Acts xviii. 9 f. m ii. 17. n 2 Ti. iv. 18. o 2 Co. ii. 3. p *Cf.* I. iv. 10.

Ver. 16. **αὐτὸς δὲ**, perhaps with a slight implicit apposition to the *you* or *we* of the previous sentence.—**ἀγαπήσας καὶ δοὺς, κ.τ.λ.**, connection as in John iii. 16.—**παράκλησιν** for this world, **ἐλπίδα** for the world to come; all hope is encouragement, but not vice-versa.

Ver. 17, in contrast to the disquiet and confusion of ii. 2. **ἔργῳ** as in i. 11, iii. 4, 7 f., **λόγῳ** as iii. 1, 15; I., i. 8. See the fulsome pagan inscription of Halicarnassus, which after giving thanks for the birth of Augustus, **σωτῆρα τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους**, declares that men now are full of **ἐλπίδων μὲν χρηστῶν πρὸς τὸ μέλλον, εὐθυμίας δὲ εἰς τὸ παρόν.** Contrast also the **κενὴ ἐλπὶς** of the impious in Sap. iii. 11.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. In addition to offering prayers on their behalf, Paul asks them to pray for the continued success of the gospel ("may others be as blest as we are"!) and (ver. 2), for its agents' safety (Isa. xxv. 4, LXX, a reminiscence of). The opponents here are evidently (ii. 10 f.) beyond hope of conversion; preservation from their wiles is all that can be expected. For a speedy answer to this prayer, see Acts xviii. 9 f. The repeated use of **ὁ Κύριος** in vv. 1-5, brings out the control of God amid the plots and passions of mankind.—**ἀτόπων.** The general sense of the term is given by Philo in his queer allegorising of Gen. iii. 9 (*Leg. Alleg.*, iii. 17, **ἄτοπος λέγεται εἶναι ὁ φαῦλος**); commonly it is used, as elsewhere in the N.T., of things, but here of persons, either as = "ill-disposed," or, in a less general and derivative sense = "perverse" (*cf.* Nägeli, *der Wortschatz des Paulus*, p. 37), or "froward". The general aim of the passage is to widen the horizon of the Thessalonians, by enlisting their sympathy and interest on behalf of the apostles. They are not the only sufferers, or the only people who need prayer and help.—**οὐ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς εἰς Κόρινθόν ἐσθ' ὁ πλοῦς**, so ran the ancient proverb. Paul writes from Corinth that while everyone has the chance, not all have the desire, to arrive at the faith. **ἡ πίστις** is the faith of the gospel, or Christianity. By a characteristic play upon the word, Paul (ver. 3), hurries on to add, "but the Lord is faithful". **ὑμᾶς** (for which Bentley and Baljon plausibly conjecture **ἡμᾶς**) shows how lightly his mind rests on thoughts of his own peril as compared with the need of others. It is impossible to decide, either from the grammar or from the context, whether **τοῦ πονηροῦ** is neuter or masculine. Either sense would suit, though, if there is a reminiscence here of the Lord's prayer (so Feine, *Jesus Christus u. Paulus*, 252 f., and Chase, *Texts and Studies*, i. 3. 112 f.), the masculine would be inevitable, as is indeed more probable for general reasons (so *e.g.*, Hofmann, Everling, Ellicott, etc.)

Ver. 4. **πεποίθαμεν** (= we have faith), still playing on the notion of **πίστις.** Paul rallies the Thessalonians by reminding them, not only of God's faithfulness, but of their friends' belief in them.

Ver. 5. **κατευθύναι, κ.τ.λ.** Paul no longer (I., iii. 11) entertains the hope of revisiting them soon. "God's love and Christ's patient endurance" (*i.e.*, the **ὑπομονή** which Christ inspires and re-

Κύριος [q] κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν [r] ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

6. [s] Παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, [t] ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [u] στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ [v] ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἣν παρελάβετε [1] παρ' ἡμῶν. 7. αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἴδατε πῶς δεῖ [w] μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς· ὅτι οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν ἐν ὑμῖν, 8. [x] οὐδὲ δωρεὰν ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, ἀλλ' [y] ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ [z] ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν· 9. [a] οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς [b] τύπον δῶμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ [b] μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς. 10. καὶ γὰρ ὅτε ἦμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, τοῦτο παρηγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι [c] εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζ-

q 1 Chron. xxix. 18 (LXX), Ps. Sol. xii. 6, etc.
r *Cf.* ii. 16; *cf.* Abbott, *Joh. Gramm.* 2033 b.
s *Cf.* Ignat. *ad Polyk.* 5.
t See on 1 Cor. i. 10.
u See on 2 Cor. viii. 20.
v *Cf.* I. v. 14, "a loafer" (Rutherford).
w *Cf.* I. i. 6, ii. 14, and on 1 Cor. iv. 16.
x I. ii. 3, v. 5.
y *Cf.* I. ii. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 27, Herm. *Sim.* v. 6, 2, etc., "toiling and moiling" (Rutherford).
z I. ii. 9 (with a different motive).
a See on 1 Cor. ix. 3-18, and 2 Cor. i. 24.
b See on Phil. iii. 17.
c Did. xii. 3.

[1] Read **παρελαβετε**, with BG, 43, 73, 80, g, goth., syr.p, arm., etc. (so Lach., Tr., WH, Bj., Weiss), or **παρελαβοσαν** (**ελαβοσαν** D*) with ℵ*A, d, e, 17, etc. (Ti., Al., Zim., Lgft., Wohl., Findlay [Tr., WH, Lach., all in marg.]).

quires, *cf.* Ignat. *ad. Rom.*, last words) correspond to the double experience of love and hope in ii. 16. It is by the sense of God's love alone, not by any mere acquiescence in His will or stoical endurance of it, that the patience and courage of the Christian are sustained. *Cf. Ep. Arist.*, 195, **ἐπὶ τῶν καλλίστων πράξεων οὐκ αὐτοὶ κατευθύνομεν τὰ βουλευθέντα· θεὸς δὲ τελειοῖ τὰ πάντων.** Connect with ver. 3 and *cf.* Mrs. Browning's line, "I waited with patience, which means almost power".

Vv. 6-16. Injunctions upon church-life and order.

Ver. 6. How necessary it was to promote **ὑπομονή** with its attendant virtues of diligence and order at Thessalonica, is evident from the authoritative (**ἐν ὀν. τ. Κυρίου**) tone and the crisp detail of the following paragraph. **Παραγγ.**, like **ἀτάκτως**, has a military tinge (*cf.* on I. iv. 2, and Dante's *Paradiso*, xii. 37-45). **στελλ.**, for his own sake (ver. 14), as well as for yours: a service as well as a precaution. The collective action of his fellow-Christians, besides preserving (1 Cor. v. 6) themselves from infection—and nothing is so infectious as an insubordinate, indolent, interfering spirit—will bring home to him a sense of his fault. Lightfoot aptly cites the **παράγγελμα** of Germanicus to his mutinous troops: "discedite a contactu, ac diuidite turbidos: id stabile ad paenitentiam, id fidei uinculum erit" (Tacit. *Annal.*, i. 43).—The **ἄτακτοι** of 6-12 are excitable members who "break the ranks" by stopping work in view of the near advent, and thus not only disorganise social life but burden the church with their maintenance. The apostles had not been idle or hare-brained enthusiasts, and their example of an orderly, self-supporting life is held up as a pattern. Insubordination of this kind is a breach of the apostolic standard of the Christian life, and Paul deals sharply with the first symptoms of it. He will not listen to any pious pleas for this kind of conduct.

Ver. 8. Paul's practice of a trade and emphasis upon the moral discipline of work are quite in keeping with the best Jewish traditions of the period. Compare *e.g.*, the saying of Gamaliel II. (*Kiddusch.* i. 11): "He who possesses a trade is like a fenced vineyard, into which no cattle can enter, etc."—**δωρεάν** = "for nothing, gratis".

Ver. 9. The apostles had the right to be maintained by the church, but in this case they had refused to avail themselves of it. The Thessalonians are not to misconstrue their action.

Ver. 10. Precept as well as example (*DCG*, ii. 2). As is perhaps implied in **ὅτι, εἰ . . . ἐσθιέτω** is a maxim quoted by the apostle, not from some unwritten saying of Jesus (Resch) but from the Jewish counterparts, based on Gen. iii. 19, which are cited by Wetstein, especially *Beresch. rabba*, xiv. 12: "ut, si non laborat, non manducet". *Cf.* Carlyle's *Chartism*, chap. iii ("In all ways it needs, especially in these times, to be proclaimed

εσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω. 11. [d] ἀκούομεν γάρ τινας περιπατοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν ἀτάκτως, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ [e] περιεργαζομένους. 12. τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις παραγγέλλομεν καὶ [f] παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ [g] ἵνα μετὰ [h] ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν. 13. ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί, μὴ [i] ἐγκακήσητε [k] καλοποιοῦντες. 14. εἰ δέ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ [l] τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον [m] σημειοῦσθε, μὴ [n] συναναμίγνυσθαι αὐτῷ, ἵνα [o] ἐντραπῇ· 15. καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν [p] ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ [q] νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν. 16. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης [r] δῴη ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην [s] διὰ παντὸς ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ.

d "We are informed" (as 1 Cor. xi. 18).
e For the paronomasia, see Blass, § 82, 4, and Deissm. 225.
f Sc. αὐτούς.
g Cf. on I. iv. 1.
h Cf. on Acts xi. 18.
i Cf. on Gal. vi. 9; Eph. iii. 3.

k Only here in N.T. l *i.e.*, not 1 Thess. (so Lünemann, Schmiedel, Schäfer) but (so Pelt, Lgft., Findlay, etc.) the present, Win. § 18, 4. m Only here in N.T. n *Cf.* 1 Cor. v. 9 f. o *Cf.* Tit. ii. 8. p *Cf.* Job xix. 11 (LXX). q *Cf.* I. v. 14, 1 Cor. iv. 14, and 2 Cor. ii. 7. r Opt. without ἄν, as in 1 Peter i. 2; Hellenistic opt., Win. § 14, 10. s = "continually" Lk. xxiv. 53, Ps. Sol. ii. 40, etc.

aloud that for the idle man there is no place in this England . . . he that will not work according to his faculty, let him perish according to his necessity"). The use of ἐν Κυρίῳ here and in 1 Cor. xi. 11 (*cf.* Matt. xix. 4 f.) proves, as Titius argues (*der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit*, 1900, p. 105), that the original divine ideas of the Creation are fulfilled and realised in the light of Christ's gospel; the entire process of human life culminates in the faith of Christ, and therefore no unqualified antithesis can be drawn between ordinary life and Christian conduct.

Ver. 11. The γάρ goes back to ver. 6. "Whereas I am told that some of your number are behaving in a disorderly fashion, not busy but busybodies," fussy and officious, doing anything but attending to their daily trade. "Ab otio ualde procliue est hominum ingenium ad curiositatem" (Bengel). The first persecution at Thessalonica had been fostered by a number of fanatical loungers (Acts xvii. 5). On the sensible attitude of the primitive church to labour, see Harnack's *Expansion*, i. 215 f. M. Aurelius (iii. 4) warns people against idle, fussy habits, but especially against τὸ περίεργον καὶ κακόηθες, and an apt parallel to this use of ἀτάκτως lies in Dem. *Olynth.*, iii. 34: ὅσα (funds or food) οὗτος ἀτάκτως νῦν λαμβάνων (*i.e.*, takes without rendering personal service in the field) οὐκ ὠφελεῖ, ταῦτ' ἐν ἴσῃ τάξει λαμβανέτω.

Ver. 12. They are not directly addressed (contrast 6, 13).—μετὰ ἡσυχίας, in the homely sphere of work. The three causes of disquiet at Thessalonica are (*a*) the disturbing effect of persecution, (*b*) the tension produced by the thought of the advent of Christ, and (*c*), as an outcome of the latter, irregularity and social disorganisation in the community.

Ver. 13. ὑμεῖς δέ, whoever else drops out of the ranks of industrious, steady Christians.—μὴ ἐγκ., implying that they had not begun to grow slack (Moulton, 122 f.). Perhaps with a special allusion to the presence of people who abused charity; generous Christians must not forego liberality and help, arguing that it is no use to succour any because some will take advantage of the church's largess.

Ver. 14. διὰ τ. ἐπ., implying that the matter ends with this letter (Weiss); Paul has spoken his last word on the subject. With this and the following verse, *cf.* Did. xv. 3 (ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου μηδεὶς λαλείτω μηδὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω, ἕως οὗ μετανοήσῃ).—ἐντραπῇ, "be ashamed" (= αἰδεῖσθαι as often).

Ver. 15. Disapproval, as a means of moral discipline, loses all its effect if the offender does not realise its object and reason (νουθετεῖτε), or if it is tainted with personal hostility.—ὡς ἀδελφόν. Compare the fine saying of Rabbi Chanina ben Gamaliel on Deut. xxv. 3, that after the punishment the offender is expressly called brother, not sinner.

Ver. 16. εἰρήνην, as opposed to these fears and troubles of the church. Κύριος is probably, in accordance with Paul's usual practice, to be taken as = Jesus Christ, but the language of ver. 5 and of

ὁ Κύριος μετὰ [t] πάντων ὑμῶν.

17. ὁ [u] ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου, ὅ ἐστι σημεῖον ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ· [v] οὕτω γράφω.

18. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ [t] πάντων ὑμῶν.

t Emphatic: the censured as well as the steady members.

u *Cf.* on 1 Cor. xvi. 21, and 2 Cor. xiii. 13.

v Autograph as means of recognising authenticity, *cf.* Abbott, *Joh. Gram.* 2691, and Cicero's *Catil.* iii. 5, Plautus, *Bacch.* iv. 4, 78, etc.

I., v. 23, makes the reference to God quite possible.

Vv. 17, 18. Conclusion. Paul now takes the pen from his amanuensis, to add the salutation in his own handwriting for the purpose of authenticating the epistle (otherwise in 1 Cor. xvi. 21). This, he observes, is the sign-manual of his letters (*cf.* ii. 2), *i.e.*, the fact of a personal written greeting at the close, not any form of words (like ver. 18), or the use of the word "grace," or "certum quendam nexum literarium" (Grotius). The precaution is natural, in view of his suspicion about unauthorised communications. Compare "the σεσημείωμαι (generally contracted into σεση) with which so many of the Egyptian papyrus-letters and ostraca close" (Milligan, p. 130), or the postscript in one's own handwriting (ξύμβολον) which guaranteed an ancient letter (Deissmann: *Licht vom Osten*, 105). μετά (*cf.* ver. 16), the divine presence is realised through the experience of Christ's grace.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

PRELIMINARY.

THOSE who propose to read this exposition of the Pastoral Epistles may find it convenient to be apprised at the outset of the conclusions assumed in it concerning the genuineness and integrity of the Letters. After a careful review of the arguments adduced by the traditionalists and the anti-traditionalists, and after the devotion of considerable thought to a minute study of the Epistles themselves, the present writer finds it easier to believe that St. Paul was the author of them, as they have come down to us, than that a Paulinist (assuming that there ever was a special school of Pauline thought), sometime between 90 and 120 A.D., worked up a few fragments of genuine letters of his master into 2 Timothy and Titus, and then composed 1 Timothy in imitation of his own style. This second alternative represents, broadly speaking, the theory of the anti-traditional school of critics.

The only serious difficulties which preclude an unhesitating acceptance of these letters, as they stand, as the composition of St. Paul, lie in (1), the style, which, although fundamentally not un-Pauline, presents undeniably certain obvious peculiarities which are not found in any of the ten other Pauline letters, and (2) in the writer's outlook on religion—in particular, the relations of God and Christ respectively to man's salvation, and the place of faith and works in the spiritual life—which seems to be that of one who had travelled on the Pauline road (assuming that there was a public highway that could be so described), further than we should have deemed it possible in the years—few at most—which separate the close of St. Paul's life from the date of the Epistles of the first Roman captivity. The main features of the landscape are the same, but the distances are different.

On the other hand, this altered theological outlook, as well as the writer's concern about Church institutions, is responsible for the

peculiar religious phraseology in so far as it does indeed differ from features common to the earlier groups of letters; so that whatever considerations help us to account for the former change will also aid in the solution of the problem of style and vocabulary.

The other arguments against the Pauline authorship, based on: (3) the impossibility of fitting into the Acts of the Apostles the personal and local references in the Pastorals, (4) the alleged marks of the second century in the heresy which is combated, and (5) the allegation that the details of Church organisation reflect the policy of the dominant party of the early second century—are, it is believed, assumptions for which there is no foundation. And, in fact, (4) and (5) are not now insisted on by many of the anti-traditional school, and will not be dealt with in this introduction.

Before passing on to a brief discussion of the style and the historical setting of the Epistles, it will not be amiss to suggest some considerations which may help, not indeed to solve the problem before us, but to enable us to believe that it would not be a problem at all could we only know a little more about the personal history of St. Paul, and of the inner life of the Christian Church in the first century. In the first place, we must remember that it was a period of intensely vigorous and rapidly developing Church life. We are so much accustomed to regard as normal Christian communities in which nine-tenths of the professed adherents are spiritually only half alive, that we find it difficult to realise what manner of thing Church life was when every one took a keen interest in his religion, and the spiritual life of every Church member was full and strong, even if not always consistent. The years that elapsed between Pentecost and 100 A.D. represent the infancy of the Church; and we all know how momentous in their after consequences are a child's experiences during the first five or six years of its life. But the first century was even more significant for the subsequent history of the Church than is infancy in the case of a human being. The development of the Church, as we experience it, at least in Europe, is slow; looking back thirty years we can indeed perceive some change; but in the first century a year wrought what it now takes a generation to effect. What we know of the rapid development in applied science in our own day supplies us with an experience somewhat analogous to the growth of the Christian Church—doctrinally and institutionally—in the first century. We have seen in the space of ten, or even five, years a complete revolution in men's notions as to what is possible and reasonable in the rate of travel on the high road or in the air.

It was while the Church was thus rapidly taking shape that St. Paul came into it; and, if we may judge from the extant evidence, he quickly became the most powerful constructive force in it. But there were other agencies at work, human, as well as Divine and divinely inspired, and St. Paul was himself wrought on and shaped as much, or more, than he shaped others. Always a student but never a recluse, he shared to the full the common life of the unexclusive early Church. He did not "dwell apart," though always conscious that his innermost life was "hid with Christ in God". And not only did his life move with the Church's life, but it was brought into close touch with every possible human experience—except those of domestic life—to a degree rarely equalled by any other man. The label that correctly describes the contents of a given human personality to-day may be, in some cases, not misleading five or ten years hence; but St. Paul was not one of these constant quantities. His personality was not that of a Milton, self-determining, holding on its course "like a star," unaffected by the storms of the lower atmosphere; he was as sympathetic, and therefore open to impressions from without, as if he had been a weak man. Of this impressionableness and craving for sympathy we have abundant evidence in the Epistles that are universally acknowledged to be genuine. Such a man is likely to undergo changes in mental outlook, to become possessed by fresh ideals and conceptions, so as to bewilder less agile minds; and, of course, new thoughts require for their expression words and phrases for which the man had no use before. In the case of St. Paul, this is no imaginary supposition. The difference between the Paul of Philippians and the Paul of 1 Timothy is not greater than, perhaps not as great as, between the Paul of Thessalonians and the Paul of Ephesians. The fact just noticed should put us on our guard against the easy assumption that the normal Pauline presentation of the relations between God and man is that found in the central group of his Epistles: Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians.

There is, however, a difference between the Pastorals and the earlier letters for which the lapse of time alone cannot account, and that is a diminution in force. The letters to Timothy and Titus are certainly of apostolic quality; the ordinary reader, and still more the student, who compares them with the best of the sub-apostolic literature, can at once perceive the difference between what is inspired and what is merely interesting, edifying, and even noble. Nevertheless, we miss in the Pastorals the exuberant vigour, the reserved strength of the earlier letters. The explanation of this may well be

that before St. Paul wrote these letters he had ceased to be an elderly, and had, perhaps rapidly, become an old man. There is nothing impossible in this supposition. The surprising thing is that it has not been more generally recognised as a probable factor in the solution of the problem presented by the Pastorals. When we think of the intensity with which St. Paul had lived his life—always at high pressure—and what a hard life it had been, it would be a marvel indeed if old age with its diminished powers had not come suddenly upon him.

We hold then that the author of the Pastorals was Paul; but "Paul the aged"; much more aged, and more truly so, than when he penned his note to Philemon. We may observe, as a sign of old age, a certain inertia which makes him satisfied to express his meaning in habitual, almost stereotyped, words and phrases; words and phrases which are only open to the objection—in itself unreasonable—that we have heard them quite recently. The brain no longer responds to the will to utter "words that burn"; and it seems as fitful in the origination of "thoughts that breathe". It is not that St. Paul is not truly inspired in the Pastorals. These letters satisfy the practical test of inspiration, *viz.*, their yield of matter for thought is never exhausted by study. There are, moreover, several passages in them that have touched the hearts of Christians in every age as nearly as anything the apostle ever wrote. But even in these, perhaps more in these than in less striking paragraphs—for ordinary details of Church life must be dealt with in ordinary language—we detect a failing of power in comparison with the Paul of the earlier letters: the inspiration is as true, but it is not as strong; the heart and arteries and veins do their duty, but the blood does not course so quickly as in the days of youth. To put it quite plainly: the difficulties that meet the student of the Pastoral Epistles lie rather in the logical connexion of the paragraphs than in the profundity of the thoughts expressed in them; and whatever obscurity there may be in some of the expressions used is due in nearly every case to the meagreness of our information concerning the circumstances of the writer and of the Church.

In the earlier epistles, on the contrary, it often happens that the apostle's thoughts and conceptions are too great for expression. He does not, indeed cannot, formulate them precisely; he gives them the most adequate expression he can; and the Holy Spirit has ever since been leading the Church to a constantly increasing comprehension of them. But in the Pastorals we do not meet any such struggles between thought and language. We are never conscious

that we are present at the birth of some mighty principle which can reach maturity only at the end of time. Great theological statements concerning man's salvation—not of the relation of Christ to the universe—are formulated, not daringly sketched; the conceptions of the mutual relations of God and man which are involved in these statements are not new to the author; he has mastered them completely, and presents them with a finished expression which leaves the reader satisfied. Take, for example, the statement of the wideness of God's saving purposes in 1 Tim. ii. 4-6; the summary of the working out of the Incarnation in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; the analysis of the saving process in Tit. iii. 4-7. Here we have theological principles in their classical expression; they do not need exegesis, they only demand to be "marked, learned, and inwardly digested".

Again, the apostle, in these letters is not only not creative; he is displayed to us as receptive of the thoughts of other makers of Christian theology, his contemporaries. When St. Paul wrote the Pastoral Epistles, his own work as an originating constructive theologian had come to an end; and there comes into clear view—what had been hitherto veiled—the effect on him of the action of the religious life of the communities in which he lived. It is a truth, obvious when stated, yet sometimes ignored, that the thoughts about religion current in the Christian Society of the first century, had not been generated only by St. Paul, but by St. John and St. Peter and others whose names and achievements we can only conjecture. When we were young, we used to picture the Palestine of the patriarchs as a land in which no person or thing except Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their flocks were of any significance; they dominated the landscape as do the saints in medieval pictures. When we grew older, it was almost disturbing to one's faith to realise that to the busy merchants and peasants of Palestine, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were not persons of unusual importance. Yet, as always happens, the truer account, unpalatable at first, is found to be more suggestive and helpful than the older fancy. In like manner, a realisation that St. Paul did not dominate the Church of his time, as his history in the Acts and his epistles so largely dominate the New Testament, will be found a helpful consideration.

The Church is a greater thing than the greatest saint or theologian in it; and St. Paul could not have helped, even if he would, being influenced by the Christianity, as actually lived, of the men and women around him; and that in three ways at least. (1) His own theology came back to him not quite the same as it had come from his brain. It is not only the elements of matter that are subject to

reaction in consequence of fusion; the same natural law operates in the interaction of the thoughts of a thoughtmaker with the minds of those to whom his thoughts are communicated. And, if we may carry on the same analogy, the Church of St Paul's time was unable to take up, to hold in solution, the whole of the Pauline theology; a considerable amount of it was held in suspension to be absorbed gradually by the Church in the course of the ages. (2) Again, as has just been pointed out, the religious thought of the Christian Society in which St. Paul lived was fed and stirred by other apostles, of whom we can name St. John and St. Peter. It is surely not unreasonable to suppose that these apostles spoke before they wrote, that what they published was the most perfect expression attainable by them of what they had been speaking about during the whole of their ministry; that, in fact, Johannine literature was, for the Church of the first century, the final presentation, not the origination, of Johannine thought and expression. Is it too much to expect that those who study the writings contained in the New Testament should cease to think of the authors of them as solitaries who had no other means but books of acquiring ideas or a vocabulary, and who, in turn, only influenced the thought and phraseology of the men of their time by books or treatises composed at the close of their lives. It is strange that men cannot see the Church, the Society which conditioned, was not conditioned by, St. Paul, St. John and St. Peter. This consideration is intended to prepare the reader to be not astonished or perplexed by the occasional Johannine turns of phrase that occur in the Pastorals, and which are noted in the course of the exposition. (3) Furthermore, it must not be thought strange that the Providence of God, the Holy Spirit Who guides the Church, should have called the apostle Paul almost wholly away from thoughts of the Church's place in history and in the universe to the administration of, and provision for, the daily needs of the Church as actually experienced by man. Our own generation has not been without examples of men summoned from the library of the "great house" into less obviously inspiring chambers, which serve the more material, but not less necessary, needs of the household. Christians who think of the Church as a visible Divine Society with a life on earth continuous to the end of time, cannot think that St. Paul as reflected in the Pastorals is less worthy of admiration than St. Paul as reflected in Romans. Nor will they be offended if they find that his new preoccupation with ordinary Church life has left a trace on his idiom; if, it may be, he has caught some of the current

phrases of ordinary religious society. He is not less intelligible to Timothy, or less truly himself.

THE STYLE OF THE LETTERS.

It was noticed in the beginning of this Introduction that the consideration of most weight against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is the style of the composition, which differs from that of any of the groups of the other ten Pauline letters—the genuineness of which is here assumed—by (*a*) the recurrence in them of certain, almost stereotyped, forms of expression, (*b*) by a general difference in the structure of sentences, and (*c*) by the absence from them of alleged characteristic Pauline words. These three sorts of variation are here enumerated in the order of tbeir importance. No fair-minded traditionalist will be disposed to minimise the gravity of the problem presented by these indisputable facts. On the other hand, these acknowledged peculiarities must not be allowed to obscure the equally undoubted fact that the Epistles present not only as many characteristic Pauline words as the writer had use for, but that, in the more significant matter of turns of expression, the style of the letters is, as has been stated before, fundamentally Pauline. This will be evident from an inspection of the references. Perhaps it is true to say that the positive stylistic peculiarities of the letters—the large number of unusual words,[1] the recurrent phraseology—deprive of its just weight the counter argument based on its admittedly Pauline element, just because this is normal, and does not strike the eye. It is at least a strong argument on the traditionalist side, that the un-Pauline style of the Pastorals was not commented on by the early Greek Christian critics, as was the un-Pauline style of Hebrews, and the un-Johannine style of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, the peculiarities of expression are not such as a clever imitator of St. Paul's style would introduce.

Taking up, in the first place, the recurrent words, terms and phrases, it will be convenient to divide them into three categories.

A. Terms, or phrases, of the religious life of the Christian Society.
B. Polemical phraseology in reference to false teaching.
C. Favourite terms, or expressions, of the author's.

It is not pretended that this classification can be carried out consistently; but it seemed to be worth attempting. In particular it

[1] Dean Bernard, *Past. Epp.*, p. xxxvi., notes that the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα amount to 176, a number "proportionately twice as great as in any other of St. Paul's letters."

may deserve consideration whether we have not presented to us, in the style of the Pastorals, a new, but not the less true, aspect of St. Paul as a writer, no longer creating a Christian terminology, but freely making use of the phraseology he heard around him, towards the formation of which he had been a principal, but not the only, contributor. On the other hand, in so far as this supposition is true it precludes our making use of the occurrence of certain phrases and words in extant early writings, as proofs that the authors of those writings had read the Pastoral Epistles.

In the following list of terms and phrases, a = 1 Timothy; b = 2 Timothy; c = Titus; the numbers indicate the number of occurrences of the term or phrase in the epistle. When the term or phrase is not peculiar to the Pastorals, a reference is given to its occurrence elsewhere, or "etc." is added.

Terminology of the Christian Society.

a, b, c.

ἡ ἀλήθεια, in a technical sense: a, 3; b, 4; c (2 Cor. iv. 2, etc.).

ἡ διδασκαλία: A, The body of doctrine; absolutely, or with epithets (see **ὑγιαίνουσα**): a, 4; b, 2; c, 3.

ἡ διδασκαλία: B, The act of teaching: a, 3; b, c (Rom. xii. 7).

ἡ πίστις, *fides quae creditur*: a, 8; b, 2; c, 3.

πίστις [κ.] ἀγάπη: a, 4; b, 2; c (1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8).

πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή: a, [b], c.

ἡ ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία: a, b, c, 2. **ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι**: a, b. **ὑγιαίνειν τῇ πίστει**: c, 2. **λόγος ὑγιής**: c. *Cf.* **νοσῶν**: a; **γάγγραινα**: b.

ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας and **ἐπιγινώσκειν τ. ἀληθείαν**: a, 2; b, 2; c (Heb. x. 26; *cf.* Philem. 6).

[ἡ] εὐσέβεια: a, 7; b. **κατ' εὐσέβειαν**: a, c. **εὐσεβῶς ζῆν**: b, c. **εὐσεβεῖν**: a (Acts, 4; 2 Pet. 5).

σώφρων: a, c, 3. **σωφρονεῖν**: c (Mark v. 15; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 13). **σωφρονισμός**: b. **σωφρονίζειν**: c. **σωφρόνως**: c. **σωφροσύνη**: a, 2 (Acts xxvi. 25).

ὁ νῦν αἰών: a, b, c.

ἐπιφάνεια: a, b, 3; c (2 Thess. ii. 8) (**ἐπιφαίνειν**: c, 2; Luke i. 79; Acts xxvii. 20; *cf.* Acts ii. 20).

ὠφέλιμος: a, 2; b, c.

διάβολοι, adj.: a, b, c.

ἀρνεῖσθαι: a, b, 4; c, 2, etc., but not Paul.

a, b.

συνείδησις καθαρά: a, b (**συνείδ. ἀγαθή**: a, 2; Acts xxiii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21).

καθαρὰ καρδία: a, b.
πίστις ἀνυπόκριτος: a, b.
πίστις κ. ἀγάπη ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b.
πίστις ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ: a, b; etc.
καλός: qualifying adj. (not incl. καλὸν ἔργον): a, 9; b, 3 (esp. καλὴ στρατεία, a, or στρατιώτης, b, καλὸς ἀγών, a, b); etc., but not Paul.
παγὶς: a; τοῦ διαβόλου: a, b.
φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην . . . πίστιν ἀγάπην: a, b.
ἀγωνίζομαι τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα: a, b.
παραθήκην φυλάσσειν: a, b, 2.
παρακολουθεῖν διδασκαλίᾳ: a, b.
ἄνθρωπος [τ.] Θεοῦ: a, b.

a, c.

καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα: a, 4; c, 4; etc., but not Paul.
σεμνός: a, 2; c (Phil. iv. 8); or σεμνότης: a, 2; c.
σωτήρ (of God the Father, not incl. Tit. ii. 13): a, 3; c, 3.

b, c.

εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον: b.
πρὸς „ „ „ ἐξηρτισμένος: b.
„ „ „ „ ἀδόκιμοι: c.
„ „ „ „ ἑτοίμους: c.

PECULIAR TO *ONE* LETTER.

ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ: a, 2.
μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ: a, 2 (ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή: a,).
ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς ζωῆς: a, 2.
μακάριος (of God): a, 2.
τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως, or τῆς εὐσεβείας: a, 2.
πίστις κ. ἀγάπη κ. ἁγιασμός, or ἁγνεία: a, 2.
ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τί or τινά: b, 3 (Rom. i. 16, and five other ins.).
ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα (Last Day): b, 3 (Matt. 2; Luke, 3; 2 Thess. 1).
καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: c, 2.

POLEMICAL PHRASEOLOGY.

ἀληθεία: ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας: a. περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν: b. μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: b. μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθ. ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα: b. ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: b. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας τ. ἀκοὴν ἀποστρέψουσιν: b. ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν: c.

νοῦς: διεφθαρμένων . . . τ. νοῦν: a. κατεφθαρμένοι τ. νοῦν: b. μεμίανται αὐτῶν . . . ὁ νοῦς: c.

πίστις: περὶ τ. πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν: a. περὶ τ. πίστιν ἠστόχησαν: a. ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τ. πίστιν: b. ἀποστήσονταί τινες τ. πίστεως: a. ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τ. πίστεως: a. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.

συνείδησις: κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν: a. μεμίανται αὐτῶν . . . ἡ συνείδησις: c. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 5, 19.

ἀστοχεῖν: a, 2; b. See ἀλήθεια and πίστις.

ἀνατρέπουσιν τήν τινων πίστιν: b. ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν: c. *Cf.* ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων, b.

βέβηλος: a, 3; b (Heb. xii. 16). (βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι: a, b).

γενεαλογίαι: a, c.

ἐκζητήσεις or ζητήσεις: a, 2; b, c. (μωραὶ ζητήσεις: b, c.)

λογομαχεῖν and λογομαχία: a, b.

ματαιολογία and ματαιολόγος: a, c. *Cf.* ζητήσεις . . . μάταιοι, c.

ἔρις: a, c.

μάχη: b, c.

μῦθος: a, 2; b, c (2 Pet. i. 16).

νόμος: a, 2; νομικός: c; νομοδιδάσκαλος: a.

ἐπὶ πλεῖον προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας: b. οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον: b. προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον: b.

Author's Favourite Terms.

a, b, c.

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος: a, b, c.

πιστὸς ὁ λόγος κ. πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος: a, 2.

παραιτοῦ: a, 2; b, c.

οἶκος (household): a, 5; b, 2; c (1 Cor. i. 16, etc.).

περί with accusative: a, 3; b, 2; c (Phil. ii. 23, etc.).

a, b.

χάριν ἔχω; a, b (Luke xvii. 9; Heb. xii. 28).

διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τ. Θεοῦ, or τ. Κυρίου: a; b, 2.

εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος . . . διδάσκαλος: a, b.

χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη: a, b.

ὧν ἐστίν: a; b, 2.

a, c.

ὡσαύτως: a, 4; c, 2.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ: a, c.

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: a, 2; c.

διαβεβαιοῦσθαι περί τινος: a, c.

προσέχειν: a, 5; c. (προσέχειν μύθοις: a, c.)

b, c.

σπούδασον : b, 3 ; c. (σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν : b, 2 ; c.)
περιΐστασο : b, c.
δι' ἣν αἰτίαν : b, 2 ; c (Luke viii. 47 ; Acts xxii. 24 ; Heb. ii. 11).

b.

συνκακοπάθησον : b, 2.

The second difference in style by which the Pastoral Epistles are marked off from the earlier letters may be given in the words of Lightfoot.

The Syntax.

(*a*) "It is stiffer and more regular than in the earlier Epistles, more jointed and less flowing. The clauses are marshalled together, and there is a tendency to parallelism."

e.g., 1 Tim. i. 9, ii. 1, 2, iii. 16, iv. 12, 13, 15, v. 10, vi. 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 11, 12, iii. 1-8, 10-13, 16, iv. 2, 4, 5, 7 ; Tit. i. 7, 8, 9, ii. 7, 12, iii. 1-3.

(*b*) "There is a greater sententiousness, an abruptness and positiveness of form. Imperative clauses are frequent.

e.g., 1 Tim. iv. 11, 15, 16, v. 7, 8, 22-25, vi. 2, 6, 11, 20; 2 Tim. i. 13, 14, ii. 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 19, 22, 23, iii. 1, 5, 12, 16."

(*Biblical Essays*, p. 402.)

These differences in syntax are not unconnected with the small variety and paucity of particles which are a negative feature of the Pastorals. But neither characteristic is very astonishing, since in point of fact, the Epistles are of the nature of episcopal charges, authoritative, not argumentative; enforcing disciplinary regulations, not unfolding theological conceptions, or vindicating personal claims.

We come, in the last place, to state and consider the problem presented by the purely negative characteristic of the style of the Pastoral Epistles, the fact that we do not find in them certain alleged characteristic Pauline words. Those who urge this as a serious argument against the traditional belief as to the authorship of these letters do not seem to make allowance for the fact that they are *ex hypothesi* dealing with a real man—not a machine; a man who had travelled much, and had read much ; who was constantly coming into contact with fresh people, constantly confronted with fresh problems of practical life. The vocabulary of such a man is not likely to remain unaffected in its contents or use. Add to this,

that each of the other letters which are ascribed to him arose out of special circumstances, and deals almost exclusively with those special circumstances, and that the circumstances which called forth the letters to Timothy and Titus were, confessedly, quite different from those out of which any of the other Pauline letters arose. When these obvious facts are considered, it is difficult to treat seriously an argument which assumes that St. Paul was provided with only one set of words and terms; unalterable, no matter to whom, or on what subject, he was writing.

It is not thus that non-Biblical compositions are critically examined. We do not demand that Shakespeare's *Sonnets* or *Cymbeline* should exhibit a certain percentage of *Hamlet* words. And the argument becomes all the more unreasonable when one thinks how very small in extent is the extant literary work of St. Paul: less than 150 small octavo pages in Westcott and Hort's edition, and of these the Pastorals occupy only fifteen. If we had been privileged to hear St. Paul's sermons, or to listen to his conversation, how many Pauline words, as shown in a concordance, should we have heard?

Antecedently, we should not expect that an author's favourite expressions would be distributed over the pages of his book like the spots on a wall-paper pattern; nor is this notion confirmed when we examine the list of Pauline words missing from the Pastorals, as given by Holtzmann (*Pastoralbriefe*, p. 98, *sqq.*) and less fully by von Soden (*Hand-Commentar*, p. 177 *sqq.*).

In the complete list of verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, fifty in all, as printed below, each group of cognate words, bracketed together, is for argument's sake, treated as a unit. And the numbers indicate the number of times the word occurs in St. Paul's Epistles. The words that are spaced are those, which after an examination of a concordance, can be plausibly claimed as characteristically Pauline; that is to say, they are of comparative frequent occurrence, and are found in at least three groups of his Epistles. It must be allowed that the absence of all of these is surprising. The simplest explanation is that some of them had passed out of St. Paul's ordinary vocabulary; and that, in the case of others, the subject matter of the Pastorals did not demand their use. Some of them, obviously, belong to the vocabulary of certain theological conceptions, others to that of a writer's temperament and temper.

For the purpose of analysis, it will be convenient to think of the other ten epistles of St. Paul as falling into four groups, *viz.*:—

(i.) 1 and 2 Thessalonians.
(ii.) Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal.
(iii.) Eph., Col., Philem.
(iv.) Philippians, which though it is one of group iii., as being one of the epistles of the first Roman captivity, yet inasmuch as it was written somewhat later, may be considered apart.

ἄδικος, 3, ἀκαθαρσία, 9, ἀκροβυστία, 19, (ἀποκαλύπτειν, 13, ἀποκάλυψις, 13), ἀπολύτρωσις, 7, γνωρίζειν, 18, διαθήκη, 9 (δικαιοῦν, 27, δικαίωμα, 5), δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, 9, δοκεῖν, 18, ἕκαστος, 42, (ἐλευθερία, 7, ἐλεύθερος, 16, ἐλευθεροῦν, 5), (ἐνέργεια, 8, ἐνεργεῖν, 17, ἐνέργημα, 2, ἐνεργής, 2), ἔξεστιν, 5, ἔργα νόμου, 9, κἀγώ, 27, καταργεῖν, 25, κατεργάζεσθαι, 20, (καυχᾶσθαι, 35, καύχημα, 10, καύχησις, 10), κρείσσων, 4, μείζων, 4, μικρός, 4, μωρία, 5, (ὁμοιοῦν, 1, ὁμοίωμα, 5), ὁμοίως, 4, ὁρᾶν, 10, οὐρανός, 21, παράδοσις, 5, παραλαμβάνειν, 11, πατὴρ ἡμῶν, 7, outside salutations, πείθειν, 2, (περισσεία, 3, περισσεύειν, 26, περίσσευμα, 2, περισσός, 2, περισσότερος, 6), περιπατεῖν, 32, (πεποιθέναι, 12, πεποίθησις, 6), πλεονάζειν, 8, (πλεονεκτεῖν, 5, πλεονέκτης, 4, πλεονεξία, 6), οἱ πολλοί, 8, (πρᾶγμα, 4, πρᾶξις, 3, πράσσειν, 18), σπλάγχνα, 8, (συνεργεῖν, 3, συνεργός, 12), σῶμα, 91, (ταπεινός, 3, ταπεινοῦν, 4), (τέλειος, 8, τελειότης, 1, τελειοῦν, 1), υἱοθεσία, 5, υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ, 17, (ὑπακοή, 11, ὑπακούειν, 11), (φρονεῖν, 24, φρόνημα, 4, φρόνησις, 1, φρόνιμος, 5), φύσις, 11, χαρίζεσθαι, 16, χρηστός, 3.

Of the fifty characteristically Pauline words no less than eleven do not occur in groups i., iii., iv., *viz.*, ἄδικος, δικαιοῦν, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, ἔξεστιν, ἔργα νόμου, μείζων, μικρός, μωρία, ὁμοίως, πείθειν, οἱ πολλοί. Of these, ἄδικος is not found in 2 Cor. or Gal.; δικαιοῦν not in 2 Cor. though twice in the Pastorals; while δικαίωμα only occurs in Rom.; δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ not in 1 Cor. or Gal.; ἔξεστιν not in Rom. or Gal.; ἔργα νόμου not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; μείζων not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; μικρός not in Rom.; μωρία only in 1 Cor. (while μωρός, also in 1 Cor. (4), occurs in the Pastorals twice); ὁμοίως not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; πείθειν not in Rom. or 1 Cor.; οἱ πολλοί not in Gal., but five times in Rom. It is obvious, from these facts, that these eleven words are not characteristically Pauline.

Of the others, four do not occur in groups i. and iii., *viz.*, δοκεῖν, κρείσσων, ὁμοιοῦν, ταπεινός. Of these, δοκεῖν not in Rom.; κρείσσων not in Rom., 2 Cor. or Gal.; ὁμοιοῦν not in 1 Cor., 2 Cor. or Gal.; and ταπεινός not in 1 Cor. or Gal.

Seven do not occur in groups i. and iv., *viz.*, ἀκροβυστία, ἀπολύτρωσις, διαθήκη, ἐλευθερία, υἱοθεσία, φύσις, χρηστός. Of these, ἀκροβυστία not in 2 Cor.; ἀπολύτρωσις not in 2 Cor. or Gal. Of the ἐλευθερία

group, ἐλεύθερος and ἐλευθεροῦν are not in 2 Cor., and ἐλευθεροῦν is not in 1 Cor. υἱοθεσία not in 1 Cor. or 2 Cor.; φύσις not in 2 Cor.; χρηστός not in 2 Cor. or Gal.; leaving διαθήκη (once in iii.) and ἐλευθερία (twice in iii.) as the only words that are evenly distributed in group ii.

Among those which do not occur in group i., *viz.*, γνωρίζειν, κατεργάζεσθαι, σπλάγχνα, τέλειος, φρονεῖν, χαρίζεσθαι, we notice that of the twenty instances of κατεργάζεσθαι seventeen occur in Rom. and 2 Cor.; σπλάγχνα, not found in Rom., 1 Cor. or Gal., occurs three times in Philem.; none of the τέλειος group is found in 2 Cor. or Gal., while τελειοῦν and τελειότης are absent from Rom. and 1 Cor. Of the thirty-four instances of the φρονεῖν group, one of which is 1 Tim. vi. 17, Rom. and Phil. account for twenty-five; φρόνημα is only found in Rom., φρόνησις only in Eph., φρόνιμος only in Rom., 1 Cor., and 2 Cor.; leaving γνωρίζειν and χαρίζεσθαι fairly representative words.

It remains to notice a few of these characteristically Pauline words which are not found in Philippians, *viz.*: ἀκαθαρσία, καταργεῖν, ὁρᾶν, παράδοσις, πλεονεκτεῖν, and υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ. ἀκαθαρσία is not found in 1 Cor.; καταργεῖν does, in point of fact, occur in 2 Tim.; ὁρᾶν, found in 1 Tim. iii. 16, does not occur in 2 Cor. or Gal., παράδοσις not in Rom. or 2 Cor.; none of the πλεονεκτεῖν group is found in Gal., while πλεονεκτεῖν and πλεονεξία are both absent from 1 Cor., and πλεονέκτης from 2 Cor. Of the seventeen places where our Lord is called υἱὸς [τ. Θεοῦ,] eleven are found in Rom. and Gal.

In the whole list, then, there are twenty-seven words, or more than half, the absence of which from the Pastorals obviously need call for no remark. The following facts with regard to the distribution of some of the others are suggestive; and diminish, if they do not wholly remove, the difficulty of the problem before us. ἕκαστος (42) occurs twenty-two times in 1 Cor.; of the ἐνέργεια group (29) three members are not found in Rom., 2 Cor., or Gal., *i.e.*, ἐνέργεια, ἐνέργημα, ἐνεργής; neither is ἐνέργεια found in 1 Cor. Of the twenty-seven occurrences of κἀγώ, more than half, nineteen, are found in 1 Cor. and 2 Cor. Of the καυχᾶσθαι group (55) more than half, twenty-nine, occur in 2 Cor; παραλαμβάνειν (11) is not found in Rom. or 2 Cor. πατὴρ ἡμῶν, apart from its common use in salutations, is found three times in 1 Thess., twice in 2 Thess., and once each in Gal. and Phil. Of the περισσεία group (39), none is found in Gal.; three not in 1 Cor., *i.e.*, περισσεία, περισσός and περίσσευμα; two not in Rom., *i.e.*, περίσσευμα and περισσότερος. On the other hand, nearly half, seventeen, of the total is found in 2 Cor. (which has also περισσο-

τέρως seven times), seven occur in 1 Cor. and five in Phil. Neither πεποιθέναι nor πεποίθησις occurs in 1 Cor.; πεποίθησις not in Rom. or Gal. Here again seven cases belong to 2 Cor. and seven to Phil. Of the πρᾶγμα group (25), thirteen belong to Rom., which has ten out of the eighteen occurrences of πράσσειν. Neither of the συνεργεῖν group (15) occurs in Gal.; yet its distribution is otherwise fairly even. The distribution of σῶμα (91) is remarkable. Just more than half, forty-six, of its occurrences are found in 1 Cor.; chap. vi. having eight, chap. xii., eighteen, chap. xv., nine. Neither ὑπακοή nor ὑπακούειν occur in 1 Cor. or Gal.; ὑπακούειν not in 2 Cor.

An analysis of the list of Pauline particles that are not found in the Pastoral Epistles yields the same general result; that is to say, the great majority of them are confined to group ii. of the Epistles; and that is explained by the fact that that group is the most argumentative and controversial, and the subject matter demands the employment of inferential and similar particles. Thus ἄρα (15), ἕνεκεν (6), ἴδε (1) ἰδού (9, of which 6 are in 2 Cor.), ποῦ (10, 8 of which are in 1 Cor.), παρά, acc. (14), are not found outside group ii.; ἔπειτα (11, 7 of which are in 1 Cor.), μήπως (10), οὔτε (34, of which 22 are in 4 verses), are only in group ii. and in 1 Thess. The following also do not occur in groups i and iii: ἄχρι (ii. 12, iv. 2), οὔπω (ii. 2, iv. 1) πάλιν (ii. 25, iv. 3). The following do not occur in group iii. διότι (10: i. 3, ii. 6, iv. 1), ἔμπροσθεν (7: i. 4, ii. 2, iv. 1), ἔτι (15: i. 1, ii. 13, iv. 1). The distribution of the others is as follows: ἀντί (5: i, 2, ii. 2, iii. 1), ἄρα οὖν (12: i. 2, ii. 9, iii, 1), διό (27, i. 2, ii. 18, iii. 6, iv. 1), ὅπως (9: i. 1, ii. 7, iii. 1), οὐκέτι (15: ii. 13, iii. 2), ἐν παντί (16: i. 1, ii. 11, of which 10 are in 2 Cor.; iii. 2, iv. 2), ποτέ (does occur in Tit., otherwise 19: i. 1, ii. 8, iii. 9, iv. 1), ὥσπερ (14: i. 1 ii. 13), σύν (38: i. 4, ii. 21, iii. 9, iv. 4). There are twenty-four characteristically Pauline particles in the above enumeration. Of these, ten are not found in group i., fifteen are not found in group iii., and in fact, in the epistles of the first Roman captivity (groups iii. and iv.), which are about half as long again as the Pastoral Epistles, particles are very sparingly used; διό, ἐν παντί and σύν alone being at all common. It may be proper to note here in connexion with the absence of σύν from the Pastorals, that twice, in 2 Tim. iv. 11 and Tit. iii. 15, μετά is used where the other Pauline letters have σύν; otherwise the usage of μετά in the Pastorals does not differ from that of St. Paul elsewhere. Another noteworthy feature in the Pastorals is the absence of the article, especially before common Christian terms. This peculiarity, and also the deficiency in particles, may be possibly due to the amanuensis employed by St. Paul at this

time. See Dean Bernard, *Past. Epp.* p. xli., and Milligan, *Thessalonians*, p. 126.

Historical Setting of the Epistles.

It is altogether unneccessary for any one now to restate the arguments which prove that the references to persons and places in the Pastorals cannot be accommodated to the history of St. Paul and of his companions as given in the Acts. The "historical contradictions" are marshalled with crushing force by Lightfoot in his *Biblical Essays*, p. 403 *sqq.* Critics of the anti-traditional school who accept, as genuine Pauline fragments, those sections of the Pastorals in which the personal and local references occur are obliged to allocate these references to different parts of the Acts; and, even so, the explanations given are forced and unconvincing. It must then be clearly understood that our claim of the Pastorals for St. Paul is based on the assumption that his ministry was prolonged for at least two years beyond the date of the close of the Acts. If St. Paul was martyred immediately, or very soon, after the expiration of the two years' confinement mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, then he did not write the Pastoral Epistles or any portion of them. This is a vital point; and demands at least a brief discussion of the main arguments in favour of the traditional opinion. Supposing that the Pastorals were not in our hands, and the question were asked, Was the two years' confinement in Rome mentioned in Acts xxviii. 30, followed by St. Paul's execution, or by his release?—the answer must be that all the *positive* evidence available is in favour of the latter alternative. There are three lines of argument: (1) the way in which the Acts ends; (2) the evidence of the epistles written during, or towards the end, of those two years; (3) external testimony.

(1) It ought to be unnecessary to observe that the author of the Acts knew what happened at the end of those two years. We can only guess why he stopped where he did; yet some guesses have more probability than others. There were limits to the size of books in those days. On the supposition that St. Luke knew of a subsequent ministry of his master's, the close of the Roman captivity would be a suitable point at which to bring vol. i. of the Acts to a conclusion, whether regard be had to considerations of space, or of literary fitness; the arrival at Rome being the fulfilment of the apostle's intention announced in Acts xix. 21. On the other hand, if St. Luke knew that St. Paul's two years' confinement had been followed at once by his execution, the historian's omission to mention

it cannot be accounted for. A brief record would have been all that was necessary, and this would not have added unduly to the length of the book.

Salmon's explanation (*Introduction*, p. 312) that "why St. Luke has told us no more is, that he knew no more; and that he knew no more, because at the time nothing more had happened—in other words, that the book of the Acts was written a little more than two years after Paul's arrival at Rome," will not commend itself to many scholars. It seems more natural to suppose that both the Gospel and the Acts were published after St. Paul's death. Literary men do not always succeed in completing their designs before they die; and the later the date we assign to Acts, the greater is the probability that St. Luke died before he had reduced to literary form his memories of the Apostle's post-Roman-captivity history.

Passing now to an examination on this point of the third group of St. Paul's Epistles, the evidence afforded by them is distinctly favourable to the supposition that St. Paul was released after the two years of Acts xxviii. 30. We must of course avoid the error into which some fall, of imagining that every foreboding or declared intention recorded in a narrative, or preserved in a published letter, would have been suppressed by the editor if it had not been realised. And accordingly we can only infer from the tone of Philippians and Philemon that, in St. Paul's judgment, when he wrote these letters, the prospect of his release was favourable. No other inference can be drawn from "I know that I shall abide, yea, and abide with you all, for your progress and joy in the faith" (Phil. i. 25); "I trust in the Lord that I myself also shall come shortly" (ii. 24); "Prepare me also a lodging: for I hope that through your prayers I shall be granted unto you" (Philem. 22). Contrast with these passages the tone of 2 Timothy, which is that of a man who knew that his days were numbered, and that the end was not far off.

What seems to be a natural conclusion from the internal evidence of Acts xxviii. and of Philippians and Philemon is confirmed by the tradition of the early Church as it is expressed by Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii., 22: "Paul is said (λόγος ἔχει), after having defended himself to have set forth again upon the ministry of preaching, and to have entered the same city a second time, and to have there ended his life by martyrdom. Whilst then a prisoner, he wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy, in which he both mentions his first defence, and his impending death." It is to be noted that there is no contrary tradition; nor is it easy to see what end could have been served by the invention of this one.

There are two passages in earlier writers which are adduced as proof that St. Paul at one time visited Spain. Since it is impossible to find room for such a journey within the period covered by the Acts, these passages, if accepted as proofs of the expedition to Spain, are therefore proofs of a missionary activity of St. Paul subsequent to the date of the close of the Acts. In the Letter of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, § 5, the writer speaks of Peter and Paul as contemporary martyrs; and Paul he describes as κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει . . . δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών.

It is difficult to believe that a native of Rome, writing from Rome, would speak of the world's capital as ἡ δύσις or τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως; nor did Corinth lie so far to the east of Rome as to justify such a rhetorical expression (see Lightfoot's note *in loc.*). Nor can we argue from the opening of the following chapter—"Unto these men of holy lives was gathered (συνηθροίσθη) a vast multitude"—that Clement meant to date the fury of Neronic persecution as subsequent to the martyrdom of St. Paul. Writing about thirty years after "the great tribulation," he mentions the martyrs in order of dignity. In any case, he mentions Peter's death before that of Paul; yet this was never considered an argument against the tradition that the two apostles were martyred together; nor would it be felt as a serious objection to the recent theory that St. Peter outlived St. Paul by many years.

The following passage from the Muratorian Canon, in its obscure simplicity, reads like a fragment of a genuine tradition rather than a literary figment based on Rom. xv. 28: "Acta autem omnium apostolorum sub uno libro scripta sunt. Lucas optime Theophilo comprendit, quia sub praesentia eius singula gerebantur, sicuti et semote passionem [*perh.* semota passione] Petri euidenter declarat, sed et *profectionem* [*perh.* profectione] *Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis*" (text as given by Westcott, *Canon. N.T.*, p. 535). The argument is unaffected even if the words from "passionem" be derived from the early second century *Actus Petri cum Simone.* See James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, ii., xi., and Dean Bernard, *Pastoral Epp.*, p. xxx. These considerations force us to the conclusion that the assumption that St. Paul's life ended where St. Luke's history terminates is arbitrary, and contrary to the evidence that is available. It remains to present to the reader a conjectural outline (based on Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, p. 223) of St. Paul's movements between his release and his second Roman imprisonment.

(1) A journey from Rome to Asia Minor. It is natural to suppose

that he visited Philippi and Colossæ, in accordance with the intimations cited above from Phil. and Philem. Perhaps he now visited Crete.

(2) A journey to Spain; perhaps passing through Dalmatia and Gaul (?) (2 Tim. iv. 10). Possibly on this journey he became aware of the convenience of Nicopolis in Epirus as a centre for work.

(3) Last journey Eastward. Visits Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 3). The dispute with Hymenæus and Alexander the smith, and the services of Onesiphorus (1 Tim. i. 20; 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14) perhaps now took place. Leaves Timothy in charge of the Church at Ephesus. Visits Macedonia (1 Tim. i. 3).

[1 Timothy.]

Visits Crete; leaves Titus in charge; returns to Asia (as hoped in 1 Tim. iii. 14, iv. 13).

[Titus.]

Passes through Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20), Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13), where perhaps he was arrested, Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20). In any case he never reached Nicopolis as anticipated in Tit. iii. 12. It is here assumed that the winter mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21, is the same as that of Tit. iii. 12.

[2 Timothy.]

External Evidence.

With regard to the external attestation to the Pastoral Epistles, it must be acknowledged that some early heretics, who acknowledged the genuineness of the other letters attributed to St. Paul, rejected these. Basilides, who flourished in the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A.D.), is the first who is said to have done so. Clement Al. (*Strom.* ii. 11) states that some, Gnostics apparently, were actuated in this decision by dislike of the expression ἡ ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις in 1 Tim. vi. 20: ὑπὸ ταύτης ἐλεγχόμενοι τῆς φωνῆς οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱρέσεων τὰς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἀθετοῦσιν ἐπιστολάς. On the other hand, the extant fragments of another Gnostic, Heracleon, contain an allusion to 2 Tim. ii. 13: ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτὸν οὐδέποτε δύναται (Clem. Al., *Strom.* iv. 9). The Canon of Marcion, which contained only his own edition of the Gospel according to St. Luke and ten of St. Paul's epistles, of course did not include the Pastorals; but Tatian (died about 170) did not wholly follow him in this, since he regarded Titus as certainly genuine. "Hanc vel maxime Apostoli pronuntiandam credidit, parvi pendens Marcionis, et aliorum qui cum eo in hac parte consentiunt, assertionem" (Jerome, *Prol. in Tit.*). In the same context, St.

Jerome declares that these adverse judgments were not critical in any true sense, but merely arbitrary: "cum haeretica auctoritate pronuntient et dicant, Illa epistola Pauli est, haec non est". However that may be, there is at least no trace in the writings of the Church controversialists of arguments of a critical nature; whereas in the dispute as to the authorship of Hebrews, Clement Al. and Origen were compelled to discuss the problem presented by its un-Pauline style. In any case, the fact that the rejection of the Pastorals by some heretics was noted amounts to a positive testimony in their favour by the contemporary Church.

From the time of Irenæus, Clement Al. and Tertullian[1]—that is, practically from the time that N.T. books are quoted by their author's names—until the year 1804, when Schmidt in his *Introduction* denied the genuineness of 1 Timothy, no one, Christian or non-Christian, doubted that the Pastoral Epistles were genuine letters of the Apostle Paul. They are included in all MSS., Versions and Lists of the Pauline Epistles without exception, and in the same order (*i.e.*, 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit.). An interesting exception as regards the order meets us in the Muratorian Fragment: "Uerum ad Philemonem unam, et ad Titum unam, et ad Timotheum duas pro affectu et dilectione; in honore tamen ecclesiae catholicae in ordinatione ecclesiasticae disciplinae sanctificatae sunt". The composer of this catalogue here arranges the groups of four personal letters of St. Paul in rough chronological order. As 2 Tim. was obviously the last letter that St. Paul wrote, the two to Timothy are placed last, Titus being joined to them as evidently dealing with kindred topics.

It remains that the reader should have placed before him the traces, more or less distinct, of the Pastoral Epistles in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and of the pre-Irenæus period.

Clement of Rome. *Ad Cor.* 1. (A.D. 95.)

§ 1 (1 Tim. vi. 1). ὥστε τὸ . . . ὄνομα ὑμῶν μεγάλως βλασφημηθῆναι.

§ 1 (1 Tim. v. 17). τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς . . . πρεσβυτέροις.

§ 1 (1 Tim. ii. 9, 11; Tit. ii. 4). γυναιξίν . . . στεργούσας καθηκόντως τοὺς ἄνδρας ἑαυτῶν ἔν τε τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε, πάνυ σωφρονούσας.

[1] *e.g.*, Irenæus, *Haer.* Praef.; i. 16, 3; ii. 14, 7; iii. 3, 3; iii. 3, 4; iv. 16, 3. Clem. Al., *Strom.* i. p. 350. Tert., *de Praescr.* 6, 25. *Adv. Marcion.* v. 21.

§ 2 (1 Tim. vi. 8). τοῖς ἐφοδίοις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρκούμενοι.

* § 2 (Tit. iii. 1). ἕτοιμοι εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν.

§ 7 (1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7). ὁ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ἀγὼν ἐπίκειται.

§ 7 (1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4). ἴδωμεν . . . τί προσδεκτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς.

* § 26 (Tit. ii. 10). αὐτῷ δουλευσάντων ἐν πεποιθήσει πίστεως ἀγαθῆς.

§ 29 (1 Tim. ii. 8). προσέλθωμεν οὖν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι ψυχῆς, ἁγνὰς καὶ ἀμιάντους χεῖρας αἴροντες πρὸς αὐτόν.

* § 32 (Tit. iii. 5-7). πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν . . . οὐ δι' αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ.

* § 37 (1 Tim. i. 18). στρατευσώμεθα οὖν . . . ἐν τοῖς ἀμώμοις προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ.

§ 42 (1 Tim. iii. 10). καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.

* § 45 (2 Tim. i. 3). τῶν ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει λατρευόντων.

§ 47 (1 Tim. vi. 1). ὥστε καὶ βλασφημίας ἐπιφέρεσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου.

§ 55 (2 Tim. ii. 1). γυναῖκες ἐνδυναμωθεῖσαι διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ.

§ 55 (1 Tim. i. 17). Θεὸν τῶν αἰώνων.

§ 61 (1 Tim. i. 17). βασιλεῦ τῶν αἰώνων.

To these we may add, perhaps, the prayer for Kings in §§ 60, 61, in conformity with the direction given in 1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 2, and in those places only of the N.T.

On a review of these passages, it must in candour be admitted that those marked with an asterisk seem to be the only ones that suggest a literary dependence on the Pastorals. The others, it may be plausibly maintained, are simply illustrations of that current religious phraseology which the Pastorals themselves reflect. Taken all together, they prove that Clement's mind was at home in the religious world to which the Pastorals belong; but while the present writer believes that Clement was as familiar with these letters as he was with 1 Cor., he cannot affirm such a position to be wholly free from uncertainty.

IGNATIUS (*circ.* A.D. 110).

* *Magn.* § 8 (Tit. i. 14, iii. 9). μὴ πλανᾶσθε ταῖς ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀνωφελέσιν οὖσιν· εἰ γὰρ μέχρι νῦν κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι.

§ 11 (1 Tim. i. 1). πεπληροφόρησθε ἐν τῇ γεννήσει κ. τ. πάθει κ. τ. ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένῃ ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου· πραχθέντα ἀληθῶς κ. βεβαίως ὑπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

Trall. Inscr. and § 2 have also *Jesus Christ our hope.*

Polyc. § 2 (2 Tim. ii. 25). τοὺς λοιμοτέρους ἐν πραΰτητι ὑπότασσε.

*§ 2 (2 Tim. iv. 5; ii. 5; i. 10; i. 5, 12). νῆφε, ὡς Θεοῦ ἀθλητής· τὸ θέμα ἀφθαρσία καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, περὶ ἧς καὶ σὺ πέπεισαι.

§ 3 (1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 3). ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες μή σε καταπλησσέτωσαν.

*§ 3 (2 Tim. ii. 12). ἕνεκεν Θεοῦ πάντα ὑπομένειν ἡμᾶς δεῖ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὑπομείνῃ.

§ 3 (1 Tim. i. 17). τὸν ἀόρατον.

*§ 4 (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2). δούλους καὶ δούλας μὴ ὑπερηφάνει· ἀλλὰ μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φυσιούσθωσαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ πλέον δουλευέτωσαν.

*§ 6 (2 Tim. ii. 4). ἀρέσκετε ᾧ στρατεύεσθε, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὰ ὀψώνια κομίζεσθε.

§ 7 (Tit. iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 21). ἕτοιμοί ἐστε εἰς εὐποιΐαν Θεῷ ἀνήκουσαν.

The echoes of the Pastorals are especially remarkable in the Epistle to Polycarp; and it is peculiarly worthy of remark that in this letter, which was admittedly a personal communication from Ignatius to Polycarp, the writer passes from exhortations to Polycarp himself—and those too of a very delicate nature—to general exhortations addressed to the whole Church. Contrast *e.g.* § 5 with § 6; and in the middle of a section addressed to the whole Church he interposes a personal appeal to Polycarp. This illustrates admirably a feature in the Pastorals which has been alleged as a serious objection to their acceptation as genuine letters; *i.e.* the intermingling of personal matter with directions and exhortations addressed to the Church.

POLYCARP. *Ad Phil.* (*circ.* A.D. 110).

*§ 4 (1 Tim. vi. 10, 7). ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλεπῶν φιλαργυρία. εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι ἔχομεν.

§ 5 (2 Tim. ii. 12). ἐὰν πολιτευσώμεθα ἀξίως αὐτοῦ, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν αὐτῷ.

§ 8 (1 Tim. i. 1). προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν . . . ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

* § 9 (2 Tim. iv. 10). οὐ γὰρ τὸν νῦν ἠγάπησαν αἰῶνα.

* § 12 (1 Tim. ii. 2, iv. 15). *Orate* etiam *pro regibus et potestatibus et principibus* . . . ut fructus vester *manifestus sit in omnibus.*

The Acts of Martyrdom of Polycarp (A.D. 155 or 156).

§ 10 (1 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 1). δεδιδάγμεθα γὰρ ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν . . . ἀπονέμειν.

There can be no question that in the Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians we have express citations from 1 and 2 Timothy. It is, to say the least, difficult to believe that a man like Polycarp, who had been a disciple of the Apostle John, and who, when he wrote this letter, was bishop of Smyrna and in full vigour of life, would have made such honourable use of letters which had been compiled by an unknown Paulinist a few years before. We regard the evidence of Polycarp as a fact of capital importance; for it removes any possible doubt that may hang over inferences drawn from Ignatius; and it supports us in our belief that the Pastoral Epistles were also known to Clement of Rome. For the sake of completeness, we may add echoes of the Letters in other extant second century Christian Literature. The three passages cited from the Epistle of Barnabas are not of necessity based on our Letters; and the same may be said of the four quotations from Justin Martyr, with the possible exception of that from *Dial.* § 47.

The So-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome (*circ.* 120-140 A.D.).

§ 7 (2 Tim. ii. 4, 5). ἀγωνισώμεθα, εἰδότες ὅτι . . . οὐ πάντες στεφανοῦνται, εἰ μὴ οἱ πολλὰ κοπιάσαντες καὶ καλῶς ἀγωνισάμενοι . . . ὁ τὸν φθαρτὸν ἀγῶνα ἀγωνιζόμενος, ἐὰν εὑρεθῇ φθείρων . . . ἔξω βάλλεται τοῦ σταδίου.

§ 8 (1 Tim. vi. 14, 12). τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν.

§ 17 (Tit. ii. 12). μὴ ἀντιπαρελκώμεθα ἀπὸ τῶν κοσμικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.

§ 20 (1 Tim. i. 17). τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ ἀοράτῳ . . . ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ.

The So-called Epistle of Barnabas (A.D. 70-132).

§ 7 (2 Tim. iv. 1). εἰ οὖν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὢν Κύριος καὶ μέλλων κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ἔπαθεν.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 14). ἡ παράβασις διὰ τοῦ ὄφεως ἐν Εὔᾳ ἐγένετο.

§ 12 (1 Tim. iii. 16). υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς·

The Epistle to Diognetus (*circ.* A.D. 150).

* § 4 (1 Tim. iii. 16). τὸ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν θεοσεβείας μυστήριον μὴ προσδοκήσῃς δύνασθαι παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μαθεῖν.

* § 9 (Tit. iii. 4). ἦλθε δὲ ὁ καιρὸς ὃν Θεὸς προέθετο λοιπὸν φανερῶσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χρηστότητα καὶ δύναμιν (ὢ τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ), οὐκ ἐμίσησεν ἡμᾶς . . . ἐλεῶν αὐτὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας ἀνεδέξατο, αὐτὸς τὸν ἴδιον υἱὸν ἀπέδοτο λύτρον ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

§ 11 (1 Tim. iii. 16). [μαθηταῖς] οἷς ἐφανέρωσεν ὁ Λόγος φανείς. This and the following section do not really belong to the Epistle.

Justin Martyr (*circ.* 140 A.D.).

Dial. § 7 (1 Tim. iv. 1). τὰ τῆς πλάνης πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια δοξολογοῦσιν.

§ 35 (1 Tim. iv. 1). ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτους εἶναι ἄνδρας, ὁμολογοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι Χριστιανοὺς καὶ . . . Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογεῖν . . . Χριστόν, καὶ μὴ τὰ ἐκείνου διδάγματα διδάσκοντας ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς πλάνης πνευμάτων.

* § 47 (Tit. iii. 4). ἡ γὰρ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ἄμετρον τοῦ πλούτου αὐτοῦ τὸν μετανοοῦντα . . . ὡς δίκαιον . . . ἔχει.

§ 118 (2 Tim. iv. 1). ὅτι κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς οὗτος ὁ Χριστός, εἶπον ἐν πολλοῖς.

The Acts of Paul and Thecla (not later than 170 A.D.).

* § 14 (2 Tim. ii. 18). λέγει οὗτος ἀνάστασιν γενέσθαι, ὅτι ἤδη γέγονεν ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἔχομεν τέκνοις. Note also the use in this work of the names Demas and Hermogenes as ὑποκρίσεως γέμοντες, § 1, and Onesiphorus as seeking Paul, § 2.

Athenagoras (*circ.* 176).

Legatio, 16 (1 Tim. vi. 16). πάντα γὰρ ὁ Θεός ἐστιν αὐτὸς αὑτῷ, φῶς ἀπρόσιτον.

* 37 (1 Tim. ii. 2). τοῦτο δ᾽ ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγοιμεν.

Theodotus (*Excerpta ex Scriptis Theodoti*, Clem. Al. p. 350).

(1 Tim. vi. 16). καὶ ὁ μὲν φῶς ἀπρόσιτον εἴρηται.

The Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons (*circ.*180).

* Euseb. *H.E.* v. i. (1 Tim. iii. 15). ἐνέσκηψεν ἡ ὀργὴ . . . εἰς Ἄτταλον Περγαμηνὸν τῷ γένει, στύλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀεὶ γεγονότα.

* (1 Tim. vi. 13). ὁ δὲ . . . Ποθεινὸς . . . ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἐσύρετο . . . ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπεδίδου τὴν καλὴν μαρτυρίαν.

Euseb. *H.E.* v. 3 (1 Tim. iv. 3, 4). ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης, μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . πεισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε καὶ ηὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ.

Theophilus of Antioch (*circ.* 181).

* *ad Autol.* i. 1 (2 Tim. iii. 8). φράσις εὐεπὴς τέρψιν παρέχει . . . ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι τὸν νοῦν κατεφθαρμένον.

* *ad Autol.* ii. 16 (Tit. iii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 4 (?)). ἔτι μὴν καὶ εὐλογήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων γενόμενα, ὅπως ᾖ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσιόντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

ad Autol. iii. 14 (Tit. iii. 1; Tim. ii. 2). ἔτι μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν κελεύει ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεῖος λόγος, ὅπως ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν.

The Integrity of the Letters.

It is scarcely too much to say that but for the difficulty presented by their style, and the assumption that St. Paul never left Rome alive, no one would have suspected these letters of being a compilation. But inasmuch as no one has been found to deny the *bona fide* Pauline character of some sections of them—at least in 2 Timothy—those who impugn the genuineness of the letters as they have come down to us have been compelled to exercise much ingenuity in attempts to apportion the matter of the letters between St. Paul and the compiler or compilers. For an account of their schemes the student is referred to the articles on these epistles in Hastings *D. B.*, and the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and for a fuller account, to Moffatt's *Historical N. T.*

To those who agree that the problem presented by the style and the historical setting of the Pastorals is unsolved, but not insoluble, all attempts to decompose these letters will seem unprofitable. There is sound sense in the old scholastic maxim: "Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem". The case of the Pastorals is not like that of 2 Corinthians, in which plausible reasons may be alleged for theories of dislocation. There is no difficulty in presenting such an outline of 1 Tim. or 2 Tim. or Tit. as will show it to be a single letter, with as much unity of purpose as a *bona fide* letter—not a college essay—can be expected to have.

But even were we to grant, one moment, that the style and historical considerations must preclude a Pauline authorship for them, yet, the next moment, we find ourselves confronted by more serious objections to the theory of compilation. To begin with, the historical difficulty presented by the personal and local references in the admittedly Pauline sections is insurmountable, on the hypothesis that the whole of St. Paul's history is contained in the Acts.

Again, without using violent language about "forgery," it is not easy to explain why the alleged compiler should pretend to be St. Paul. The ascription of a book to an honoured name was not a precedent condition to its acceptance or acceptability in the primitive Church. Hebrews, and the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle to Diognetus do not claim anyone as their authors. Whoever it was that produced the Pastorals, he was just as good a practical Christian as St. Paul himself; and he had no compelling reason to hide his identity. The case of 2 Peter is different. That epistle, whoever wrote it, was always reckoned a disputed book.

Again, how are we to explain the honourable use, certainly by Polycarp, and probably by Clement of Rome and Ignatius, not to mention other later second century writers, of a work which only appeared, *ex hypothesi*, not earlier than 90 A.D.? And, further, if these epistles are due to a compiler, he must have been an extraordinarily clever man, and quite capable not only of supplementing the Pauline fragments, but of editing them. Now by the year 90 A.D. Timothy's name had become venerated in the Church. Is it likely that a Churchman of that time, writing too, as is alleged, with an ecclesiastical bias, would have permitted the publication of letters which certainly give the impression of Timothy as a not very heroic person? The treatment of Linus (2 Tim. iv. 21) raises a similar question. A tradition, which no one has ever questioned, names Linus as the first bishop of Rome; the subordinate position he occupies in this letter is, as Salmon has noted (*Introd. N.T.* p. 411), quite intelligible if St. Paul was the author of it. It is, on the other hand, extremely unlikely that an editor of the year 90 A.D., who had no scruple in writing in St. Paul's name, would not have given Linus a more prominent place.

These are a few of the difficulties which may be urged on the traditional side in this "contest of opposite improbabilities".

Analysis of 1 Timothy.

"Guard the Deposit."

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.
B. i. 3-20: The Crisis, and the Men—Paul and Timothy.

(*a*) The Crisis: 3-11.

(1) 3-7. The motive of the letter is to provide Timothy with a memorandum of previous oral instructions for the combating of those who mischievously and ignorantly endeavour to oppose the Law to the Gospel.

(2) 8-11. This opposition is really factitious; inasmuch as the Law and the Gospel are, both of them, workings of law, God's law, the final cause of which is right conduct.

(*b*) The Men : 12-20.

(1) 12-17. Paul's own spiritual history illustrates the fundamentally identical moral basis of the Law and the Gospel. Paul had been "faithful," trustworthy, while under the Law; therefore Christ pardoned his violent opposition to the Gospel, because it was due to ignorance, though a sinful ignorance. Moreover, this whole transaction—the triumph of Christ's long-suffering over Paul's sinful antagonism—has an enduring value. It is an object lesson to encourage to repentance sinners to the end of time. Glory be to God!

(2) 18-20. The present charge to Timothy, although its immediate exciting cause is the recent action of Hymenæus and Alexander and their followers, ought not to be new in its substance to Timothy. It is practically identical with what the prophets gave utterance to at his ordination.

C. ii., iii. The foundations of Sound Doctrine.

False teaching is most effectually combated indirectly; not by controversy, with its negations, but by quiet, positive foundation work on which true views about God and Man can be based. We begin then with:—

(*a*) ii. 1—iii. 1 *a*. Public Prayer.

(1) ii. 1-7. Its universal scope; and the Divine sanction for catholicity in human sympathy.

(2) ii. 8—iii. 1 *a*. The Ministers of Public Prayer: men, not women; with a judgment as to the true function of Woman in the Church and in Society.

(*b*) iii. 1 *b*-16. The Ministry of the Divine Society.

(1) 1 *b*-7. The qualifications of the episcopus.

(2) 8-10, 12, 13. The qualifications of the deacons.

(3) 11. The qualifications of women Church-workers.

(4) 14-16. Caution to Timothy lest he should be tempted to think these details trivial, in comparison with more obviously spiritual things. The importance of rules depends on the importance of that with which they are concerned. The Church, for whose ministers rules have been just laid down, is the greatest Society in the world: human, yet divinely originated and inspired; the House of God; an extension of the Incarnation.

D. iv. A fresh word of prophecy (see i. 18) addressed to Timothy in his present office.

(*a*) 1-5. The false teaching more clearly defined as a spurious asceticism. This is condemned, *a priori*, by considerations (1) of the declared character and object of the material creation, and (2) of the purifying effect of benedictions.

(*b*) 6-16. The spurious asceticism, however, as it manifests itself in practice, is best combated (1), 6-10, by the Church teacher showing an example in his own person of genuine holiness, and (2), 11-16, by active pastoral care, courageous outspokenness and the diligent cultivation of all God-given ministerial graces.

E. v. 1—vi. 19. This naturally suggests the specification of directions for administration of the Church by a Father in God.

(*a*) v. 1, 2. He must not deal with his people *en masse*, but individually. He cannot treat alike old men and young men, elder women and younger women.

(*b*) v. 3-16. There is one class of the laity in particular which, because they have a special claim on the Church, need a discriminating care: the widows. The Church cannot afford to support all widows, nor would it be right to relieve their relatives, if they have any, of responsibility for them. Consequently, none can be entered on the list for relief but those over a certain age, and who have a good record for consistent Christian lives. Young widows had better marry again.

(*c*) v. 17-25. The questions of Church finance and discipline, as they concern widows, suggest recommendations on the same subjects, as they concern the presbyters: (1) 17, 18, finance; (2) 19-25, discipline, with, 23, a parenthetical personal counsel to Timothy, suggested by the word *pure* in 22.

(*d*) vi. 1, 2. Ruling principles for the conduct of Christians who are slaves, towards heathen and Christian masters respectively.

(*e*) vi. 3-19. A right judgment in all these matters which affect our daily life depends on right bàsal convictions as to the true values of things material and spiritual.

(1) 3-10. The false teachers reverse the true order: they regard religion as a sub-section of the world; whereas the world has its own place—an honourable place—as subordinate to religion.

(2) 11-16. A solemn adjuration to Timothy to adhere to the principles just laid down; and

(3) 17-19. to urge the observance of them upon the well-to-do members of the Christian Society.

F. vi. 20-21. Final appeal, summing up the perennial antagonism between character (the natural fruit of the faith) and mere intellectualism.

Analysis of 2 Timothy.

Sursum Corda.

A. i. 1, 2. Salutation.

B. i. 3—ii. 13. Considerations which should strengthen Timothy's moral courage (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*), interspersed with appeals to his loyalty (α, β, γ, δ, ε).

(a) 3-5. Paul's thoughts of, and prayers for, him; and Paul's recognition of Timothy's faith.

(b) 6, 7. An objective fact in Timothy's own spiritual history: his ordination; since when there is available for his use, Power, Love, and Discipline, the gifts of God.

(α) 8-10. An appeal based on thoughts of the Gospel, as the power of God.

(c) 11, 12. Paul's own steadfastness.

(β, γ) 13, 14. Appeals based on loyalty to the human teacher, and to the Divine Spirit.

(d) 15. The deterrent example of the disloyal of Asia.

(e) 16-18. The stimulating example of Onesiphorus.

(δ) ii. 1, 2. An appeal for the provision of a succession of loyal teachers.

(ε) ii. 3-13. An appeal based on "the Word of the Cross"; *i.e.*, Suffering is the precedent condition of glory. This is exemplified in the earthly analogies of the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer; in the actual experiences of Jesus Christ Himself, and of Paul.

C. ii. 14-26. General exhortations to Timothy as a Church teacher, as regards (a) 14-18, the positive and negative subject-matter of his instructions; (b) 19-21, the true and optimistic conception of the Church in relation to all teachers, true and false; (c) 22-26, the personal equipment of the true teacher, and his treatment of the erring.

D. iii. 1—iv. 8. A word of prophecy setting forth—

(a) iii. 1-9. The practical shortcomings of the false teachers.

(b) iii. 10-17. A recalling of Timothy's past spiritual history: (1) 10-13, the conditions under which his discipleship began; (2) 14-17, the holy persons by whom, and the sacred writings on which, his youth had been nourished.

(c) iv. 1-8. A concluding solemn adjuration to play the man while there is time. As for Paul, the contest is over, the crown is in sight; there is a crown for Timothy, too, if he takes Paul's place.

E. iv. 9-22. Personal details: Instructions, 9, 11, 13, 21; News about other members of the Pauline comradeship. 10, 11, 12, 20; A warning, 14, 15; A reminiscence and a confident hope, 16-18; Salutations and greetings, 19, 21; Final benediction, 22.

Analysis of Titus.

"*Maintain Good Works.*"

A. i. 1-4. Salutation.

B. i. 5-16. The position of affairs in Crete, which (a), 5-9, necessitates that the foundation of Church organisation—the presbyterate—be well and truly laid; in view of (b), 10-16, the natural unruliness and bad character of the people, aggravated by Jewish immoral sophistries.

C. ii. 1—iii. 11. Heads of necessary elementary moral instruction for the Cretan folk.

(a) ii. 1-10. For aged men and aged women; for young women and young men—and what is said about these latter applies also to Titus—and slaves.

(*b*) ii. 11-15. The eternal sanction for this insistence on the practice of elementary virtues is the all-embracing scope of the Gospel of God's Grace; which has been visibly manifested, with its call to repentance, its assurance of help, and its certain hope.

(*c*) iii. 1, 2. Obedience to the civil authority is also a Gospel virtue.

(*d*) iii. 3-7. These instructions are not given in a spirit of superiority. We ourselves were once in as bad moral condition as are the Cretans, if not worse, until we came to know, and test the love of God, unmerited and saving.

(*e*) iii. 8-11. In conclusion, the sum of all is: Let the people maintain good works, and shun useless speculations. Let Titus not be lax in dealing with leaders of the false teaching.

D. iii. 12, 13. Personal instructions.

E. iii. 14. Concluding summary, repeating the teaching of 8-11.

F. iii. 15. Final salutation.

The Text.

The text which is printed above the exposition is in the main that of Westcott and Hort. In a very few cases other readings have been adopted in this text (see *e.g.* 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. ii. 4, iii. 9); and in some places their punctuation has been modified.

The *apparatus criticus* is based on that of Tischendorf's eighth edition. The readings of the Old Latin fragments, r, Cod. Frisingensis, have been added, and the references to m (*Speculum*) have been given according to the edition by Weihrich in the Vienna *Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.* Of the uncial MSS. cited by Tisch., E_2 (Cod. Petropolitanus, or Sangermanensis, ix. or x.) has not been noted, since it is merely a transcript of D_2. On the other hand, it has been thought best to cite both F_2 and G_3, since it is not certain that the latter is a copy of the former, though both are derived from one exemplar.

Only the most important cursives are mentioned in these notes. The reader will understand that the attestation of KLP carries with it, in most cases, that of the great bulk of the cursive MSS. Neither has it been thought advisable to cite the more obscure versions. Even if their readings were critically ascertained they would not carry much weight. For a similar reason patristic citations are sparingly used. Subjoined is a list of the authorities cited in the critical notes.

ℵ, Cod. Sinaiticus, iv. St Petersburg.

A, Cod. Alexandrinus, v. London.

C, Cod. Ephraemi rescriptus, v. Paris. It does not contain 1 Tim. i. 1-iii. 9, μυστη | ριον.

D (D_2), Cod. Claromontanus, vi. Paris.

F (F_2), Cod. Augiensis, ix. Trinity College, Cambridge.
G (G_3), Cod. Boernerianus, ix. Dresden.
H (H_3), Cod. Coislinianus, vi. Fragments. Those that contain portions of the Pastorals are in Paris and Turin. It only contains: 1 Tim. iii. 7-13, vi. 9-13; 2 Tim. ii. 1-9; Tit. i. 1-3, 15—ii. 5, iii, 13-15.
I (I^2), Cod. Tischendorfianus (Petropolitanus, Tisch.), v. St. Petersburg. Contains only Tit. i. 1-13.
K (K_2) Cod. Mosquensis, ix. Moscow.
L (L_2), Cod. Bibliothecae Angelicae, ix. Rome.
P (P_2), Cod. Porphyrianus, ix. St. Petersburg.

Of the Old Latin MSS. cited, d, e, f, g are the Latin portions of the bilingual uncials, D_2, E_3, F_2 and G_3 respectively. m is the treatise entitled *Speculum*, practically a catena of texts or *testimonia*, formerly ascribed to St Augustine. r is the Cod. Frisingensis, v. or vi. (Munich) fragments, containing *inter alia*, 1 Tim. i. 12—ii. 15; v. 18—vi. 13.

The only MSS. of the Vulgate cited are Cod. Amiatinus (am.), A.D. 716, Florence, and Cod. Fuldensis (fuld.) A.D. 541-546, Fulda in Germany.

The other versions are indicated as follows:—
syr^{pesh} (Tisch., syr^{sch}) = Peshitto Syriac.
syr^{hcl} (Tisch., syr^{p}) = Harkleian Syriac.
syrr = both Syriac Versions.
boh (Tisch., cop.) = Bohairic Egyptian.
sah = Sahidic Egyptian.
arm = Armenian.
go = Gothic.

For a complete bibliography of the Pastoral Epistles the reader is referred to the articles, "Timothy, Epistle to," and "Titus, Epistle to," by W. Lock, in Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. iv., pp. 775, 785, and the articles "Timothy and Titus (Epistles)," by J. Moffatt, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica.* To the articles themselves—the former temperately conservative, the latter, uncompromisingly anti-traditional—the present writer is much indebted. Diligent use has also been made of the labours of the following commentators on the continuous text: St. Chrysostom's Homilies, full of good sense and practical wisdom; Bengel, pithy, direct and spiritual; Ellicott, a sound grammarian from the classical Greek standpoint, and therefore useful as a warning against possible pitfalls, but very dry; Alford, still most serviceable as the variorum edition of A.D. 1865; J. H. Bernard (*Cambridge Greek Testament*) whose notes on the ethical language of the Epistles

are most illuminating, and H. von Soden, in the *Hand-Commentar*, remarkable for subtle verbal analysis ; but his exegesis is vitiated by his critical position as to the authorship and date of the letters. Suspicion and half-heartedness do not make for profound exposition.

Plummer's large treatment of certain sections, in the *Expositor's Bible*, has been found helpful and suggestive. Field's *Notes* (alas, too few !) *on Trans. N.T.* are indispensable ; and H. P. Liddon's analysis of 1 Timothy is masterly.

On the general subject of the Epistles, Salmon's *Introduction N.T.* (p. 397 *sqq.*), Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* (xi., xii.), Wace's Introduction in the *Speaker's Commentary*, J. H. Bernard's Introduction (*Cambridge Greek Testament*), Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*, and Hort's *Judaistic Chistianity* and *Christian Ecclesia* have been largely made use of. It has not, however, been thought necessary, especially when space had to be considered, to specify in every case the authority for the sentiment expressed, or the explanation adopted. In any case, the Church, in the long run, acts on the counsel of Thomas à Kempis : " Non quaeras quis hoc dixerit : sed quid dicatur attende " (*De Imit. Christi*, i. 5).

September, 1909.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Ā

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a] ἀπόστολος [a] Χριστοῦ [a] Ἰησοῦ [1] [b] κατʼ [b] ἐπιταγὴν [2] [c] Θεοῦ [c] σωτῆρος [c] ἡμῶν καὶ [3] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [4] τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν,

a 2 Cor. i. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1, cf. 1 Cor. i. 1, Tit. i. 1. b Rom. xvi. 26, Tit. i. 3. c Jude 25, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 3, iv. 10, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4.

[1] So ℵDFGP, 80, one other, d, f, g, fuld., boh., syr[hcl]; Ἰησ. Χριστ. AKL, am., syr[pesh], arm.

[2] ἐπαγγελίαν ℵ.

[3] Ins. Κυρίου ℵDcKL; om. AD*FGP, 17, 31, seven others, d, f, g, vg., go., syrr., sah., boh., arm.

[4] So AD*FGP, 17, five others, d, f, g, am., fuld., go., sah., syrr.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵDcKL, boh., arm.

CHAPTER I.—VV. 1-2. SALUTATION.—Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.** The use of this official title is an indication that the Pastoral Epistles were not merely private letters (*ctr.* **Παῦλος δέσμιος Χρ. Ἰησ.**, Philem. 1), but were intended to be read to the Churches committed to the charge of Timothy and Titus respectively. The phrase means simply one *sent by* Christ, not primarily one *belonging to* Christ. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 25, where Epaphroditus is spoken of as **ὑμῶν ἀπόστ.**, and 2 Cor. viii. 23, **ἀπόστ. ἐκκλησιῶν. ἀπόστ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** is also found in 2 Cor. i. 1, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1, 2 Tim. i. 1; **ἀπόστ. Ἰησ. Χρ.** in 1 Cor. i. 1, Tit. i. 1. The difference in the use *Jesus Christ* and *Christ Jesus* seems to be this: in each case the first member of the compound name indicates whether the historical or the notional idea of the Person is chiefly in the writer's mind. *Jesus Christ* briefly expresses the proposition, "Jesus is the Christ"; it embodies the first theological assertion concerning Jesus; it represents the conception of the historical Jesus in the minds of those who had seen Him. St. John, St. Peter and St. James employ this name when speaking of our Lord. But in *Christ Jesus*, on the other hand, the theological conception of *the Christ* predominates over that of the actual *Jesus* Who had been seen, felt and heard by human senses. Accordingly we find *Christ Jesus* in every stage of the Pauline Epistles; and, as we should expect, more frequently in the later than in the earlier letters. In almost every instance of the occurrence of *Jesus Christ* in the Pastoral Epistles the thought of the passage concerns the humanity, or historical aspect, of our Lord. Thus in Tit. i. 1, "a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ," we could not substitute *Christ Jesus* without weakening the antithesis. See note there. St. Paul, here as elsewhere, claims to have been as truly *sent* by Christ as were those who were apostles before him.

κατʼ ἐπιταγήν: *in obedience to the command.* The full phrase **κατʼ ἐπιτ. θ. σ. ἡμῶν** occurs again (**τοῦ σωτ. ἡμ. θεοῦ**) in a similar context in Tit. i. 3; **κατʼ ἐπιτ. τοῦ αἰωνίου θ.** in Rom. xvi. 26. In 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8, **κατʼ ἐπιτ.** is used in a different sense.

St. Paul more commonly refers the originating cause of his mission to the *will of God* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1). He would hardly say *through the will of Christ*, **θέλημα** being used of the eternal counsel of the Godhead; but inasmuch as the *command* is the consequent of the *will*, he can speak of his apostleship as being due to the *command*

2. Τιμοθέῳ [d] γνησίῳ [e] τέκνῳ [f] ἐν [f] πίστει· χάρις, [g] ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς [1] καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. 3. Καθὼς

d Phil. iv. 3, Tit. i. 4, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 8, Phil. ii. 20, Ecclus. vii. 18. e 1 Cor. iv. 17, ver. 18, 2 Tim. i. 2, ii. 1, Tit. i. 4. Philem. 10, 3 John 4. f Ver. 4, 1 Tim. ii. 7, Tit. iii. 15. g 2 Tim. i. 2, 2 John 3, Jude 2.

[1] Ins. ἡμῶν ℵcDcKLP, syrr., sah.

of Christ Jesus, as well as of God the Father. In this matter Jesus Christ is co-ordinated with God the Father in Gal. i. 1; while in Rom. i. 4, 5, Paul's apostleship is "through Jesus Christ our Lord" only. On the other hand, in Tit. i. 3, St. Paul says he was intrusted with the message "according to the commandment of God our Saviour". Here it is to be noted that the *command* proceeds equally from God and Christ Jesus. This language could hardly have been used if St. Paul conceived of Christ Jesus as a creature. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vii. 379) compare St. Paul's use of **ἐπιταγή** as a *Divine* command with its technical use in heathen dedicatory inscriptions. We cannot, with Chrys., narrow the "commandment of God" to the specific date of St. Paul's commission by the Church, whether in Acts xiii. 2 or on an earlier occasion. St. Paul claimed that he had been "separated from his mother's womb" (Gal. i. 15).

θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν: Westcott on 1 John iv. 14 has an instructive note on the Biblical use of the term **σωτήρ**. "The title is confined (with the exception of the writings of St. Luke) to the later writings of the N.T., and is not found in the central group of St. Paul's Epistles." It may be added that in the Lucan references (Luke i. 47, of God; ii. 11, Acts v. 31, xiii. 23, of Christ) the term **σωτήρ** has not primarily its full later evangelical import, and would be best rendered *deliverer*, as in the constant O.T. application of the term to God. Perhaps the same is true of Phil. iii. 20, and Eph. v. 23, where it is used of Christ. On the other hand, apart from **ὁ σωτὴρ τ. κόσμου** (John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14), the conventional evangelical use is found: of God the Father in (*a*) 1 Tim. i. 1, Jude 25, **θεὸς σωτὴρ ἡμῶν**; (*b*) 1 Tim. ii. 3, Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, **ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν θεός**; (*c*) 1 Tim. iv. 10, **σωτήρ** in apposition to **θεός** in the preceding clause; of Christ, in (*a*) 2 Tim. i. 10, **ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς**; (*b*) Tit. i. 4, iii. 6, **Χρ. Ἰησ. ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν**; (*c*) 2 Pet. i. 11, ii. 20, iii. 18, **ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησ. Χρ.**; (*d*) 2 Pet. iii. 2, **ὁ Κύριος καὶ σωτήρ**. To the (*c*) class belong, perhaps, Tit. ii. 13, 2 Pet. i. 1, **ὁ [μέγας] θεὸς [ἡμῶν] καὶ σωτὴρ [ἡμῶν] Ἰησ. Χρ.**; but see note on Tit. ii. 13.

In the text, there is an antithesis between the offices of God as *our Saviour* and of Christ Jesus as *our hope*. The one points to the past, at least chiefly, and the other to the future. In speaking of the saving action of God, St, Paul uses the aorist. 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. ii. 11, iii. 4, 5. He *saved* us, potentially. See further on ch. ii. 3. God, as the Council of Trent says (Sess. vi. cap. 7), is *the efficient cause* of our justification, while Jesus, "our righteousness," besides being *the meritorious cause*, may be said to be *the formal cause*; for "the righteousness of God by which He maketh us righteous" is embodied in Jesus, Who "was made unto us . . . righteousness and sanctification" (1 Cor. i. 30). We advance from salvation to sanctification; and accordingly we must not narrow down the conception *Christ Jesus our hope* to mean "the hope of Israel" (Acts xxiii. 6, xxviii. 20); but rather the historical manifestation of the Son of God as Christ Jesus is the ground of our "hope of glory" (Col. i. 27). Our hope is that "the body of our humiliation will be conformed to the body of His glory" (Phil. iii. 20, 21). See also Eph. iv. 13. Our hope is that "we shall be like Him" (1 John iii. 2, 3). See also Tit. ii. 13, **προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα**. For this vivid use of an abstract noun compare Eph. ii. 14, **αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν**.

Ignatius borrows this noble appellation: *Magn.* 11; *Trall.* inscr., "Jesus Christ Who is our hope through our resurrection unto Him"; *Trall.* 2, "Jesus Christ our hope; for if we live in Him, we shall also be found in Him". See also Polycarp, 8.

Ver. 2. **γνησίῳ** qualifies the compound **τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει**, just as in Tit. i. 4 it qualifies **τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν**. As in the relation of the heavenly Father to those who are His children by adoption and grace, some are "led by the Spirit of God," and so are genuine sons of

[h] **παρεκάλεσά σε [i] προσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, πορευόμενος εἰς Μακεδονίαν, ἵνα [k] παραγγείλῃς τισὶν μὴ [l] ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 4. μηδὲ**

h 1 Cor. xvi. 12, 2 Cor. viii. 6, ix. 5, xii. 18.
i Matt. xv. 32 = Mark viii. 2, Acts xviii. 18.
k 1 Cor. vii. 10, xi. 17, 1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 4, 6, 10, 12, 1 Tim. iv. 11, v. 7, vi. 13, 17.
l 1 Tim. vi. 3 only, not LXX.

God, so in the filial relationships of earth—physical, spiritual, or intellectual—some sons realise their vocation, others fail to do so. **γνήσιος** (and **γνησίως**, Phil. ii. 20) is only found in the N.T. in Paul. See reff. It might be rendered *lawful, legitimate*, as **γυνή γνησία** means "lawful wife" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 382). Dean Bernard (*comm. in loc.*) cites an interesting parallel from Philo (*de Vit. Cont.* p. 482, ed. Mangey), where "the young men among the Therapeutae are described as ministering to their elders **καθάπερ υἱοὶ γνήσιοι**." **τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει**: The parallel from Tit. i. 4 quoted above proves that **πίστις** here is *the* faith, as A.V. Absence of the article before familiar Christian terms is a characteristic of the Pastorals. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 15, "In Christ Jesus I begat you through the gospel". See also Gal. iv. 19, Philem. 10; and, for the term **τέκνον** as applied to Timothy, see reff. St. Paul "begat him through the gospel" on the first missionary journey. He was already a disciple in Acts xvi. 1. Nothing can be safely inferred from the variation **ἀγαπητῷ** in 2 Tim. i. 2 for **γνησίῳ**. The selection from among these semi-conventional terms of address is influenced by passing moods of which the writer is not wholly conscious; but a pseudepigraphic author would be careful to observe uniformity.

ἔλεος as an element in the salutation in addition to **χάρις** and **εἰρήνη** is only found, in the Pauline Epistles, in 1 and 2 Timothy. See reff. "Mercy" is used in an informal benediction, Gal. vi. 16, "Peace be upon them, and mercy". Bengel notes that personal experience of the mercy of God makes a man a more efficient minister of the Gospel. See vv. 13, 16, 1 Cor. vii. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 1, Heb. ii. 17. See also Tobit vii. 12 (ℵ) **ὁ κύριος . . . ποιήσαι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἔλεος κ. εἰρήνην** and Wisd. iii. 9, iv. 15, **χάρις κ. ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ**. If one may hazard a conjecture as to what prompted St. Paul to wish *mercy* to Timothy rather than to Titus, it may be a subtle indication of the apostle's anxiety as to Timothy's administrative capacity. Another variation in the salutation in Titus is the substitution of *Saviour* for *Lord*. This calls for no comment.

Note the anarthrous **θεὸς πατήρ** as in all the Pauline salutations, with the exception of 1 Thess., where we have simply **χάρις ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη**. In Colossians the blessing is only from God the Father. **ἡμῶν** is added to **πατρὸς** except in 2 Thess. and the Pastorals.

Vv. 3-7. THE MOTIVE OF THIS LETTER: to provide Timothy with a written memorandum of previous verbal instructions, especially with a view to novel speculations about the Law which sap the vitality of the Gospel; the root of which is sincerity, and its fruit, love.

Ver. 3. **καθώς**: The apodosis supplied at the end of ver. 4 in the R.V., *so do I now*, is feebler than the *so do* of the A.V. We need something more vigorous. St. Paul was more anxious that Timothy should *charge some*, etc., than that he should merely *abide at Ephesus*. This is implied in the A.V., in which *so do* = *stay there and be a strong ruler*.

An exact parallel occurs in Mark i. 2. Similar anacolutha are found in Rom. v. 12, Gal. ii. 4, 5, 6, Eph. iii. 1.

παρεκάλεσά σε: It is far-fetched to regard this word as specially expressive of a *mild* command, as Chrys. suggests. **παρακαλεῖν** constantly occurs, and with very varying meanings, in the Pauline Epistles. **διεταξάμην** is used in the corresponding place in Tit. i. 5, because there the charge concerns a series of injunctions.

προσμεῖναι: *ut remaneres* (Vulg.). The word (see Acts xviii. 18) naturally implies that St. Paul and Timothy had been together at Ephesus, and that St. Paul left Timothy there as vicar apostolic.

πορευόμενος refers to St. Paul, not to Timothy, as De Wette alleged. The grammatical proof of this is fully gone into by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 404, "If the subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the finite verb, any attributes which it may have are put in the nominative".

It is unnecessary here to prove that it is impossible to fit this journey of St. Paul to Macedonia, and Timothy's stay at Ephesus connected therewith, into the period covered by the Acts.

τισίν: **τινες** is intentionally vague. The writer has definite persons in his mind, but for some reason he does not

[m] προσέχειν [n] μύθοις καὶ [o] γενεαλογίαις [p] ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες [q] ἐκζητήσεις [1] [r] παρέχουσι μᾶλλον ἢ [s] οἰκονομίαν [2] Θεοῦ τὴν [t] ἐν [t] πίστει.

m Acts viii. 6, 10, 11, xvi. 14, 1 Tim. iii. 8, iv. 1, 13. Tit. i. 14, Heb. ii. 1, vii. 13, 2 Peter i. 19. n 1 Tim. iv. 7, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14, 2 Pet. i. 16, Wisd. xvii. 4, Ecclus. xx. 19. o Tit. iii. 9 only, not LXX. p Here only, N.T., Job xxxvi. 26, 3 Macc. ii. 9. q Here only, not LXX, see 1 Tim. vi. 4. r 1 Tim. vi. 17, Tit. ii. 7, etc. s 1 Cor. ix. 17, Eph. i. 10, iii. 2, 9, Col. i. 25. t See ver. 1.

[1] So ℵA, 17, three others; **ζητήσεις** DFGKLP.

[2] So ℵAFGKLP, boh., syr^hcl-txt, arm.; **οἰκοδομίαν** Dc, 192, Dam. txt; **οἰκοδομὴν** D*, Iren., go., syr^pesh and hcl-mg; *aedificationem* d, f, g, m50, vg. See Eph. iv. 29.

choose to specify them. To do so, in this case, would have had a tendency to harden them in their heresy, "render them more shameless" (Chrys.). The introduction of the personal element into controversy has a curiously irritating effect. For this use of **τινες** see 1 Cor. iv. 18, 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2, Gal. i. 7, ii. 12, 1 Tim. i. 6, 19, v. 15, vi. 10, 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18.

μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν: This compound occurs again in 1 Tim. vi. 3, and means *to teach a gospel or doctrine different from that which I have taught.* **ἕτερος** certainly seems to connote difference *in kind*. Gal. i. 6, **ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο,** and 2 Cor. xi. 4, illustrate St. Paul's language here. The heresy may have been of recent origin, and not yet completely systematised—heresy of course does not aim at finality—but St. Paul does not mean to deal gently with it. It was to him false and accursed (*cf.* Gal. i. 8, 9). His forebodings for the church in Ephesus (Acts xx. 29, 30) were being fulfilled now. Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 134) compares the **διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις** of Heb. xiii. 9.

St. Paul elsewhere uses compounds with **ἑτερο**, *e.g.*, 2 Cor. vi. 14, **ἑτεροζυγεῖν**; and more remarkably still, when quoting Isa. xxviii. 11 in 1 Cor. xiv. 21, he substitutes **ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις** for **διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας** of the LXX. The word is found in Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 3, **οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀξιόπιστοι εἶναι καὶ ἑτεροδιδασκαλοῦντες.**

Ver. 4. **μηδὲ προσέχειν**: *nor to pay attention to.* This perhaps refers primarily to the hearers of the **ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι** rather than to the false teachers themselves. See reff.

μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις: "Polybius uses both terms in similarly close connection, *Hist.* ix. 2, 1" (Ell.). Two aspects of, or elements in, the one aberration from sound doctrine.

Some light is thrown upon this clause by other passages in this group of letters (1 Tim. i. 6, 7, iv. 7, vi. 4, 20; 2 Tim. ii. 14, 16, 23, iv. 4; Tit. i. 10, 14, iii. 9). The myths are expressly called Jewish (Tit. i. 14), and this affords a good argument that **νομοδιδάσκαλοι** and **νόμος**, in 1 Tim. i. 7, 8 and Tit. iii. 9, refer to the Mosaic Law, not restricting the term *Law* to the Pentateuch. Now a considerable and important part of the Mosaic legislation has relation only to Palestine and Jerusalem; it had no practical significance for the devotional life of the Jews of the Dispersion, with the exception of the community that worshipped at Hierapolis in Egypt. There is a strong temptation to mystics to justify to themselves the continued use of an antiquated sacred book by a mystical interpretation of whatever in it has ceased to apply to daily life. Thus Philo (*De Vit. Contempl.* § 3) says of the Therapeutae, "They read the holy Scriptures, and explain the philosophy of their fathers in an allegorical manner, regarding the written words as symbols of hidden truth which is communicated in obscure figures". Those with whom St. Paul deals in the Pastoral Epistles were not the old-fashioned conservative Judaisers whom we meet in the Acts and in the earlier Epistles; but rather the promoters of an eclectic synthesis of the then fashionable Gentile philosophy and of the forms of the Mosaic Law. **μῦθοι**, then, here and elsewhere in the Pastorals (see reff.), would refer, not to the stories and narrative of the O.T. taken in their plain straightforward meaning, but to the arbitrary allegorical treatment of them.

γενεαλογίαι may similarly refer to the genealogical matter in the O.T. which is usually skipped by the modern reader; but which by a mystical explanation of the derivations of the nomenclature could be made to justify their inclusion in a sacred book, every syllable of which might be supposed antecedently to contain edification. This general interpretation, which is that of Weiss, is

5. Τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς [u] παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ [v] καθαρᾶς [v] καρδίας καὶ [w] συνειδήσεως [w] ἀγαθῆς καὶ [x] πίστεως [x y] ἀνυποκρίτου· 6. ὧν τινὲς [z] ἀστοχήσαντες [a] ἐξετράπησαν εἰς [b] ματαιολογίαν, 7. θέλοντες

u Acts v. 28, xvi. 24, 1 Thess. iv. 2, ver. 18, not LXX.
v Ps. l. (li.) 12, Matt. v. 8, 2 Tim. ii. 22.
w Acts xxiii. 1, 1 Tim. i. 19, 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21.
x 2 Tim. i. 5.
y Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6, Jas. iii. 17, 1 Pet. i. 22.
z 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18 only, N.T., Ecclus. vii. 19, viii. 9.
a 1 Tim. v. 15, vi. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Heb. xii. 13.
b Here only, not LXX; *cf* Tit. i. 10.

supported by Ignat. *Magn.* 8, "Be not seduced by strange doctrines nor by antiquated fables (**ἑτεροδοξίαις μηδὲ μυθεύμασιν τοῖς παλαιοῖς**), which are profitless. For if even unto this day we live after the manner of Judaism (**κατὰ Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῶμεν**), we avow that we have not received grace." Hort maintains that **γενεαλογίαι** here has a derived meaning, "all the early tales adherent, as it were, to the births of founders" (see *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 135 *sqq.*). On the other hand, Irenæus (*Haer.* Praef. 1 and Tertullian (*adv. Valentin.* 3; *de Praescript.* 33) suppose that the Gnostic groupings of *aeons* in genealogical relationships are here alluded to. It was natural that they should read the N.T. in the light of controversies in which they themselves were engaged.

ἀπεράντοις: *endless*, *interminatis* (Vulg.), *infinitis* (m.), because leading to no certain conclusion. Discussions which do not concern realities are interminable, not from their profundity, as the ocean is popularly speaking unfathomable in parts, but because they lead to no convincing end. One end or conclusion is as good as another. The choice between them is a matter of taste.

αἵτινες: qualitative, *they are of such a kind as*, *the which* (R.V.).

ἐκζητήσεις: *Questionings* to which no answer can be given, which are not worth answering. See reff. on vi. 4. Their unpractical nature is implied by their being contrasted with **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. Life is a trust, a stewardship, committed to us by God. Anything that claims to belong to religion, and at the same time is prejudicial to the effectual discharge of this trust is self-condemned.

παρέχουσι: **παρέχω** is used here as in the phrase **κόπους παρέχω**.

It will be observed that **οἰκονομία** is here taken subjectively and actively (*the performance of the duty of an* **οἰκονόμος** entrusted to a man by God; so also in Col. i. 25); not objectively and passively (*the dispensation of God*, *i.e.*, the Divine plan of salvation). The Western reading **οἰκοδομήν** or **οἰκοδομίαν**, *aedificationem*, is easier; but the text gives a deeper meaning.

τὴν ἐν πίστει: This is best taken as in *the* faith; *cf.* ver. 2, ii. 7, Tit. iii. 15. The trust committed to us by God is exercised in the sphere of the faith.

The aposiopesis at the end of ver. 4 is due to an imperative need felt by St. Paul to explain at once, and develop the thought of, **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. The true teaching—that of the apostle and of Timothy—would be the consequence of the charge given by Timothy and would issue in, be productive of, an **οἰκονομία θεοῦ**. This **οἰκονομ. θ.** is *the object aimed at*, **τέλος**, *of the charge*; and is further defined as *love*, etc.

This is the only place in Paul in which **τέλος** means *the final cause*. In every other instance it means *termination*, *result*, *i.e. consequence*. 1 Peter i. 9 is perhaps an instance of a similar use.

The charge is referred to again in ver. 18. See also 1 Thess. iv. 2. The expressed object of the charge being the comprehensive virtue, love, it is strange that Ellicott should characterise this exegesis as "too narrow and exclusive". Bengel acutely observes that St. Paul does not furnish Timothy with profound arguments with which to refute the heretics, because the special duty of a church ruler is concerned with what is positively necessary. The love here spoken of is that which is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10); and its nature is further defined by its threefold source. Heart, conscience, faith, mark stages in the evolution of the inner life of a man. Heart, or disposition, is earlier in development than conscience; and faith, in the case of those who have it, is later than conscience.

καθαρὰ καρδία is an O.T. phrase. See reff. **συνείδησις** is **καθαρά** in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3; it is **ἀγαθή** in reff.; **καλή** in Heb. xiii. 18; it occnrs without any epithet in 1 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 15. **πίστις ἀνυπόκριτος** occurs again 2 Tim. i. 5; and the adj. is applied to **ἀγάπη**, Rom. xii. 9, 2 Cor. vi. 6. See other reff. It is evident that no stress can be laid on the choice of epithets in any particular passage.

Ver. 6. **ὧν**: *i.e.*, the disposition, con-

εἶναι [c] νομοδιδάσκαλοι, μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσιν, μήτε περὶ τίνων [d] διαβεβαιοῦνται. 8. Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι καλὸς ὁ νόμος ἐάν τις αὐτῷ [e] νομίμως χρῆται [1]· 9. εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ

c Luke v. 17, Acts v. 34, not LXX.
d Tit. iii. 8, not LXX.
e 2 Tim. ii. 5, 4 Macc. vi. 18 only.

[1] So ℵDFGKL; χρήσηται AP, 73.

science, and faith as qualified. **τινὲς**: see note on ver. 3. **ἀστοχήσαντες**: (*aberrantes*, Vulg.; *recedentes*, m[7]; *excedentes*, m[50]). In the other passages where this word occurs the A.V. and R.V. have *erred*; here *swerved*. They *missed the mark* in point of fact. It may be questioned whether they really had aimed at a pure heart, etc. But having missed, being in fact "corrupted in mind" vi. 5; "branded in their conscience," iv. 2; and "reprobate concerning the faith," 2 Tim. iii. 8, they did not secure as their own *love*, practical beneficence, but its exact opposite, empty talking, *vaniloquium*, Tit. i. 10. The content of this empty talking is analysed in Tit. iii. 9.

It is more natural to suppose that **ὧν** is governed by **ἀστοχήσαντες** (Huther, Grimm, Alf.) than by **ἐξετράπησαν** (Ellicott). **ἀστοχεῖν** is used absolutely with **περί** elsewhere in the Pastorals; but in Ecclus. it governs a genitive directly. **ἐκτρέπεσθαι** governs both gen. and acc.; the latter in vi. 20.

Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 373, quote examples of **ἀστοχέω** from papyri (ii. B.C. ii. A.D.) in the sense "fail" or "forget," *e.g.*, **ἀστοχήσαντες τοῦ καλῶς ἔχοντος**. **ἐξετράπησαν** introduces a new metaphor: *they had turned aside out of the right path*.—**ματαιολογία**: Here only; but **ματαιολόγοι** occurs, Tit. i. 10. See vi. 20: "Vanitas maxima, ubi de rebus divinis non vere disseritur, Rom. i. 21" (Bengel).

Ver. 7. **νομοδιδάσκαλοι**: The Mosaic or Jewish law is meant. See Tit. iii. 9. The term is used seriously, of official teachers of the law, in reff.

μὴ νοοῦντες, κ.τ.λ.: *Though they understand neither, etc.* The participle is concessive, and **με** is here subjective, as usual, expressing St. Paul's opinion about them. For the sentiment *cf.* vi. 4, 1 Cor. viii. 2. **λέγουσιν** refers to the substance of their assertions, while **διαβεβαιοῦνται** (*affirmant*, see Tit. iii. 8) is expressive of the confident manner (R.V.) in which they made them. They did not grasp the force either of their own propositions (hence resulted **βέβηλοι κενοφωνίαι**), or the nature of the great topics—Law, Philosophy, etc.—on which they dogmatised, hence their inconsistencies, **ἀντιθέσεις τοῦ ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως** (vi. 20). On the combination of the relative and interrogative pronouns in one sentence, see Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 211.

Vv. 8-11.. And yet this alleged antagonism of the Law to the Gospel is factitious: *the Law* on which they insist is part of law in general; so is the Gospel with which I was entrusted. The intention of both is to a large extent identical: to promote right conduct.

Ver. 8. **οἴδαμεν**, as in Rom. vii. 14, 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, introduces a concession in the argument. **καλὸς ὁ νόμος** was a concession made by St. Paul, Rom. vii. 16, also Rom. vii. 12, **ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος**. It is possible that it had been objected that his language was inconsistent with his policy. It may be questioned whether **καλός**, in St. Paul's use of it, differs from **ἀγαθός**, as meaning good in appearance as well as in reality. For the use of **καλός** in the Pastorals, see notes on i. 18 and iii. 1. **τις** has no special reference to the teacher as distinct from the learner. The law is **καλός** in its own sphere; but *Corruptio optimi pessima*; "Sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds". **νομίμως** here means *in accordance with the spirit in which the law was enacted*. It does not mean *lawfully* in the usual acceptation of that term. St. Paul impresses the word into his service, and does it violence in order to give an epigrammatic turn to the sentence. In 2 Tim. ii. 5, **νομίμως** has its ordinary meaning *in accordance with the rules of the game*. **χρῆται**: In Euripides, *Hipp.* 98 **νόμοις χρῆσθαι** means "to live under laws".

Ver. 9. **εἰδώς** refers to **τις**, *as knowing this* (R.V.). For the expression *cf.* **οἶδας τοῦτο**, 2 Tim. i. 15 and Eph. v. 5. **νόμος**: Although **νόμος** when anarthrous may mean the Mosaic Law, the statement here is perfectly general (so R.V.). The Mosaic Law does not differ in the range of its application, though it may in the details of its enactments, from law in general, of which it is a subdivision. *Law is not enacted for*

κεῖται, [f] ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ [g] ἀνυποτάκτοις, [h] ἀσεβέσι [h] καὶ [h] ἁμαρτωλοῖς, [i] ἀνοσίοις καὶ [k] βεβήλοις, [l] πατρολῴαις καὶ [m] μητρολῴαις, [n] ἀνδροφόνοις, 10. πόρνοις, [o] ἀρσενοκοίταις, [p] ἀνδραποδισταῖς, [q] ψεύσταις, [r] ἐπιόρκοις, καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ [s] ὑγιαινούσῃ [s] διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται,

f Mark xv. 28 (?) = Luke xxii. 37 = Is. liii. 12, Acts ii. 23, 1 Cor. ix. 21 (4), 2 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Pet. ii. 8. g Tit. i. 6, 10, Heb. ii. 8, not LXX. h Prov. xi. 31, 1 Pet. iv. 18. i 2 Tim. iii. 2, only, N.T. k 1 Tim. iv. 7, vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16, Heb. xii. 6 only, N.T. l Here only, not LXX. m Here only, not LXX. n Here only N.T., 2 Macc. ix. 28. o 1 Cor. vi. 9, not LXX. p Here only, not LXX. q Rom. iii. 4, Tit. i. 12, Rev. xxi. 8? John (2), 1 John (5). r Here only N.T., *cf.* Matt. v. 33. s 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 9, ii. 1, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 3, 2 Tim. i. 13, Tit. ii. 8, Tit. i. 13, ii. 2.

a naturally law-abiding man (dative of reference). **δίκαιος** is used here in the popular sense, as in "I came not to call the righteous". It is unnecessary to suppose that St. Paul had his theory of justification in his mind when writing this; though of course those who "are led by the Spirit" are **δίκαιοι** of the highest quality, **κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος** (Gal. v. 18 *sqq.*, 23). The enumeration of those whom legislators have in view when enacting laws naturally begins with **ἄνομοι,** of whom the **ἀνυπότακτοι,** *unruly*, those who deliberately rebel against restriction of any kind, are the extreme type. There is no special class or quality of crime involved in the terms **ἄνομος** and **ἀνυπότακτος.** As the series advances, the adjectives indicate more definite and restricted aspects of lawlessness: the first three pairs represent states of mind; then follow examples of violations of specific enactments. Since St. Paul is here dealing with the law of natural religion, it is not safe to deepen the shade of **ἀσεβής, κ.τ.λ.** by looking at the conceptions they express in the light of the Lord.

ὁ ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλός is a pair of epithets familiar from its occurrence in Prov, xi. 31 (quoted 1 Pet. iv. 18. See also Jude 15). The **ἀσεβής** is one whose mental attitude towards God Himself is that of deliberate irreverence; the **βέβηλος** acts contumeliously towards recognised expressions or forms of reverence to God.

Alford and Ellicott, following a hint from Bengel, suppose that in the series commencing **πατρολῴαις** St. Paul is going through the second table of the Decalogue. It is an argument against this that when St, Paul is unquestionably enumerating the Commandments, Rom. xiii. 9, he places the command against adultery before that against murder (so Luke xviii. 20; Jas ii. 11; Philo, *De Decalogo*, xxiv. and xxxii.; Tert. *de Pudic*, v., all following LXX (B) of Deut. chap. v.). There is therefore no necessity to give **πατρολῴας** the weak rendering *smiter of a father* (R.V. m.) in order to make the word refer to normal breaches of the Fifth Commandment, It can, of course, both by derivation and use, be so rendered, The Greek word, like *parricide* in Latin and English, may be applied to any unnatural treatment of a parent.

The apostle is here purposely specifying the most extreme violations of law, as samples (**καὶ εἴ τι ἕτερον**) of what disregard of law may lead to. The healthy, wholesome teaching of Christ is of course in opposition to such enormities; it is also in opposition to the false teachers; these teachers have failed to attain to a pure heart, etc. Consequently, although professing to teach the Law, they find themselves in opposition to the essential spirit of law. Let them, and those who listen to them, take care lest their teaching inevitably issue in similar enormities.

Ver. 10. **ἀνδραποδισταῖς,** *plagiariis* (Vulg.), includes all who exploit other men and women for their own selfish ends; as **πόρνοις** and **ἀρσενοκοίταις** include all improper use of sexual relations.

διδασκαλία means *the body of doctrine*, the apostolic *Summa Theologiæ*. The noun is used absolutely, 1 Tim. vi. 1, or with varying epithets: **ὑγιαίνουσα,** *sana* (here, 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1); **καλή,** *bona* (1 Tim. iv. 6); **κατ' εὐσέβειαν,** *secundum pietatem* (1 Tim. vi. 3); **μου** (2 Tim. iii. 10); **τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ** (Tit. ii. 10).

It means *the act of teaching* in Rom. xii. 7, xv. 4, 1 Tim. iv. 13, 16, v. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 16, Tit. ii. 7. The term occurs fifteen times in the Pastoral Epistles in a technical Christian sense. This is in the writer's mind even in 1 Tim. iv. 1, **διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων.** It is found four times in the other Pauline Epistles. Of these Rom. xii. 7 is the nearest approach to the special connotation here.

With **ὑγιαίνουσα** (see reff.) compare

11. κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ [t] μακαρίου Θεοῦ, ὃ [u] ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ. 12. [1] [v] Χάριν [v] ἔχω τῷ [w] ἐνδυναμώσαντί [2] με Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν, ὅτι [x] πιστόν με [x] ἡγήσατο, θέμενος εἰς

t 1 Tim. vi. 15.
u Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4, Tit. i. 3.
v Luke xvii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3, Heb. xii. 28.
w Acts ix. 22, Rom. iv. 20, Eph. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 17.
x Heb. xi. 11, cf. Acts xxvi. 2, Phil. ii. 3, 1 Thess. v. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 15.

[1] Ins. καὶ DKL, d, go., syrr.; om. καὶ ℵAFGP, 17, 31, 67**, 80, 238, five others, f, g, vg., boh., arm.

[2] ἐνδυναμοῦντι ℵ*, 2, 17, three others, Thphyl.

ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι (1 Tim. vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13), λόγος ὑγιής (Tit. ii. 8), and ὑγιαίνειν (ἐν) τῇ πίστει (Tit. i. 13, ii. 2).

The image is peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but it is not therefore un-Pauline, unless on the assumption that a writer never enlarges his vocabulary or ideas. *Healthy, wholesome* admirably describes Christian teaching, as St. Paul conceived it, in its complete freedom from casuistry or quibbles in its theory, and from arbitrary or unnatural restrictions in its practice. The terms νοσῶν as applied to false teaching (1 Tim. vi. 4), and possibly γάγγραινα (2 Tim. ii. 17) were suggested by contrast. See Dean Bernard's note on this verse.

Ver. 11. **κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, κ.τ.λ.,** refers to the whole preceding sentence and is not to be connected with διδασκαλίᾳ only, which would necessitate τῇ κατὰ, κ.τ.λ. This reading is actually found in D,* *d, f, g*, Vg., Arm., *quae est secundum*, etc. Von Soden connects with δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται.

Inasmuch as unsound teaching had claimed to be a εὐαγγέλιον (Gal. i. 6), St. Paul finds it necessary to recharge the word with its old force by distinguishing epithets. εὐαγγέλιον had become impoverished by heterodox associations. The gospel with which St. Paul had been entrusted was *the gospel of the glory of the blessed God*. *Cf.* "the gospel of the glory of Christ," 2 Cor. iv. 4. *The gospel concerning the glory*, etc., *which reveals the glory*. And this glory, although primarily an attribute of God, is here and elsewhere treated as a blessed state to which those who obey the gospel may attain, and which it is possible to miss (Rom. iii. 23, v. 2, xv. 7. See Sanday and Headlam on Rom. iii. 23). The phrase is not, as in A.V., an expansion of "The gospel of God," Mark i. 14, etc., "the gospel of which God is the author," τῆς δόξης being a genitive of quality=*glorious*. (Compare Rom. viii. 21, 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 6, 18; Col. i. 11, 27; Tit. ii. 13).

μακαρίου: *Blessed* as an epithet of God is only found here and in vi. 15, where see note. Grimm compares the μάκαρες θεοί of Homer and Hesiod. But the notion here is much loftier. We may call God *blessed*, but not *happy*; since happiness is only predicated of those whom it is possible to conceive of as unhappy.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ: This phrase occurs again Tit. i. 3. *Cf.* Rom. iii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 17, Gal. ii. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 4. St. Paul does not here allude to his particular presentation of the gospel, as in Gal. ii. 7; nor is he thinking specially of God's goodness to him in making him a minister, as in Rom. xv. 16, Eph. iii. 8, Col. i. 25; he is merely asserting his consistency, and repudiating the charge of antinomianism which had been brought against him.

Vv. 12-14. I cannot mention my part in the furtherance of the gospel without expressing my gratitude to our Lord for His forgiveness of my errors and His confidence in my natural trustworthiness, and His grace which gave me strength to serve Him.

Ver. 12. This parenthetical thanksgiving, which is quite in St. Paul's manner, is suggested by ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 9 *sqq.*, Eph. iii. 8.

χάριν ἔχω: see note on 2 Tim. i. 3.
ἐνδυναμώσαντι: The aor. is used because the writer's thoughts pass back to the particular time when he received inward strength increasingly, Acts ix. 22. In Phil. iv. 13 the present participle is appropriate, because he is describing his present state. The word ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι is only found in N.T. in Paul and Acts ix. 22. Is it fanciful to suppose that Luke's use of it in Acts was suggested by his master's account of that crisis? **ὅτι**: *because*.

πιστόν: *trustworthy*, as a steward is expected to be, 1 Cor. iv. 2. See ref. There is, as Bengel remarks, a touch of ἀνθρωποπάθεια, of anthropomorphism or accommodation, in πιστόν με ἡγήσατο.

διακονίαν, 13. τὸ[1] πρότερον ὄντα[2] [y] βλάσφημον καὶ [z] διώκτην καὶ [a] ὑβριστήν· ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ· 14. [b] ὑπερεπλεόνασεν δὲ ἡ χάρις [c] τοῦ [c] Κυρίου [c] ἡμῶν μετὰ [d e] πίστεως [d e] καὶ [d e] ἀγάπης [d] τῆς [d] ἐν [d] Χριστῷ [d] Ἰησοῦ. 15. [f] Πιστὸς[3] [f] ὁ

y 2 Tim. iii. 2.
z Here only, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 9, Gal. i. 13, 23, Phil. iii., 6, not LXX.

a Rom. i. 30 only (N.T.). b Here only, not LXX. c 2 Tim. i. 8, Heb. vii. 14, 2 Pet. iii. 15, Rev. xi. 15. d 2 Tim. i. 13. e Col. i. 4, 1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 15, vi. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 22, Tit. ii. 2, cf. Gal. v. 6, Eph. vi. 23, 1 Tim. iv. 12, Rev. ii. 19. f 1 Tim. iii. 1, iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8, cf. Tit. i. 9, Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6.

[1] So ℵAD*FGP, 17, 47, 67**, 80, three others; τὸν DcKL.

[2] Ins. με A, 73, g.

[3] *Humanus* r, Latin MSS. known to Jerome, Ambrst., Julian pel., Aug.

The Divine Master *knew* that His steward Paul would be trustworthy. Paul, not unnaturally, speaks as if God's apprehension of him were of the same relative nature as his own *hope* of final perseverance.

θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν: The fact that Christ employed Paul in His service was a sufficient proof of His estimate of him. **διάκονος** and **διακονία** are used in a general sense of St. Paul's ministry also in Rom. xi. 13, 1 Cor. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iii. 6, iv. 1, v. 18, vi. 3, Eph. iii. 7, Col. i. 23, 25. *Cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 6, 2 Tim. iv. 5, 11. The nature of it is exactly defined in Acts xx. 24, "to testify the gospel of the grace of God".

Ver. 13. **ὄντα**: concessive: "*though I was*," etc. **βλάσφημον**: *a blasphemer*. The context alone can decide whether **βλασφημεῖν** is to be rendered *rail* or *blaspheme*. It was against Jesus personally that Paul had acted (Acts ix. 5, xxii. 7, xxvi. 14). This brings into stronger relief the kindness of Jesus to Paul. **ὑβριστής**, rendered *insolent* (R.V.), Rom. i. 30, covers both words and deeds of despitefulness. *Injurious* is sufficiently comprehensive, but, in modern English, is not sufficiently vigorous.

ἀλλὰ ἠλεήθην: *Obtaining mercy* does not in this case mean the pardon which implies merely exemption from punishment; no self-respecting man would value such a relationship with God. Rather St. Paul has in his mind what he has expressed elsewhere as the issue of having received mercy, *viz.*, to have been granted an opportunity of serving Him whom he had injured. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 25, xv. 10, 2 Cor. iv. 1.

ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα: A possible echo of the Saying from the Cross recorded in Luke xxiii. 34, **οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν**. See also John xv. 21, xvi. 3, Acts iii. 17, xiii. 27, 1 Cor. ii. 8. There is a remarkable parallel in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Judah xix. 3, **ἠλέησέ με ὅτι ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ τοῦτο ἐποίησα**) dated by Charles between 109-106 B.C.

ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ does not so much qualify **ἀγνοῶν**, as correct a possible notion that all ignorance must be excusable. St. Paul declares, on the contrary, that his was a positive act of sinful disbelief; but "where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly," **ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις**, Rom. v. 20.

Ver. 14. **ὑπερπλεονάζειν** only occurs here in N.T.; but St. Paul constantly uses compounds with **ὑπέρ**. The comparative force of the **ὑπέρ**—grace outweighing sin—is brought out in Rom. v. 15 *sqq.* In these passages at least it is not true, as Ellicott maintains, that **ὑπέρ** has a superlative (*abound exceedingly*) force.

τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν: The expression *our Lord* (without the addition of *Jesus* or *Jesus Christ*), common in modern times, is rare in N.T. See reff. In 2 Peter iii. 15 it is not certain if the reference is to Christ, the Judge, or to the Father who determines the moment of His coming. In Rev. xi. 15 God the Father is meant.

Faith and love which is in Christ Jesus occurs again in 2 Tim. i. 13. In both places the singular relative is improperly used for the plural. It is one of the writer's habitual phrases; and therefore we cannot suppose any special relevance to the context in either of its constituent parts, though here Bengel contrasts *faith* with the *unbelief;* and *love* with the *blasphemer*, etc., of ver. 13. *Faith and love*, are the inward and outward manifestations respectively of the bestowal and realisation of grace.

πίστις ἐν Χρ.'Ιησ. occurs Gal. iii. 26, 1 Tim. iii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 15. **πίστις** and **ἀγάπη** are also associated (in this order) in the first six reff.

Vv. 15-17. The dealings of Christ with me, of course, are not unique. My ex-

λόγος καὶ πάσης [g] ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς [h] ἦλθεν [h] εἰς τὸν [h] κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι· ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ. 16. ἀλλὰ

g 1 Tim. iv. 9 only, not LXX.
h John i. 9, iii. 19, vi. 14, ix. 39, xi. 27, xii. 46, xvi. 28, xviii. 37.

perience is the same in kind, though not in degree, as that of all saved sinners. Christ's longsuffering will never undergo a more severe test than it did in my case, so that no sinner need ever despair. Let us glorify God therefor.

Ver. 15. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**: The complete phrase, **πιστὸς . . . ἄξιος** recurs in 1 Tim. iv. 9; and **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος** in 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2 Tim. ii. 11, Tit. iii. 8.

The only other places in the N.T. in which **πιστὸς** is applied to **λόγος** in the sense of *that can be relied on* are Tit. i. 9, **ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου**; Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6, **οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί**.

In Tit. i. 9 the **πιστὸς λόγος** cannot mean an isolated saying, but rather the to ality of the revelation given in Christ. Of the other five places in which the phrase occurs there are not more than two in which it is possible to say with confidence that a definite saying is referred to, *i.e.*, here, and perhaps 2 Tim. ii. 11. In the other passages, the expression seems to be a brief parenthetical formula, affirmative of the truth of the general doctrine with which the writer happens to be dealing. See notes in each place.

πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος: Field (*Notes on Trans. N.T.* p. 203) shows by many examples from Diodorus Siculus and Diog. Laert. that this phrase was a common one in later Greek. He would render **ἀποδοχή** by *approbation* or *admiration.* See also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 185. **ἀπόδεκτος** occurs 1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4; **ἀποδέχεσθαι** in Luke and Acts.

Other examples in the Pastorals of the use of **πᾶς** (=*summus*) with abstract nouns (besides ch. iv. 9) are 1 Tim. ii. 2, 11, iii. 4, v. 2, vi. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. ii. 10, 15, iii. 2.

Χρ. Ἰησ. ἦλθεν—σῶσαι: This is quite evidently a saying in which the apostolic church summed up its practical belief in the Incar ation. **ἔρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον**, as used of Christ, is an expression of the Johannine theology; see reff. It is the converse of another Johannine expression, **ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς . . .** (*or* **ὁ πατὴρ**) **εἰς τὸν κόσμον**: John iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18, 1 John iv. 9. **εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον** is used in the same association, Heb. x. 5. **εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον** is used of sin, Rom. v. 12; **ἐξέρχεσθαι εἰς τ. κ.** of false prophets in 1 John iv. 1, 2 John 7.

When we say that this is a Johannine expression, we do not mean that the writer of this epistle was influenced by the Johannine *literature.* But until it has been proved that John the son of Zebedee did not write the Gospel which bears his name, and that the discourses contained in it are wholly unhistorical, we are entitled, indeed compelled, to assume that what we may for convenience call Johannine theology, and the familiar expression of it, was known wherever John preached.

With **ἦλθεν . . . σῶσαι** *cf.* Luke xix. 10, **ἦλθεν . . . σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.** For the notion expressed in **ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι** *cf.* Matt. i. 21, ix. 13; see also John xii. 47, **ἦλθον . . . ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον**; John i. 29, **ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου**; and 1 John ii. 2.

The pre-existence of Christ, as well as His resistless power to save, is of course assumed in this noble summary of the gospel.

ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ: In the experiences of personal religion each individual man is alone with God. He sees nought but the Holy One and his own sinful self (*cf.* Luke xviii. 13, **μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ**). And the more familiar a man becomes with the meeting of God face to face the less likely is he to be deceived as to the gulf which parts him, limited, finite, defective, from the Infinite and Perfect. It is not easy to think of anyone but St. Paul as penning these words; although his expressions of self-depreciation elsewhere (1 Cor. xv. 9, Eph. iii. 8) are quite differently worded. In each case the form in which they are couched arises naturally out of the context. The sincerity of St. Paul's humility is proved by the fact that he had no mock modesty; when the occasion compelled it, he could appraise himself; *e.g.*, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11, Gal. ii. 6.

Ver. 16. **ἀλλά**: This is not adversative, but rather continues from ver. 13, and develops the expression of self-depreciation. The connexion is: "I was such a sinner that antecedently one might doubt

διὰ τοῦτο ἠλεήθην, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ [i] ἐνδείξηται Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς [1] τὴν [k] ἅπασαν [k] μακροθυμίαν, πρὸς [l] ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰς [m] ζωὴν [m] αἰώνιον. 17. τῷ δὲ [n] βασιλεῖ [n] τῶν [n] αἰώνων, [o] ἀφθάρτῳ,[2] [p] ἀοράτῳ, [q] μόνῳ [3] θεῷ, τιμὴ καὶ δόξα εἰς τοὺς

i (of God) Rom. ix. 17, 22, Eph. ii. 7.
k 2 Tim. iv. 2, *cf.* Col. i. 11, see 2 Tim. iii. 10.
l 2 Tim. i. 13 only, not LXX.
m John iv. 14, 36, vi. 27, xii. 25, Acts xiii. 48, Rom. v. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 12, Tit i. 2, iii. 7, etc.
n Tob. xiii. 6, 10, Enoch ix. 4, Rev. xv. 3, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 15.
o Wisd. xii. 1, xviii. 4, Rom. i. 23.
p Col. i. 15, Heb. xi. 27.
q John v. 44. Jude 25.

[1] So AD, 17, 47, 80, six others, d, f, r, vg., go., sah.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵKLP, 37, syrr., boh., arm.

[2] **ἀθανάτῳ** D*, *inmortali* d, f, r, vg., go., syrhcl-mg; FG, g, r (*incorruptibili*) add **ἀθανάτῳ** after **ἀοράτῳ**.

[3] Ins. **σοφῷ** ℵcDbcKLP, go., syrhcl (from Rom. xvi. 27); om. **σοφῷ** ℵ*AD*FG, 17, 37, one other, Latt., sah., boh., syrpesh.

whether I could be saved or was worth saving. But Christ had a special object in view in extending to me His mercy."

διὰ τοῦτο, followed by **ἵνα** and referring to what follows, occurs in Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, Eph. vi. 13, 2 Thess. ii. 11, Philem. 15. See also Rom. xiii. 6. **ἐν ἐμοί** is used as in Gal. i. 16, 24, and as **ἐν ἡμῖν** in 1 Cor. iv. 6. *I was an object lesson* in which Christ displayed the extent of His longsuffering.

πρώτῳ: Alford correctly says that the foll. **μελλόντων** proves that St. Paul here combines the senses *first* (A.V.) and *as chief* (R.V.).

τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν: *the utmost longsuffering which he has* (Blass, *Grammar*, p. 162). Here r renders **μακροθ.** *longanimitatem*. Chrys., followed by Alf. and Ell., explains, "Greater longsuffering He could not show in any case than in mine, nor find a sinner that so required *all* His longsuffering; not a part only". If there had been only one soul of sinful man to save, it would have needed the Incarnation to save that soul. In St. Paul's case, conversion had been preceded by a long internal struggle on his part, and patience on Christ's part: "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad". **ἅπας** only occurs in the Pauline epistles again in Eph. vi. 13. Its use "is confined principally to literary documents" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii. vi. 88).

πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων: The use of the genitive here is paralleled exactly in 2 Peter ii 6, **ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβεῖν**, "an example unto those that should live ungodly"; and 1 Cor. x. 6, **ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν**; also 1 Tim. iv. 12, where see reff. It does not mean as R.V. (*an ensample of them*), that St. Paul was the first specimen of Jesus' work of grace, but rather as A.V. (*a pattern to them*), that no one who ever afterwards hears the gracious invitation of Christ need hang back from accepting it by reason of the greatness of his sin, when he has the example of St. Paul before him (so Chrys.). The **ὑποτύπωσις**, of course, is the whole transaction of St. Paul's conversion in all its bearings, *ad informationem eorum qui credituri sunt illi* (Vulg.). Bengel compares Ps. xxxii. 5, 6, "Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. For this let every one that is godly pray unto thee," etc.

πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ: **πιστεύειν** is usually followed by **εἰς** and the acc., or the simple dat. But **ἐπί** with acc., and **ἐν** are also found. The construction in the text is due to an unconscious recollection of Isaiah xxviii. 16 (also quoted Rom. ix. 33, x. 11, 1 Peter ii. 6); and no other explanation need be sought. The only other certain instance of the same construction is Luke xxiv. 25. The critical editors reject it in Matt. xxvii. 42.

Ver. 17. This noble doxology might be one used by St. Paul himself in one of his eucharistic prayers. It is significant that in the Jewish forms of thanksgiving מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם is of constant occurrence. See reff., and **θεὸς τῶν αἰ.** in Ecclus. xxxvi. 22. Bengel's suggestion (on ch. i. 4) that there is a polemical reference to the aeons of Gnosticism is fanciful and unnecessary. **βασιλεύς**, as a title of God the Father, is found in vi. 15 and Rev. xv. 3, a passage of which Swete says (*comm.* in loc.), "The thought as well as the phraseology of the Song is strangely Hebraic". *Cf.* Ps. ix. 37 (x. 16).

ἀφθάρτῳ: The three adjectives **ἀφθά-**

αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν. 18. Ταύτην τὴν [r] παραγγελίαν [s] παρατίθεμαί σοι, [t] τέκνον Τιμόθεε, κατὰ τὰς [u] προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφη-

r See ver. 5. s Luke xii. 48, xxiii. 46, Acts xiv. 23, xx. 32, 2 Tim. ii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 19. t See ver. 2. u 1 Tim. v. 24.

ρτῳ, ἀοράτῳ, μόνῳ are co-ordinate epithets of θεῷ, *to God immortal*, *invisible*, *unique*.

ἄφθαρτος, *immortal*, as an epithet of God, occurs Rom. i. 23 (*cf.* Wisd. xii. 1, τὸ γὰρ ἄφθαρτόν σου . . . πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσιν, and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 376). It is expanded in vi. 15 *sq.*, *who only hath immortality*, just as ἀοράτῳ becomes *whom no man hath seen*, *nor can see* (for the thought, see John i. 18, Col. i. 15, Heb. xi. 27, 1 John iv. 12), and μόνῳ becomes *the blessed and only potentate*. For the epithet μόνος, used absolutely, see reff. and also Ps. lxxxvi. 10, John xvii. 3, Rom. xvi. 27.

τιμὴ καὶ δόξα: This combination in a doxology is found Rev. iv. 9, δώσουσιν . . . δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν; v. 13, ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα. In St. Paul's other doxologies (Gal. i. 5, Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Phil. iv. 20, Eph. iii. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 18), with the exception of 1 Tim. vi. 16 (τιμὴ καὶ κράτος), τιμή is not found; and he always has ἡ δόξα (see Westcott, Additional Note on Heb. xiii. 21).

Vv. 18-20. The charge that I am giving you now is in harmony with what you heard from the prophets at your ordination. It only emphasises the fundamental moral relations of man to things unseen and seen. The rejection of these principles of natural religion naturally issues in a perversion of revealed religion, such as caused the excommunication of Hymenaeus and Alexander.

Ver. 18. ταύτην τὴν παραγγελίαν is partly resumptive of ver. 3; it is the positive aspect of what is there negatively expressed; but as it concerns Timothy directly, it has a reference forward to ἵνα στρατεύῃ, κ.τ.λ., and to the general contents of the epistle. Bengel refers it to παραγγελίας, ver. 5. Peile to πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, κ.τ.λ.

παρατίθεμαί σοι: The use of this word, as in Luke xii. 48, 2 Tim. ii. 2, suggests that the παραγγελία is more than an injunction of temporary urgency, that it is connected with, if not the same as, the παραθήκη (*depositum*) of 1 Tim. vi. 20, etc.

τέκνον Τιμόθεε: There is a peculiar affectionate earnestness in this use of the personal name, here and in the conclusion of the letter (vi. 20). *Cf.* Luke x. 41, *Martha*, *Martha;* xxii. 34, *Peter;* John xiv. 9, *Philip;* xx. 16, *Mary*. For τέκνον see note on ver. 2.

κατὰ τὰς . . . προφητείας, κ.τ.λ.: By the prophecies, etc., are meant the utterances of the prophets, such as Silas (and not excluding St. Paul himself) who were with St. Paul when the ordination of Timothy became possible; utterances which pointed out the young man as a person suitable for the ministry, *led the way to* him (R.V.m.). So Chrys. There is no need to suppose that any long interval of time elapsed between the first prophetical utterances and the laying on of hands. In any case, similar prophecies accompanied the act of ordination. This explanation agrees best with the order of the words, and is in harmony with earlier and later references to the extraordinary function of prophets in relation to the ministry in the apostolic church. Thus in Acts xiii. 1, 2, the imposition of hands on Paul and Barnabas—whether for a special mission or to a distinct order it matters not—was at the dictation of prophets. And Clem. Alex. (*Quis Dives*, 42) speaks of the Apostle John, κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαινομένων. In the same sense may be understood Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 42: οἱ ἀπόστολοι . . . καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους.

It is evident from iv. 14 that the prophecy accompanying the laying-on of hands was considered at least contributory to the bestowal of the charisma; it is natural to suppose that it was of the nature of a charge to the candidate. St. Paul here says that his present charge to Timothy is *in accordance with*, *in the spirit of*, *and also in reinforcement of* (ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς) the charge he had originally received on an occasion of peculiar solemnity. This is a stimulating appeal like that of 2 Tim. iii. 14, "knowing of whom thou hast learned them".

Ellicott disconnects προαγούσας from ἐπὶ σέ; but "forerunning, precursory," is pointless as an epithet of predictions, though quite appropriate as applied to ἐντολή in Heb. vii. 18; and the notion

τείας, ἵνα [v] στρατεύῃ [1] ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν καλὴν [w] στρατείαν, 19. ἔχων πίστιν καὶ [x] ἀγαθὴν [x] συνείδησιν, ἥν τινες [y] ἀπωσάμενοι [z] περὶ [z] τὴν [z] πίστιν [a] ἐναυάγησαν· 20. ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὓς [b] παρέδωκα [b] τῷ [b] Σατανᾷ ἵνα [c] παιδευθῶσι μὴ [d] βλασφημεῖν.

v 1 Cor. ix. 7, 2 Cor. x. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 4. w 2 Cor. x. 4. x See ver. 5. y Acts xiii. 46. z 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. iii. 8. a 2 Cor. xi. 25 only, not LXX. b 1 Cor. v. 5. c Acts vii. 22, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xi. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 25, Tit. ii. 12. d Matt. ix. 3 = Mark ii. 7, Matt. xxvi. 65, John x. 36, Acts xiii. 45, xviii. 6, xxvi. 11.

[1] στρατεύσῃ ℵ*D*.

of "prophecies uttered over Timothy at his ordination . . . foretelling his future zeal and success" is unnatural.

ἵνα στρατεύῃ . . . τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν: The ministry is spoken of as *a warfare*, *militia*, "the service of a **στρατιώτης** in all its details and particulars" (Ell.). See reff., and an interesting parallel in 4 Macc. ix. 23, **ἱερὰν κ. εὐγενῆ στρατείαν στρατεύσασθε περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας.**

ἐν αὐταῖς: *in them*, as in defensive armour. (Winer Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 484). *Cf.* Eph. vi. 14, 16, for a similar use of **ἐν**.

καλός is characteristic of the Pastorals, in which it occurs twenty-four times as against sixteen times in the other Pauline Epistles. It has a special Christian reference in such phrases as the present, and as qualifying **στρατιώτης**, 2 Tim. ii. 3; **ἀγών**, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7; **διδασκαλία**, 1 Tim. iv. 6; **ὁμολογία**. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13: **παραθήκη**, 2 Tim. i. 14; **διάκονος**, 1 Tim. iv. 6. Moreover, the use of the word in these epistles is also different from that found in the earlier epistles: (*a*) it is used as a qualifying adjective twelve times in the Pastorals (excluding **καλὸν ἔργον, καλὰ ἔργα**) *viz.*, in addition to the reff. already given, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 13, vi. 19. This use is not found in the other Pauline Epistles. (*b*)As a predicate it occurs twice, *viz.*, 1 Tim. i. 8, iv. 4, as against once elsewhere in Paul, Rom. vii. 16. On the other hand, **τὸ καλόν** is not found in the Pastorals, though five times elsewhere (Rom. vii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21); nor **καλά** (Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21); nor **καλόν** (Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. v. 6, vii. 1, 8, 26, ix. 15; Gal. iv. 18); but **τοῦτο καλόν** occurs chap. ii. 3 (Tit. iii. 8) as well as in 1 Cor. vii. 26. See also note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 19. **ἔχων**: It is best perhaps to suppose that the metaphor of warfare is not continued beyond **στρατείαν**; else we might render, *holding faith*, as a shield, *cf.* Eph. vi. 16. But **ἐν αὐταῖς** implies that the prophecies included every piece of defensive armour. So **ἔχων** here simply means *possessing*, as in 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 13, iii. 5, Rom. ii. 20, 1 Cor. xv. 34, 1 Pet. iii. 16. **συνείδησιν**: see note on ver. 5.

τινες: see note on ver. 3.

ἀπωσάμενοι: The indictment against the moral standard of the false teachers is here expressed more severely than above in ver. 6. There they are said to have "missed" or "neglected" faith, etc.; but here that they *thrust it from them* (R.V., *cf.* Acts xiii. 46) when it importuned for admittance into their hearts. "Recedit invita. Semper dicit, Noli me laedere" (Bengel).

περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν: Another change of metaphor: *they suffered moral shipwreck, so far as the faith is concerned.* "When the life is corrupt, it engenders a doctrine congenial to it" (Chrys.). We are not justified in interpreting *suffered shipwreck* as though it meant that they were lost beyond hope of recovery. St. Paul himself had suffered shipwreck at least four times (2 Cor. xi. 25) when he wrote this epistle. He had on each occasion lost everything except himself. For the construction, *cf.* **περὶ τὴν πίστιν [ἀλήθειαν] ἠστόχησαν**, 1 Tim. vi. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 18; **ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν**, 2 Tim. iii. 8. **περί** with acc. is used in a somewhat similar sense in Mark iv. 19, Luke x. 40, 41, Acts xix. 25, Phil. ii. 23 (the only instance in Paul outside the Pastorals) 1 Tim. vi. 4, Tit. ii. 7.

Hymenaeus and Alexander were the ringleaders of those who had suffered shipwreck. There is no sufficient reason to suppose that this Hymenaeus is different from the heretic of the same name in 2 Tim. ii. 17, where his error is more precisely defined. The identification of Alexander with Alexander the smith of 2 Tim. iv. 14 is more precarious.

Ver. 20. **οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ**: *I have delivered* (A.V.) expresses more

a Rom. xii. 1, 1 Cor. iv. 16, Eph. iv. 1.
b Luke v. 33, Phil. i. 4.

II. 1. [a] Παρακαλῶ [1] [a] οὖν πρῶτον πάντων [b] ποιεῖσθαι [b] δεήσεις, προσευχάς, [c] ἐντεύξεις, [d] εὐχαριστίας, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων·—

c 2 Macc. iv. 8, 1 Tim. iv. 5. d 1 Cor. xiv. 16, Phil. iv. 6.

[1] παρακάλει, *obsecra*, D*FgrG, d, g (not r), sah.

accurately than *I delivered* (R.V.) the force of the aorist followed by the subjunctive: they were still under sentence of excommunication (see Field *in loc.*). The theory of the relation of the Church to non-Christians which underlies this phrase is expressed in 1 John v. 19, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται. The ἐξουσία τοῦ Σατανᾶ was "the darkness" over against "the light" of the Kingdom of God (Acts xxvi. 18). The conception is not popular among modern Christians. The two kingdoms, if there are two, have interpenetrated each other. The phraseology, here and in the parallel, 1 Cor. v. 5, is based on Job ii. 6, ἰδοὺ παραδίδωμί σοι αὐτόν. The name Σατανᾶς also occurs in chap. v. 15 and in eight other places in the Pauline Epistles.

ἵνα παιδευθῶσι: The apostolic severity was not merely punitive; it was also corrective. The intention, at least, of excommunication was ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ, 1 Cor. v. 5. So Chrys. We must not therefore render here, sarcastically, *that they may learn*, A.V., but *that they might be taught* or *instructed*. At the same time, it is unnatural to assume with Bengel that the παιδεία was intended to keep them from blaspheming at all; St. Paul hoped that it might prevent a repetition of the sin. The term has more of the association of discipline here and in 1 Cor. xi. 32, 2 Cor. vi. 9, than in the other references.

βλασφημεῖν: It is absurd to suppose that St. Paul here refers to a railing disparagement of his own apostolic claims.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-7. In the first place, let me remind you that the Church's public prayers must be made expressly for all men, from the Emperor downwards. This care for all becomes those who know that they are children of a Father who wishes the best for all His children. He is one and the same to all, and the salvation He has provided in the Atonement is available for all. My own work among the Gentiles is one instance of God's fetching home again His banished ones.

Ver. 1. παρακαλῶ οὖν: This is presumptive of, and a further development of the παραγγελία of i. 18. See reff. St. Paul here at last begins the subject matter of the letter. The object of παρακαλῶ is not expressed; it is the Church, through Timothy.

πρῶτον πάντων is to be connected with παρακαλῶ: *The most important point in my exhortation concerns the universal scope of public prayer.* The A.V. connects πρῶτ. πάντ. with ποιεῖσθαι, as though the framing of a liturgy were in question.

ποιεῖσθαι is mid. The mid. of ποιεῖν is not of frequent occurrence in N.T.; it is found chiefly in Luke and Paul. For the actual expression δεήσεις ποιεῖσθαι, see reff., and Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 320, note, and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 250.

There is of course a distinction in meaning between δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἐντεύξεις, *supplications* (in special crises) *prayers*, *petitions*; that is to say, they cannot be used interchangeably on every occasion; but here the nuances of meaning are not present to St. Paul's mind: his object in the enumeration is simply to cover every possible variety of public prayer. This is proved conclusively by the addition εὐχαριστίας, which of course could not be, in any natural sense, for all men. But every kind of prayer must be accompanied by thanksgiving, Phil. iv. 6, Col. iv. 2. On ἔντευξις, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 284. and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*. trans. p. 121. The retention of *thanksgivings* in the reference to this verse in the opening of the Anglican prayer *For the whole state of Christ's Church* is scarcely justified by referring it to God's triumphs of grace in the lives of the faithful departed. Less unnatural is the explanation of Chrysostom, that "we must give thanks to God for the good that befals others".

προσευχή and δέησις (in this order) are combined, Eph. vi. 18, Phil iv. 6; and in chap. v. 5 in the same order as here.

ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων: The blessed effects of intercessory prayer on those who pray and on those for whom prayer

2. ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν [e] ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, ἵνα [f] ἤρεμον καὶ [g] ἡσύχιον [h] βίον [i] διάγωμεν ἐν πάσῃ [k] εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ [l] σεμνότητι·

e 2 Macc. iii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 1. f Es. iii. 13 only. g 1 Pet. iii. 4. h Luke viii. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 4, 1 John ii. 16. i Ecclus. xxxviii. 27, 2 Macc. xii. 38, 3 Macc. i. 3, iv. 8, vi. 35, Tit. iii. 3. k Acts iii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 16, iv. 7, 8, vi. 3, 5, 6, 11, 2 Tim. iii. 5, Tit. i. 1, 2 Pet. i. 3, 6, 7, iii. 11. l 2 Macc. iii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 4, Tit. ii. 7.

is made is urged with special reference to the circumstances of the early Church by Polycarp, *Phil.* 12; Tert. *Apol.* § 30; *ad Scapulam*, § 2; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 17; *Dial.* 35. "No one can feel hatred towards those for whom he prays. . . . Nothing is so apt to draw men under teaching, as to love and be loved" (Chrys.).

Ver. 2. **ὑπὲρ βασιλέων**: Prayer for all men must be given intensity and directness by analysis into prayer for each and every sort and condition of men. St. Paul begins such an analytical enumeration with *kings and all that are in high place;* but he does not proceed with it. This verse 2 is in fact an explanatory parenthesis, exemplifying how the prayer "for all men" is to begin. The plural *kings* has occasioned some difficulty; since in St. Paul's time, Timothy and the Ephesian Church were concerned with one king only, the Emperor. Consequently those who deny the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals suppose that the writer here betrays his consciousness of the associated emperors under the Antonines. But, in the first place, he would have written **τῶν βασιλέων**: and again, the sentiment was intended as a perfectly general one, applicable to all lands. St. Paul knew of kingdoms outside the Roman empire to which, no doubt, he was sure the Gospel would spread; and even within the Roman empire there were honorary **βασιλεῖς** whose characters could seriously affect those about them. The plural is similarly used in Matt. x. 18 and parallels.

On the duty of prayer for kings see Jer. xxix. 7, Ezra vi. 10, Bar. i. 11, 1 Macc. vii. 33, Rom. xiii. 1, Tit. iii. 1, 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Such prayer was a prominent feature in the Christian liturgy from the earliest times to which we can trace it (*e.g.*, Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 61). It is specially noted in the Apologies as a proof of the loyalty of Christians to the Government, *e.g.*, Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 17; Tert. *Apol.* 30, 31, 39; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, p. 39. Origen, *Cont. Cels.* viii. 12.

ἐν ὑπεροχῇ: *in high place* (R.V.). The noun occurs in an abstract sense, **καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας**, 1 Cor. ii. 1; but the verb is found in this association: Rom. xiii. 1, **ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις**; 1 Pet. ii. 13, **βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι**. The actual phrase **τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων** is found in an inscription at Pergamum "after 133 B.C." (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 255).

ἵνα ἤρεμον: This expresses not the reason why prayer was to be made for kings, but the purport of the prayer itself. *Cf.* Tert. *Apol.* 39, "Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministeriis eorum ac potestatibus, pro statu seculi, pro rerum quiete". So Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 60, **δὸς ὁμόνοιαν καὶ εἰρήνην ἡμῖν . . . [ὥστε σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς] ὑπηκόους γινομένους . . . τοῖς ἄρχουσιν καὶ ἡγουμένοις ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**, and esp. § 61. Von Soden connects **ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.** with **παρακαλῶ.**

ἤρεμος and **ἡσύχιος**, *tranquil and quiet* (R.V.), perhaps refer to inward and outward peace respectively. See Bengel, on 1 Pet. iii. 4. **ἡσυχία** also has an external reference where it occurs in N.T., Acts xxii. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 12, 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12. **ἠρεμέω** is found in a papyrus of ii. A.D. cited by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 471.

διάγω is used in the sense of *passing one's life*, absolutely, without **βίον** expressed, in Tit. iii. 3.

ἐν πάσῃ εὐσεβείᾳ κ. σεμνότητι: *with as much piety and earnestness* or *seriousness as is possible.* This clause, as Chrys. points out, qualifies the prayer for a tranquil and quiet life. **εὐσέβεια** and **σεμνότης**, *piety* and *seriousness*, belong to the vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles, though **εὐσ.** occurs elsewhere; see reff. In the Pastorals **εὐσέβεια** is almost a technical term for *the Christian religion as expressed in daily life.* It is used with a more general application, *religious conduct*, in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and in 2 Peter. It and its cognates were "familiar terms in the religious language of the Imperial period" (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 364). **σεμνότης** is rather *gravitas*, as Vulg. renders it in Tit. ii. 7, than *castitas* (Vulg. here and 1 Tim. iii. 4) just as **σεμνός** is a wider term than *pudicus* as Vulg. always renders it (Phil. iv. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2). The

—3. [m] τοῦτο[1] [m] καλὸν καὶ [n] ἀπόδεκτον [o] ἐνώπιον [o] τοῦ [p] σωτῆρος [p] ἡμῶν [o] [p] Θεοῦ, 4. ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς [q] ἐπίγνωσιν [q] ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν. 5. Εἷς γὰρ Θεός, εἷς καὶ [r] μεσίτης

m 1 Cor. vii. 26, *cf.* Tit. iii. 8. n 1 Tim. v. 4 only, not LXX. o Rom. xiv. 22, 1 Cor. i. 29, 2 Cor. iv. 2, vii. 12, Gal. i. 20, 1 Tim. v. 4, 21, vi. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1, *cf.* Rom. iii. 20, 2 Cor. viii. 21. p See 1 Tim. i. 1. q 2 Tim. ii. 25, iii. 7, Tit. i. 1, Heb. x. 26, *cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 3. r Gal. iii. 19, 20, Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24.

[1] Ins. γὰρ ℵ^cDFGKLP, d, f, g, m^101, r, vg. (*enim*), go., syrr., arm.; om. γὰρ ℵ*A, 17, 67**, boh., sah.

A.V. *honesty* is an older English equivalent for *seemliness*. σεμνός and σεμνότης connote gravity which compels genuine respect.

Ver. 3. τοῦτο: *i.e.*, prayer for all men.

καλόν: not to be joined with ἐνώπιον, but taken by itself, as in reff. See note on i. 18. ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ occurs again, v. 4. *Prayer for all men approves itself to the natural conscience, and it is also in accordance with the revealed will of God.*

θεοῦ is almost epexegetical of σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. *Our Saviour*, if it stood alone, might mean Christ; but it is God the Father that is the originating cause of salvation. See note on i. 1.

Ver. 4. "The grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men" (Tit. ii. 11) as was foreshadowed in the O.T.; *e.g.* Ps. lxvii. 2, "Thy saving health among all nations". God is, so far as His inclination or will is concerned, "the Saviour of all men," but actually, so far as we can affirm with certainty, "of them that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10). These *He saved*, ἔσωσεν (2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5), *i.e.*, *placed in a state of being saved*. But here St. Paul does not say θέλει σῶσαι, but θέλει σωθῆναι; for by His own limitation of His powers, so far as they are perceived by us, the salvation of men does not depend on God alone. It depends on the exercise of the free will of each individual in the acceptance or rejection of salvation (so Wiesinger, quoted by Alf.; and, as Bengel notes on ἐλθεῖν, *non coguntur*), as well as on the cooperation of those who pray for all men; and, by so doing, generate a spiritual atmosphere in which the designs of God may grow.

It is also to be observed that since *salvation* means *a state of being saved*, there is no difficulty in *the knowledge of the truth* following it in the sentence, as though it were a consequence rather than a precedent condition. This is indeed the order indicated in the Last Commission: "baptising them . . . teaching them" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). So that there is no need to suppose with Ell., that καὶ εἰς . . . ἐλθεῖν was "suggested by . . . the enunciation of the great truth which is contained in the following verse".

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν: This whole phrase recurs in 2 Tim. iii. 7. For ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας see reff. In Heb. x. 26 both words have the article. It has been shown by Dean Armitage Robinson (*Ephesians*, p. 248 *sqq.*) that ἐπίγνωσις is not *maior exactiorque cognitio*; but, as distinguished from γνῶσις "which is the wider word and expresses 'knowledge' in the fullest sense, ἐπίγνωσις is knowledge directed towards a particular object, perceiving, discerning, recognising". *Cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 11, ἤρξατο . . . εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἔρχεσθαι. ἀλήθεια occurs fourteen times in the Pastorals; and often with a special Christian reference, like ὁδός and εὐσέβεια. See *e.g.* in addition to this place, 1 Tim. iii. 15, iv. 3, vi. 5, 2 Tim. ii. 15, 18, iii. 8, iv. 4, Tit. i. 14. It is a term that belongs to the Johannine theology as well as to the Pauline.

Ver. 5. This emphatic statement as to the unity of the Godhead is suggested by the singular σωτῆρος just preceding. The εἷς neither affirms nor denies anything as to the complexity of the nature of the Godhead; it has no bearing on the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; it simply is intended to emphasise the uniqueness of the relations of God to man. The use of *one*, with this intention, is well illustrated by Eph. iv. 4-6, ἓν σῶμα, κ.τ.λ. The current thought of the time was conscious of many σωτῆρες. In contrast to these, St. Paul emphasises the uniqueness of the σωτήρ and θεός worshipped by Christians. The contrast is exactly parallel to that in 1 Cor. viii. 6, εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοί, καὶ κύριοι πολλοί· ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ . . . καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησ. Χρ. The question as to the

Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, 6. ὁ [s] δοὺς [s] ἑαυτὸν [t] ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ [u] μαρτύριον [1] [v] καιροῖς [v] ἰδίοις, 7. [w] εἰς

s Gal. i. 4, Tit. ii. 14.
t Here only, not LXX.
u Acts iv. 33, 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1, 2 Thess. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 8.
v 1 Tim. vi. 15, Tit. i. 3.
w 2 Tim. i. 11, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8.

[1] Om. τὸ μαρτύριον A; καὶ μαρτ. ℵ*; οὗ τὸ μαρτ. καιρ. ἰδ. ἐδόθη D*FgrG, d, g, Ambrst., *datum est;* 67**, 80, 115 ins. οὗ. [Lucas Brug.: "*Testimonium temporibus suis.* His verbis nec praeponendum est *cuius*, nec postponendum *confirmatum est:* haec enim consulto a patribus omissa sunt". One at least of MSS. of vg. reads *confirmatum est.*]

mutual relations of the Persons of the Godhead had not arisen among Christians, and was not present to the writer's mind. Indeed if it had been we could not regard the epistle as a portion of revealed theology. Revealed theology is unconscious. The *prima facie* distinction here drawn between εἷς θεός and εἷς μεσίτης would have been impossible in a sub-apostolic orthodox writer.

Again, the oneness of God has a bearing on the practical question of man's salvation. It is possible for all men to be saved, because over them there are not many Gods that can exercise possibly conflicting will-power towards them, but one only. See also Rom. iii. 30. One Godhead stands over against one humanity; and the Infinite and the finite can enter into relations one with the other, since they are linked by a μεσίτης who is both God and man. It is noteworthy that μεσίτης θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων is applied to the archangel Michael in *The Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Dan. vi. 2.

ἄνθρωπος explains how Christ Jesus could be a mediator. He can only be an adequate mediator whose sympathy with, and understanding of, both parties is cognisable by, and patent to, both. Now, although God's love for man is boundless, yet without the revelation of it by Christ it would not be certainly patent to man; not to add that one of two contending parties cannot be the mediator of the differences (Gal. iii. 20). See also Rom. v. 15. Again, we must note that ἄνθρωπος (*himself man*, R.V., not *the man*, A.V.) in this emphatic position suggests that the verity of our Lord's manhood was in danger of being ignored or forgotten.

Ver. 6. ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτόν: The Evangelists record our Lord's own declarations that His death was a spontaneous and voluntary sacrifice on His part, Matt. xx. 28 = Mark x. 45, δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. *Cf.* John x. 18; and St. Paul affirms it, Gal. i. 4, τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν; Tit. ii. 14, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (παραδίδωμι is used in Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25). We may note that this statement necessarily implies not only the pre-existence of our Lord, but also His co-operation in the eternal counsels and purpose of the Father as regards the salvation of man.

Alford is probably right in saying that δοῦναι ἑαυτόν, as St. Paul expresses it, suggests more than δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The latter might naturally be limited to the sacrifice of His death; the former connotes the sacrifice of His lifetime, the whole of the humiliation and self-emptying of the Incarnation. The soundness of this exegesis is not impaired by the probability that τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ may be nothing more than a Semitic periphrasis for ἑαυτόν. See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 87, who compares Mark viii. 36, ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, with Luke ix. 25, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς.

ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων: If we are to see any special force in the ἀντί, we may say that it expresses that the λύτρον is equivalent in value to the thing procured by means of it. But perhaps St. Paul's use of the word, if he did not coin it, is due to his desire to reaffirm our Lord's well-known declaration in the most emphatic way possible. λύτρον ἀντὶ merely implies an exchange; ἀντίλυτρον ὑπέρ implies that the exchange is decidedly a benefit to those on whose behalf it is made. As far as the suggestion of vicariousness is concerned, there does not seem to be much difference between the two phrases.

τὸ μαρτύριον, as Ellicott says, "is an accusative in apposition to the preceding sentence," or rather clause, ὁ δοὺς . . . πάντων. So R.V. Bengel compares ἔνδειγμα, 2 Thess. i. 5; *cf.* also Rom. xii. 1. The great act of self-sacrifice is timeless; but as historically apprehended by us, the testimony concerning it must be made during a particular and suitable

[w]ὃ [w]ἐτέθην ἐγὼ [x]κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος—[y]ἀλήθειαν [y]λέγω,[1] [z]οὐ [z]ψεύδομαι—[a]διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν [b]ἐν [b]πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. 8. [c]Βού-

x 2 Tim. i. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 5.
y John viii. 45, 46, Rom. ix. 1, *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 6.
z Rom. ix. 1, 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 20.
a 2 Tim. i. 11.
b See 1 Tim. i. 2.
c 2 Cor. i. 17, Phil. i. 12, 1 Tim. v. 14, Tit. iii. 8.

[1] Add ἐν Χριστῷ (from Rom. ix. 1) א*DcKL, 17, 37, many others, go., arm.

period of history, *i.e.*, from the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostolic company (Acts i. 8) until the Second Coming (2 Thess. i. 10). The temporal mission of the Son of God took place "when the fulness of the time came" (Gal. iv. 4); it was an **οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν** (Eph. i. 10). The testimony is of course borne by God (1 John v. 9-11), but He uses human agency, the preachers of the Gospel.

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: See reff. The analogy of Gal. vi. 9, **καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν**, suggests that we should render it always *in due season.* The plural expresses the fact that the bearing of testimony extends over many seasons; but each man reaps his own harvest only once. In any case, the seasons relate both to the Witness and that whereof He is a witness: "*his* own times" and "*its* own times" (R.V.).

The dative is that "of the time wherein the action takes place," Ell., who compares Rom. xvi. 25, **χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου.**

Ver. 7. **εἰς ὅ**: scil. **τὸ μαρτύριον**, or **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον**, as in the parallel passage, 2 Tim. i. 11.

The phrase **εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ κ. ἀπόστολος** [**καὶ**] **διδάσκαλος** is repeated in 2 Tim. i. 11, as **ἀλήθειαν . . . ψεύδομαι** occurs again Rom. ix. 1; but there we have the significant addition [**λέγω**] **ἐν Χριστῷ.** For similar asseverations of the writer's truthfulness see Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 10, xii. 19, Gal. i. 20.

There is nothing derogatory from the apostle in supposing that the personal struggle in which he had been for years engaged with those who opposed his gospel made him always feel on the defensive, and that his self-vindication came to be expressed in stereotyped phrases which rose to his mind whenever the subject came before him, even in a letter to a loyal disciple.

κῆρυξ is used in the N.T. of a preacher here, and twice elsewhere; see reff. But **κήρυγμα** and **κηρύσσω** are constantly used of Christian preaching. *Cf.* esp. Rom. x. 15, **πῶς δὲ κηρύξωσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν**; Bengel takes it in the sense of *ambassador; cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20.

διδάσκαλος: **διδάσκαλοι**, in the technical Christian sense, are mentioned in Acts xiii. 1, 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, Eph. iv. 11. Here and in 2 Tim. i. 11 the term is used in a general signification. St. Paul does use **διδάσκειν** of his own ministerial functions: 1 Cor. iv. 17, Col. i. 28, 2 Thess. ii. 15.

ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ: It is best to take both these words in connexion with **διδάσκαλος**, and objectively, *in the faith and the truth* (see on ch. i. 2). It is no objection to this view that the article is not expressed; the anarthrousness of common Christian terms is a feature of these epistles. Others, with Chrys., take both terms subjectively, *faithfully and truly.* Ellicott "refers **πίστις** to the subjective faith of the apostle, **ἀλήθ.** to the objective truth of the doctrine he delivered". This does not yield a natural sense.

Harnack notes that the collocation of **ἀπόστολος, διδάσκαλος** is peculiar to the Pastorals and Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 15, 16, 25; *Vis.* iii. 5, "The apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons"). Harnack opines that "Hermas passed over the prophets because he reckoned himself one of them". But the opinion of Lietzmann, which he quotes, seems sounder: Hermas "conceives this **προφητεύειν** as a private activity which God's equipment renders possible, but which lacks any official character" (*Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, trans. vol. i. p. 340).

Vv. 8—iii. 1*a*. The ministers of public prayer must be the men of the congregation, not the women. A woman's positive duty is to make herself conspicuous by good works, not by personal display. Her place in relation to man is one of subordination. This is one of the lessons of the inspired narratives of the Creation and of the Fall. Nevertheless this does not affect her eternal position. Salvation is the goal alike of man and woman. They both attain supreme blessedness in the working out of the primal penalty imposed on Adam and Eve.

Ver. 8. **βούλομαι οὖν**: **οὖν** is resumptive of the general topic of public worship

λομαι οὖν [d] προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας [e] ἐν [e] παντὶ [e] τόπῳ, [f] ἐπαίροντας [g] ὁσίους [f] χεῖρας [h] χωρὶς [i] ὀργῆς καὶ [k] διαλογισμοῦ,[1] 9. [l] ὡσαύτως [2 3] γυναῖκας ἐν [m] καταστολῇ [n] κοσμίῳ [4] μετὰ [o] αἰδοῦς καὶ [p] σωφροσύνης

d 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5, 13, xiv. 14, 15. e 1 Cor. i. 2, 2 Cor. ii. 14, 1 Thess. i. 8.
f Luke xxiv. 50. g Tit. i. 8, Heb. vii. 26, Rev. xv. 4, xvi. 5. h Phil. ii. 14, 1 Tim. v. 21. i Mark iii. 5, Rom. xii. 19, xiii. 4, 5, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, Jas. i. 19, 20. k Rom. xiv. 1, Phil. ii. 14. l 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11, v. 25, Tit. ii. 3, 6. m Here only N.T., Isa. lxi. 3. n Eccles. xii. 9, 1 Tim. iii. 2. o Here only N.T., 3 Macc. i. 19, iv. 5. p Acts xxvi. 25, ver. 15.

[1] So ℵ*ADKLP, d, f, m25, 81, r, vg., go., sah., arm.; **διαλογισμῶν** ℵcFgrG, 17, 47, 67**, 80, nineteen others, g, boh., syrr.

[2] Ins. **καὶ** ℵcDFGKL, d, f, g, m81, r (*autem et*), vg., go., sah., boh., syrr., arm.; om **καὶ** ℵ*AP, 17, 71.

[3] Ins. **τὰς** DbcKL. [4] **κοσμίως** ℵcDgr*FG, 17.

from which the writer has digressed in vv. 3-7. **βούλομαι οὖν** is found again in v. 14. In both places, **βούλομαι** has the force of a practical direction issued after deliberation. See also reff. On the contrary, **θέλω δέ** is used only in reference to abstract subjects. See Rom. xvi. 19, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xi. 3, xiv. 5. **προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας**: *that the men should conduct public worship*. Perhaps Bengel is right in understanding 1 Peter iii. 7 in the same sense. See reff. for **προσεύχεσθαι** in this special signification. **τοὺς ἄνδρας**: *the men* of the community as opposed to the women, ver. 9 (R.V.). There is no specific restriction of the conduct of worship to a clergy.

ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ: to be connected with what precedes: the directions are to apply to every Church without exception; no allowance is to be made for conditions peculiar to any locality; as it is expressed in 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 34, **ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων, αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν.** The words do not mean *in any place*, as though fixed places for worship were a matter of indifference; neither is there any allusion, as Chrys. explain it, to the abolition by Christ of the restriction of worship to one place, Jerusalem, as in John iv. 21. **ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας**: This is not directly intended to enjoin a particular gesture appropriate to prayer, but merely avoids the repetition of **προσεύχεσθαι.** To uplift the hands in prayer was customary: 1 Kings viii. 22, Ps. xxviii., 2 etc., Isa. i. 15, Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 29. The men that are to have the conduct of the public worship of the Church must be upright men who have clean hands, hands that are holy (Job. xvii. 9; Ps. xxiii. (xxiv.) 4; Jas. iv. 8). For **ὅσιος** as an adj. of *two* terminations, compare Luke ii. 13, Rev. iv. 3. See Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 80.

χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ: This indicates the two conditions necessary to effectual prayer: *freedom from irritation* towards our fellow-men (Matt. vi. 14, 15, Mark xi. 25), and confidence towards God (Jas. i. 6; Luke xii. 29). **διαλογισμός** has the sense of *doubt* in Rom. xiv. 1. This sense (A.V. *doubting*) is that given to the term here by Chrysostom (**ἀμφιβολία**) and Theodoret (**πιστεύων ὅτι λήψῃ**). The rendering *disputing* (R.V.) *disceptatio* (Vulg.) merely enlarges the notion conveyed in **ὀργή**. The reff. to **ὀργή** are places where it is spoken of as a human affection.

Ver. 9. Having assigned to the men the prominent duties of the Church, St. Paul proceeds to render impossible any misconception of his views on this subject by forbidding women to teach in public. But he begins by emphasising what is their characteristic and proper glory, the beauty of personality which results from active beneficence.

The essential parts of the sentence are **ὡσαύτως γυναῖκας . . . κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς . . . δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.** Both **προσεύχεσθαι** and **κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς** depend on **βούλομαι**, as does **ὡσαύτως**, which introduces another regulation laid down by the apostle. In the Christian Society, it was St. Paul's deliberate wish that the men should conduct public worship, and that the women should adorn the Society and themselves by good works. This verse has no reference to the de meanour of women while in Church. It is inconsistent with the whole context to supply **προσεύχεσθαι** after **γυναῖκας.**

The connexion of **ἐν καταστολῇ—σωφροσύνης** has been disputed. Ellicott takes it as "a kind of adjectival predica tion to be appended to **γυναῖκας**," stating what is the normal condition of women, who are to superadd the adornment of good works. But it is more natural to

[q] κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν [r] πλέγμασιν καὶ [1] [s] χρυσίῳ [2] ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ [t] ἱματισμῷ [u] πολυτελεῖ, 10. ἀλλ'—ὃ [v] πρέπει γυναιξὶν [w] ἐπαγγελλομέναις [x] θεοσέβειαν—δι' [y] ἔργων [y] ἀγαθῶν. 11. Γυνὴ ἐν [z] ἡσυχίᾳ [a] μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ [b] ὑποταγῇ. 12. διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ [3] οὐκ

q Tit. ii. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5.
r Here only, not LXX
s 1 Pet. iii. 3, Rev. xvii. 4.
t Luke vii. 25, ix. 29, John xix. 24, Acts xx. 33.
u Mark xiv. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 4.
v Eph. v. 3, Tit. ii. 1, Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26.
w 1 Tim. vi. 21, Tit. i. 2.
x Here only N.T., *cf.* John ix. 31.
y 1 Tim. v. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 21, iii. 17, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1.
z Acts xxii. 2, 2 Thess. iii. 12.
a 1 Cor. xiv. 35.
b Wisd. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. ix. 13, Gal. ii. 5, 1 Tim. iii. 4.

[1] ἢ DcKL, f, m81, r, vg., go., sah., syrhcl.

[2] So AFGP, 17, 31, 47, 80, a few others; χρυσῷ אDKL.

[3] γυν. δὲ διδάσκ. KL.

connect it directly with **κοσμεῖν**, with which **ἐν πλέγμασιν, κ.τ.λ.** is also connected as well as **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν**; the change of preposition being due to the distinction between the means employed for adornment and the resultant expression of it. The effect of the practice of good works is seen in an *orderly appearance*, etc.

ὡσαύτως is a word of frequent occurrence in the Pastorals. See reff. Except in v. 25, it is used as a connecting link between items in a series of regulations. The use of it in Rom. viii. 26, 1 Cor. xi. 25 is different.

καταστολή, as Ellicott says, "conveys the idea of external appearance as *principally* exhibited in dress". It is "*deportment*, as exhibited externally, whether in look manner or dress". The commentators cite in illustration Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 4, where the **καταστολὴ κ. σχῆμα σώματος** of the Essenes is described in detail. The Latin *habitus* is a good rendering, if we do not restrict that term to dress, as the Vulg. here, *habitu ornato*, seems to do. But *ordinato* (r) hits the meaning better.

κόσμιος is applied to the episcopus in iii. 2. It means *orderly*, as opposed to disorderliness in appearance. **κοσμίως** (see *apparat. crit.*) would be a **ἅπαξ λεγ.** both in Old and New Testament. **μετὰ αἰδοῦς**: *with shamefastness and self-control* or *discreetness*: the inward characteristic, and the external indication or evidence of it.

For **σωφροσύνη**, see Trench, *Synonyms, N.T.* The cognate words **σωφρονίζειν**, Tit. ii. 4; **σωφρονισμός**, 2 Tim. i. 7; **σωφρόνως**, Tit. ii. 12; **σώφρων**, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5, are in N.T. peculiar to the Pastoral Epistles; but **σωφρονεῖν**, Tit. ii. 6, is found also in Mark, Luke, Rom., 2 Cor. and 1 Pet. See Dean Bernard's note here.

ἐν πλέγμασιν, κ.τ.λ.: The parallel in 1 Pet. iii. 3, **ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων, ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος**, is only a parallel. The two passages are quite independent. The vanities of dress—of men and women—is common topic.

Ver. 10. **ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει**: It has been assumed above that **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν** is to be connected with **κοσμεῖν**. In this case **ὃ πρέπει—θεοσέβειαν** is a parenthetical clause in apposition to the sentence. It is, however, possible, though not so natural, to connect **δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν** with **ἐπαγγ. θεοσ.** So Vulg., *promittentes pietatem per bona opera.* Then **ὃ** would mean **καθ' ὃ**, or **ἐν τούτῳ ὃ** (Math.), and the whole clause, **ἀλλ' ὃ—ἀγαθῶν**, would be an awkward periphrasis for, and repetition of, **ἐν καταστολῇ—σωφροσύνης**.

ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι usually means *to promise* as in Tit. i. 2; but here and in vi. 21 *to profess*.

θεοσέβεια: **ἅπ. λεγ.**, but the adj. **θεοσεβής** occurs John ix. 31.

διά is instrumental, as in iv. 5, 2 Tim. i. 6, 10, 14, iii. 15, iv. 17, Tit. iii. 5, 6, not of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Tim. ii. 15, iv. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 2.

ἔργων ἀγαθῶν: see note on chap. iii. 1.

Ver. 11 *sqq.* With these directions compare those in 1 Cor. xiv. 33-35.

ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ: *with complete subjection* [to their husbands]. *Cf.* Tit. ii. 5.

Ver. 12. **διδάσκειν**: This refers of course only to public teaching, or to a wife's teaching her husband. In Tit. ii. 3 St. Paul indicates the natural sphere for woman's teaching. In 1 Cor. women are forbidden **λαλεῖν** in the Church. The choice of terms is appropriate in each case.

αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός: *dominari in virum, to have dominion over* (R.V.). "The adj. **αὐθεντικός** is very well established in the vernacular. See Nägeli, p. 49

ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ [c] αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν [a] ἡσυχίᾳ. 13. Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος [d] ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὕα· 14. καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ [e] ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ [f] ἐξαπατηθεῖσα[1] ἐν [g] παραβάσει γέγονεν. 15.

c Here only, not LXX.
d Gen. ii. 7, Rom. ix. 20.
e Eph. v. 6, Jas. i. 26.
f Rom. vii. 11, xvi. 18, 1 Cor. iii. 18, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 2 Thess. ii. 3.
g Rom. ii. 23, iv. 15, v. 14, Gal. iii. 19, Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15.

[1] ἀπατηθεῖσα ℵcDb? cKL.

. . . the Atticist warns his pupil to use **αὐτοδικεῖν** because **αὐθεντεῖν** was vulgar (**κοινότερον**) . . . **αὐθέντης** is properly one who acts on his own authority, hence in this context an autocrat" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 374).

ἀλλ' εἶναι: dependent on some such verb as **βούλομαι** implied, as opposed to **οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω**.

Ver. 13. It would not be fair to say that St. Paul's judgment about the relative functions of men and women in the church depended on his belief as to the historicity of the Biblical story of the Creation. He certainly uses this account in support of his conclusions; yet supposing the literal truth of the early chapters of Genesis, it would be possible to draw quite other inferences from it. The first specimen produced of a series is not always the most perfect. The point in which Adam's superiority over Eve comes out in the narrative of the Fall is his greater strength of intellect; therefore men are better fitted for the work of public instruction. "The woman taught once, and ruined all" (Chrys.). Eve's reasoning faculty was at once overcome by the allegation of jealousy felt by God, an allegation plausible to a nature swayed by emotion rather than by reflection. The Tempter's statement seemed to be supported by the appearance of the fruit, as it was rendered attractive by hopes of vanity to be gratified. Adam's better judgment was overcome by personal influence (Gen. iii. 17, "Thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife"); he was not deceived. But the intellectual superior who sins against light may be morally inferior to him who stumbles in the dusk.

Ἀδὰμ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη: The elder should rule. A more profound statement of this fact is found in 1 Cor. xi 9, **οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα.**

πλάσσειν is the term used in Gen. ii. 7 and expresses the notion of God as a potter, Rom. ix. 20. (*am* here has *figuratus*.)

Ver. 14. **ἡ δὲ γυνή**: St. Paul says **ἡ γυνή** rather than **Εὕα**, emphasing the sex rather than the individual, because he desires to gives the incident its general application, especially in view of what follows. So Chrys.

ἐξαπατηθεῖσα: It is doubtful if we are entitled to render this, as Ell. does, *being completely deceived*. In 2 Cor. xi. 3 St. Paul says **ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὕαν**, where there is no reason why he should not have used the simple verb. St. Paul uses the compound verb in five other places, the simple verb only once (see reff.). So that the simplest account that we can give of his variation here, and in 2 Cor. xi. 3, from the **ὁ ὄφις ἠπάτησέν με** of Gen. iii. 13, is that the compound verb came naturally to his mind.

ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν: Inasmuch as **παράβασις** is used of Adam's transgression in Rom. v. 14, it may be asked, What is the force of St. Paul's apparent restriction here of the phrase to Eve? Might it not be said of Adam as well, that he **ἐν παραβ. γέγονεν**? To which St. Paul would perhaps have replied that he meant that it was woman who *first* transgressed, in consequence of having been deceived. **ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν πάντες.** Ecclus. xxv. 24. This notion of *coming into a state of sin at a definite point of time* is well expressed by **γέγονεν**. For **γίνεσθαι ἐν** *cf.* **ἡ διακονία . . . ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ** (2 Cor. iii. 7); **ἐν λόγῳ κολακίας ἐγενήθημεν** (1 Thess. ii. 5).

Ver. 15. **σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας**: The penalty for transgression, so far as woman is concerned, was expressed in the words, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children" (Gen. iii. 16). But just as in the case of man, the world being as it is, the sentence has proved a blessing, so it is in the case of woman. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" expresses man's necessity, duty, privilege, dignity. If the necessity of work be "a stumbling-block," man can "make it a stepping-stone" (Browning, *The Ring and the*

σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς [h] τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν [i] μείνωσιν [i] ἐν [k] πίστει [k] καὶ [k] ἀγάπῃ καὶ [l] ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ [m] σωφροσύνης· III. 1. [a] Πιστὸς[1] ὁ [a] λόγος.

h Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 14. i John viii. 31, xv. 9, 10, 2 Tim. iii. 14, 1 John iv. 16, 2 John 9. k See 1 Tim. i. 14. l Rom. vi. 19, 22, 1 Cor. i. 30, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, 2 Thess. ii. 13, Heb. xii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 2. m Ver. 9. a See 1 Tim i. 15.

[1] ἀνθρώπινος D*, *humanus* d, m47, g (*humanus t fidelis*), Ambrst., Sedul. Similarly *humanus* is the rendering in chap. i. 15 in r, Aug., Julianpelag apud Aug. Jerome comments adversely on this rendering (Ep. 24 ad Marcell.).

Book, *The Pope*, 413), Nay, it is the only stepping-stone available to him. If St. Paul's argument had led him to emphasise the man's part in the first transgression, he might have said, "He shall be saved in his toil," his overcoming the obstacles of nature.

So St. Paul, taking the common-sense view that childbearing, rather than public teaching or the direction of affairs, is woman's primary function, duty, privilege and dignity, reminds Timothy and his readers that there was another aspect of the story in Genesis besides that of woman's taking the initiative in transgression: the pains of childbirth were her sentence, yet in undergoing these she finds her salvation. *She shall be saved in her childbearing* (R.V.m. nearly). That is her normal and natural duty; and in the discharge of our normal and natural duties we all, men and women alike, as far as our individual efforts can contribute to it, "work out our own salvation".

This explanation gives an adequate force to σωθήσεται, and preserves the natural and obvious meaning of τεκνογονία, and gives its force to τῆς. διά here has hardly an instrumental force (as Vulg. *per filiorum generationem*); it is rather the διά of accompanying circumstances, as in 1 Cor. iii. 15. σωθήσεται . . . διὰ πυρός. It remains to note three other explanations:—

(1) She shall be "preserved in the great danger of child-birth".

(2) Women shall be saved if they bring up their children well, as if τεκνογονία = τεκνοτροφία. So Chrys.

(3) She shall be saved by means of *the Childbearing* "of Mary, which gave to the world the Author of our Salvation" (Liddon). "The peculiar function of her sex (from its relation to her Saviour) shall be the medium of her salvation" (Ellicott). The R.V., *saved through the childbearing*, is possibly patient of this interpretation. No doubt it was the privilege of woman alone to be the medium of the Incarnation. This miraculous fact justifies us perhaps in pressing the language of Gen. iii. 15, "thy seed," and in finding an allusion (though this is uncertain) in Gal. iv. 4, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός; but woman cannot be said to be saved by means of a historic privilege, even with the added qualification, "if they continue," etc. See Luke xi. 27, 28, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee. . . . Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God," etc.

ἐὰν μείνωσιν: This use of μένειν with ἐν and an abstract noun is chiefly Johannine, as the reff. show.

The subject of μείνωσιν is usually taken to be γυναῖκες; but inasmuch as St. Paul has been speaking of women in the marriage relation, it seems better to understand the plural of the woman and her husband. Compare 1 Cor. vii. 36 where γαμείτωσαν refers to the παρθένος and her betrothed, whose existence is implied in the question of her marriage. If this view be accepted, then πίστις, ἀγάπη, and ἁγιασμός refer respectively to the duties of the man and wife to God, to society, and to each other: faith towards God, love to the community, and sanctification in their marital relations. See chap. iv. 12 where these three virtues are again combined. See ver. 9 for σωφροσύνη.

CHAPTER III.—VER. 1. πιστὸς ὁ λόγος: This refers to the exegesis of Genesis which has preceded. (So Chrys.). We may compare Barnabas, § 9, where, after an allegorical explanation of Abraham's 318 servants, the writer exclaims, οὐδεὶς γνησιώτερον ἔμαθεν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λόγον· ἀλλὰ οἶδα ὅτι ἄξιοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς. See note on i. 15.

Vv. 1 *b*-13. The qualifications of the men who are to be ministers; and first (*a*) of the episcopus (1 *b* 7) secondly (*b*) of the deacons (8-13) with a parenthetical instruction respecting women church-workers (11).

Εἴ τις [b]ἐπισκοπῆς [c]ὀρέγεται, [d]καλοῦ [d]ἔργου [e]ἐπιθυμεῖ. 2. [f]δεῖ [f]οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον [g]ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, [h]μιᾶς [h]γυναικὸς [h]ἄνδρα, [i]νηφά-

b Here only in this sense, *cf.* Acts i. 20.
c 1 Tim. vi. 10, Heb. xi. 16.
d 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18, Tit. ii. 7, 14, iii. 8, 14.
e Here only in Pastorals.
f Acts i. 21.
g 1 Tim. v. 7, vi. 14, not LXX.
h Ver. 12, Tit. i. 6.
i 1 Tim. iii. 11, Tit. ii. 2, not LXX.

εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς, κ.τ.λ.: Having given elementary directions concerning the scope of public prayer, and the ministers thereof, St. Paul now takes up the matter of Church organisation. He begins with the office of the episcopus, or presbyter, because that is of the very essence of Church order. On the question as to the terms presbyter and episcopus, it is sufficient here to state my own conclusion, that they represent slightly different aspects of the same office, pastoral and official; aspects which came naturally into prominence in the Jewish and Greek societies respectively which gave birth to the names. This seems the obvious conclusion from a comparison of Acts xx. 17, 28; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 5, 7; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 4, 5, v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2; Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 44; Polycarp, 5; Clem. Al. *Quis Dives*, §42.

ὀρέγεται . . . ἐπιθυμεῖ: The R.V. (*seeketh . . . desireth*) indicates to the English reader that two distinct Greek words are used; a fact which is concealed in the A.V. (*desire . . . desireth*). So Vulg. has *desiderat* in both places; but m[47], *cupit . . . desiderat.* **ὀρέγεσθαι**, which occurs again in vi. 10 of *reaching after* money, is not used in any depreciatory sense. Field (in loc.) notes that "it has a special application to such objects as a man is commonly said to *aspire to*". The sanity of St. Paul's judgment is nowhere better seen than in his commendation of lawful ambition. A man may be actuated by a variety of motives; yet it is not inevitable that those that are lower should impair the quality of the higher; they need not interpenetrate each other. In any case, St. Paul credits the aspirant with the noblest ideal: *He who aspires to be an episcopus desires to perform a good work*, "*Est opus; negotium, non otium.* Acts xv. 38, Phil. ii. 30" (Bengel).

καλοῦ ἔργου: **καλὸν ἔργον** and **καλὰ ἔργα** (see reff.) are not peculiar to the Pastorals (Matt. v. 16, xxvi. 10 = Mark xiv. 6; John x. 32, 33); but, as the references show, the phrase is found in them only of the Pauline Epistles. On the other hand, **ἔργα ἀγαθά** occurs six times in the Pastorals. See reff. on chap. ii. 10. We perceive in the use of it a qualification of the earlier depreciation of the works of the Law, induced by a natural reaction from the abuse of that teaching.

Ver. 2. With the qualifications of the episcopus as given here should be compared those of the deacons, ver. 8 *sqq.*, and those of the episcopus in Tit. i. 6 *sqq.*

δεῖ οὖν . . . ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι. The **ἐπισκοπή** being essentially a good work, "*bonum negotium bonis committendum*" (Bengel). The episcopus is the *persona* of the Church. It is not enough for him to be not criminal; he must be *one against whom it is impossible to bring any charge of wrong doing such as could stand impartial examination.* (See Theodoret, cited by Alf.). He must be *without reproach* (R.V.), *irreprehensible* (Trench), a term which involves a less exacting test than *blameless* (A.V.); the deacon (and the Cretan episcopus) must be **ἀνέγκλητος**, *one against whom no charge has, in point of fact, been brought.*

No argument can be based on the singular **τὸν ἐπίσκοπον**, here or in Tit. i. 7, in favour either of the monarchical episcopate or as indications of the late date of the epistle; it is used generically as **ἡ χήρα**, ch. v. 5; **δοῦλον Κυρίου**, 2 Tim. ii. 24.

The better to ensure that the episcopus be *without reproach*, his lead ng characteristic must be self-control. In the first place—and this has special force in the East—he must be a man who has—natural or acquired—a high conception of the relations of the sexes: a married man, who, if his wife dies, does not marry again. Men whose position is less open to criticism may do this without discredit, but the episcopus must hold up a high ideal. Second marriage, which is mentioned as a familiar practice (Rom. vii. 2, 3), is expressly permitted to Christian women in 1 Cor. vii. 39, and even recommended to, or rather enjoined upon, young widows in 1 Tim. v. 14.

μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, of course, does not mean that the episcopus must be, or have been, married. What is here forbidden is digamy under any circumstances. This view is supported (*a*) by the general drift of the qualities required here in a bishop; self-control or temperance, in his use of food and drink, pos-

λιον, [k]σώφρονα, [l]κόσμιον, [m]φιλόξενον, [n]διδακτικόν, 3. μὴ [o]πάροινον, μὴ [o]πλήκτην,[1] ἀλλὰ [p]ἐπιεικῆ, [q]ἄμαχον, [r]ἀφιλάργυρον, 4. τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου [s]καλῶς [t]προϊστάμενον, τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν [u]ὑποταγῇ μετὰ πάσης

k Tit. i. 8, ii. 2, 5. l See 1 Tim. ii. 9. m Tit. i. 8, 1 Pet. iv. 9, not LXX, *cf.* Rom. xii. 13, Heb. xiii. 2. n 2 Tim. ii. 24, not LXX. o Tit. i. 7, not LXX. p Phil. iv. 5, Tit. iii, 2, Jas. iii. 17, 1 Pet. ii. 18. q Tit. iii. 2, not LXX. r Heb. xiii. 5, not LXX. s Ver. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17. t Rom. xii. 8, 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 12, v. 17, *cf.* Tit. iii. 8, 14. u See 1 Tim. ii. 11.

[1] Ins. μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ 37, very many others.

sessions, gifts, temper; (*b*) by the corresponding requirement in a church widow, v. 9, **ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή**, and (*c*) by the practice of the early church (Apostolic Constitutions, vi. 17; Apostolic Canons, 16 (17); Tertullian, *ad Uxorem*, i. 7: *de Monogam.* 12; *de Exhort. Castitatis*, cc. 7, 13; Athenagoras, *Legat.* 33; Origen, *in Lucam*, xvii. p. 953, and the Canons of the councils, *e.g.*, Neocaesarea (A.D. 314) can. 7. Quinisext. can. 3).

On the other hand, it must be conceded that the patristic commentators on the passage (with the partial exception of Chrysostom)—Theodore Mops. Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome—suppose that it is bigamy or polygamy that is here forbidden. But commentators are prone to go too far in the emancipation of their judgments from the prejudices or convictions of their contemporaries. In some matters "the common sense of most" is a safer guide than the irresponsible conjectures of a conscientious student.

νηφάλιον: *temperate* (R.V.). A.V. has *vigilant* here, following Chrys.; *sober* in ver. 11, and Tit. ii. 2, with *vigilant* in margin. As this quality is required also in women officials, ver. 11, and in aged men, Tit. ii. 2, it has in all probability a reference to moderate use of wine, etc., and so would be equivalent to the **μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας** of the diaconal qualifications, ver. 8. **ἐγκρατῆ** is the corresponding term in Tit. i. 8. The adj. only occurs in these three places; but the verb **νήφειν** six times; in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, and in 1 Peter iv. 7, it is used of the moderate use of strong drink.

σώφρονα: *soberminded* (R.V.), *serious, earnest.* See note on ii. 9. Vulg., *prudentem* here and in Tit. ii. 2, 5; but *sobrium* in Tit. i. 8. Perhaps **σεμνός** (ver. 8) is the quality in deacons that corresponds to **σώφρων** and **κόσμιος** in the episcopus.

κόσμιον: *orderly* (R.V.), perhaps *dignified* in the best sense of the term. *ordinatum* (m[47]). "Quod **σώφρων** est intus, id **κόσμιος** est extra" (Bengel). The word is not found in *Titus*.

φιλόξενον: This virtue is required in the episcopus also in Tit. i. 8, but not of the deacons, below; of Christians generally, 1 Peter iv. 9, 1 Tim. v. 10 (*q.v.*), Rom. xii. 13, Heb. vi. 10, xiii. 2, 3 John 5. See Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 27 ("Bishops, hospitable persons (**φιλόξενοι**), who gladly received into their houses at all times the servants of God without hypocrisy"). This duty, in episcopi, "was closely connected with the maintenance of external relations," which was their special function. See Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 368.

διδακτικόν, as a moral quality would involve not merely the ability, but also the willingness, to teach, such as ought to characterise a servant of the Lord, 2 Tim. ii. 24. The notion is expanded in Tit. i. 9. The deacon's relation to theology is passive, ver. 9.

Ver. 3. **μὴ πάροινον** (*no brawler*, R.V., *quarrelsome over wine*, R.V.m.), and **μὴ πλήκτην** are similarly coupled together in Tit. i. 7. **παροινία** means *violent temper*, not specially excited by over-indulgence in strong drink. In the time of Chrysostom and Theodoret manners had so far softened that it was felt necessary to explain the term **πλήκτης** figuratively, of "some who unseasonably smite the consciences of their brethren". But see 2 Cor. xi. 20.

ἀλλ' ἐπιεικῆ, ἄμαχον: *gentle, not contentious.* This pair, again, of cognate adjectives is repeated in the general directions as to Christian conduct, Tit. iii. 2. Compare 2 Tim. ii. 24 (of the servant of the Lord). The corresponding episcopal virtues in *Titus* (i. 7) are **μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον.**

ἀφιλάργυρον: In *Titus* the corresponding episcopal virtue is **μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ.** See note on ver. 8 and Tit. i. 7.

Ver. 4. **τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου**: Although **ἴδιος** commonly retains in the N.T. the emphatic sense *own*, yet there can be no doubt that examples occur of the later weakened sense in which it means simply **αὐτοῦ**, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. vii. 2. We are not therefore justified in insisting on the emphatic sense, *own*, here or in ver. 12,

v σεμνότητος,—5. εἰ δέ τις τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου [t] προστῆναι οὐκ οἶδεν, πῶς [w] ἐκκλησίας [w] Θεοῦ [x] ἐπιμελήσεται;—6. μὴ [y] νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ [z] τυφω-

v See 1 Tim. ii. 2. w Ver. 15, see note here.

x Luke x. 34, 35. y Here only, N.T. z 1 Tim. vi. 4, 2 Tim. iii. 4, not LXX.

vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, 9. See J. H. Moulton *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 87 *sqq*., and *Expositor*, vi., iii. 277, and Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 123 *sq*. **οἶκος** also means *household*, 1 Cor. i. 16 and in the Pastorals.

προϊστάμενον: **προΐστασθαι** is perhaps used, here and in ver. 12, because it would naturally suggest church government. See reff., and Hermas, *Vis*. ii. 4; Justin Martyr, *Apol*. i. 65. A different use is found in Tit. iii. 8, 14, **καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι**, where see note. The domestic qualification, as we may call it, of the episcopus, also applies to deacons (ver. 12) and to the Cretan episcopus (Tit. i. 6).

τέκνα ἔχοντα: Alford cannot be right in supposing that **τέκνα** is emphatic. It would be absurd to suppose that a man otherwise suited to the office of an episcopus would be disqualified because of childlessness. The clause is parallel to **μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα**: if the episcopus be a married man, he must not be a digamist; if he have children, they must be **ἐν ὑποταγῇ**.

ἐν ὑποταγῇ—σεμνότητος: *with the strictest regard to propriety*, see note on chap. ii. 2. Most commentators join these words closely together. The **σεμνότης** of the children in their extra-family relations being the outward and visible expression of the **ὑποταγή** to which they are subject in domestic life. This is a more natural reference of **σεμνότ.** than to the general household arrangements, "*ut absit luxuria*" (Bengel). On the other hand, there is much force in Dean Bernard's remark that "**σεμνότης** is hardly a grace of childhood." He connects **ἔχοντα μετὰ πασ. σεμν.** This seems to be supported by ver. 8, **διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνούς** and ver. 11. Von Soden takes a similar view.

Ver. 5. The argument is akin to that stated by our Lord, Luke xvi. 10. "He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much, etc." It is all the more cogent inasmuch as the Church is the house of God. The point is resumed in ver. 15. Alf. quotes a sentence from Plato in which both **προστῆναι** and **ἐπιμελεῖσθαι** are used of the government of a family; nevertheless it is not fanciful to suppose that we have here a deliberate interchange of terms, **προστῆναι** being, as we have seen above, almost a technical term to express Church government; while **ἐπιμελ.** expresses the personal care and attention of a father for his family. See the use of the verb in Luke x. 34, 35, and of **ἐπιμέλεια** in Acts xxvii. 3.

ἐκκλησία θεοῦ is also found in ver. 15. **ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ** occurs nine times in Paul (1 Thess.; 2 Thess.; 1 Cor.; 2 Cor.; Gal.). The omission of the article before **θεοῦ** is characteristic of the Pastorals. The phrase is found also in St. Paul's apostolic charge to the episcopi of Ephesus in Acts xx. 28.

Ver. 6. Verses 6 and 7 have nothing corresponding to them in *Titus*, or in the qualifications for the diaconate in this chapter.

μὴ νεόφυτον κ.τ.λ.: *not a recent convert*. **νεόφυτος** in O.T. is used literally of a young plant (Job xiv. 9; Ps. cxxvii. (cxxviii.) 3; cxliii. (cxliv.) 12; Isa. v. 7). For its use in secular literature, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 220.

The significance of this qualification is apparent from its absence in the parallel passage in *Titus*. It is evident that Church organisation in Crete was in a very much less advanced state than in Ephesus. On the first introduction of the Gospel into a country, the apostles naturally "appointed their first fruits to be bishops and deacons" (Clem. Rom. i. § 42; Acts xiv. 23), because no others were available; and men appointed in such circumstances would have no temptation to be puffed up any more than would the leaders of a forlorn hope. But as soon as there came to be a Christian community of such a size as to supply a considerable number of men from whom leaders could be selected, and in which office might be a natural object of ambition, the moral risk to **νεόφυτοι** of early advancement would be a real danger. It is difficult to avoid at least a passing attack of **τύφωσις**, if you are promoted when young.

τυφωθείς: **τυφόω** comes from **τῦφος**, the primary meaning of which is *smoke* or *vapour*, then *conceit* or *vanity* which befogs a man's judgment in matters in which he himself is concerned. The R.V. always renders it *puffed up*. Vulg. here, *in superbiam elatus*.

θεὶς εἰς κρίμα [a] ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ [b] διαβόλου. 7. δεῖ δὲ [1] καὶ [c] μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ [d] τῶν [d] ἔξωθεν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς [e] ὀνειδισμὸν [a] ἐμπέσῃ καὶ [f] [g] παγίδα [g] τοῦ [b] [g] διαβόλου. 8. Διακόνους [h] ὡσαύτως [i] σεμνούς,[2]

a 1 Tim. vi 9, Heb. x. 31. b Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11, 1 Tim. iii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 26. c Tit. i. 13 only, in Paul. d Mark iv. 11, 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, Col. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 12. e Rom. xv. 3 (Ps. lxix 10), Heb. x. 33, xi. 26, xiii. 13. f Rom. xi. 9 (Ps. lxix. 23), 1 Tim. vi. 9. g 2 Tim. ii. 26. h See 1 Tim. ii. 9. i Phil. iv. 8, 1 Tim. iii. 11, Tit. ii. 2.

[1] Ins. αὐτὸν DKLP, d, f, m47, vg. [2] Om. σεμνούς ℵ*, three cursives.

κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου: **κρίμα** is best taken in the sig. *condemnation*, as in Rom. iii. 8, Rev. xvii. 1, and **τοῦ διαβόλου** as objective genitive: "*Lest he be involved in the condemnation which the devil incurred*," or, *the judgment pronounced on the devil*, whose sin was, and is, pride. See Ecclus. x. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 4. So most commentators, especially the ancients. On the other hand, **τοῦ διαβόλου** in ver. 7 is the subjective genitive, *a snare laid by the devil;* and it is possible to render **κρίμα τ. διαβ.** *the accusation brought by the devil*, or *a judgment effected by the devil*, who may succeed in this case, though he failed in that of Job. This is however not a natural translation; and it is to be observed that **ἐμπίπτειν** in reff. expresses a final doom, not a trial, such as that of temptation or probation. Dean Bernard takes **τοῦ διαβόλου** as subjective genitive in both verses; and in the sense of *slanderer: the judgment passed by the slanderer; the snare prepared by the slanderer.*

τοῦ διαβόλου: St. Paul uses this name for the Evil Spirit three times in the Pastorals and twice in Eph. (see reff.); **ὁ πονηρός** in Eph. vi. 16; **ὁ Σατανᾶς** elsewhere eight times. **διάβολος**, without the article, means *slanderer* in ver. 11 and reff. there.

Ver. 7. **τῶν ἔξωθεν**: **οἱ ἔξω** in Mark iv. 11 (**ἔξωθεν**, W.H. m.) means those who came into contact—more or less close—with Jesus, but who were not His disciples. In the Pauline use (see reff.) it means the non-Christian Society in which the Church lives. St. Paul's attitude towards *them that are without* is one of the many proofs of his sanity of judgment. On the one hand, they are emphatically outside the Church; they have no *locus standi* in it, no right to interfere. On the other hand, they have the law of God written in their hearts; and, up to a certain point, their moral instincts are sound and their moral judgments worthy of respect. In the passage before us, indeed, St. Paul may be understood to imply that the opinion of "those without" might usefully balance or correct that of the Church. There is something blameworthy in a man's character if the consensus of outside opinion be unfavourable to him; no matter how much he may be admired and respected by his own party. The *vox populi*, then, is in some sort a *vox Dei:* and one cannot safely assume, when we are in antagonism to it, that, because we are Christians, we are absolutely in the right and the world wholly in the wrong. Thus to defy public opinion in a superior spirit may not only bring *discredit*, **ὀνειδισμός**, on oneself and on the Church, but also catch us in the devil's snare, *viz.*, a supposition that because the world condemns a certain course of action, the action is therefore right and the world's verdict may be safely set aside.

We cannot infer with Alford and von Soden, from the absence of another preposition before **παγίδα**, that **ὀνειδισμόν** also depends on **τοῦ διαβόλου**. It would not be easy to explain satisfactorily **ὀνειδ. τ. διαβόλου**.

Ver. 8. **διακόνους ὡσαύτως**: *s.c.* **δεῖ εἶναι.**

For **ὡσαύτως**, see on ii. 9.

σεμνούς: *grave*. "The word we want is one in which the sense of gravity and dignity, and of these as inviting reverence, is combined" (Trench). See note on ver. 2. The term is used in reference to women workers and old men.

μὴ διλόγους: Persons who are in an intermediate position, having in the same department chiefs and subordinates, are exposed to a temptation to speak of the same matter in different tones and manner, according as their interlocutor is above or below them. So Theodoret, **ἕτερα μὲν τούτῳ ἕτερα δὲ ἐκείνῳ λέγοντες**. Polycarp (§ 5) has the same phrase of deacons. Lightfoot there suggests the rendering *tale-bearers*. Perhaps *insincere*. *Cf.* **δίγλωσσος**, Prov. xi. 13, etc.

μὴ [k] διλόγους, μὴ [l] οἴνῳ [l] πολλῷ [m] προσέχοντας, μὴ [n] αἰσχροκερδεῖς, 9. ἔχοντας τὸ [o] μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν [p] καθαρᾷ [p] συνειδήσει. 10. καὶ οὗτοι δὲ [q] δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἶτα [r] διακονείτωσαν, [s] ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες. 11. γυναῖκας [h] ὡσαύτως [i] σεμνάς, μὴ [t] διαβόλους,

k Here only, not LXX.
l Tit. ii. 3, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 23.
m See 1 Tim. i. 4.
n Tit. i. 7, not LXX, *cf.* Tit. i. 11, 1 Pet. v. 2.
o Ver. 16, 1 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 1, Eph. vi. 19, Col. i. 26, 27, ii. 2, iv. 3.
p 2 Tim. i. 3.
q 1 Cor. xi. 28, xvi. 3, 2 Cor. viii. 22, xiii. 5, 1 Thess. ii. 4.
r Acts xix. 22, ver. 13, 1 Pet. iv. 11, not LXX.
s 3 Macc. v. 31, 1 Cor. i. 8, Col. i. 22, Tit. i. 6, 7.
t 2 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. ii. 3.

μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας: Less ambiguously expressed than **νηφάλιος** in the case of the episcopus. A similar direction is given about women, Tit. ii. 3, **μὴ οἴν. πολ. δεδουλωμένας.**

μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς: This negative qualification is demanded of the episcopus in Tit. i. 7. See reff. The rendering *not greedy of filthy lucre* is unnecessarily strong; the **αἰσχρότης** consists, not in the source whence the gain comes, but in the setting of gain before one as an object in entering the ministry. *Not greedy of gain* expresses the writer's meaning. The **κέρδος** becomes **αἰσχρόν** when a man makes the acquisition of it, rather than the glory of God, his prime object. On the other hand, the special work of deacons was Church finance; and no doubt they had to support themselves by engaging in some secular occupation. They would thus be exposed to temptations to misappropriate Church funds, or to adopt questionable means of livelihood. If such circumstances were contemplated, *not greedy of filthy lucre* might be an allowable rendering. In Crete, the episcopus would seem to have also performed the duties of the deacon; consequently he is required to be **μὴ αἰσχροκερδής.**

ἔχοντας: See note on chap. i. 19.

Ver. 9. **τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως**: *the faith as revealed*, is the same as **τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον**, ver. 16. In the earlier epistles of St. Paul **τὸ μυστήριον** is *a revealed secret*, in particular, the purpose of God that Jew and Gentile should unite in one Church. The notion of *a secret* is still prominent, because the revelation of it was recent; but just as *revelation* passes from a phase of usage in which the wonderful fact and manner of the disclosure is prominent to a stage in which the content or substance of what has been revealed is alone thought of, so it was with **μυστήριον**; in the Pastorals it means *the revelation given in Christ*, *the Christian creed* in fact. See Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 234 *sqq.*, and Lightfoot on Col. i. 26. It was not the function of a deacon to teach or preach; it was sufficient if he were a firm believer. **ἐν. καθ. συνειδ.** is connected with **ἔχοντας.** Hort (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 201) approves of the expl. given by Weiss of **τὸ μυστ. τ. πίστ.**, "the secret constituted by their own inner faith". This seems unnatural.

Ver. 10. **δοκιμαζέσθωσαν**: Chrys. notes that this corresponds to the provision **μὴ νεόφυτον** in the case of the episcopus. This testing of fitness for the office of deacon may have been effected either by (*a*) a period of probationary training,—if the injunction in v. 22, "Lay hands hastily on no man," has reference to ordination, it is another way of saying **δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον**,—or by (*b*) the candidates producing what we should call testimonials of character. Such testimonials would attest that a man was **ἀνέγκλητος**, *i.e.*, that no specific charge of wrong-doing had been laid against him (*unblamed* is Hort's rendering). Until a man has proved his suitability for a post by administering it, this is the most that can be demanded. Each step subjects a man's character to a fresh strain. If he comes out of the trial unscathed, he is entitled to be called **ἀνεπίλημπτος.** It is significant that in Tit. i. 6, 7, where the ordination of presbyters, or episcopi, with no antecedent diaconate is contemplated, this elementary and superficial test, that they should be **ἀνέγκλητοι**, is mentioned. See note on ver. 2. In a normal condition of the Church, episcopi are chosen from those whose fitness is matter of common knowledge.

διακονείτωσαν: For instances of this absolute technical sense of the word see reff.

Ver. 11. **γυναῖκας**: Sc. **δεῖ εἶναι**, not governed by **ἔχοντας** (ver. 9). These are *the deaconesses*, *ministrae* (Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97) of whom Phoebe (Rom. xvi. 1) is an undoubted example. They performed for the women of the early Church the same sort of ministrations that the deacons did for the men. In confirmation of this

[u] νηφαλίους, πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν. 12. διάκονοι ἔστωσαν [v] μιᾶς [v] γυναικὸς [v] ἄνδρες, τέκνων [w] καλῶς [w] προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων· 13. οἱ γὰρ καλῶς [x] διακονήσαντες [y] βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν [z] περιποιοῦνται

u See ver. 2.
v Ver. 2, Tit. i. 6.
w See ver. 4.
x See ver. 10.
y Here only, N.T.
z Luke xvii. 33, Acts xx. 28, 1 Macc. vi. 44, etc.

view it should be noted that **ὡσαύτως** is used in introducing a second or third member of a series. See on ii. 9. The series here is of Church officials. Again, the four qualifications which follow correspond, with appropriate variations, to the first four required in deacons, as regards demeanour, government of the tongue, use of wine, and trustworthiness. And further, this is a section dealing wholly with Church officials. These considerations exclude the view that *women in general*, as R.V. apparently, are spoken of. If *the wives of the deacons* or of the clergy were meant, as A.V., it would be natural to have it unambiguously expressed, *e.g.*, by the addition of **αὐτῶν**.

διαβόλους: *slanderers*. While men are more prone than women to be **δίλογοι**, double-tongued, women are more prone than men to be slanderers. See Tit. ii. 3. The term is predicated in 2 Tim. iii. 3, not of *men*, but as characterising the human race, **ἄνθρωποι**, in the last days.

νηφαλίους: see note on ver. 2.

πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσιν: It may be that, as Ell. suggests, this has a reference to the function of deaconesses as almoners, a possible inference from *Constt. Apost.* iii. 16. But more probably it is a comprehensive summary with a general reference, like **πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν**, Tit. ii. 10.

Ver. 12. As the episcopi were naturally drawn from the ranks of the deacons, the diaconate was a probation time, in the course of which the personal moral qualifications for the **ἐπισκοπή** might be acquired. See notes on vv. 2 and 4.

Ver. 13. From what has been noted above on St. Paul's teaching in relation to men's lawful aspirations, it will appear that it is not necessary to explain away the obvious meaning of this clause in accordance with a false spirituality which affects to depreciate the inducements of earthly rewards. The parable of the talents (Matt. xxv. 21), implies Christ's approval of reasonable ambition. Nor is this to be answered by a statement that "the recompense of reward" to which we are permitted to look is heavenly and spiritual. For the Christian, there can be no gulf fixed between the earthly and the heavenly; at least in the category of things which are open to him, as a Christian, to desire. The drawing of such distinctions is akin to the Manichaean disparagement of matter.

The **βαθμὸν καλόν** which the man may acquire who has served well as a deacon is *advancement* to the presbyterate or episcopate. So Chrys. The R.V., *gain to themselves a good standing*, does not necessarily imply an advance in rank, but an assured position in the esteem of their fellow-Christians. We know that among the many who possess the same rank, whether in church or state, some from their character and abilities gain a standing that others do not.

Some modern commentators follow Theodoret in giving a purely spiritual force to **βαθμόν**, *i.e.*, **ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι βίῳ**, "a good standing place, *viz.*, at the Great Day" (Alf.); "the step or degree which a faithful discharge of the **διακονία** would gain in the eyes of God" (Ell.). Alf. lays emphasis on the aor. part. as viewing the **διακονία** from the standpoint of the Day of Judgment; but it is equally suitable if the standpoint be that of the day on which they receive their advancement. There is more force in his emphasis on the present, **περιποιοῦνται**, *they are acquiring*. This interpretation does not seem to be in harmony with the context. The qualifications that are noted in ver. 12 have relation to the effectual administration of the Church on earth. It would be harsh to affirm that one who was a digamist and who could not keep his household in order would suffer for it in the Day of Judgment, however unsuitable he might be for office in the church.

πολλὴν παρρησίαν: a Pauline phrase. See reff. In these passages **παρρ.** means *confidence*, without reference to *speech*.

Although Ell. renders the clause "great boldness in the faith that is in Christ Jesus," he explains the boldness as resting on faith in Christ Jesus, and as descriptive of the believer's attitude in regard to, and at, the Day of Judgment. See 1 John iv. 17. If we reject his explanation of **βαθμόν**, it would be natural to interpret **παρρ., κ.τ.λ.**, of a

καὶ [a] πολλὴν [a] παρρησίαν ἐν [b] πίστει [b] τῇ [b] ἐν [b] Χριστῷ [b] Ἰησοῦ. 14. Ταῦτά σοι γράφω, ἐλπίζων ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ[1] [c] ἐν [c] τάχει,[2] 15. ἐὰν δὲ [d] βραδύνω, ἵνα εἰδῇς πῶς δεῖ[3] ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ [e] ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν [f] ἐκκλησία [f] Θεοῦ ζῶντος, στύλος καὶ [g] ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.

a 2 Cor. iii. 12, vii. 4, Philem. 8.
b 2 Tim. iii. 15, cf. 2 Tim. i. 13.
c Rom. xvi. 20, Luke xviii. 8, Acts xii. 7, xxii. 18, xxv. 4, Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6.
d 2 Pet. iii. 9 only, N.T.
e 2 Cor. i. 12, Eph. ii. 3, Heb. x. 33, xiii. 18, 1 Pet. i. 17, 2 Pet. ii. 18.
f See ver. 5.
g Here only, not LXX, cf. 1 Cor. vii. 37, xv. 58, Col. i. 23.

[1] Om. πρὸς σὲ F^grG^gr, 67**, two others, arm; f, g ins. after *cito*.
[2] ἐν τάχει ACD*P, 17, two others; τάχιον ℵD^cFGKL.
[3] Ins. σε D*, d, f, vg., arm.

confident public expression of the faith, such as would belong to an experienced Christian who had gained a good standing, and had, in consequence, no temptation to be δίλογος. Von Soden connects ἐν πίστει with περιποιοῦνται, *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 13.

Vv. 14-16. These general directions will serve you as a guide in the administration of the Church until you see me. Your charge is one of transcendent importance. The Church is no human institution: it is the household of God, and also the means whereby the power of the Incarnation is available for man's use.

Ver. 14. This verse makes it clear that Timothy's position was a temporary one; he was acting as St. Paul's representative at Ephesus to "put them in remembrance of his ways which be in Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 17).

ταῦτα has a primary reference to the preceding directions regarding public prayers and Church officers; but it naturally includes the following supplementary remarks. For this use of **γράφω**, in place of the epistolary aorist, see especially 2 Cor. xiii. 10, also 1 Cor. xiv. 37, 2 Cor. i. 13, Gal. i. 20.

ἐλπίζων . . . βραδύνω is parenthetical; and expresses at once an excuse for the brevity and incompleteness, from one point of view, of the directions, and also an expectation that they are sufficient to serve their temporary purpose.

ἐν τάχει: **τάχιον**, which is read by Tisch., is, according to Blass (*Grammar*, pp. 33, 141, 142), an instance of the intensive or elative use of the comparative: *cf.* **βέλτιον** 2 Tim. i. 18. This view is rejected by Winer-Moulton (*Grammar*, p. 304) and Ellicott; but their explanations are far-fetched: "More quickly, sooner, than thou wilt need these instructions," "sooner than I anticipate". See also J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. pp. 78, 79, 236.

Ver. 15. **ἵνα εἰδῇς . . . ἀναστρέφεσθαι**: It is a matter of indifference whether we render *how men ought to behave themselves* (R.V.), or *how thou oughtest to behave thyself* (A.V.; R.V. m.). It was Timothy's duty to carry out the apostle's directions, directions relating to the life, **ἀναστροφή**, of the Church. His **ἀναστροφή** would necessarily react on that of the Church. See the Western interpolation in *apparat. crit.*

οἴκῳ θεοῦ: *the household*, perhaps, rather than *the house, of God*. In view of the prevailing paucity of articles in these Epistles, one cannot lay stress on the absence of **τῷ** before **οἴκῳ**, so as to render, *a house of God such as is the Church, etc.* **οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ** is always found elsewhere. The Church is God's **οἶκος**, Heb. iii. 6; God's **κατοικητήριον**, Eph. ii. 22; a **ναὸς ἅγιος**, Eph. ii. 21; **ναὸς θεοῦ**, 1 Cor. iii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 16; a **μεγάλη οἰκία**, of which God is the **δεσπότης**, 2 Tim. ii. 20; an **οἶκος πνευματικός**, 1 Pet. ii. 5.

The body of the Church, **τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν**, is a **ναὸς ἁγίου πνεύματος** (1 Cor. vi. 19); and the human body of Jesus was a **ναός** (John ii. 21); but it is not in accordance with Scriptural language so to describe the body of any individual Christian.

οἴκῳ . . . ἥτις: "The noun which forms the predicate in a relative sentence, annexed for the purpose of explanation (**ὅς . . . ἐστίν**), sometimes gives its own gender and number to the relative, by a kind of attraction" (Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 206).

θεοῦ ζῶντος: A constant phrase, occurring again iv. 10.

στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα κ.τ.λ.: The view of Gregory Nyssen and Greg. Naz. that **στύλος** here refers to Timothy does not need refutation, although an early reference to this passage in the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (Eus.

16. καὶ [h] ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς [i] εὐσεβείας [k] μυστήριον· ὃς [1] [l] ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, [m] ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, [n] ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις,

h Here only, N.T., 4 Macc. (3).
i See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
k See note.
l John i. 31. Heb. ix. 26, 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 John i. 2, iii. 5, 8.
m Ps. l. (li.) 6, Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35, Luke vii. 29.
n Luke xxiv. 34, Acts ix. 17, xiii. 31, xxvi. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, 7, 8, Heb. ix. 28.

[1] So ℵ*cA*C*FgrGgr, 17, 73, 181, sah., boh., syrhcl-mg, go., Or.int, Epiph., Theod. Mops., Cyr. Al. Liberatus Diaconus (circ. 560 A.D.), *Breviarium causae Nest. et Eutych.*, 19, says, "Hoc tempore Macedonius Constantinopolitanus episcopus, ab imperatore Anastasio dicitur expulsus, tanquam evangelia falsasset, & maxime illud apostoli dictum: *qui apparuit in carne, justificatus est in spiritu*. Hunc enim immutasse, ubi habet ὅς, id est, *qui*, monosyllabum graecum, littera mutata Ο in Θ vertisse, & fecisse, ΘϹ, id est *deus*, ut esset *Deus apparuit per carnem*"; a relative is found in syrpesh, syrhcl-txt, arm., all Latin Fathers; ὃ D*, *quod*, d, f, g, vg.; θεὸς ℵc(xii?)CcDcKLP, Chrys., Thdrt., Euthalius, Damasc., Thphl., Oec., Didymus, Greg. Nyss.

H. E. v. 1) applies στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα to the martyr Attalus. στύλος has of course a personal reference in Gal. ii. 9; *cf.* also Rev. iii. 12; but it is childish to suppose that metaphors have a constant value in the Bible. Holtzmann's suggestion that στύλος is in apposition to θεοῦ is rightly rejected by von Soden.

The clause is, of course, in apposition to ἐκκλησία which is by a kindred metaphor called in 2 Tim. ii. 19 ὁ στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ. This latter passage suggests that we should here render ἑδραίωμα *ground* or *basis* rather than *stay* (R.V. m.). ἑδραῖος is rendered *steadfast* elsewhere. See reff. and especially Col. i. 23 (τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι), *ctr.* Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 174.

The truth, ἡ ἀλήθεια, has, as has been already stated, a technical Christian connotation in the Pastorals, and has not a wider reference than the Christian revelation, which is *the truth* in so far as it has been revealed. The Church, of the old covenant or of the new, is the divinely constituted human Society by which the support and maintenance in the world of revealed truth is conditioned. Truth if revealed to isolated individuals, no matter how numerous, would be dissipated in the world. But the Divine Society, in which it is given an objective existence, at once compels the world to take knowledge of it, and assures those who receive the revelation that it is independent of, and external to, themselves, and not a mere fancy of their own.

Bengel puts a full stop at ζῶντος and removes it after ἀληθείας, making τὸ . . . μυστήριον the subject of the sentence, and στύλος . . . μέγα the predicate, The mystery, etc., is the pillar, etc., and confessedly great," μέγα being used as in 1 Cor. ix. 11, 2 Cor. xi. 15, the whole expression being equivalent to πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος. He quotes from Rabbi Levi Barcelonita and Maimonides parallel expressions concerning precepts of the Law, "*fundamentum magnum et columna valida legis*," and a striking phrase from Irenæus, *Haer.* iii. 11, 8, *Columna autem et firmamentum ecclesiae est evangelium*, στύλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Ver. 16. The connexion of thought lies in a feeling that the lofty terms in which the Church has been just spoken of may demand a justification. *The truth* of which the Church is στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα is not a light thing nor an insubstantial fabric; *the truth* is, more expressly, τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, *the revelation to man of practical religion;* and, beyond yea or nay, this truth, this revelation, is great. Whether you believe it or not, you cannot deny that the claims of Christianity are tremendous.

μέγας is rare in Paul: (Rom. ix. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 11, xvi. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Eph. v. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Tit. ii. 13). The nearest parallel to the present passage is Eph. v. 32, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. See note on ver. 9. On εὐσέβεια, see chap. ii. 2.

If we assume that ὃς is the right reading, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that what follows is a quotation by St. Paul from a primitive creed or summary of the chief facts to be believed about Jesus Christ. And one is tempted to conjecture that another fragment of the same summary is quoted in 1 Pet. iii. 18, θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι. ὃς, then, does not form part of the quotation at all; it is simply intro-

[o] ἐκηρύχθη [o] ἐν [o] ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, [p] ἀνελήμφθη [q] ἐν

o Gal. ii. 2, cf. 2 Cor. i. 19, Col. i. 23. p Mark xvi. 19, Acts i. 2, 11, 22. q Luke ix. 31, 1 Cor. xv. 43, Phil. iv. 19, Col. iii. 4.

ductory, and relative to the subject, Jesus Christ, whose personality was, in some terms, expressed in an antecedent sentence which St. Paul has not quoted.

As the passage stands, there are three pairs of antithetic thoughts: (1) (*a*) the flesh and (*b*) the spirit of Christ, (2) (*a*) angels and (*b*) Gentiles—the two extremes of the rational creation, (3) (*a*) the world and (*b*) glory. In another point of view, there is a connexion between 2 *a* and 3 *b*, and between 2 *b* and 3 *a*. Again, we may say that we have here set forth (1) the Incarnation in itself, (2) its manifestation, (3) its consequence or result, as affecting man and God.

The antithesis between the **σάρξ** and **πνεῦμα** of Christ is drawn, in addition to 1 Pet. iii. 18, also in Rom. i. 3, 4. **τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης.** We cannot leave out of account in discussing these passages the parallel in 1 Pet. iv. 6, **εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκὶ ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι.** The **πνεῦμα** of Christ, as man, in these passages means His human spirit, the naturally permanent spiritual part of a human personality. See also 1 Cor. v. 5.

ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί: He who had been from all eternity "in the form of God" became cognisable by the limited senses of human beings, **ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας** (Rom. viii. 3), became *manifest in the flesh*, **σὰρξ ἐγένετο** (John i. 14). **φανεροῦν** is used in connexion with Christ in four associations in the N.T.:—

(1) as here, of the objective fact of the Incarnation: John i. 31 (?), Heb. ix. 26, 1 Pet. i. 20, 1 John i. 2 (bis), iii. 5, 8.

(2) of the revelation involved in the Incarnation: Rom. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, iv. 4, 2 Tim. i. 10, Tit. i. 3. N.B. in Rom. and Col. the verb is used of a **μυστήριον**.

(3) of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ, which were, in a sense, repetitions of the marvel of the Incarnation, as being manifestations of the unseen: Mark xvi. 12, 14, John xxi. 1 (bis), 14.

(4) of the Second Coming, which will be, as far as man can tell, His final manifestation: Col. iii. 4, 1 Pet. v. 4, 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2.

ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι: *proved* or *pronounced to be righteous in His higher nature*. The best parallel to this use of **δικαιοῦν** is Ps. l. (li.) 6, **ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου,** also Matt. xi. 19 = Luke vii. 35. We are not entitled to assume that the **ἐν** has the same force before **πνεύματι** that it has before **σαρκί**; the repetition of the preposition is due to a felt need of rhythmic effect. If we are asked, When did this **δικαίωσις** take place? we reply that it was on a review of the whole of the Incarnate Life. The heavenly voice, **ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα,** heard by human ears at the Baptism and at the Transfiguration, might have been heard at any moment during the course of those "sinless years". He was emphatically **ὁ δίκαιος** (Acts iii. 14, xxii. 14; 1 John ii. 1. See also Matt. iii. 15; John xvi. 10.) It is enough to mention without discussion the opinions that **πνεύματι** refers (*a*) to the Holy Spirit, or (*b*) to the Divine Personality of Christ.

ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις: Ellicott points out that in these three pairs of clauses the first member of each group points to *earthly* relations, the second to *heavenly*. So that these words **ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις** refer to the fact that the Incarnation was "a spectacle to angels" as well as "to men"; or rather, as Dean Bernard notes (*Comm. in loc.*), **ὤφθη** and **ἐκηρύχθη** mark the difference in the communication of the Christian Revelation to angels—the rational creatures nearest to God—and to the Gentiles—farthest from God. "The revelation to Gentiles is *mediate*, by preaching . . .; the revelation to the higher orders of created intelligences is *immediate*, by vision." It was as much a source of wonderment to the latter as to the former. See 1 Pet. i. 12. The angels who greeted the Birth (Luke ii. 13), who ministered at the temptations (Matt. iv. 11, Mark i. 13), strengthened Him in His agony (Luke xxii. 43), proclaimed His Resurrection and stood by at the Ascension, are only glimpses to us of "a cloud of witnesses" of whose presence Jesus was always conscious (Matt. xxvi. 53).

ὤφθη is usually used of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ to *men*. See reff.

ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ: This was in itself a miracle. See 2 Thess. i. 10, John xvii. 21.

[q] δόξῃ. IV. 1. Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα [a] ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν [b] ὑστέροις καιροῖς [c] ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως, [d] προσέχοντες πνεύμασι [e] πλάνοις [1] καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων 2. ἐν [f] ὑποκρίσει [g] ψευδολόγων, [h] κεκαυ-

a Here only, not LXX. b Matt. xxi. 31 only, N.T. c Luke viii. 13, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Heb. iii. 12. d See 1 Tim. i. 4. e Here only as adj., *cf.* 2 John 7, Eph. iv. 14, 2 Thess. ii. 11. f 2 Macc. vi. 25, Gal. ii. 13, Matt. xxiii. 28, Mark xii. 15, Luke xii. 1, 1 Pet. ii. 1. g Here only, not LXX. h Here only, not LXX.

[1] πλάνης P, 31, 37, twenty-four others, vg. (*erroris*), go., arm.

Winer-Moulton notes (*Grammar*, p. 326) that ἐπιστεύθη cannot be referred to πιστεύειν Χῷ but presupposes the phrase πιστ. Χόν. *Cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10.

ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ: This is the verb used of the Ascension. See reff. *Cf.* ἀνάλημψις Luke ix. 51.

ἐν δόξῃ: ἐν has, in this case, a pregnant sense, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἐστὶν ἐν δόξῃ (Ell.). See also reff., in which ἐν δόξῃ is a personal attribute of the glory that surrounds and transfigures a glorified spiritual person; but in this place δόξα means the place or state of glory; *cf.* Luke xxiv. 26, ἔδει . . . τὸν Χριστόν . . . εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-5. Over against the future triumph of the truth, assured to us by the finished work of Christ, we must set the opposition, grievous at present, of the Spirit of error. His attacks have been foreseen by the Spirit of holiness. They are just now expressed in a false spirituality which condemns God's good creatures of marriage and food.

Ver. 1. **τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα**: The Apostle here passes to another theme, the manifestation of religion in daily life. The connexion between this section and the last is as indicated above. There is a slightly adversative force in the connecting δέ.

The Spirit is the Holy Spirit Who speaks through the prophets of the New Dispensation, of whom St. Paul was one. Here, if the following prophetical utterance be his own, he speaks as if Paul under the prophetic influence had an activity independent of Paul the apostle.

ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς: *The latter times*, of course, may be said to come before *the last days*, ἔσχαται ἡμέραι (Isa. ii. 2, Acts ii. 17, Jas. v. 3, 2 Pet. iii. 3; καιρὸς ἔσχατος, 1 Pet. i. 5; ἔσχ. χρόνος, Jude 18).

But a comparison with 2 Tim. iii. 1, a passage very similar in tone to this, favours the opinion that the terms were not so distinguished by the writers of the N.T. In this sort of prophetical warning or denunciation, we are not intended to take the future tense too strictly. Although the prophet intends to utter a warning concerning the future, yet we know that what he declares will be hereafter he believes to be already in active operation. It is a convention of prophetical utterance to denounce sins and sinners of one's own time (τινες) under the form of a predictive warning. *Cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 3, ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς, κ.τ.λ. It gives an additional impressiveness to the arraignment, to state that the guilty persons are partners in the great apostacy, the culmination of the world's revolt from God.

τινες is intentionally vague. See note on 1 Tim. i. 3. It is not used, as in Rom. iii. 3, of an indefinite number.

πνεύμασι πλάνοις: As the Church is guided aright by the Spirit of truth, He is opposed in His beneficent ministrations by the Spirit of error, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης (1 John iv. 6), who is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου, whose agents work through individuals, the "many false prophets who have gone out into the world" (1 John iv. 1).

διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων must be, in this context, *doctrines taught by demons*, a σοφία δαιμονιώδης (Jas. iii. 15). See Tert. *de Praescr. Haeret.* 7. The phrase does not here mean *doctrines about demons*, demonology. Still less are heresiarchs here called *demons*. This is the only occurrence of δαιμόνιον in the Pastorals. In Acts xvii. 18 the word has its neutral classical meaning, "a divine being," see also ver. 22; but elsewhere in the N.T. it has the LXX reference to evil spirits. For διδασκ. see note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 2. **ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων**: The three genitives ψευδολ. κεκαυστ. κωλ. are coordinate, and refer to the human agents of the seducing spirits and demons. ἐν ὑποκρίσει depends on πνεύμασι and διδασκαλίαις. The spirits work, and the teachings are exhibited, in the hypocrisy of them that speak lies; and this hypocrisy finds detailed expression in regulations suggested by a false asceticism.

στηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, 3. κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, [i] ἀπέχεσθαι [k] βρωμάτων ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς [l] μετάλημψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τοῖς

i Acts xv. 20, 29, 1 Thess. iv. 3, 1 Pet. ii. 11.

k Rom. xiv. 15, 20, 1 Cor. viii. 8, 13, Heb. xiii. 9.

l Here only, not LXX.

Although the ψευδολόγοι are included in the τινες . . . προσέχοντες, yet there is a large class of persons who are merely deceived; who are not actively deceiving others, and who have not taken the initiative in deceit. These latter are the ψευδολόγοι. For this reason it is better to connect ἐν ὑποκρίσει with προσέχοντες (Ell., von Soden) rather than with ἀποστήσονται (Bengel, Alf.), though no doubt both verbs refer to the same class. ἐν ὑποκρίσει of course is not adverbial as A.V., *speaking lies in hypocrisy*. This could only be justified if ψευδολόγων referred to δαιμονίων. The absence of an article before ὑποκρίσει need cause no astonishment.

ψευδολόγων: This word expresses perhaps more than ψεύστης the notion of definite false statements. A man might be on some occasions and on special points a ψευδολόγος, *a speaker of that which is not true*, and yet not deserve to be classed as a ψεύστης, *a liar*.

κεκαυστηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν: These speakers of falsehood are radically unsound. They are in worse case than the unsophisticated heathen whose conscience bears witness with the law of God (Rom. ii. 15). The conscience of these men is perverted. κεκαυστ. may mean that they are *past feeling*, ἀπηλγηκότες (Eph. iv. 19), that *their conscience is callous* from constant violation, as skin grows hard from searing (A.V., R.V. m., so Theodoret); or it may mean that these men *bore branded on their conscience the ownership marks of the Spirit of evil*, the devil's seal (ctr. 2 Tim. ii. 19), so perhaps R.V.; as St. Paul "bore branded on his body the marks of Jesus" (Gal. vi. 17), as "Christ's bondservant" (1 Cor. vii. 22). (So Theophylact). Either of these interpretations is more attractive than that of Bengel, followed by Alford, who takes it to mean that *the marks of crime are burnt into them*, so that they are self-condemned. See Tit. i. 15, iii. 11.

There is no special force in ἰδίαν (see on chap. iii. 4), as though a course of deceiving others should, by a righteous judgment, result in a loss to themselves of moral sensitiveness.

Ver. 3. κωλυόντων γαμεῖν: Spurious asceticism, in this and other departments of life, characterised the Essenes (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 2) and the Therapeutae (Philo *Vit. Contempl.* § 4), and all the other false spiritualists of the East; so that this feature does not supply a safe ground for fixing the date of the epistle. At the same time, it is not likely that this particular heresy was present to St. Paul's mind when he was writing 1 Cor. vii. 25-40; see especially 38, ὁ μὴ γαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιήσει; but similar views are condemned in Col., see especially Col. ii. 16, 21, 22. See also Heb. xiii., iv. St. Paul had come to realise how tyrannous the weak brother could be; and he had become less tolerant of him.

ἀπέχεσθαι: The positive κελευόντων, *commanding*, must be supplied from the negative κελευόντων μή, *commanding not* = κωλυόντων.

d. f. g. Vulg. preserve the awkwardness of the Greek, *prohibentium nubere, abstinere a cibis*. But Faustus read *abstinentes*, and Origen int. *et abstinentes se a cibis*. Epiphanius inserts παραγγέλλουσιν after βρωμ., and Isidore inserts καὶ κελευόντων before ἀπεχ., which was also suggested by Bentley. Theophylact inserts similarly συμβουλευόντων. Hort conjectures that ἀπέχεσθαι is a primitive corruption for ἢ ἅπτεσθαι or καὶ γεύεσθαι. He maintains that "no Greek usage will justify or explain this combination of two infinitives, adverse to each other in the tenor of their sense, under the one verb κωλυόντων; and their juxtaposition without a conjunction in a sentence of this kind is at least strange". Blass, however (*Grammar*, p. 291) alleges as a parallel κωλύσει ἐνεργεῖν καὶ [*sc.* ποιήσει] ζημιοῦν from Lucian, *Charon*, § 2. Another instance of zeugma, though not so startling as this, is in ii. 12, οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω . . . εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. See also 1 Cor. x. 24, xiv. 34 (T.R.). For ἀπέχεσθαι, as used in this connexion, see reff.

ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἔκτισεν, κ.τ.λ.: It has been asked why St. Paul does not justify by specific reasons the use of marriage, as he does the use of food. The answer seems to be that the same general argument applies to both. The final cause of both is the same, *i.e.*, to keep the race alive; and man is not entitled to place restrictions on the use of either, other than those which can be shown to be in accordance with God's law.

πιστοῖς καὶ [m] ἐπεγνωκόσι [m] τὴν [m] ἀλήθειαν. 4. ὅτι πᾶν [n] κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ οὐδὲν [o] ἀπόβλητον μετὰ εὐχαριστίας [p] λαμβανόμενον· 5. ἁγιάζεται γὰρ διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ [q] ἐντεύξεως. 6. Ταῦτα

m Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 4.
n Jas. i. 18. Rev. v. 13, viii. 9.
o Here only, not LXX.
p Mark xv. 23, John xiii. 30, xix. 30, Acts ix. 19, Rev. xxii. 17.
q See 1 Tim. ii. 1.

μετάλημψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας is one complex conception. This expresses the ideal use, truly dignified and human, of food. See Rom. xiv. 6, **ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ**; and 1 Cor. x. 30, **εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω, τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ;** St. Paul of course does not mean that believers only are intended by God to partake of food. His argument is an *à fortiori* one. "Those that believe," etc., are certainly included in God's intention. He who makes His sun to rise on the evil is certainly well pleased to make it rise on the good.

Again, St. Paul does not merely desire to vindicate the use of some of God's creatures for them that believe, but the use of *all* of God's creatures, so far as they are not physically injurious. "God saw *every thing* that he had made, and behold, it was very good," **καλὰ λίαν** (Gen. i. 31).

For the association of **μετάλημψις** compare the phrase **μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς**, Acts ii. 46, and reff. on 2 Tim. ii. 6.

τοῖς πιστοῖς: *dat. commodi*, as in Tit. i. 15, where see note.

τὴν ἀλήθειαν means, as elsewhere in these epistles, the Gospel truth in general, not the truth of the following statement, **πᾶν κτίσμα, κ.τ.λ.**

Ver. 4. **ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα**: This is the proof of the preceding statement, consisting of (*a*) a plain reference to Gen. i. 31, (*b*) a no less clear echo of our Lord's teaching, Mark vii. 15 (Acts x. 15), also re-echoed in Rom. xiv. 14, Tit. i. 15.

λαμβανόμενον: This verb is used of taking food into one's hand before eating (in the accounts of the feeding of the multitudes, Matt. xiv. 19 = Mark vi. 41; Matt. xv. 36 = Mark viii. 6, also Luke xxiv. 30, 43) as well as of eating and drinking. See reff. Perhaps it is not fanciful to note its special use in connexion with the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 23; Matt. xxvi. 26 (bis) 27; Mark xiv. 22, 23; Luke xxii. 19).

καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον: The statement of Gen. i. 31 which is summed up in *Every creature of God is good* might be met by the objection that nevertheless certain kinds of food were, in point of fact, to be *rejected* by the express command of the Mosaic Law. St. Paul replies that *thanksgiving* disannuls the Law in each particular case. Nothing over which thanksgiving can be pronounced is any longer included in the category of things tabooed. It is evident, from the repetition of the condition, **μετὰ εὐχαριστίας λαμβ.**, that St. Paul regarded that as the only restriction on Christian liberty in the use of God's creatures. Is it a thing of such a kind that I can, without incongruity, give thanks for it?

Field regards **οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον** here as a proverbial adaptation of Homer's saying (*Il.* Γ. 65): **οὔτοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα.**

For **κτίσμα** see reff. **κτίσις** is found in Rom. (7), 2 Cor. (1), Gal. (1), Col. (2); but in these places *creation* is the best or a possible rendering. **κτίσμα** means unambiguously *thing created*.

Ver. 5. **ἁγιάζεται**: The use of the present tense here supports the explanation given of ver. 4, and helps to determine the sense in which **λόγος θεοῦ** is used. The food lying before me at this moment, which to some is **ἀπόβλητος**, is sanctified here and now by the **εὐχαριστία**. See 1 Cor. x. 30.

λόγος θεοῦ and **ἔντευξις** (see note on ii. 1) are in some sense co-ordinate (almost a hendiadys), and together form elements in a **εὐχαριστία**. If St. Paul had meant by **λόγος θεοῦ**, the general teaching of Scripture, or the particular text, Gen. i. 31, he must have said **ἡγίασται**. At the same time, the written word was an element in the notion of the writer. **λόγος θεοῦ** has not here merely its general sense, a divine communication to man; it rather determines the quality of the **ἔντευξις**, as *a scriptural prayer; a prayer in harmony with God's revealed truth*. The examples that have come down to us of grace before meat are, as Dean Bernard notes here, "packed with scriptural phrases".

The best commentary on this verse is the action of St. Paul himself on the ship, when, having "taken bread, he gave thanks to God in the presence of all; and he brake it, and began to eat" (Acts xxvii. 35).

Although there is not here any direct

[r] ὑποτιθέμενος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καλὸς ἔσῃ διάκονος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[1] [s] ἐντρεφόμενος τοῖς λόγοις τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ᾗ[2] [t] παρηκολούθηκας.[3] 7. τοὺς δὲ [u] βεβήλους καὶ [v] γραώδεις

r Here only (N.T.) in this sense.
s Here only, not LXX.
t Luke i. 3, 2 Tim. iii. 10.
u See 1 Tim. i. 9.
v Here only, not LXX.

[1] Ἰησ. Χριστ. Dᶜ, 17, 31, 47, many others, am., syrpesh.
[2] ἧς A, 80, one other.
[3] So ℵADKLP; παρηκολούθησας CFG.

reference to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it is probable that thoughts about it have influenced the language; for the Eucharist is the supreme example of all benedictions and consecrations of material things. And if this be so, the passage has light thrown on it by the language of Justin Martyr and Irenæus about the Prayer of Consecration; *e.g.*, Justin, *Apol.* i. 66. "As Jesus Christ our Saviour, by the word of God (**διὰ λόγου θεοῦ**) made flesh, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that *the food over which thanks have been given by the word of prayer which comes from him* (**τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν**)—that food from which our blood and flesh are by assimilation nourished—is both the flesh and the blood of that Jesus who was made flesh". Similarly Irenæus (*Haer.* v. 2, 3), "Both the mingled cup, and the bread which has been made, receives upon itself *the word of God*, and the Eucharist becomes the body of Christ" (**ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ**). Perhaps by *the word of prayer which comes from him* Justin means a formula authorised by Christ. It must be added that the Prayer Book of Serapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, *circ.* A.D. 380, contains an *epiclesis* in which we read, "O God of truth, let thy holy Word come to sojourn on this bread, that the bread may become Body of the Word, and on this cup, that the cup may become Blood of the Truth" (Bishop J. Wordsworth's trans.).

A comparison of these passages suggests an association in the thought of the primitive Church of the Holy Spirit and the **λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ**.

Vv. 6-10. The spread of these mischievous notions among the brethren is most effectively discouraged by a demonstration in the person of the minister himself of the positive teaching of the Gospel as to practical life. We are assured, and declare our confidence by our lives, that Christianity differs essentially from theosophy in that it has respect to the eternal future, as well as to the passing present.

Ver. 6. **ταῦτα**: repeated in ver. 11, refers to all the preceding directions, but more especially to the warnings against false asceticism.

ὑποτιθέμενος: (*remind*, *suggest*) is a somewhat mild term, as Chrys. points out; but in some circumstances suggestion is more effectual than direct exhortation.

διάκονος Χρ. Ἰησ. seems emphatic, a deacon, not of the Church, but of Christ Jesus, who is the Chief Pastor.

ἐντρεφόμενος: The present tense is significant, "meaning to imply constancy in application to these things" (Chrys.), "ever training thyself" (Alf.). "The present . . . marks a continuous and permanent nutrition" (Ell.). The process begun from his earliest years, 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15, was being still maintained.

ἡ πίστις and **ἡ διδασκαλία** denote respectively the sum total of Christian belief, conceived as an ideal entity, and the same as imparted little by little to the faithful. See note on i. 10.

ᾗ παρηκολούθηκας: There is a similar use of this verb in 2 Tim. iii. 10, where see note. Alford attempts to give the word here the same force as in Luke i. 3, by rendering *the course of which thou hast followed*. The A.V., *whereunto thou hast attained*, expresses also the sense of achievement which we find in Luke *l.c.* It seems better, however, to associate the word with the notion of discipleship; so R.V., *doctrine which thou hast followed until now*.

Ver. 7. W. H. place a comma after **παρηκολούθηκας** and a full stop after **παραιτοῦ**; so R.V. nearly. But as **παραιτοῦ** is an imperative, as in reff. in Pastorals, it is best taken as antithetic to **γύμναζε**.

γραώδεις: The **μῦθοι**, in addition to their profane nature, as impeaching the

[w] μύθους [x] παραιτοῦ, [y] γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς [z] εὐσέβειαν· 8. ἡ γὰρ [a] σωματικὴ [b] γυμνασία [c] πρὸς [c] ὀλίγον ἐστὶν [d] ὠφέλιμος· ἡ δὲ [z] εὐσέβεια πρὸς πάντα [d] ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν, [e f] ἐπαγγελίαν [e] ἔχουσα [f] ζωῆς τῆς νῦν καὶ τῆς μελλούσης. 9. [g] πιστὸς [g] ὁ [g] λόγος [g] καὶ [g] πάσης [g] ἀποδοχῆς [g] ἄξιος. 10. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ[1] [h] κοπιῶμεν καὶ

w See 1 Tim. i. 4. x 1 Tim. v. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10, Heb. xii. 25. y 2 Macc. x. 15, Heb. v. 14, xii. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 14. z See 1 Tim. ii. 2. a 4 Macc. i. 32, iii. 1, Luke iii. 22. b 4 Macc. xi. 20 only. c Jas. iv. 14. d 2 Tim. iii. 16, Tit. iii. 8, not LXX. e *Cf.* Different use in 2 Cor. vii. 1, Heb. vii. 6. f 2 Tim. i. 1. g See 1 Tim. i. 15. h Matt. xi. 28, Col. i. 29, Phil. ii. 16, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 17.

[1] Ins. **καὶ** FgrGKL.

goodness of the Creator, were absurd, unworthy of a grown man's consideration. See note on chap. i. 4. Hort's view (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 138) that **βεβήλους** here merely means "the absence of any divine or sacred character" does not seem reasonable.

παραιτοῦ: *refuse, turn away from*, as in Heb. xii. 25. Alf. renders *excuse thyself from*, as in Luke xiv. 18 (bis), 19. *Decline* would be a better rendering. In addition to the reff. given above, **παραιτέομαι** occurs in Mark xv. 6, Acts xxv. 11 (a speech of St. Paul's), Heb. xii. 19.

γύμναζε: There is here an intentional paradox. Timothy is to meet the spurious asceticism of the heretics by *exercising himself in the practical piety of the Christian life*. See chap. ii. 2. The paradox is comparable to **φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ἡσυχάζειν** of 1 Thess. iv. 11. The true Christian asceticism is not essentially **σωματική**, although the body is the means by which the spiritual nature is affected and influenced. Although it brings the body into subjection (1 Cor. ix. 27), this is a means, not an end in itself.

Ver. 8. **σωματικὴ γυμνασία**: The parallel cited by Lightfoot (*Philippians*, p. 290) from Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* xv. 2, 5) renders it almost certain that the primary reference is to gymnastic exercises (as Chrys., etc., take it); but there is as certainly in **σωματικὴ γυμνασία** a connotation of ascetic practices as the outward expression of the theories underlying the fables of ver. 7. **παραιτοῦ** elsewhere in the Pastorals is followed by reasons why the particular thing or person should be avoided. The teaching is identical with that in Col. ii. 23. St. Paul makes his case all the stronger by conceding that an asceticism which terminates in the body is of some use. The contrast then is not so much between *bodily exercise*, commonly so called, and *piety*, as between *piety* (which includes a discipline of the body) and an absurd and profane theosophy of which discipline of the body was the chief or only practical expression.

πρὸς ὀλίγον: *to a slight extent;* as contrasted with **πρὸς πάντα**. **πρὸς ὀλίγον** means *for a little while* in Jas. iv. 14. This notion is included in the other. The R.V., *for a little* is ambiguous; perhaps intentionally so. In view of the genuine asceticism of St. Paul himself, not to mention other examples, it is unreasonable to think him inconsistent in making this concession.

ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς; If we take **ἐπαγγελία** to signify *the thing promised* (as in Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4, xiii. 32), rather than *a promise*, we can give an appropriate force to the rest of the sentence. A consistent Christian walk possesses, does not forfeit, that which this life promises; in a very real sense "it makes the best of both worlds". **ἔχω** will then have its usual meaning; and **ζωῆς** is the genitive of possession, as in Luke xxiv. 49, Acts i. 4 (**ἐπ. τοῦ πατρός**). It is not the genitive of apposition, *piety promises life*. That which is given by life to Christians is the best thing that life has to give. Von Soden compares **πάντα ὑμῶν**, 1 Cor. iii. 21 sq. Bacon's saying "Prosperity is the blessing of the Old Testament; Adversity is the blessing of the New" is only half a truth. If religion does not make us happy in this life, we have needlessly missed our inheritance (see Matt. vi. 33; Mark x. 30). On the other hand, though piety does bring happiness in this life, the exercise of it deliberately with that end in view is impious; as Whately said, "Honesty is the best policy, but the man who is honest for that reason is not honest".

Ver. 9. **πιστὸς—ἄξιος**: This is parenthetical and retrospective. The teaching of ver. 8 is the **λόγος**. So Chrys.

Ver. 10. **γὰρ**, as in the parallel 2

[i] ἀγωνιζόμεθα,[1] ὅτι [k] ἠλπίκαμεν[2] ἐπὶ Θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστιν [l] σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν. 11. [m] Παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε. 12. μηδείς σου τῆς νεότητος καταφρονείτω, ἀλλὰ [n] τύπος

i 1 Cor. ix. 25, Col. i. 29, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7.
k John v. 45. 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Tim. v. 5, vi. 17.
l See 1 Tim. i. 1.
m See 1 Tim. i. 3.
n 1 Cor. x. 6, Phil. iii. 17, 1 Thess. i. 7, 2 Thess. iii. 9, Tit. ii. 7, 1 Pet. v. 3.

[1] So ℵ*ACFgrGgrK, 17, 31, 47, five others; ὀνειδιζόμεθα ℵcDLP, d, f, g, vg., go., syrr., boh., arm.

[2] ἠλπίσαμεν D*, 17.

Tim. ii. 11, introduces a statement in support of the judgment, **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος.**

εἰς τοῦτο: *i.e.*, with a view to the obtaining the promised blessings of life. The best commentary on this is what St. Paul said in an earlier epistle, "As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (2 Cor. vi. 10).

κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμεθα express St. Paul's personal experience of what the profession of Christianity involved. It was then an almost universal experience, see Acts xiv. 22; but is not of necessity a concomitant of the exercising of oneself to godliness. The two words are similarly combined Col. i. 29, **εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος. κοπιᾶν** is usually used by St. Paul of ministerial labours: his own, 1 Cor. xv. 10, Gal. iv. 11, and those of others, Rom. xvi. 12, 1 Cor. xvi. 16, 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17; but this restriction is not necessary, nor would it be suitable here. See reff.

For **ὀνειδιζόμεθα** (var. lect.) *cf.* Matt. v. 11 = Luke vi. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 14.

ὅτι ἠλπίκαμεν, κ.τ.λ.: This was at once an incentive to exertion, and thus correlative to **ἐπαγγελία ζωῆς**, and in itself a part of the thing promised, the **ἐπαγγελία**. A consciousness that we are in an harmonious personal relation with the living God lifts us into a sphere in which labour and striving have no power to distress us.

ἠλπίκαμεν: *we have our hope set on* (R.V.). The same use of the perfect of this verb, "expressing the continuance and permanence of the **ἐλπίς**" (Ell.), is found in the reff. In addition, **ἐλπίζω** is also followed by **ἐπί** with the dat. in Rom. xv. 12 (Isa. xi. 10) and 1 Tim. vi. 17; by **ἐπί** with the acc. in 1 Tim. v. 5, 1 Pet. i. 13; by **εἰς** with an acc. in John v. 45, 2 Cor. i. 10, 1 Pet. iii. 5; and by **ἐν** followed by the dat. in 1 Cor. xv. 19.

θεῷ ζῶντι: As indicated above, this is said in relation to **ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς**. To know the living God is life eternal (John xvii. 3).

ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων, κ.τ.λ.: *Saviour of all* (**τὸν πάντων σωτῆρα**) occurs in Wisd. xvi. 7. *Cf. Saviour of the world*, John iv. 42.

The *prima facie* force of **μάλιστα** certainly is that all men share in some degree in that salvation which the **πιστοί** enjoy in the highest degree. Compare the force of **μάλιστα** in Acts xxv. 26, Gal. vi. 10, Phil. iv. 22, 1 Tim. v. 8, 17, 2 Tim. iv. 13; Tit. i. 10.

The statement is more unreservedly universalist in tone than chap. ii. 4 and Tit. ii. 11; and perhaps must be qualified by saying that while God is potentially Saviour of all, He is actually Saviour of the **πιστοί**. It is an argument *a minori ad majus* (as Bengel says); and the unqualified assertion is suitable. If all men can be saved, surely the **πιστοί** are saved, in whose number we are included. It is better to qualify the statement thus than, with Chrys. and Bengel, to give to **σωτήρ** a material sense of God's relation to all men, as the God of nature; but a spiritual sense of His relation to them that believe, as the God of grace. See notes on ch. i. 1; ii. 4.

Vv. 11-16. Silent example or mild suggestion will not do in every case. There are many occasions when it will be necessary for you to speak out, with the authority given to you at your ordination. At the same time, do not forget that the charismatic gift will die if it be neglected. Give yourself wholly to the cultivation of your character; so will you save yourself and those committed to your charge.

Ver. 11. **παράγγελλε**: In point of time, *teaching* precedes *commanding*. The tone of command can only be used in relation to fundamentals which have been accepted, but are in danger of being forgotten. Similar directions recur in v. 7 and vi. 3.

Ver. 12. **μηδείς—καταφρονείτω** ("*Libenter id faciunt senes inanes*," Ben-

γίνου τῶν πιστῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν [o] ἀναστροφῇ, ἐν [p] ἀγάπῃ,[1] ἐν [p] πίστει, ἐν [q] ἁγνίᾳ. 13. ἕως ἔρχομαι [r] πρόσεχε τῇ [s] ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. 14. μὴ [t] ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ [u] χαρίσματος, ὃ

o Gal. i. 13, Eph. iv. 22, Heb. xiii. 7, Jas. iii. 13, 1 Pet. (6), 2 Pet. (2).
p See 1 Tim. i. 14. q 1 Tim. v. 2 only, N.T. r See 1 Tim. i. 4. s Acts xiii. 15, 2 Cor. iii. 14.
t Heb. ii. 3. u Rom. i. 11, xii. 6, 1 Cor. i. 7, vii. 7, xii. 4, 9, 28, 30, 31, 2 Tim. i. 6, 1 Pet. iv. 10.

[1] Add ἐν πνεύματι KLP. See 2 Cor. vi. 6.

gel). Many, probably, of the Ephesian presbyters were older than Timothy. For **μηδείς** in this position, *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 18, x. 24; Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 18; Tit. ii. 15; Jas. i. 13. **καταφρονέω** connotes that the contempt felt in the mind is displayed in injurious action. (See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vi., viii. 432). The meaning of this direction is qualified by the following **ἀλλὰ τύπος γίνου, κ.τ.λ.** It means, *Assert the dignity of your office even though men may think you young to hold it. Let no one push you aside as a boy.* Compare the corresponding direction Tit. ii. 15, **μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω.** On the other hand, St. Paul shows Timothy "a more excellent way" than self-assertion for the keeping up of his dignity: Give no one any ground by any fault of character for despising thy youth.

σου depends on **τῆς νεότητος.** Field supports this by an exact parallel from Diodorus Siculus. The two genitives do not, in strict grammar, depend on **καταφρον.**, *despise thee for thy youth.*

τῆς νεότητος: St. Paul had met Timothy on the second missionary journey, dated by Harnack in A.D. 47, and by Lightfoot in A.D. 51. About the year 57, St. Paul says of Timothy, "Let no man despise him" (1 Cor. xvi. 11). 1 Tim. may be dated not more than a year before St. Paul's martyrdom, which Harnack fixes in A.D. 64, and Lightfoot in A.D. 67. The question arises, Could Timothy's **νεότης** have lasted all that time, about fifteen or sixteen years? We must remember that we have no information about Timothy's age when he joined St. Paul's company. But if he had been then fifteen or sixteen, or even seventeen, **νεότης** here need cause no difficulty. Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part II. vol. i. p. 448) adduces evidence from Polybius and Galen to show that a man might be called **νέος** up to the age of thirty-four or thirty-five. In any case, the terms "young" and "old" are used relatively to the average age at which men attain to positions in the world. Forty is reckoned old for a captain in the army, young for a bishop, very young for a Prime Minister. In an instructive parallel passage, Ignatius commends the Magnesians (§ 3) and their presbyters for not presuming upon the youth of their bishop. For Timothy's comparative youth, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 22, **τὰς δὲ νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας φεῦγε.**

τύπος γίνου: For the sentiment, compare reff. and 1 Cor. iv. 16, Phil. iv. 9.

τύπος is followed by the genitive of the person for whose edification the **τύπος** exists in 1 Cor. x. 6, 1 Pet. v. 3.

In the following enumeration, **λόγος** is coupled with **ἀναστροφή** as *words* with *deeds* (Rom. xv. 18; Col. iii. 17). These refer to Timothy's public life; while *love, faith* and *purity* refer to his private life, in reference to which they are found in conjunction in ii. 15.

Ver. 13. **ἕως ἔρχομαι**: For **ἕως** with present indic, instead of fut. see Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 370. *Cf.* Luke xix. 13, John xxi. 22, 23.

ἀνάγνωσις, παράκλησις, διδασκαλία are the three elements in the ministry of the word: (*a*) *reading aloud* of Scripture (Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 14, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 262); (*b*) *exhortation* based on the reading, and appealing to the moral sense (2 Tim. iv. 2; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 67); (*c*) *teaching*, appealing to the intellect, see note on chap. i. 10. Exhortation and teaching are similarly joined in Rom. xii. 7, 8, and 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 14. **μὴ ἀμέλει**: J. H. Moulton (*Grammar*, vol. i. p. 122 *sqq.*), distinguishes (*a*) **μή** with the pres. imperat, "Do not go on doing so and so," *e.g.*, 1 Tim. v. 22, 23, from (*b*) **μή** with the aor. subjunctive, "Do not begin to do it" (1 Tim. v. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8). In this case, **μὴ ἀμέλει** is equivalent to **πάντοτε μελέτα.** Timothy's **χάρισμα** lay in his commission to rule and in his powers as a preacher. The **χάρισμα** was given by God; in this particular case the formal and solemn assumption of its use was accompanied by the indication of prophecy addressed to the ear, and by the

ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ [v] ἐπιθέσεως [v] τῶν [v] χειρῶν τοῦ [w] πρεσβυτερίου. 15. ταῦτα [x] μελέτα, ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι, ἵνα σου ἡ [y] προκοπὴ [z] φανερὰ [z] ᾖ [1] πᾶσιν. 16. [a] ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· [b] ἐπίμενε αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν καὶ σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντάς σου.

V. 1. Πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ [a] ἐπιπλήξῃς, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα,

v Acts viii. 18, 2 Tim. i. 6, Heb. vi. 2.
w Here only in this sense.
x Acts iv. 25 (Ps. ii. 1).
y Phil. i. 12, 25.
z Rom. i. 19, Gal. v. 19, 1 John iii. 10.
a Luke xiv. 7, Acts iii. 5, xix. 22.
b Acts xiii. 43 (T.R.), Rom. vi. 1, xi. 22, 23, Col. i. 23.
a Here only, not LXX.

[1] Ins. ἐν DcKLP.

laying on of hands addressed to the eye. See Acts xiii. 1-3.

Winer-Moulton notes, p. 471, that the *instrument*, as such, is never expressed by **μετά** in good prose. Here, *with*, *amid imposition of hands* (conjointly with the act of imposition). **μετά** is here equivalent to **διά** in the sense given above, *i.e.*, of accompanying circumstances.

2 Tim. i. 6 is usually reconciled with this passage by saying that the body of presbyters was associated with St. Paul in the laying on of hands. But there is no reason to suppose that the same transaction is referred to in both places. Here the charismata refer to preaching and teaching; but in 2 Tim., to the administrative duties committed to Timothy, as it is reasonable to suppose, by St. Paul alone, when he appointed him his representative. Note that **διά** is used of St. Paul's imposition of hands (2 Tim. i. 6), **μετά** of that of the presbyters, here. This suggests that it was the imposition of hands by St. Paul that was the instrument used by God in the communication of the charisma to Timothy.

πρεσβυτέριον: elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5) means the Jewish Sanhedrin; but Ignatius uses the term, as here, to indicate the presbyters in a local Church (*Trall.* 7, 13; *Philadelph.* 7, etc.).

Ver. 15. **ταῦτα**: *i.e.*, reading, exhortation, teaching. **μελέτα**: *practise, exercise thyself in*, rather than *meditari*. So R.V., *Be diligent in*. (Bengel compares **γύμναζε** ver. 7.) *Cf.* Psal. i. 2, **ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσει**, "In his law will he exercise himself," P.B.V., quoted by Prof. Scholefield.

ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι: To the parallels cited by Wetstein, **ἐν τούτοις ὁ Καῖσαρ . . . ἦν** (Plut. *Pomp.* p. 656 *b*), "Omnis in hoc sum" (Horace, *Epistles*, i. 1, 11) and Alford: "Totus in illis" (Horace, *Sat.* i. 9, 2), we may add **ἐν φόβῳ Κυρίου ἴσθι**, Prov. xxiii. 17. Timothy's progress manifest to all would secure his youth from being despised: *cf.* Matt. v. 16.

φανερὰ ᾖ: This expression is quite Pauline; see reff.; but St. Paul more frequently has **φανερὸς γενέσθαι**, 1 Cor. iii. 13, xi. 19, xiv. 25, Phil. i. 13.

Ver. 16. **ἔπεχε σεαυτῷ, κ.τ.λ.**: The teacher must needs prepare himself before he prepares his lesson. A similar thought is conveyed by the order of the words in Gen. iv. 4, "The Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering". **ἐπέχειν** (see reff. and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 377) has a quite different signification in Phil. ii. 16. *Cf.* Acts xx. 28, **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς**.

τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: *Thy teaching* (R.V.). *The doctrine* (A.V.) can take care of itself. See note on i. 10. **αὐτοῖς** is neuter, referring to the same things as **ταῦτα**; not masc., "Remain with the Ephesians," as Grotius supposed, a view tolerated by Bengel.

σεαυτὸν σώσεις: *cf.* Ezek. xxxiii. 9.

Chapter V.—Vv. 1-16. The wise Church ruler must understand how to deal with his people individually. Each age and condition needs separate treatment: old men, young men; old women, young women. Widows in particular need discriminating care; since some of them may have to be supported by the Church; and we must not let the Church be imposed on, nor give occasion for scandal. Accordingly Church widows must be at least sixty years old, and be of good character.

Ver. 1. **πρεσβυτέρῳ** is best taken as a term of age, *seniorem* (Vulg.). This view is supported by the **ὡς πατέρα, πρεσβυτέρας, νεωτέρας**. The term **νεωτέρους** might possibly refer to a subordinate Church officer. In Acts v. 6 it is susceptible of that meaning; but in the subsequent narrative (Acts v. 10) **οἱ νεώτεροι** who are in attendance on the Apostles are merely **νεανίσκοι**.

νεωτέρους ὡς ἀδελφούς, 2. [b] πρεσβυτέρας ὡς μητέρας, νεωτέρας ὡς ἀδελφὰς ἐν πάσῃ [c] ἁγνείᾳ. 3. Χήρας τίμα τὰς [d] ὄντως χήρας. 4. εἰ δέ τις χήρα τέκνα ἢ [e] ἔκγονα ἔχει, μανθανέτωσαν [1] πρῶτον τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον [f] εὐσεβεῖν καὶ [g] ἀμοιβὰς ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς [h] προγόνοις· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν [2] [i] ἀπόδεκτον [k] ἐνώπιον [k] τοῦ [k] Θεοῦ. 5. ἡ δὲ [l] ὄντως

b Here only, N.T. c See 1 Tim. iv. 12. d Mark xi. 32, 1 Tim. v. 5, 16, vi. 19. e Here only, N.T. f 4 Macc. (5), Sus. 64, Acts xvii. 23. g Here only, N.T., not LXX. h 2 Tim. i. 3 only, N.T. i 1 Tim. ii. 3. k See 1 Tim. ii. 3. l See ver. 3.

[1] μανθανέτω two cursives, d, f, m[82], vg. (except am* = *discant*).
[2] Ins. καλὸν καὶ 37, many others, boh., go., arm. See chap. ii. 3.

ἐπιπλήξῃς: *Treat harshly*. The more usual **ἐπιτιμᾶν** occurs 2 Tim. iv. 2. **παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα**: Respect for age must temper the expression of reproof of an old man's misdemeanours. **νεωτέρους** and the following accusatives in ver. 2 are governed by some such verb as *treat, behave towards, deal with*, implied in **ἐπιπλήξῃς** and **παρακάλει**.

Ver. 2. **ἐν πάσῃ ἁγνίᾳ**: *with the strictest regard to purity*, or perhaps *propriety*. Christians, Athenagoras tells us (*Legat*. 32), considered other Christians, according to their age, as sons and daughters; brothers and sisters; fathers and mothers. Ellicott quotes Jerome's maxim, "Omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige" (Epist. 52, 5, p. 259). Compare *de Imitatione Christi*, i. 8, "Be not a friend to any one woman, but recommend all good women in general to God".

Ver. 3. **τίμα**: It is difficult to fix precisely the force of **τιμάω** in this connexion. On the one hand, the passage (vv. 3-8) is a part of the general directions as to Timothy's personal relations to his flock. *Respect, honour*, would, then, render the word adequately. On the other hand, vv. 4 and 8 show that the question of widows' maintenance, as a problem of Church finance, was in the apostle's mind; and he goes on, in ver. 9, to lay down regulations for the admission of widows to the number of those who were entered on the Church register for support. Perhaps *respect* was first in the writer's mind, while the term used, **τίμα**, easily lent itself to the expression of the notion of *support*, which immediately suggested itself. Similarly Chrys. (**τῆς τῶν ἀναγκαίων τροφῆς**), comparing ver. 17, where **τιμή** has the sense of *pay*, *cf*. Ecclus. xxxviii. 1, Matt. xv. 4-6, Acts xxviii. 10. *Honora beneficiis* is Bengel's comment.

τὰς ὄντως: Those who really deserve the name of widows are (1) those who have no younger relatives on whom they have a claim for support, (2) those who conform to certain moral and spiritual requirements detailed below.

Ver. 4. **ἔκγονα**: *offspring* ought to be the best rendering of this. It has a wider connotation than *children* and narrower than *descendants*.

μανθανέτωσαν: It ought not to be necessary to say that the subject of this verb is **τέκνα ἢ ἔκγονα**, only that Chrys. Theod. Vulg. and d agree in referring it to the class **χῆραι**. ("Requite them in their descendants, repay the debt through the children," Chrys.; "*Discat primum domum suam regere*." See critical note.) Similarly Augustine says of his mother Monica, "Fuerat enim unius viri uxor, mutuam vicem parentibus reddiderat, domum suam pie tractaverat" (*Confessiones*, ix. 9). This can only be regarded as a curiosity in exegesis.

πρῶτον: The first duty of children is filial piety. **οἶκον**, which is usually correlative to parents rather than children, is used here "to mark the duty as an act of family feeling and family honour" (De Wette, quoted by Ell.).

εὐσεβεῖν (*domum pie tractare*, m[88]) with a direct accusative is also found in reff. Ellicott supplies an appropriate illustration from Philo, *de Decalogo*, § 23, "where storks are similarly said **εὐσεβεῖν** and **γηροτροφεῖν**".

προγόνοις: When the term occurs again, 2 Tim. i. 3, it has its usual meaning *forefather*. It is usually applied to forbears that are dead. Here it means parents, grandparents, or great-grandparents that are living; and this use of it was probably suggested by **ἔκγονα**, a term of equally vague reference. Plato, *Laws*, xi. p. 932, is quoted for a similar application of the word to the living.

τοῦτο γάρ, κ.τ.λ.: Besides being enjoined in the O.T., our Lord taught the same duty, Mark vii. 16-13 = Matt. xv. 4-6. See also Eph. vi. 1, 2.

Ver. 5. **ἤλπικεν ἐπί**: *hath her hope set on*. See on iv. 10, the analogy of

χήρα καὶ [m] μεμονωμένη [n] ἤλπικεν ἐπὶ [1] Θεὸν [2] καὶ [o] προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας· 6. ἡ δὲ [p] σπαταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν. 7. καὶ ταῦτα [q] παράγγελλε, ἵνα [r] ἀνεπίλημπτοι ὦσιν. 8. εἰ δέ τις [s] τῶν [s] ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα [3] [t] οἰκείων οὐ [u] προνοεῖ,[4] τὴν [v] πίστιν [v] [w] ἤρνηται καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χείρων. 9. Χήρα [x] καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα γεγονυῖα, ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς

m Here only, not LXX.
n See 1 Tim. iv. 10.
o Wisd. iii. 9, Acts xi. 23, xiii. 43.
p Ecclus. xxi. 15, Ezek. xvi. 49, Jas. v. 5.
q See 1 Tim. i. 3. r See 1 Tim. iii. 2. s John i. 11, xiii. 1, Acts iv. 23. t Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19. u Rom. xii. 17, 2 Cor. viii. 21. v Rev. ii. 13. w 2 Tim. iii. 5, Tit. ii. 12, *cf.* also 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13, Tit. i. 16. x Here only, N.T.

[1] Ins. τὸν ℵ^c ADKL; om. τὸν ℵ*CFGP.

[2] So ℵ^c ACKLP, d, e, f, m25, 82, 110, vg.; Κύριον ℵ*D^gr*.

[3] Ins. τῶν CD^bc KLP.

[4] So ℵ^c ACD^c LP; προνοεῖται ℵ*D*FGK, one cursive.

which favours the omission of the article here.

προσμένει: She is like Anna, **νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσιν λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν** (Luke ii. 37). **προσκαρτερεῖν** is more usual in this connexion, *e.g.*, Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2.

Ell. notes that Paul always has the order **νυκτ. καὶ ἡμ.** as here. Luke has also this order, with the acc., but **ἡμ. καὶ νυκτ.** with the gen. In Rev. the order is **ἡμ. καὶ νυκτός**.

Ver. 6. **σπαταλῶσα**: The modern term *fast*, in which the notion of prodigality and wastefulness is more prominent than that of sensual indulgence, exactly expresses the significance of this word. The R.V., *she that giveth herself to pleasure*, is stronger than the A.V. A somewhat darker force is given to it here by the associated verb in ver. 11, **καταστρηνιάσωσιν**. The Vulg. is felicitous, *Quae in deliciis est, vivens mortua est*. The expression is more terse than in Rev. iii. 1, "Thou hast a name that thou livest and thou art dead". *Cf.* Rom. vii. 10, 24, Eph. iv. 18. Wetstein quotes in illustration from Stobaeus (238), as descriptive of a poor man's life of anxiety, **πένης ἀποθανὼν φροντίδων ἀπηλλάγη, ζῶν γὰρ τέθνηκε**.

Ver. 7. **ταῦτα** is best referred to ver. 4, with its implied injunctions to the younger generation to support their widows.

ἀνεπίλημπτοι: *i.e.*, all Christians whom it concerns, not widows only.

Ver. 8. The Christian faith includes the law of love. The moral teaching of Christianity recognises the divine origin of all natural and innocent human affections. The unbeliever, *i.e.*, the born heathen, possesses natural family affection; and though these feelings may be stunted by savagery, the heathen are not likely to be sophisticated by human perversions of religion, such as those denounced by Jesus in Mark vii. Ell. says. "It is worthy of notice that the Essenes were not permitted to give relief to their relatives without leave from their **ἐπίτροποι**, though they might freely do so to others in need; see Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 6."

The Christian who falls below the best heathen standard of family affection is the more blameworthy, since he has, what the heathen has not, the supreme example of love in Jesus Christ. We may add that Jesus Himself gave an example of providing for one's own, when He provided a home for His mother with the beloved disciple.

οἱ ἴδιοι are near relatives: **οἱ οἰκεῖοι**, members of one's household. One of the most subtle temptations of the Devil is his suggestion that we can best comply with the demands of duty in some place far away from our home. Jesus always says, Do the next thing; "Begin from Jerusalem". The path of duty begins from within our own house, and we must walk it on our own feet.

οἰκείων: The omission of the article in the true text before **οἰκείων** precludes the possibility of taking the word here in the allegorical sense in which it is used in Gal. and Eph.: "the household of the faith"; "the household of God".

προνοεῖ: This verb is only found elsewhere in N.T. in the phrase **προνοεῖσθαι καλά**, Rom. xii. 17, 2 Cor. viii. 21 (from Prov. iii. 4, **προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων**).

Ver. 9. **καταλεγέσθω**: St. Paul passes naturally from remarks about the duty of

γυνή, 10. [y] ἐν [z] ἔργοις [z] καλοῖς [y] μαρτυρουμένη, εἰ [a] ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ [b] ἐξενοδόχησεν, εἰ ἁγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν, εἰ [c] θλιβομένοις [d] ἐπήρκεσεν,

y Acts vi. 3, x. 22, xxii. 12, Heb. xi. 2, 39.
z See 1 Tim. iii. 1.
a Here only, not LXX.
b Here only, not LXX.
c 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 8, vii. 5, 1 Thess. iii. 4, 2 Thess. i. 6, 7, Heb. xi. 37.
d 1 Macc. (2), ver. 16 only.

Church members to their widowed relatives to specific rules about the admission of widows to the roll of Church widows (see Acts vi. 1). The **χήρα** of this ver. is **ἡ ὄντως χήρα** of vv. 3 and 5, who was to receive consideration and official recognition. These widows had no doubt a ministry to fulfil—a ministry of love, prayer, intercession, and giving of thanks (Polycarp, 4); but it is difficult to suppose that St. Paul, or any other practically minded administrator, would contemplate a presbyteral order of widows, the members of which would enter on their duties at the age of 60, an age relatively more advanced in the East and in the first century than in the West and in our own time. We may add that the general topic of widows' maintenance is resumed and concluded in ver. 16.

In the references to widows in the earliest Christian literature outside the N.T. (with the exception of Ignatius *Smyrn.* 13) they are mentioned as objects of charity along with orphans, etc. (Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 6, *Polyc.* 4; Polycarp, 4; Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4, *Mand.* viii., *Sim.* i. v. 3, ix. 26, 27; Justin, *Apol.* i. 67). None of these places hints at an order of widows. The subject cannot be further discussed here; but the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the later institution of widows as an order with official duties was suggested by this passage. The history of Christianity affords other examples of supposed revivals of apostolic institutions.

Ell., who follows Grotius in seeing in this verse regulations respecting an ecclesiastical or presbyteral widow, objects to the view taken above that it is "highly improbable that when criteria had been given, ver. 4 *sq.*, fresh should be added, and those of so very *exclusive* a nature: would the Church thus limit her alms?"

But ver. 4 *sq.* does not give the criteria, or qualifications of an official widow; but only describes the dominant characteristic of the life of the "widow indeed," *viz.*, devotion; and again, the Church of every age, the apostolic not less than any other, has financial problems to deal with. Charity may be indiscriminating, but there are only a limited number of widows for whose whole support the Church can make itself responsible; and this is why the limit of age is here so high. At a much younger age than 60 a woman would cease to have any temptation to marry again.

Lightfoot has important notes on the subject in his commentary on Ignatius, *Smyrn.* §§ 6, 13 (*Apost. Fathers*, part ii. vol. ii. pp. 304, 322). See also, on the deaconess widow, Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, trans. vol. i. p. 122. The opinion of Schleiermacher that deaconesses are referred to here is refuted (1) by the provision of age, and (2) by the fact that they have been dealt with before, iii. 11.

According to Bengel, the gen. **ἐτῶν** depends on **χήρα, μὴ ἔλαττον** being an adverb, "of 60 years, not less".

γεγονυῖα: It is best to connect this with the preceding words, as in Luke ii. 42, **καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα.** In favour of this connexion is the consideration that in the parallel, iii. 2, **μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα** stands alone, and that if **γεγονυῖα** were to be joined with what follows, it would most naturally follow **γυνή.** As a matter of fact, this transposition is found in P.; and this connexion is suggested in D, two cursives, d, f, g, m[141], Vulg. (*quae fuerit* (g *fuerat*) *unius viri uxor*) go, boh, syrr, Theodore Mops., Theodoret, and Origen.

ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή: The Church widows must conform to the same ideal of the married life as the episcopi. See Tert. *ad uxorem*, i. 7, "Quantum fidei detrahant, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiae secundae, disciplina ecclesiae et praescriptio apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit praesidere, cum viduam allegi in ordinem [*al.* ordinationem], nisi univiram, non concedit."

Ver. 10. **ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη**: **ἐν** with **μαρτυρεῖσθαι** means *in respect of*. See reff. and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii., 562.

It is characteristic of the sanity of apostolic Christianity that as typical examples of "good works," St. Paul instances the discharge of commonplace duties, "the daily round, the common task". For **ἔργα καλά** see on chap. iii. 1.

εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν: As has been just

εἰ παντὶ [e] ἔργῳ [e] ἀγαθῷ [f] ἐπηκολούθησεν. 11. νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας [g] παραιτοῦ· ὅταν γὰρ [h] καταστρηνιάσωσιν[1] τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖν

e See 1 Tim. ii. 10.
f Josh. xiv. 14.
g See 1 Tim. iv. 7.
h Here only, not LXX.

[1] So ℵCDKL; καταστρηνιάσουσιν AFGP, 31.

explained, the εἰ is not so much dependent on καταλεγέσθω as explanatory of ἐν ἔργοις καλ. μαρτ. The rendering of the Vulg., d, f, g, Amb., *filios educavit*, is better than that of m[141], *nutrivit*, or Ambrst. *enutrivit*. It is not child-birth so much as the "Christianly and virtuously bringing up of children," her own or those entrusted to her charge, that St. Paul has in his mind. Tert. *de Virg. vel.* 9, alluding to this passage, says, "Non tantum univirae, id est nuptae, aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres et quidem educatrices filiorum, scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum structae facile norint ceteras et consilio et solatio iuvare, et ut nihilominus ea decucurrerint, per quae femina probari potest". The later Church widows, among other duties, had the care of the Church orphans (*cf*, Hermas *Mand.* viii.; Lucian, *de morte Peregrini*, 12).

ἐξενοδόχησεν: Hospitality is a virtue especially demanded in a condition of society in which there is much going to and fro, and no satisfactory hotel accommodation. The episcopus must be φιλόξενος (iii. 2, where see note).

εἰ ἁγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν: If the strangers were also "saints," members of the Christian Society, they would naturally receive special attention. The mistress of the house would act as servant of the servants of God (*cf.* Gen. xviii. 6; 1 Sam. xxv. 41). Unless we assume the unhistorical character of St. John's Gospel, it is natural to suppose that the story told in John xiii. 5-14, and the Master's command to do as He had done, was known to St. Paul and Timothy. The absence of an article before πόδας "is due to assimilation to ἁγίων" (Blass, *Grammar*, p. 151, note 2).

εἰ παντὶ—ἐπηκολούθησεν cuts short any further enumeration of details, *if in short, she has devoted herself to good works of every kind.* There is an exact parallel to this use of ἐπακολουθέω in Josh. xiv. 14, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν [Caleb] ἐπακολουθῆσαι τῷ προστάγματι Κυρίου Θεοῦ Ἰσραήλ. The word also means to "check" or "verify" an account. In Mark xvi. 20, "the signs 'endorse' the word" (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 376). So here it may connote sympathy with, and interest in, good works, without actual personal labour in them.

Ver. 11. There are two main factors in the interpretation of this verse: (1) a general Church regulation—not laid down by St. Paul but found in existence by him—that a widow in receipt of relief should be ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή; and (2) his determination to make provision that no scandal should arise from broken vows. The notion was that there was a marriage tie between Christ and the Church widow. This would be *her first faith, her earliest and still valid plighted troth.* *Cf.* Rev. ii. 4, τὴν ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκες (of the Church at Ephesus).

νεωτέρας may be rendered positively, *young.*

παραιτοῦ: *reject.* This verb is used of "profane and old wives' fables" (iv. 7), of "foolish and ignorant questionings" (2 Tim. ii. 23), of "a man that is heretical" (Tit. iii. 10); so that, at first sight, it seems a harsh term to use in reference to "young widows". But the harshness is explained when we remember that St. Paul is speaking, not of the widows in themselves, but as applicants for admission to the roll of specially privileged Church widows. In a Church still immature as to its organisation and *morale* the authorities would be only courting disaster were they to assume the control of young widows, a class whose condition gave them independence in the heathen society around them.

καταστρηνιάσωσιν: *Cum enim luxuriatae fuerint* [*in deliciis egerint*, m[110]] *in Christo* (Vulg.).

The word denotes the particular character of their restiveness. It was understood with this sexual reference in Pseud. Ignat. *ad Antioch.* 11, αἱ χῆραι μὴ σπαταλάτωσαν, ἵνα μὴ καταστρηνιάσωσι τοῦ λόγου. στρῆνος (over-strength), *wantonness* or *luxury* occurs Rev. xviii. 3; στρηνιάω, Rev. xviii. 7, 9, to *wax wanton, live wantonly*, or *luxuriously.* The preposition κατά, with the genitive, has the sense *against*, of opposition, as in καταβραβεύω, καταγελάω, καταδικάζω, κατακαυχάομαι, κατακρίνω, etc.

θέλουσιν, 12. ἔχουσαι κρίμα ὅτι τὴν πρώτην πίστιν [l] ἠθέτησαν. 13. [k] ἅμα [k] δὲ [k] καὶ [l] ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσιν, [m] περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας, οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀργαὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ [n] φλύαροι καὶ [o] περίεργοι, λαλοῦσαι [p] τὰ

Mark vii. 9, Luke vii. 30, Gal. ii. 21, iii. 15, Heb. x. 28.
k Acts xxiv. 26, Col. iv. 3, Philem. 22.
l Matt. xii. 36, xx. 3, 6, Tit. i. 12, Jas. ii. 20, 2 Pet. i. 8.
m Acts xix. 13, Heb. xi. 37.
n Here only, N.T.; see note.
o Not LXX; see note.
p Tit. i. 11.

For ὅταν with the subjunctive or indicative, see Winer Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 388. The subjunctive, as in the text, is the normally correct way of expressing a contemplated contingency.

τοῦ Χριστοῦ: Here only in the Pastorals.

γαμεῖν θέλουσι: θέλειν has here an emphatic sense, as in John vii. 17; and its association here supports the view that it "designates the will which proceeds from inclination," as contrasted with **βούλομαι**, "the will which follows deliberation" (Thayer's Grimm, *s.v.*). γαμεῖν is used of the woman also, ver. 14, Mark x. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 28, 34.

Ver. 12. **ἔχουσαι κρίμα**: *deserving censure*. There is no special force in ἔχουσαι, as Ell. explains, "bearing about with them a judgment, *viz.*, that they broke their first faith". This seems forced and unnatural. ἔχειν κρίμα is correlative to λαμβάνεσθαι κρίμα (Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Rom. xiii. 2; Jas. iii. 1). They *have condemnation because, etc.*, *habentes damnationem quia* (Vulg. m). κρίμα of course by itself means *judgment;* but where the context, as here, implies that the judgment is a sentence of guiltiness, it is reasonable so to translate it.

τὴν πρώτην πίστιν: This has been already explained. On the use of πρῶτος for πρότερος see Blass, *Gram.* p. 34.[1]

ἠθέτησαν: *annulled*, *irritam fecerunt* (Vulg. m).

Ver. 13. **ἅμα δὲ καί** is Pauline. See reff.

It is best to assume an omission of εἶναι, not necessarily through corruption of the text, as Blass supposes (*Gram.* p. 247). On the example cited by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 437 from Plato, *Euthyd.* p. 276 *b*, οἱ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, and Dio. Chrys. lv. 558, Field notes, "Although the reading in Plato may be doubtful, there is no doubt of the agreement of St. Paul's construction with *later* usage". Field adds two from St. Chrysostom T. vii. p. 699 *a* : τί οὖν; ἂν παλαιστὴς μανθάνῃς; T. ix. p. 259 *b* : εἰ ἰατρὸς μέλλοις μανθάνειν. He notes that the correlative phraseology, διδάξαι (or διδάξασθαι) τινὰ τεκτόνα, χαλκέα, ἱππέα, ῥήτορα, is to be found in the best writers.

It is impossible to connect μανθ. περιερχ. as Vulg., *discunt circuire domos;* for, as Alf. says, "μανθάνω with a participle always means *to be aware of*, *take notice of*, the act implied in the verb". Here, *e.g.*, the meaning would be "they learn that they are going about," which is absurd. Bengel's view, that μανθάνουσι is to be taken absolutely, is equally impossible: "being idle, they are learners," the nature of the things they learn to be inferred from the way they spend their time. Von Soden connects μανθ. with τὰ μὴ δέοντα; suggesting that they learnt in the houses referred to in 2 Tim. iii. 6 what was taught there (ἃ μὴ δεῖ, Tit. i. 11).

περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας: These last words may possibly refer to the house to house visitation, *going about* (R.V.), which might be part of the necessary duty of the Church widows; but which would be a source of temptation to young women, and would degenerate into *wandering* (A.V.).

οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . ἀλλὰ καί is a Pauline use of constant occurrence. See Rom. v. 3, 11, viii. 23, ix. 10; 2 Cor. vii. 7, viii. 19; Phil. ii. 27 [οὐ . . . δὲ μόνον]; 2 Tim. iv. 8. Also in Acts xix. 27, 3 Macc. iii. 23.

ἀργαί, φλύαροι, περίεργοι: A series of natural causes and consequences. The social intercourse of idle people is naturally characterised by silly chatter which does not merely affect the understanding of those who indulge in it, but leads them on to mischievous interference in other people's affairs.

φλύαροι: φλυαρεῖν is found in 3 John 10, *prating*. φλύαρος is an epithet of φιλοσοφία in 4 Macc. v. 10; and in Prov. xxiii. 29 (א^c) φλυαρίαι ὁμιλίαι ἐνφιλόνικοι are among the consequences of excessive wine-drinking.

περίεργοι: See 2 Thess. iii. 11, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους. In Acts xix. 19 τὰ περίεργα, *curious arts*, means the arts of those who are curious about, and pry into, matters concealed from human knowledge, *impertinent* to man's lawful needs.

[p] μὴ [p] δέοντα. 14. [q] βούλομαι οὖν νεωτέρας γαμεῖν, [r] τεκνογονεῖν, [s] οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, μηδεμίαν [t] [u] ἀφορμὴν [u] διδόναι τῷ [v] ἀντικειμένῳ [w] λοιδορίας [x] χάριν· 15. ἤδη γάρ τινες [y] ἐξετράπησαν [1] ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. 16. εἴ τις [2] πιστὴ ἔχει χήρας [z] ἐπαρκείτω [3] αὐταῖς, καὶ μὴ [a] βαρείσθω ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἵνα ταῖς [b] ὄντως χήραις ἐπαρκέσῃ.

q See 1 Tim. ii. 8.
r Here only, not LXX, cf. 1 Tim. ii. 15.
s Here only, not LXX.
t Luke xi. 54, Rom. vii. 8, 11, 2 Cor. xi. 12, Gal. v. 13.
u 2 Cor. v. 12.
v 2 Thess. ii. 4, cf. Luke xiii. 17, xxi. 15, 1 Cor. xvi. 9, Phil. i. 28.
w 1 Pet. iii. 9 only, N.T.
x Luke vii. 47, Gal. iii. 19, Eph. iii. 1, 14, Tit. i. 5, 11, 1 John iii. 12, Jude 16.
y See 1 Tim. i. 6.
z See ver. 10.
a See note.
b See ver. 3.

[1] ἐξετράπ. τινες AF^gr G, g.
[2] Ins. πιστὸς ἢ DKL, d, fuld., syrr.
[3] So CDKLP; ἐπαρκείσθω ℵA[FG], 17.

λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα expresses the positively mischievous activity of the **φλύαροι**, as **περίεργοι**. Compare Tit. i. 11, **διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ**. In both passages **μή** is expressive of the impropriety, in the writer's opinion, of whatever might conceivably be spoken and taught; whereas **τὰ οὐ δέοντα** would express the notion that certain specific improper things had, as a matter of fact, been spoken. See Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 603.

Ver. 14. **βούλομαι οὖν**: See note on 1 Tim. ii. 8.

νεωτέρας: The insertion of **χήρας** before **νεωτέρας** in about 30 cursives, Chrys. Theodoret, John Damasc., Jerome, is a correct gloss (so R.V.). The whole context deals with widows, not with women in general, as A.V. and von Soden.

γαμεῖν: There is nothing really inconsistent between this deliberate injunction that young widows should marry again, and the counsel in 1 Cor. vii. 8, that widows should remain unmarried. The widows here spoken of would come under the class of those who "have not continency"; not to mention that the whole world-position of the Church had altered considerably since St. Paul had written 1 Cor.

οἰκοδεσποτεῖν: well rendered in Vulg., *matres-familias esse*. The verb is only found here in the Greek Bible, but **οἰκοδεσπότης** frequently occurs in the Synoptists. It is the equivalent of **οἰκουργούς**, Tit. ii 5.

τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ: The singular (see ref.) does not refer to Satan, but is used generically for human adversaries. The plural is more usual, as in the other reff. *Cf.* **ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας**, Tit. ii. 8.

λοιδορίας χάριν is connected of course with **ἀφορμήν**, not with **βούλομαι**, as Mack suggests, "I will . . . on account of the reproach which might otherwise come on the Church".

For the sentiment *cf.* vi. 1, Tit. ii. 5, 8, 1 Peter ii. 12, iii. 16. In all these places the responsibility of guarding against scandal is laid on the members of the Church generally, not specially on the Church rulers. The construction of **χάριν** here is not quite the same as in Gal. iii. 19, Tit. i. 11, Jude 16. Here it is an appendage to the sentence, explanatory of **ἀφορμὴν διδόναι**.

Ver. 15. **τινες**: See note on i. 3.

ἐξετράπησαν ὀπίσω τοῦ Σ.: This is a pregnant phrase, meaning *They have turned out of the way* [*of life and light*] *and have followed after Satan*". "The prepositional use of **ὀπίσω**, which is foreign to profane writers, takes its origin from the LXX (Hebr. אַחֲרֵי)" (Blass, *Gram.* p. 129). The primary phrase is **ἔρχεσθαι** [also **ἀκολουθεῖν** or **πορεύεσθαι**] **ὀπίσω τινός**. For **ὀπίσω** in an unfavourable sense *cf.* Luke xxi. 8, John xii. 19, Acts v. 37, xx. 30, 2 Peter ii. 10, Jude 7, Rev. xiii. 3. The phrase, no doubt, refers to something worse than a second marriage.

Ver. 16. **εἴ τις πιστή**: This is one of those difficulties that prove the *bona fide* character of the letter. We may explain it in either of two ways: (1) It not unfrequently happens that the language in which we express a general statement is unconsciously coloured by a particular instance of which we are thinking at the moment. St. Paul has some definite case in his mind, of a Christian woman who had a widow depending on her, of whose support she wishes the Church to relieve her, or (2) the verse may be an afterthought to avoid the possibility of the ruling given in vv. 4, 7, 8 being supposed to refer to men only. Von Soden explains it by the independent position

c See 1 Tim. iii. 4.
d Heb. iii. 3, x. 29.
e See note on 1 Tim. iv. 10.
f Rom. ix. 17, x. 11, *cf.* Mark xv. 28.

17. Οἱ [c] καλῶς [c] προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς [d] ἀξιούσθωσαν, μάλιστα οἱ [e] κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ· 18. [f] λέγει

of married women indicated in ver. 14 and Tit. ii. 5. The phrase ἔχει χήρας may be intended to include dependent widowed relatives, aunts or cousins, who could not be called προγόνοι.

βαρείσθω. Compare the use of βάρος, 1 Thess. ii. 6, δυνάμενοι ἐν βάρει εἶναι; of ἐπιβαρέω, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8; καταβαρέω, 2 Cor. xii. 16; ἀβαρής, 2 Cor. xi. 9.

This verse proves that the κατάλογος of widows here in view was primarily at least for poor relief.

Vv. 17-25. What I have been saying about the support of widows reminds me of another question of Church finance: the payment of presbyters. Equity and scriptural principles suggest that they should be remunerated in proportion to their usefulness. You are the judge of the presbyters; in the discharge of this office be cautious in accusing, and bold in rebuking. I adjure you to be impartial. Do not absolve without deliberate consideration. A lax disciplinarian is partner in the guilt of those whom he encourages to sin. Keep yourself pure. I do not mean this in the ascetic sense; on the contrary, your continual delicacy demands a stimulant. But, to resume about your duties as a judge, you need not distress yourself by misgivings; you will find that your judgments about men, even when only instinctive, are generally correct.

Ver. 17. The natural and obvious meaning of the verse is that while all presbyters discharge administrative functions, well or indifferently, they are not all engaged in preaching and teaching. We distinguish then in this passage three grades of presbyters: (1) ordinary presbyters with a living wage; (2) efficient presbyters (κοπιῶντες, 1 Thess. v. 12); (3) presbyters who were also preachers and teachers. *Cf.* Cyprian (*Epist.* 29), *presbyteri doctores*. It must be added that Hort rejects the distinction between (2) and (3) (*Christian Ecclesia*, p. 196).

ὁ διδάσκων and **ὁ παρακαλῶν** were possessors of distinct and recognised charismata (Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 8, 28, 29, xiv. 6).

προεστῶτες: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 4.

διπλῆς τιμῆς: *Remuneration* is a better rendering of τιμή than *pay*, as less directly expressive of merely monetary reward. Liddon suggests the rendering *honorarium*. On the one hand, διπλῆς certainly warrants us in concluding that presbyters that ruled well were better paid than those that performed their duties perfunctorily. Bengel justifies the better pay given to those that "laboured in the word, etc.," on the ground that persons so fully occupied would have less time to earn their livelihood in secular occupations. On the other hand, we must not press the term *double* too strictly (*cf.* Rev. xviii. 6, διπλώσατε τὰ διπλᾶ). πλείονος τιμῆς (Theod.) is nearer the meaning than "double that of the widows, or of the deacons, or simply, liberal support" (Chrys.). The phrase is based, according to Grotius, on Deut. xxi. 17; in the division of an inheritance the first-born received two shares, *cf.* 2 Kings ii. 9. The custom of setting a double share of provisions before presbyters at the love feasts (*Constt. Ap.* ii. 28) must have been, as De Wette says, based on a misunderstanding of this passage.

ἀξιούσθωσαν implies that what they were deemed worthy of they received.

κοπιῶντες: There is no special stress to be laid on this, as though some preachers and teachers worked harder in the exercise of their gift than others.

λόγῳ: The omission of the article, characteristic of the Pastorals, obscures the reference here to the constant phrase *speak*, or *preach the word*, or *the word of God*.

διδασκαλίᾳ: See note on chap. i. 10.

Ver. 18. If this verse is read without critical prejudice, it implies that in the writer's judgment a quotation from Deut. xxv. 4 and the Saying, ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. might be coordinated as ἡ γραφή; just as in Mark vii. 10, Acts i. 20, and Heb. i. 10, two O.T. quotations are coupled by a καί. For this formula of quotation, in addition to the reff., see John xix. 37; Rom. iv. 3, xi. 2; Gal. iv. 30; Jas. ii. 23, iv. 5.

The question then arises, Is ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. a proverbial saying carelessly or mistakenly quoted by St. Paul as ἡ γραφή? or, Was St. Paul familiar with its presence in a written document, an early gospel, the subject of which was so sacred as to entitle it to be called ἡ

[f] γὰρ [f] ἡ [f] γραφή, Βοῦν ἀλοῶντα οὐ [g] φιμώσεις [1] · καί, Ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. 19. κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου [h] κατηγορίαν μὴ [i] παρα-

g Cf. Matt. xxii. 12, 34, Mark i. 25, iv. 39, Luke iv. 35, 1 Pet. ii. 15. h John xviii. 29, Tit. i. 6, not LXX. i Acts xxii. 18

[1] οὐ φιμ. βοῦν ἀλο. ACP, 17, 37, 80, five others, f, vg., boh., syrpesh, arm.

γραφή? The question has been prejudged by supposed necessary limitations as to the earliest possible date for a gospel; and many have thought it safest to adopt Stier's statement that ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ. was a common proverb made use of both by our Lord (Luke x. 7; Matt. x. 10), and by St. Paul. In that case, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that St. Paul forgot that it was not ἡ γραφή; for here it is not natural to take ἄξιος, κ.τ.λ., as a supplementary or confirmatory statement by the writer in the words of a well-known proverb. The proverb, if it be such, is rather the second item in ἡ γραφή, just as in 2 Tim. ii. 19, the "seal" consists of (a) "The Lord knoweth them that are his," and (b) "Let every one that nameth," etc. Our Lord no doubt employed proverbs that were current in His time, *e.g.*, Luke iv. 23, John iv. 37. In both these cases He intimates that He is doing so; but He does not do so in Matt. x. 10, or Luke x. 7. Besides, while the variation here between Matt. (τῆς τροφῆς) and Luke (τοῦ μισθοῦ) is of the same degree as in other cases of varying reports of Sayings from Q common to Matthew and Luke, yet such variation in wording is not likely in the case of a well-known proverb. We may add that it is difficult to know to what ruling of Christ reference is made in 1 Cor. ix. 14 if it be not this Saying. Critical opinion has recently grown inclined to believe that much of the gospel material which underlies the Synoptists was put into writing before our Lord's earthly ministry closed. (See Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 172.) The only question, therefore, is not, Could St. Paul have read the Evangelic narrative? but, Could he have coordinated a gospel document with the written oracles of God, venerated by every Hebrew as having a sanctity all their own? The question cannot be considered apart from what we know to have been St. Paul's conception of the person of Jesus Christ. We may readily grant that it would be a surprising thing if St. Paul thought of the writings of any contemporary apostle as "Scripture," as 2 Pet. iii. 16 does; but since he believed that Christ was "the end of the Law" (Rom. x. 4), it would be surprising were he not to have esteemed His words to be at least as authoritative as the Law which He superseded.

The order in Deut. xxv. 4 is οὐ φιμ. βοῦν ἀλο. The same text is quoted, 1 Cor. ix. 9 in the form οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλο. (B*D*FG). St. Paul's treatment of the command, as pointing to an analogy in the life of human beings, does not need any defence. Our just repudiation of the spirit in which he asks in 1 Cor., "Is it for the oxen that God careth?" must not blind us to the large element of truth in his answer, "Yea, for our sake it was written".

Ver. 19. The mention of καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι, and of what was due to them, naturally suggests by contrast the consideration of unsatisfactory presbyters. Yet even these were to be protected against the possibility of arbitrary dismissal. They were to have a fair trial in accordance with the provisions of the Old Law, Deut. xix. 15 (see also Deut. xvii. 6, Num. xxxv. 30. This requirement of two or three witnesses is used allegorically in 2 Cor. xiii. 1. *Cf.* John viii. 17, Heb. x. 28.) It has been asked, Why should this, the ordinary rule, be mentioned at all? The solution is to be found in a consideration of the private, unofficial, character of the Christian Church when this epistle was written. The Church was altogether a voluntary society, unrecognised by the state. The crimes of which its governors could take cognisance were spiritual; or if they were such as were punishable by the ordinary state law, the Church was concerned only with the spiritual and moral aspect of them, that is to say, so far as they affected Church life. There were then no spiritual courts, in the later sense of the term. No Church officer could enforce any but spiritual punishments. In these circumstances, the observance of legal regulations would not be a matter of necessity. Indeed a superintendent who was jealous for the purity of the Church might feel himself justified in acting even on suspicion, when the question arose as to the dismissal of a presbyter.

ἐκτὸς εἰ μή: This phrase arises from a

δέχου, [k] ἐκτὸς [k] εἰ [k] μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων.[1] 20. τοὺς [2] ἁμαρτάνοντας [l] ἐνώπιον [l] πάντων ἔλεγχε, ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ φόβον ἔχωσιν. 21. [m] Διαμαρτύρομαι [n] ἐνώπιον [n] τοῦ [n] Θεοῦ καὶ [3] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [4] καὶ τῶν [o] ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων, ἵνα ταῦτα [p] φυλάξῃς [q] χωρὶς

k 1 Cor. xiv. 5, xv. 2.
l Acts xix. 19, xxvii. 35.
m 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1.
n See 1 Tim. ii. 3.
o 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 6, 9, 2 John i. 13.
p Matt. xix. 20 (= Mark x. 20 = Luke xviii. 21), Luke xi. 28, John xii. 47, Acts vii. 53, xvi. 4, xxi. 24, Rom. ii. 26, Gal. vi. 13, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 14.
q Phil. ii. 14, 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] Om. ἐκτὸς-μαρτύρων Latin MSS. known to Jerome, also apparently Cyp. and Ambrst.

[2] Ins. δὲ AD*, d, f, g, *autem* (not r), go.; ins. δὲ after ἁμαρτ. FG.

[3] Ins. Κυρίου DcKLP, go., syrr.

[4] Ἰησ. Χριστ. DcFKLP, go., syrr., arm.

blend of εἰ μή and ἐκτὸς εἰ. Examples of its use are cited from Lucian. Alford notes that similar "pleonastic expressions such as χωρὶς εἰ, or εἰ μή, are found in later writers such as Plutarch, Dio Cassius, etc.". Deissmann cites an instructive example for its use in the Cilician Paul from an inscription of Mopsuestia in Cilicia of the Imperial period (*Bible Studies*, trans. p. 118). See reff.

ἐπὶ . . . μαρτύρων: This seems an abbreviation for ἐπὶ στόματος μαρτ. So R.V. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 1, Hebr. עַל־פִּי עֵד. It is a different use from ἐπὶ in the sense of *before* (a judge), Mark xiii. 9, Acts xxv. 9, 10. See Blass, *Gram.* p. 137.

Ver. 20. **τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας**: It cannot be certainly determined whether this refers to offending presbyters only or to sinners in general. In favour of the first alternative, is the consideration that it seems to be a suitable conclusion to ver. 19; and the vehemence of the adjuration in ver. 21 receives thus a justification. It demands greater moral courage to deal judicially with subordinate officials than with the rank and file of a society.

On the other hand, the sequence of thought in these concluding verses of the chapter is not formal and deliberate. Although it has been shown above that vv. 17-25 form one section, marked by one prominent topic, the relation of Timothy to presbyters, it cannot be maintained that the connexion is indisputably obvious; and the use of the present participle suggests that habitual sinners are under discussion. One is reluctant to suppose that such men would be found amongst the presbyters of the Church.

ἐνώπιον πάντων: At first sight this seems opposed to the directions given by our Lord, Matt. xviii. 15, "Shew him his fault between thee and him alone"; but the cases are quite different: Christ is there speaking of the mutual relations of one Christian with another, as brothers in the household of God; here St. Paul is giving directions to a father in God, a Christian ruler, as in 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. i. 13, ii. 15. Moreover, as Ell. points out, Christ is speaking of checking the beginning of a sinful state, St. Paul is speaking of persistent sinners.

ἵνα καὶ οἱ λοιποί, κ.τ.λ.: *Cf.* Deut. xiii. 11.

Ver. 21. **διαμαρτύρομαι**: It is easy to see that St. Paul had not perfect confidence in the moral courage of Timothy. He interjects similar adjurations, vi. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 1. In 1 Thess. iv. 6 we can understand διεμαρτυράμεθα to mean that purity had been the subject of a strong adjuration addressed by the apostle to his converts.

τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων: The epithet *elect* has probably the same force as *holy* in our common phrase, *The holy angels*. Compare the remarkable parallel, cited by Otto and Krebs, from Josephus, *B. J.* ii. 16, 4, μαρτύρομαι δὲ ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ἅγια καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρίδα τὴν κοινήν, and *Testament of Levi*, xix. 3, μάρτυς ἐστι κύριος, κ. μάρτυρες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, κ. μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς. The references to angels in St. Paul's speeches and letters suggest that he had an unquestioning belief in their beneficent ministrations; though he may not have attached any importance to speculations as to their various grades. We are safe in saying that *the elect angels* are identical with "the angels which kept their own principality" (Jude 6), "that did not sin" (2 Pet. ii. 4).

Ellicott follows Bp. Bull in giving ἐνώπιον a future reference to the Day of Judgment, when the Lord will be at-

[r] προκρίματος, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ [s] πρόσκλισιν.[1] 22. Χεῖρας [t] ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, μηδὲ [u] κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις [v] ἀλλοτρίαις· σεαυτὸν

r Here only, not LXX.
s Here only, not LXX.
t 2 Thess. ii. 2.
u 2 John 11.
v Rom. xiv. 4, xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 15, 16, Heb. ix. 25.

[1] So ℵFGK, 47**, 67**, many others, d, f, g, r, vg.; πρόσκλησιν ADLP, 17, 31, 37, 47*, 80, more than fifty-four others.

tended by "ten thousands of His holy ones" (Jude 14). But this seems an evasion due to modern prejudice. **ἐνώπιον** implies that the solemnity of the charge or adjuration is heightened by its being uttered in the actual presence of God, Christ, and the angels. Perhaps one may venture to suppose that these are thought of as in three varying degrees of remoteness from human beings, with our present powers of perception. God the Father, though indeed "He is not far from each one of us," "dwells in light unapproachable"; Christ Jesus, though in one sense He dwells in us and we in Him, is for the most part thought of as having His special presence at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; but the angels, though spiritual beings, are akin to ourselves, creatures as we are, powers with whom we are in immediate and almost sensible contact, *media* perhaps through which the influences of the Holy Spirit are communicated to us.

ταῦτα refers to all the preceding disciplinary instructions.

προκρίματος: *dislike, praejudicium.*

πρόσκλισιν: *partiality* (*nihil faciens in aliam partem declinando*, Vulg.).

Clem. Rom., *ad Cor.* 21, has the phrase **κατὰ προσκλίσεις.** The reading **πρόσκλησιν** is almost certainly due to itacism. It could only mean "*by invitation, i.e.*, the invitation or summons of those who seek to draw you over to their side" (Thayer's Grimm).

Ver. 22. Our best guide to the meaning of **χεῖρας . . . ἐπιτίθει** is the context, and more especially the following clause, **μηδὲ . . . ἀλλοτρίαις. μηδέ** constantly introduces an extension or development of what has immediately preceded; it never begins a new topic. Now the injunction *Be not partaker of other men's sins* is certainly connected with the disciplinary rebuke of sin, and refers of course to definite acts of sin committed in the past, as well as to their consequences or continuation. The whole procedure is outlined: we have the accusation in ver. 19, the conviction and sentence in ver. 20, and—in the true Pauline spirit—repentance and reconciliation in this verse; and the topic of ministerial treatment of sin is resumed and continued in ver. 24 *sq*. We can hardly doubt that St. Paul had in his mind Lev. xix. 17, "Thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbour and not bear sin because of him," **καὶ οὐ λήμψῃ δι' αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαν.** To witness in silence an act of wrong-doing is to connive at it. If this is true in the case of private persons, how much more serious an offence is it in the case of those to whom government is committed? See 2 John 11, **ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.**

χεῖρας . . . ἐπιτίθει is then best referred to imposition of hands on reconciled offenders, on their re-admission to Church communion. Eusebius (*H. E.*, vii. 2), speaking of reconciled heretics, says, "The ancient custom prevailed with regard to such that they should receive only the laying on of hands with prayers," **μόνῃ χρῆσθαι τῇ διὰ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως εὐχῇ.** See Council of Nicea, can. 8, according to one explanation of **χειροθετουμένους,** and Council of Arles, can. 8.

This was used in the case of penitents generally. So Pope Stephen (ap. Cyprian, *Ep.* 74), "Si qui ergo a quacunque haeresi venient ad vos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illis imponatur in paenitentiam". See Bingham, *Antiquities*, xviii. 2, 1, where the 15th Canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506) is cited: "Poenitentes tempore quo poenitentiam petunt, impositionem manuum et cilicium super caput a sacerdote consequantur." The antiquity of the custom may be argued from the consideration that imposition of hands was so prominent a feature in ordination, that it is not likely that its use would have been extended to anything else if such extension could not have claimed unquestioned antiquity in its favour. If the explanation of this verse given above—which is that of Hammond, De Wette, Ellicott, and Hort—be accepted, we have here the first distinct allusion to the custom of receiving back penitents by imposition of hands.

ἁγνὸν [w] τήρει. 23. μηκέτι [x] ὑδροπότει, ἀλλὰ οἴνῳ ὀλίγῳ [y] χρῶ διὰ τὸν [z] στόμαχον[1] καὶ τὰς [a] πυκνάς σου [b] ἀσθενείας. 24. τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι [c] πρόδηλοί εἰσιν, [d] προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν,

w 2 Cor. xi. 9, Jas. i. 27, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Tim. iv. 7.
x Here only N.T., Dan. i. 12, LXX. y Here only (N.T.) of food. z Here only, not LXX. a Here only, N.T., as adj. b Matt. viii. 17, Luke v. 15, viii. 2, xiii. 11, 12, John v. 5, xi. 4, Acts xxviii. 9, 1 Cor. ii. 3, Gal. iv. 13. c Vv. 24, 25, Heb. vii. 14, Judith viii. 29, 2 Macc. iii. 17, xiv. 39. d 1 Tim. i. 18.

[1] Ins. σου DcFGKL, f, g, vg., go., sah., boh., syrr., arm.; om. σου ℵAD*P, 17, d, r.

Timothy is bidden to restrain by deliberate prudence the impulses of mere pity. A hasty reconciliation tempts the offender to suppose that his offence cannot have been so very serious after all; and smoothes the way to a repetition of the sin. "Good-natured easy men" cannot escape responsibility for the disastrous consequences of their lax administration of the law. They have a share in the sins of those whom they have encouraged to sin. Those who give letters of recommendation with too great facility fall under the apostolic condemnation.

On the other hand, the ancient commentators — Chrys., Theod., Theoph., Oecumen.—refer χεῖρας ἐπιτίθει to hasty ordinations; and in support of this, the generally adopted view, it must be granted that ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν undoubtedly refers to ordination in iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6. If we assume the same reference here, the intention of the warning would be that Timothy will best avoid clerical scandals by being cautious at the outset as to the character of those whom he ordains. The clause in iii. 10, καὶ οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, would, in this case, have the same reference; and we should explain ἁμαρτίαι ἀλλότριαι as possible future sins, for the commission of which a man's advancement may give him facilities, and responsibility for which attaches, in various degrees of blameworthiness, to those who have rendered it possible for him to commit them.

σεαυτόν is emphatic, repeating in brief the warning of the previous clause.

ἁγνόν: The context demands that the meaning should not be *chaste* (*castum* Vulg.), as in Tit. ii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 2; but *pure* in the sense of *upright, honourable*, as in 2 Cor. vii. 11, Phil. iv. 8, Jas. iii. 17.

Ver. 23. μηκέτι ὑδροπότει: An adequate explanation of this seemingly irrelevant direction is that since there is a certain degree of ambiguity in ἁγνός, St. Paul thought it necessary to guard against any possible misunderstanding of *Keep thyself pure*: "I do not mean you to practice a rigid asceticism; on the contrary, I think that you are likely to injure your health by your complete abstinence from wine; so, *be no longer a water-drinker*, etc." So Hort, who thinks that this is "not merely a sanitary but quite as much a moral precept" (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 144). This explanation is preferable to that of Paley who regards this as an example of "the negligence of real correspondence . . . when a man writes as he remembers: when he puts down an article that occurs the moment it occurs, lest he should afterwards forget it" (*Horae Paulinae*). Similarly Calvin suggested that σεαυτὸν—ἀσθενείας was a marginal note by St. Paul himself. Alford's view has not much to commend it, *viz.*, that Timothy's weakness of character was connected with his constant ill health, and that St. Paul hoped to brace his deputy's will by a tonic.

For this position of μηκέτι *cf.* Mark ix. 25, xi. 14, Luke viii. 49, John v. 14, viii. 11, Rom. xiv. 13, Eph. iv. 28; and see note on chap. iv. 14.

διὰ τὸ στόμαχον: Wetstein's happy quotation from Libanius, *Epist.* 1578 must not be omitted: πέπτωκε καὶ ἡμῖν ὁ στόμαχος ταῖς συνεχέσιν ὑδροποσίαις.

Ver. 24. The connexion of this general statement is especially with ver. 22. The solemn warning against the awful consequences of an ill-considered moral judgment on those condemned was calculated to overwhelm a weak man with anxiety. Here the apostle assures Timothy that in actual practical experience the moral diagnosis of men's characters is not so perplexing as might be supposed antecedently. The exegesis of προάγουσαι and ἐπακολουθοῦσιν depends on the view we take of κρίσις; *viz.*, whether it refers to a judgment passed by man in this world, or to the final doom pronounced by God in the next. κρίσις is used of such a judgment as man may pass, in John viii. 16, 2 Peter ii. 11, Jude 9; though the

τισὶν δὲ καὶ [e] ἐπακολουθοῦσιν· 25. [f] ὡσαύτως[1] καὶ τὰ [g] ἔργα [g] τὰ [g] καλὰ[2] [e] πρόδηλα,[3] καὶ τὰ [h] ἄλλως ἔχοντα κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται.[4]

VI. 1. Ὅσοι εἰσὶν [a] ὑπὸ [a] ζυγὸν δοῦλοι τοὺς ἰδίους [b] δεσπότας πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους [c] ἡγείσθωσαν, [d] ἵνα [d] μὴ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ

e Mark xvi. 20, 1 Pet. ii. 21, *cf.* ver. 10. f See 1 Tim ii. 9. g See 1 Tim. iii. 1. h Here only, N.T.
a Ecclus. li. 26, Zech. iii. 9, Jer. xxxiv. (xxvii.) 8, 11. b Luke ii. 29, 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Tit. ii. 9, 1 Pet. ii. 18, 2 Pet. ii. 1. c See 1 Tim. i. 12. d Tit. ii. 5, Rom. ii. 24 (Isa. lii. 5).

[1] Ins. δὲ AFG, f, g, go. [2] τὰ καλὰ ἔργα KL.
[3] Add ἐστι KL; add εἰσὶ DFGP, 17, 67*, five others.
[4] So ADP, 17, 47, 67, more than thirty-five others; δύναται ℵFGKL.

word is more frequently used of the Great final Judgment. If, as is generally allowed, these verses, 24 and 25, are resumptive of ver. 22, the κρίσις here indicated is that of the Church ruler, Timothy in this case, deciding for or against the admission of men to communion (or to ordination). It is evident that the final Judgment of God, which no one can certainly forecast, cannot help or hinder a decision made in this life by one man about another. The meaning, then, of the clause is as follows: In the case of some men, you have no hesitation as to your verdict; their sins are notorious and force you to an adverse judgment. With regard to others, your suspicions, your instinctive feeling of moral disapproval, comes to be confirmed and justified by subsequent revelation of sins that had been concealed. This is, in the main, the explanation adopted by Alford.

πρόδηλοι: Not *open beforehand* (A.V.), but *evident* (R.V.), *manifesta sunt* (Vulg.) as in Heb. vii. 14 (neut.). The προ is not indicative of antecedence in time, but of publicity, as in προεγράφη, Gal. iii. 1.

προάγουσαι: It is best to take this in a transitive sense, as in Acts xii. 1, xvii. 5, xxv. 26, of bringing a prisoner forth to trial. Here the object of the verb is understood out of τινῶν ἀνθρώπων. The men are in the custody of their sins, which also testify against them. In the other case, the witnesses—the sins—do not appear until the persons on trial have had sentence pronounced on them. We supply εἰς κρίσιν after ἐπακολουθοῦσιν.

Ver. 25. ὡσαύτως here, as in chap. ii. 9, naturally introduces an antithesis to what has gone before; and this determines the meaning of τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα; not as ἔργα which are not καλά, but as ἔργα καλά which are not πρόδηλα; and justifies the R.V. rendering, *There are good works that are evident*. The next clause is parallel to the corresponding part of ver. 24: Sins and good works alike cannot be successfully and indefinitely concealed; they follow—are disclosed some time or other in justification of—the κρίσις of men. The literal rendering in R.V. m., *The works that are good are evident*, could only be defended by laying emphasis on καλά, "good in appearance as well as in reality"; but καλὰ ἔργα is of frequent occurrence in these epistles without any such special signification; see on iii. 1; and this rendering deprives ὡσαύτως of any force. Von Soden thinks that we have here a reference to the sayings in Matt. v. 14-16.

CHAPTER VI.—Vv. 1-2. The duty of Christian slaves to heathen and Christian masters respectively.

Ver. 1. The politico-social problem of the first ages of Christianity was the relation of freemen to slaves, just as the corresponding problem before the Church in our own day is the relation of the white to the coloured races. The grand truth of the brotherhood of man is the revolutionary fire which Christ came to cast upon earth. Fire, if it is to minister to civilisation, must be so controlled as to be directed. So with the social ethics of Christianity; the extent to which their logical consequences are pressed must be calculated by common sense. One of the great dangers to the interests of the Church in early times was the teaching of the gospel on liberty and equality, crude and unqualified by consideration of the other natural social conditions, also divinely ordered, which Christianity was called to leaven, not wholly to displace.

The slave problem also meets us in Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22, Tit. ii. 9, Philem. 1 Pet. ii. 18. In each place it is dealt with consistently, practically, Christianly.

The difficulty in this verse is ὑπὸ

ἡ διδασκαλία [d] βλασφημῆται. 2. οἱ δὲ πιστοὺς ἔχοντες [b] δεσπότας μὴ καταφρονείτωσαν, ὅτι ἀδελφοί εἰσιν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν, ὅτι πιστοί εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς [e] εὐεργεσίας [f] ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι.

e Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 11, Wisd. xvi. 11, 24, 2 Macc. vi. 13, ix. 26, 4 Macc. viii. 17, Acts iv. 9. f 1 Macc. ii. 48, 2 Macc. xiv. 15, Luke i. 54, Acts xx. 35.

ζυγόν. The contrast in ver. 2, **οἱ δὲ πιστ. ἔχ. δεσπ.** seems to prove that a **δοῦλος ὑπὸ ζυγόν** is one that belongs to a heathen master. The R.V. is consistent with this view, *Let as many as are servants under the yoke.* The heathen estimate of a slave differed in degree, not in kind, from their estimate of cattle; a Christian master could not regard his slaves as **ὑπὸ ζυγόν**.

τοὺς ἰδίους δεσπότας: The force of **ἴδιος** was so much weakened in later Greek that it is doubtful if it amounts here to more than **αὐτῶν**. See on iii. 4.

δεσπότης is more strictly the correlative of **δοῦλος** than is **κύριος**, and is used in this sense in reff. except Luke ii. 29. St. Paul has **κύριος** in his other epistles (Rom. xiv. 4; Gal. iv. 1; Eph. vi. 5, 9; Col. iii. 22, iv. 1); but, as Wace acutely remarks, in all these passages there is a reference to the Divine **κύριος** which gives the term a special appropriateness.

πάσης τιμῆς ἀξίους, *worthy of the greatest respect.*

ἵνα μὴ—βλασφημῆται: The phrase "blaspheme the name of God" comes from Isa. lii. 5 (*cf.* Ezek. xxxvi. 20-23). See Rom. ii. 24, 2 Pet. ii. 2. See note on v. 14. The corresponding passage in Tit. ii. 10, **ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κοσμῶσιν**, supports Alford's contention that the article here is equivalent to a possessive pronoun, *His doctrine.* On the other hand, the phrase does not need any explanation; *the doctrine* would be quite analogous to St. Paul's use elsewhere when speaking of the Christian faith. For **διδασκαλία**, see note on i. 10.

Ver. 2. A Christian slave would be more likely to presume on his newly acquired theory of liberty, equality and fraternity in relation to a Christian master than in relation to one that was a heathen. The position of a Christian master must have been a difficult one, distracted between the principles of a faith which he shared with his slave, and the laws of a social state which he felt were not wholly wrong. 1 Cor. vii. 22 and Philem. 16 illustrate the position.

μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν: *serve them all the more, magis serviant* (Vulg.).

For this use of **μᾶλλον** *cf.* Rom. xiv. 13, 1 Cor. v. 2, vi. 7, 9, Eph. iv. 28, v. 11. Ignat. *Polyc.* 4 says of Christian slaves, **μηδὲ αὐτοὶ φυσιούσθωσαν, ἀλλ' εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πλέον δουλευέτωσαν.**

ὅτι πιστοί, κ.τ.λ.: The Christian slave is to remember that the fact of his master being a Christian, *believing and beloved,* entitles him to service better, if possible, than that due to a heathen master. The slave is under a moral obligation to render faithful service to any master. If the spiritual status of the master be raised, it is reasonable that the quality of the service rendered be not lowered, but rather idealised. "*The benefit* is the improved quality of the service, and *they that partake of* or *enjoy it* are the masters" (Field *in loc.*). So Vulg., *qui beneficii participes sunt.*

εὐεργεσία has its usual non-religious signification, as in Acts iv. 9. It does not indicate the goodness of God in redemption, as suggested in A.V., influenced no doubt directly by Calvin and Beza, though the explanation is as old as Ambr., *because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit.* On the other hand, it is more natural to use **εὐεργεσία** of the kindness of an employer to a servant or employee, than of the advantage gained by the employer from his servant's good-will. Accordingly Chrysostom takes it here in the former sense, the whole clause referring to the slaves. Von Soden, taking **εὐεργεσία** similarly, renders, *as those who occupy themselves in doing good.* No doubt the best reward of faithful service is the acquisition of a character of trustworthiness and the grateful love of the master to whom you are invaluable; but it is rather far-fetched to read this subtle meaning into the passage before us. In support of the view taken above, Alford quotes from Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, iii. 18, a discussion of the query, "An beneficium dare servus domino possit?" which Seneca answers in the affirmative, adding further: "Quidquid est quod servilis officii formulam excedit, quod non ex imperio sed ex voluntate praestatur, beneficium est". See Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 270 *sqq.*, *St. Paul and Seneca.*

ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι: **ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι** properly means *to lay hold of,* hence

Ταῦτα δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει. 3. εἴ τις [g] ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ [h] προσέρχεται [1] [i] ὑγιαίνουσι [i] λόγοις, τοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ [k] τῇ [k] κατ᾽ [k l] εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ, 4. [m] τετύφωται, μηδὲν [n] ἐπιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ [o] νοσῶν περὶ [p] ζητήσεις καὶ [q] λογομαχίας,

g See 1 Tim. i. 3.
h See note.
i 2 Tim. i. 13, see 1 Tim. i. 10.
k Tit. i. 1.
l See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
m See 1 Tim. iii. 6.
n Mark xiv. 68, Acts (9), Heb. xi. 8, Jas. iv. 14, Jude 10.
o Wisd. xvii. 8 (*bis*) only.
p John iii. 25, Acts xv. 2, 7, xxv. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 9, not LXX.
q Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 14.

[1] προσέχεται ℵ*. So Bentley conj. from Latin *adquiescit*.

to help, as in reff.; and the Harclean Syriac gives that sense here. Like our English word *apprehend*, it passes from an association with the sense of touch to an association with the other senses or faculties which connect us with things about us. Field (*in loc.*) gives examples of the use of ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι as expressive of a person being *sensible* of anything which acts upon the senses, *e.g.*, the smell of a rose. The Peshitta agrees with this. Alford renders *mutually receive*, by which he seems to intend the same thing as Ell., who suggests that ἀντί has "a formal reference to the *reciprocal* relation between master and servant". Field rejects this because "receive in exchange" is ἀντιλαμβάνειν, and the examples cited by Alf. are middle only in form.

δίδασκε καὶ παρακάλει: See note on iv. 13.

Vv. 3-21. Thoughts about the right use of wealth are suggested by the slave problem, a mischievous attitude towards which is associated with false doctrine. If a man possesses himself, he has enough. This possession is eternal as well as temporal. This is my lesson for the poor, for you as a man of God (and I solemnly adjure you to learn and teach it), and for the rich.

Ver. 3. **ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ**: See note on i. 3.

καὶ μὴ: Blass (*Gramm.* p. 514) notes this case of μή following εἰ with the indicative (supposed reality) as an abnormal conformity to classical use. The usual N.T. use, εἰ . . . οὐ, appears in 1 Tim. iii. 5, v. 8. In these examples, however, the οὐ is in the same clause as εἰ, not separated from it, as here, by a καί.

προσέρχεται: *assents to*. The noun προσήλυτος, proselyte, "one who has come over," might alone render this use of προσέρχομαι defensible. But Ell. gives examples of this verb from Irenæus and Philo; and Alf. from Origen, which completely justify it. The reading προσέχεται, which seems to derive support from the use of προσέχειν, i. 4, Tit. i. 14, has not exactly the same force; "to give heed," or "attend to," a doctrine falls short of giving in one's adhesion to it.

ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις: See on i. 10.

τοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου: This is in harmony with St. Paul's teaching elsewhere, that the words spoken through the prophets of the Lord are the Lord's own words. It is thus we are to understand Acts xvi. 7, "The Spirit of Jesus suffered them not," and 1 Cor. xi. 23, "I received of the Lord," etc. The words of Jesus, "He that heareth you heareth me" (Luke x. 16) have a wider reference than was seen at first.

τῇ κατ᾽ εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ: See ref. and notes on i. 10, ii. 2.

Ver. 4. **τετύφωται**: *inflatus est* (d, m[50], r); *superbus est* (Vulg.). See on iii. 6.

νοσῶν: *morbidly busy* (Liddon), *languens* (Vulg.), *aegrotans* (m[50]). His disease is intellectual curiosity about trifles. Both *doting* and *mad after* (Alf.) as translations of νοσῶν, err by excess of vigour. The idea is a simple one of *sickness* as opposed to health. See on i. 10.

περὶ: For this use of περί see on i. 19.

ζητήσεις: See on i. 4.

λογομαχίας: It is not clear whether what is meant are *wordy quarrels* or *quarrels about words*. The latter seems the more likely. There is here the usual antithesis of words to deeds. The heretic spoken of is a theorist merely; he wastes time in academic disputes; he does not take account of things as they actually are. On the other hand, it is interesting and suggestive that to the heathen, the controversy between Christianity and Judaism seemed to be of this futile nature (see Acts xviii. 15, xxiii. 29, xxv. 19).

φθόνος, ἔρις are similarly juxtaposed Rom. i. 29, Gal. v. 20, 21, Phil. i. 15.

The plural ἔρεις is a well-supported variant in Rom. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 20. In Tit. iii. 9 it is the true reading; but in other lists of vices (1 Cor. iii. 3,

ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις,[1] βλασφημίαι, [r] ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί, 5. [s] διαπαρατριβαὶ[2] [t] διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ [u] ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας, [v] νομιζόντων [w] πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν [1] εὐσέβειαν.[3] 6. [w]Ἔστιν δὲ [x] πορισμὸς μέγας ἡ [y] εὐσέβεια μετὰ [z] αὐταρκείας· 7.

r Here only, N.T. s Here only, not LXX. t Here only metaph., cf. Luke xii. 33, 2 Cor. iv. 16, Rev. viii. 9, xi. 18. u Mark x. 19, 1 Cor. vi. 7, 8, vii. 5, Jas. v. 4 (?). v Matt. (3), Luke (2), Acts (7), 1 Cor. vii. 26, 36. w Wisd. xiii. 19, xiv. 2 only; verb, Wisd. xv. 12 only. x See ver. 5. y See 1 Tim. ii. 2. z 2 Cor. ix. 8, cf. Phil. iv. 11.

[1] So ℵAK^silP, 17, many others, syr^pesh, sah., boh., arm.; ἔρεις DFGL, 47, some others, d, f, g, m50, r, vg., go., syr^hcl.

[2] παραδιατριβαὶ a few cursives.

[3] Add ἀφίστασο ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων D^gr cKLP, m50, *Discede ab eiusmodi*, syrr., arm.

2 Cor. xii. 20, Phil. i. 15) the singular is found.

βλασφημία also occurs in a list of sins, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8.

ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί: **ὑπόνοια** (only here in N.T., but **ὑπονοέω** in Acts xiii. 25, xxv. 18, xxvii. 27, all in neutral sense, *to suppose*) has sometimes the sense of *suspicion*. See examples given by Ell. The phrase here does not mean wicked or unworthy thoughts of God—the class of mind here spoken of does not usually think about God directly, though an unworthy opinion about Him underlies their life—but *malicious suspicions* as to the honesty of those who differ from them.

Ver. 5. **διαπαρατριβαί**: The force of the **διά** is expressed in the R.V., *wranglings*, which denotes *protracted* quarrellings, *perconfricationes* (r), *conflictationes* (d, Vulg.). Field (*in loc.*) comparing **διαμάχεσθαι, διαφιλοτιμεῖσθαι**, etc., prefers the sense of *reciprocity*, *mutual irritations, gallings one of another* (A.V.m.), "as infected sheep by contact communicate disease to the sound" (Chrys.). **παραδιατριβαί** (T.R.), *perverse disputings*, is given a milder sense by Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 126, "misplaced diligence or useless disputing".

διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν: *cf.* **κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν**, 2 Tim. iii. 8, the acc. being that of the remoter object. *Cf.*, for the notion, **τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης**, Eph. iv. 22, also 1 Cor. xv. 33, 2 Cor. xi. 3, Jude 10.

ἀπεστερημένων: *privati.* **ἀποστερέω** conveys the notion of a person being deprived of a thing to which he has a right. See reff. This is expressed in R.V., *bereft of.* The truth was once theirs; they have disinherited themselves. The A.V., *destitute of*, does not assume that they ever had it.

νομιζόντων, κ.τ.λ.: *since they suppose.* For this use of the participle Bengel compares Rom. ii. 18, 20, 2 Tim. ii. 21, Heb. vi. 6.

πορισμόν: *a means of gain, quaestus.* The commentators quote Plutarch, *Cato Major*, § 25, **δυσὶ κεχρῆσθαι μόνοις πορισμοῖς, γεωργίᾳ καὶ φειδοῖ.**

τὴν εὐσέβειαν: not *godliness* in general, *pietatem* (Vulg.), but *the profession of Christianity, culturam Dei* (m50). See ii. 2. Allusions elsewhere to those who supposed that the gospel was a means of making money have usually reference to self-interested and grasping teachers (2 Cor. xi. 12, xii. 17, 18; Tit. i. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 3). Here the significance of the clause may be that the false teachers demoralised slaves, suggesting to slaves who were converts, or possible converts, that the profession of Christianity involved an improvement in social position and worldly prospects. The article before **εὐσεβ.** shews that the A.V. is wrong, *supposing that gain is godliness.*

Ver. 6. The repetition of **πορισμός** in a fresh idealised sense is parallel to the transfigured sense in which **νομίμως** is used in i. 8.

αὐταρκείας: not here *sufficientia* (Vulg.), though that is an adequate rendering in 2 Cor. ix. 8. St. Paul did not mean to express the sentiment of the A.V. of Eccles. vii. 11, "Wisdom is good with an inheritance". *Contentment* does not even give his meaning. Contentment is relative to one's lot; **αὐτάρκεια** is more profound, and denotes independence of, and indifference to, any lot; a man's finding not only his resources in himself, but being indifferent to everything else besides. This was St. Paul's condition when he had learnt to be **αὐτάρκης**, Phil. iv. 11. "Lord of himself, though not of lands" (Sir. H. Wot-

οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,[1] ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα· 8. ἔχοντες δὲ [a] διατροφὰς [2] καὶ [b] σκεπάσματα, τούτοις [c] ἀρκεσθησόμεθα. 9. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι πλουτεῖν [d] ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμὸν καὶ [e] παγίδα [3] καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς [f] ἀνοήτους [4] καὶ [g] βλαβεράς, αἵτινες [h] βυθίζουσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς [i] ὄλεθρον καὶ

a 1 Macc. vi. 49 only. b Here only, not LXX. c Luke iii. 14, Heb. xiii. 5. d See 1 Tim. iii. 6. e 1 Tim. iii. 7, 2 Tim. ii. 26. f Luke xxiv. 25, Rom. i. 14, Gal. iii. 1, 3, Tit. iii. 3. g Prov. x. 26 only. h 2 Macc. xii. 4, Luke v. 7 only. i 1 Cor. v. 5, 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Thess. i. 9 only, N.T.

[1] Ins. δῆλον ℵ^c D^bc KLP; ins. ἀληθὲς D*, *verum* (*quoniam*) d, *verum* (*quia*) m98, *haud dubium* (*quia*) f, vg., [*h*]*aut dubium*, *verum tamen* fuld., *verum* Cyp., go., syrr.; om. δῆλον ℵ*AFG, 17, g, r, vg^some MSS, sah., boh., arm.

[2] So ℵAL, f, vg.; διατροφὴν DFGKP, d, g, m98, r (*victum*).

[3] Ins. τοῦ διαβόλου D*FG, 37^mg, 238, d, f, g, m98 (not r), vg. (not am.), go.

[4] ἀνόνητους 2, two others, d, f, g, vg., Cyp., Ambrst. (*inutilia*) m98 (*quae nihil prosunt*) r (*stulta*).

ton). See chap. iv. 8. The popular as opposed to the philosophical use of αὐτάρκεια, as evidenced by the papyri, is simply *enough*. See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 375.

Ver. 7. The reasoning of this clause depends on the evident truth that since a man comes naked into this world (Job. i. 21), and when he leaves it can "take nothing for his labour, which he may carry away in his hand" (Eccles. v. 15; Ps. xlix. 17), nothing the world can give is any addition to the man himself. He is a complete man, though naked (Matt. vi. 25; Luke xii. 15; Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* lii. 25, "Non licet plus efferre quam intuleris").

Field is right in supposing that if δῆλον, as read in the Received Text, is spurious, yet "there is an ellipsis of δῆλον, or that ὅτι is for δῆλον ὅτι. L. Bos adduces but one example of this ellipsis, 1 John iii. 20: ὅτι ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν; in which, if an ellipsis of δῆλον before the second ὅτι were admissible, it would seem to offer an easy explanation of that difficult text." Field adds two examples from St. Chrysostom. Hort's conjecture t at "ὅτι is no more than an accidental repetition of the last two letters of κόσμον, ON being read as OTI" is almost certainly right.

Ver. 8. ἔχοντες δέ: The δέ has a slightly adversative force, guarding against a too literal conclusion from ver. 7. It is true that "unaccommodated man" (*Lear*, iii. 4) is "a man for a' that," yet he has wants while alive, though his real wants are few.

σκεπάσματα: may include clothes and shelter, *covering* (R.V.), *tegumentum* (r), *quibus tegamur*, as the Vulg. well puts it; but the word is used of clothing only in Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 8. 5; *Ant.* xv. 9, 2). So A.V., *raiment*, d, *vestitum* (so Chrys.).

Jacob specifies only "bread to eat and raiment to put on" (Gen. xxviii. 20); but the Son of Sirach is more indulgent to the natural man (Ecclus. xxix. 21, xxxix. 26, 27).

ἀρκεσθησόμεθα: This future is imperatival, or authoritative, as Alf. calls it. He cites in illustration, Matt. v. 48, ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι. From this point of view, the R.V., *We shall be therewith content*, *cf.* reff., is preferable to his rendering (which is equivalent to R.V. m.), *With these we shall be sufficiently provided* (*cf.* Matt. xxv. 9; John vi. 7; 2 Cor. xii. 9).

Ver. 9. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι: St. Chrysostom calls attention to the fact that St. Paul does not say, *They that are rich*, but *They that desire to be rich* (R.V.), they that make the acquisition of riches their aim. The warning applies to all grades of wealth: all come under it whose ambition is to have more money than that which satisfies their accustomed needs. We are also to note that what is here condemned is not an ambition to excel in some lawful department of human activity, which though it may bring an increase in riches, develops character, but the having a single eye to the accumulation of money by any means. This distinction is drawn in Prov. xxviii. 20: "A faithful man shall abound with blessings: But he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be unpunished".

ἐμπίπτουσιν. Wetstein notes the close parallel in the words of Seneca: "Dum divitias consequi volumus in mala

[k] ἀπώλειαν. 10. ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ [l] φιλαργυρία· ἧς τινὲς [m] ὀρεγόμενοι [n] ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοὺς [o] περιέπειραν [p] ὀδύναις πολλαῖς. 11. [q] Σὺ [q] δέ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε [1] Θεοῦ,

k Matt. vii. 13, Acts viii. 20, Rom. ix. 22, Heb. x. 39, Rev. xvii. 8, 11 (all with εἰς). l 4 Macc. i. 26, ii. 15 (?), *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 2. m See 1 Tim. iii. 1. n Mark. xiii. 22. o Here only, not LXX. p Rom. ix. 2 only, N.T. q Rom. xi. 17, 20, xiv. 10, 2 Tim. iii. 10, 14, iv. 5, Tit. ii. 1.

[1] Ins. τοῦ all except ℵ*A, 17.

multa incidimus" (*Ep.* 87). *Cf.* also Jas. i. 2, πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις. πειρασμόν refers rather to the consequencess of one's money-grubbing spirit on others, παγίδα to its disastrous effect on one's own character.

ἀνοήτους καὶ βλαβεράς: The desires in question are foolish, because they cannot be logically defended; they are hurtful, because they hinder true happiness. See Prov. xxiii. 4, "Weary not thyself to be rich".

αἵτινες: qualitative, *such as*.

βυθίζουσιν: The word is found in its literal signification in Luke v. 7. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vi. 381) illustrate its use here from a papyrus of cent. 1 B.C., συνεχέσι πολέμοις καταβυθισθεῖ[σαν] τὴν πόλιν. Bengel notes on ἐμπίπτ. βυθίζ., "*incidunt: mergunt.* Tristis gradatio." We must not lose sight of εἰς. Destruction and perdition are not, strictly speaking, the gulf in which the men are drowned. The lusts, etc., overwhelm them; and *the issue is destruction*, etc. See reff. on ἀπώλειαν.

Ver. 10. ῥίζα, κ.τ.λ.: *The root of all evils.* The R.V., *a root of all kinds of evil* is not satisfactory. The position of ῥίζα in the sentence shows that it is emphatic. Field (*in loc.*) cites similar examples of the absence of the article collected by Wetstein from Athenæus, vii. p. 280 A (ἀρχὴ καὶ ῥίζα παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἡ τῆς γαστρὸς ἡδονή), and Diog. Lært. vi. 50; and adds five others from his own observation. It is, besides, unreasonable in the highest degree to expect that, on the ground of his inspiration, St. Paul's ethical statements in a letter should be expressed with the precision of a text book. When one is dealing with a degrading vice of any kind, the interests of virtue are not served by qualified assertions.

φιλαργυρία: *avaritia* (r) rather than *cupiditas* (d, m, Vulg.). The use of this word supports the exposition given above of ver. 9. Love of money, meanness and covert dishonesty where money is concerned, is the basest species of the genus πλεονεξία.

ἧς: In sense the relative refers to ἀργύριον, understood out of φιλαργυρία, with which it agrees in grammar. The meaning is clear enough; but the expression of it is inaccurate. This occurs when a man's power of grammatical expression cannot keep pace with his thought. Alf. cites as parallels, Rom. viii. 24, ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη, and Acts xxiv. 15, ἐλπίδα . . . ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται.

τινες: See note on ch. i. 3.

ὀρεγόμενοι: *reaching after* (R.V.) expresses the most defensible aspect of *coveting* (A.V.).

ἀπεπλανήθησαν: *peregrinati sunt* (r) *erraverunt* (d, Vulg.). The faith is a very practical matter. *Have been led astray* (R.V.) continues the description of the man who allows himself to be the passive subject of temptation. Chrys. illustrates the use of this word here from an absent-minded man's passing his destination without knowing it.

περιέπειραν: *inseruerunt se.* The force of περί in this compound is intensive, as in περιάπτω, περικαλύπτω, περικρατής, περικρύπτω, περίλυπος.

ὀδύναις πολλαῖς: There is a touch of pity in this clause, so poignantly descriptive of a worldling's disillusionment.

Vv. 11-16 are a digression into a personal appeal. *Cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 1, iii. 10, 14, iv. 5.

Ver. 11. ὦ ἄνθρωπε θεοῦ: It argues a very inadequate appreciation of the fervour of the writer to suppose, as Theod. does, that this is an official title. The apostrophe is a personal appeal, arising out of the topic of other-worldliness which begins in ver. 5. Timothy, as a Christian man, had been called to a heavenly citizenship. He was a *man of God*, *i.e.*, a man belonging to the spiritual order of things with which that which is merely temporal, transitory and perishing can have no permanent relationship. The term occurs again, with an admittedly general reference, in 2 Tim. iii. 17. In any case *Man of God*, as an official title, belonged to prophets, the prophets of the Old Covenant; and we have no

ταῦτα [r] φεῦγε· [s] δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, [t] εὐσέβειαν, [u] πίστιν, [u] ἀγάπην, [v] ὑπομονήν, [w] πραϋπάθιαν.[1] 12. [x] ἀγωνίζου [y] τὸν [y] καλὸν [y] ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως· [z] ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς [a] αἰωνίου [a] ζωῆς, εἰς ἣν [2] ἐκλήθης, καὶ [b] ὡμολόγησας τὴν καλὴν [c] ὁμολογίαν ἐνώπιον πολλῶν μαρτύρων.

r 1 Cor. vi. 18, x. 14, 2 Tim. ii. 22. s Rom. ix. 30, 31, xii. 13, xiv. 19, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 1 Thess v. 15, 2 Tim. ii. 22, Heb. xii. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 11. t See 1 Tim. ii. 2. u See 1 Tim. i. 14. v Rom. v. 3, 2 Cor. vi. 4, xii. 12, Col. i. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 10, Tit. ii. 2, 2 Pet. i. 6, etc. w Here only, not LXX. x See 1 Tim. iv. 10. y 2 Tim. iv. 7, *cf.* Phil. i. 30, Col. ii. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 2, Heb. xii. 1. z 1 Tim. vi. 19. a See 1 Tim. i. 16. b John i. 20, ix. 22, xii. 42, Acts xxiii. 8, Rom. x. 9, 10, Tit. i. 16, Heb. xi. 13, xiii. 15, etc. c Heb. iii. 1, iv. 14, x. 23.

[1] So ℵ*AFG[P]; πρᾳότητα [ℵcD*] DcKL, [31].

[2] Ins. καὶ 37, some others, syrhcl c.*

proof that Timothy was a prophet of the New Covenant, though he was an evangelist (2 Tim. iv. 5), and possibly an apostle (1 Thess. ii. 6).

ταῦτα: *i.e.*, **φιλαργυρία** and its attendant evils. Love of money in ministers of religion does more to discredit religion in the eyes of ordinary people than would indulgence in many grosser vices.

It is to be noted that **φεῦγε· δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, πίστιν, ἀγάπην** recurs in 2 Tim. ii. 22. The phraseology is based on Prov. xv. 9, **διώκοντας δὲ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ**, and is thoroughly Pauline, as the reff. prove. The six virtues fall perhaps into three pairs, as Ell. suggests: "**δικαιοσ.** and **εὐσέβ.** have the widest relations, pointing to general conformity to God's law and practical piety [*cf.* **σωφρόνως κ. δικαίως κ. εὐσεβῶς**, Tit. ii. 12]; **πίστις** and **ἀγάπη** are the fundamental principles of Christianity; **ὑπομ.** and **πραϋπ.** the principles on which a Christian ought to act towards his gainsayers and opponents". As a group, they are contrasted with the group of vices in vv. 4 and 5; but we cannot arrange them in pairs of opposites. We may add that **πίστις** results in **ὑπομονή** (Jas. i. 3; Rom. v. 3; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2; Heb. xii. 1), as **ἀγάπη** does in **πραϋπάθεια**. **ὑπομονή** is *sustinentia* (r here, and Vulg. in 1 Thess. i. 3) rather than *patientia* (d and Vulg. here).

πίστις, ἀγάπη, and **ὑπομονή** are also combined in Tit. ii. 2; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 10, also 2 Pet. i. 5-7, where **εὐσέβεια**, with other virtues, forms part of the group.

Ver. 12. **ἀγωνίζου . . . ἀγῶνα**: There is evidence that **ἀγωνίζομαι ἀγῶνα** had become a stereotyped expression, perhaps from the line of Euripides: **καίτοι καλόν γ' ἂν τόνδ' ἀγῶν' ἠγωνίσω** (*Alcestis*, 648 or 664). See an Athenian inscription quoted by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 370. Nevertheless the metaphor has its full force here, and in 2 Tim. iv. 7: ***Engage in the contest which profession of the faith entails; it is a noble one.*** Allusions to the public games are notoriously Pauline (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12). The present imperative indicates the continuous nature of the **ἀγών**, while the aor. **ἐπιλαβοῦ** expresses the single act of laying hold of the prize (so ver. 19). It does not seem an insuperable objection to this view that **καταλαμβάνω** is the word used in 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. On the other hand, Winer-Moulton (*Gram.*, p. 392) argues from the asyndeton (*cf.* Mark iv. 39) that **ἐπιλαβοῦ, κ.τ.λ.** forms one notion with **ἀγωνίζου**; that "it is not the result of the contest, but itself the substance of the striving". Yet in ver. 19 (**ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς**) there is nothing in the context suggestive of struggle.

εἰς ἣν ἐκλήθης: We are called to eternal life (1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Pet. v. 10); it is placed well within our reach; but it is not put into our hands; each man must grasp it for himself.

καὶ ὡμολόγησας, κ.τ.λ.: This clause has no syntactical connexion with what has preceded. It refers to **ἀγῶνα**, the contest on which Timothy entered at his baptism, when he was called, enrolled as a soldier in the army of Jesus Christ (2 Tim. ii. 4; 1 Cor. ix. 7), and professed fidelity to his new Leader (his response to the divine call) before many witnesses. **ὁμολογία** is perhaps best referred to a formal profession of faith, here as in the reff. Cyril Jer., when recalling the baptismal ceremonies to the newly baptised, says in reference to their profession of belief in the Trinity, **ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν** (*Cat.* xx. 4).

In the primitive Church the baptism of an individual was a matter in which the Church generally took an interest and part. The rule laid down in *The Didache*,

13. [d] Παραγγέλλω σοι [1] [e] ἐνώπιον [e] τοῦ [2] [e] Θεοῦ τοῦ [f] ζωογονοῦντος [3] τὰ πάντα καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [4] τοῦ [g] μαρτυρήσαντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου

d See 1 Tim. i. 3.
e See 1 Tim. ii. 3.
f 1 Sam. ii. 6, Luke xvii. 33, Acts vii. 19.
g John v. 32, 1 John v. 10, with acc.

[1] Om. σοι ℵ*FG, 17 [g, *praecipio tibi t contestor*]. [2] Om. τοῦ ℵ.

[3] So ADFGP, 17, 31, four others; ζωοποιοῦντος ℵKL.

[4] So ADKLP, 17, 31, 37, many others, d, vg., go., syrhcl, armcodd; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵFG, more than five cursives, f, g, syrpesh, sah., boh., armed.

7, shows this: "Before the baptism let him that baptizeth and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able". Also Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 61, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. These passages explain "the many witnesses" of Timothy's good confession. It is not so natural to refer *the good confession* to a crisis of persecution, or to his ordination. The epithet καλήν here and in the following verse does not characterise the particular act of confession made by Timothy or by Christ, but refers to the class of confession, its import, as Ell. says.

Ver. 13. **παραγγέλλω σοι**: St. Paul passes in thought from the past epoch in Timothy's life, with its human witnesses, among whom was the apostle himself, to the present probation of Timothy, St. Paul far away; and he feels impelled to remind his lieutenant that there are Witnesses of his conduct whose real though unseen presence is an encouragement as well as a check. See on v. 21.

ζωογονοῦντος: This word has the sense *preserve alive*, as R.V. m. See reff. A good example from O.T. is 1 Sam. ii. 6, Κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ. The word has here a special appropriateness. Timothy is stimulated to exhibit moral courage by an assurance that he is in the hands of One whose protective power is universal, and by the example of One who, as Man, put that protective power to a successful test, and was "saved out of death" (Heb. v. 7).

τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν must have the same reference here as in the preceding verse. We have seen that in the case of Timothy, it means his baptismal profession of faith in God as revealed by Jesus Christ. In the case of Jesus Himself it is best understood of His habitual sense of His heavenly Father's presence and protection, which found its supreme expression on the Cross (Luke xxiv. 46).

μαρτυρήσαντος: Although Jesus, as Man, and His followers make the same ὁμολογία, yet their respective relations to it are different. μαρτυρέω indicates a power of origination and authentication which ὁμολογέω does not. The utterances and acts of Jesus, as Man, are human; yet He spoke and acted as no other man ever did. Matt. xvii. 27 ("That take, and give unto them for *me and thee*," not "for *us*") and John xx. 17 ("I ascend unto *my* Father *and your* Father," etc. not *our* Father or *our* God) illustrate very well this difference between Jesus and His brethren in relations which they share alike. This is why St. Paul does not here use ὁμολογέω ὁμολογίαν of Christ, but employs instead the unusual μαρτυρέω ὁμολογίαν. Jesus is ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, Rev. i. 5, ὁ μαρτ. ὁ πιστ. καὶ ἀληθινός, Rev. iii. 14. Bengel suggests that the two verbs indicate the attitudes of the bystanders in each case: "*confessus est*, cum assensione testium: *testatus est*, non assentiente Pilato". The Vulg. treats τὴν καλ. ὁμολ. as an acc. of closer specification, *qui testimonium reddidit sub Pontio Pilato, bonam confessionem.*

ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πειλάτου: With the explanation of the ὁμολογία of Jesus which has just been given, it would be natural to render this, with the Vulg., *under Pontius Pilate*; and this view is favoured by the change from ἐνώπιον, ver. 12, to ἐπί, and by the likelihood that this is a fragment of a creed. Yet the rendering *before Pontius Pilate* (Chrys., etc.), is not inconsistent with the notion that the ὁμολογία in one sense was made all during our Lord's ministry; for undoubtedly from one point of view it was when Jesus' life was hanging in the balance, depending on the decision of Pontius Pilate, that His trust in the protective love of His Father was most tried. His calm repose of soul on the assurance of God's wise and good disposition of events is well illustrated by His words as recorded in John xix. 11, "Thou wouldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above". Until it has been been proved that the Fourth Gospel is not a record of facts, it is reasonable to suppose that St. Paul and his contem-

Πειλάτου τὴν καλὴν [h] ὁμολογίαν, 14. [i] τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολὴν [k] ἄσπιλον [l] ἀνεπίλημπτον μέχρι τῆς [m] ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 15. ἣν [n] καιροῖς [n] ἰδίοις δείξει ὁ [o] μακάριος καὶ

h See ver. 12.
i 2 Tim. iv. 7, see note.
k Jas. i. 27, 1 Pet. i. 19, 2 Pet. iii. 14, not LXX.
l See 1 Tim. iii. 2.
m 2 Thess. ii. 8, 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. 1, 8, Tit. ii. 13.
n See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
o 1 Tim. i. 11.

poraries were acquainted with the general account of the trial of Jesus as therein described.

Ver. 14. **τηρῆσαι κ.τ.λ.**: The phrase **τηρεῖν τὴν ἐντολήν, τὰς ἐντολάς** or **τὸν λόγον, τοὺς λόγους** is a common one; found in Matt. xix. 17, and especially in the Johannine writings; but wherever it occurs it means *to obey* or *observe* a command or a saying; whereas here it means *to preserve intact*. Perhaps the two meanings were present to the apostle's mind; and no doubt in actual experience they merge one into the other; for a tradition is only preserved by obedience to the demand which it makes for observance. This use of the verb and the similar **τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα**, 2 Tim. iv. 7, mutually illustrate each other. **τὴν ἐντολὴν τηρεῖν** is probably equivalent to **τὴν παραθήκην φυλάσσειν**, understanding the *tradition* or *deposit* in the most comprehensive moral and spiritual sense, in which it is nothing else than "the law of the Gospel (*cf.* **ἡ παραγγελία**, i. 5), the Gospel viewed as a rule of life" (so Ell. and Alf.). St. Paul would not have distinguished this from the charge given to Timothy at his baptism. Cyril Jer. (*Cat.* v. 13), in quoting this passage, substitutes **ταύτην τὴν παραδιδομένην πίστιν** for **ἐντολήν**. This interpretation is permissible so long as we do not divorce creed from character.

ἄσπιλον ἀνεπίλημπτον: These epithets present a difficulty somewhat similar to that presented by **τηρῆσαι**. **ἄσπιλος** is a personal epithet (though applied to **οὐρανός**, Job. xv. 15, Symm.); and so is **ἀνεπίλημπτος**. See reff. on both. Alford shows, after De Wette, by examples from Philo and Plato, that **ἀνεπίλ.** may be applied to impersonal objects, such as **τέχνη, τὸ λεγόμενον**. Nevertheless although it would be intolerably awkward to refer the adjectives to **σε**—the ordinary construction with **τηρεῖν** being that the qualifying adj. should belong to its object, *e.g.*, 1 Tim. v. 22; Jas. i. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 9 (Alf.)—yet St. Paul had the personal reference to Timothy chiefly in his mind when he chose these words as qualifying **ἐντολήν**; and the R.V., which places a comma after *commandment*, possibly is intended to suggest a similar view. The man and the word are similarly identified in the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 19, etc.). If Timothy "keeps himself unspotted" (Jas. i. 27) and "without reproach," the **ἐντολή**, so far as he is concerned, will be maintained flawless.

The Ancient Homily which used to be attributed to Clem. Rom. contains a sentence written in a similar tone (§ 8), **τηρήσατε τὴν σάρκα ἁγνὴν καὶ τὴν σφραγῖδα ἄσπιλον, ἵνα τὴν ζωὴν ἀπολάβωμεν.**

μέχρι τῆς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: Death may mark the close of our probation state; but we shall not render the account of our stewardship until the **ἐπιφάνεια**. When the Pastorals were written the **ἐπιφάνεια** had in men's thoughts of it receded beyond each man's death. At an earlier period Christians set it before them as men now set death. In 2 Thess. ii. 8 the compound phrase occurs **ἐπιφάν. τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ. ἐπιφάνεια** is the term used in the Pastoral Epistles (see reff.); but the Second Coming of Christ is called **παρουσία** in 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, iv. 15, v. 23, 2 Thess. ii. 1. In 2 Tim. i. 19, **ἐπιφάνεια** includes the first manifestation of Christ in the flesh; and this application of the term is in exact correspondence with its use in heathen sacred associations, where it denoted "a conspicuous appearance or intervention of the higher powers on behalf of their worshippers". The title **ἐπιφανής**, assumed by the Seleucidæ, meant a claim to be worshipped as an incarnation of Zeus or Apollo, as the case might be (see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 380).

Ver. 15. **καιροῖς ἰδίοις**: See note on ii. 6. *In due season* may refer primarily either to the appropriateness of the occasion of the **ἐπιφάνεια** or to the supreme will of the **δυνάστης**. The wording of the discouragement given by Jesus, in Acts i. 7, to those who would pry into the future makes it natural to suppose that this latter notion chiefly was in St. Paul's mind here (**καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ**). We may perhaps put it thus: A devout mind recog-

μόνος [p] Δυνάστης, ὁ [q] Βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ Κύριος τῶν [r] κυριευόντων, 16. ὁ μόνος ἔχων [s] ἀθανασίαν, φῶς [t] οἰκῶν [u] ἀπρόσιτον, ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται· ᾧ τιμὴ καὶ [v] κράτος αἰώνιον· ἀμήν.

17. Τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν [w] τῷ [w] νῦν [w] αἰῶνι παράγγελλε μὴ [y] ὑψη-

p Ecclus. xlvi. 5, 16, 2 Macc. (8), 3 Macc. (4). q *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 17. r Luke xxii. 25. s Here only N.T., Wisd. (5), 4 Macc. (2). t Rom. (4), 1 Cor. (3). u Here only, not LXX. v 1 Pet. iv. 11 v. 11, Jude 25, Rev. i. 6, v. 13. w 2 Tim. iv. 10, Tit. ii. 12. x See 1 Tim. i. 3. y Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Rom. xi. 20, xii. 16.

nises the providential ordering of past events as having taken place at the time best fitted for them, and shrinks from the presumption of guessing the appropriate time for future events. Thus there is no presumption in saying "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son"; and when the time is ripe, He will send Him again (Acts iii. 20).

δείξει: Ell. well explains the force of this verb from John ii. 18, **τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν**; The last **ἐπιφάνεια** will be the final *proof* offered by God to the human race.

The terms of this magnificent characterisation of God are an expansion of the epithets in the doxology in i. 17 *q.v.*

μακάριος: See on i. 11. Philo (*de Sacrific. Abelis et Caini*, p. 147) has the remarkable parallel, **περὶ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγεννήτου, καὶ ἀφθάρτου, καὶ ἀτρέπτου, καὶ ἁγίου, καὶ μόνου μακαρίου.**

δυνάστης is found as a title of God in the Apocrypha. See reff., esp. 2 Macc. iii. 24, **ὁ . . . δυνάστης ἐπιφανίαν μεγάλην ἐποίησεν.** It occurs in the ordinary sense, Luke i. 52, Acts viii. 27. The choice of the phrase **μόνος δυν.** here was perhaps suggested by the thought of His absolute and irresponsible power in arranging the times and seasons for the affairs of men. It is unnecessary to seek any special polemical object in **μόνος**, as exclusive of dualism. As has been already suggested (on i. 17), the predications of glory to God that occur in these epistles are probably repeated from eucharistic prayers uttered by St. Paul in the discharge of his prophetic liturgical functions.

ὁ βασιλεύς, κ.τ.λ.: The Vulg. renders rather inconsistently, *Rex regum et Dominus dominantium*. So also in Rev. xix. 16. It is not quite obvious why the phrase is varied from the usual **βασιλεὺς βασιλέων** (2 Macc. xiii. 4; Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16) and **Κύριος [τῶν] Κυρίων** (Deut. x. 17; Ps. cxxxvi. 3; Enoch ix. 4). Perhaps the participle gives new vigour to a phrase that had lost its freshness.

Ver. 16. **ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν**: God the Father is the subject of this whole attribution; and it is the Catholic doctrine that He alone has endless existence as His *essential* property. (**οὐσίᾳ ἀθάνατος οὐ μετουσίᾳ**, Theod. *Dial.* iii. p. 145, quoted by Ell.). God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are co-eternal with the Father; but Their life is derived from and dependent on His. This is expressly declared by Christ of Himself, "As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself" (John v. 26). On this Westcott notes: "The Son has not life only as given, but life *in Himself* as being a spring of life. . . . The tense (*gave*) carries us back beyond time". Accordingly, the creed of Cæsarea, which formed the basis of that adopted at Nicea, spoke of the Son as **Ζωὴν ἐκ Ζωῆς**; a doctrine sufficiently expressed in the other phrase, **Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός**, which has survived.

φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον: This is a grander conception than that in Ps. civ. 2, "Who coverest thyself with light as with a garment". Here, if one may venture so to express it, the Person of God is wholly concealed by His dwelling, which is light; and this dwelling is itself unapproachable. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 5. 1, says that God was thought to dwell in Mount Sinai, **φοβερὸν καὶ ἀπρόσιτον.** (See also Philo, *de Vita Mosis*, ii. [iii.] 2 cited by Dean Bernard).

ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων: None *of men*; only the Son (John i. 18; Matt. xi. 27, etc.).

κράτος: For this word in doxologies see reff.

Ver. 17. **ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι**: It is the present contrast, not that between riches in this world and riches in the world to come (as Chrys.), that the apostle has in mind. Those who have money may, as well as those "that are poor as to the world," be "rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, etc." (Jas. ii. 5). The passage indicates that the Church had affected Society more widely in Ephesus than it

λοφρονεῖν,[1] μηδὲ [z] ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου [a] ἀδηλότητι, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ[2] [3] Θεῷ[4] τῷ [b] παρέχοντι ἡμῖν[5] πάντα [c] πλουσίως[6] εἰς [d] ἀπόλαυσιν, 18. [e] ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν [f] ἔργοις [f] καλοῖς, [g] εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, [h] κοινωνικούς, 19. [i] ἀποθησαυρίζοντας ἑαυτοῖς [k] θεμέλιον καλὸν [l] εἰς [l] τὸ [l] μέλλον, ἵνα [m] ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς [n] ὄντως[7] ζωῆς.

z See 1 Tim. iv. 10. a Here only, not LXX. b 1 Tim. i. 4, Luke vii. 4, Acts xxviii. 2, Col. iv. 1. c Col. iii. 16, Tit. iii. 6, 2 Pet. i. 11, not LXX. d 3 Macc. vii. 16, Heb. xi. 25 only. e Acts xiv. 17, not LXX. f See 1 Tim. iii. 1. g Here only, not LXX. h Here only, not LXX. i Ecclus. iii. 4 only. k Rom. xv. 20, 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11, 12, Eph. ii. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 19, Heb. vi. 1. l Luke xiii. 9. m 1 Tim. vi. 12. n See 1 Tim. v. 3.

[1] ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν ℵ. [2] ἐν DcKL.

[3] Ins. τῷ ADcKLP; om. τῷ ℵD*FG, three cursives arm.

[4] Ins. [τῷ] ζῶντι DKL, d, e, m22, vg. (am. not fuld*), syrr.

[5] Ins. τὰ A, 37, a few others.

[6] πλουσίως πάντα a few cursives. [7] αἰωνίου DcKLP.

had at Corinth when St. Paul wrote, "Not many mighty, not many noble, are called" (1 Cor. i. 26). It is to be observed that the expression ὁ νῦν αἰών is only found in N.T. in the Pastoral Epistles (see reff.). ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος is the expression elsewhere in N.T. (Matt. xii. 32; Luke xvi. 8, xx. 34; Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20, ii. 6 (bis), 8, iii. 18; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. i. 21). Both represent the Rabbinic עולם הזה, the present age, as contrasted with עולם הבא, the age to come. St. Paul also has ὁ κόσμος οὗτος in 1 Cor. iii. 19, v. 10, vii. 31, and ὁ νῦν καιρός in Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5, 2 Cor. viii. 14. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 21. It does not follow that because these are renderings of the same Hebrew expression, they meant the same to a Greek ear. In the three places in which ὁ νῦν αἰών occurs it has a definite material physical sense; whereas ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος has a more notional ethical force.

ἠλπικέναι ἐπί: *have their hope set on.* See note on iv. 10. For the thought compare Job. xxxi. 24, Ps. xlix. 6, lii. 7, Prov. xi. 28, Mark x. 24.

ἠλπικ. ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι: This vigorous oxymoron is not quite parallel in form to ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς, Rom. vi. 4, as Ell. suggests. There ζωῆς is a further definition of the καινότης, the prominent notion. This is a rhetorical intensifying of *riches which are uncertain*; πλούτου is the prominent word. "When the genitive stands before the governing noun, it is emphatic" (Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 240). For the thought *cf.* Prov. xxiii. 5, xxvii. 24.

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ θεῷ: God who cannot change, who abides faithful, is contrasted with the uncertainty of riches which are unreal.

τῷ παρέχ. πάντα πλουσίως: *cf.* Acts xiv. 17.

εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν: This is a greater concession to the sensuous view of life than the εἰς μετάλημψιν of iv. 3. It approaches the declaration of the Preacher that for a man to "eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good in his labour . . . is from the hand of God" (Eccles. ii. 24), "the gift of God" (Eccles. iii. 13, v. 19). No good purpose is served by pretending that God did not intend us to enjoy the pleasurable sensations of physical life. After all, things that have been enjoyed have served their purpose; they have "perished," yet "with the using" (Col. ii. 22). Obviously, they cannot take God's place as an object of hope.

Ver. 18. **ἀγαθοεργεῖν**: corrects any possible misunderstanding of εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν. **πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς**: see note on iii. 1. *Cf.* εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν, Luke xii. 21.

εὐμεταδότους: *facile tribuere* (Vulg.), *ready to impart* (*cf.* the use of μεταδίδωμι in Luke iii. 11; Rom. i. 11, xii. 8; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Thess. ii. 8).

κοινωνικούς: This does not mean *sociable* (A.V. m.), *ready to sympathise* (R.V. m.), as Chrys., and Thdrt. explain it, but ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες, Rom. xii. 13 (*cf.* Gal. vi. 6; Phil. iv. 15). A good illustration of the general sentiment is Heb. xiii. 16, τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε. Von Soden notes that the thought in εὐμεταδ. is of the needs of others, in κοινων. of the imparting of one's own.

Ver. 19. **ἀποθησαυρίζοντας**: The true hoarding produces, as its first result, a good foundation, which will entitle a man to grasp the prize, which is true life, the only life worth talking about.

20. Ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν [o] παραθήκην [1] [o p] φύλαξον, [q] ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς [r s] βεβήλους [s t] κενοφωνίας [2] καὶ [u] ἀντιθέσεις τῆς [v] ψευδωνύμου

o 2 Tim. i. 12, 14, *cf.* Lev. vi. 2, 4, Tob. x. 13, 2 Macc. iii. 10, 15. p See 1 Tim. v. 21. q See 1 Tim. i. 6. r See 1 Tim. i. 9. s 2 Tim. ii. 16. t 2 Tim. ii. 16, not LXX. u Here only, not LXX. v Here only, not LXX.

[1] **παρακαταθήκην** many cursives.

[2] **καινοφωνίας** FG, a few cursives, d, e, f, g, m50, vg. (*vocum novitates*).

Stability is the essential characteristic of a foundation. There is a contrast implied between the shifting uncertainty of riches, as a ground of hope, and the firm and permanent foundation of a Christian character. (So, nearly, Theod.)

Ingenious conjectures have been suggested for **θεμέλιον**; but it is safe to say that the mixture of metaphors—due to the condensation of language—does not distress those who read in a devout rather than in a critical spirit. For the sentiment *cf.* Matt. vi. 19, 20. There is some support given to the conjecture of Lamb-Bos, **θέμα λίαν**, by the parallel from Tobit iv. 8 *sq.* cited by Bengel, **μὴ φοβοῦ ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην· θέμα γὰρ ἀγαθὸν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ εἰς ἡμέραν ἀνάγκης.** See, on the other hand, what Ecclus. i. 15 says of Wisdom, **μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰῶνος ἐνόσσευσεν. θεμέλιος** is used metaphorically also in reff. It is to be observed that in 2 Tim. ii. 19 there is again a confusion of imagery: the foundation has a seal.

εἰς τὸ μέλλον is found in a slightly different sense (*thenceforth*), Luke xiii. 9.

ἐπιλάβωνται: See on ver. 12.

τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς: *the life which is life indeed*, an expression which is one of the precious things of the R.V. It is "the life which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. i. 1).

For **ὄντως** see v. 3.

Ver. 20. As Ell. points out, this concluding apostrophe, like the last paragraph in 2 Cor. (xiii. 11 *sqq*,), is a summary of the whole epistle.

On the intensity of the appeal in the use of the personal name see on i. 18.

τὴν παραθήκην: *depositum.* The term occurs in a similar connexion with **φυλάσσω**, 2 Tim. i. 14. and also in 2 Tim. i. 12, where see note. Here, and in 2 Tim. i. 14, it means, as Chrys. explains, **ἡ πίστις, τὸ κήρυγμα**; so Vincent of Lerins, from whose *Commonitorium* (c. 22) Alf. quotes. "Quid est *depositum*? id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinae; non usurpationis privatae, sed publicae traditionis . . . catholicae fidei talentum inviolatum illibatumque conserva. . . . Aurum accepisti, aurum redde: nolo mihi pro aliis alia subjicias: nolo pro auro aut impudenter plumbum, aut fraudulenter aeramenta supponas." That the "deposit" is practically identical with the "charge," ch. i. 5, 18, "the sound doctrine," i. 10, "the commandment," vi. 14, is indicated by the use of the cognate verb **παρατίθεμαι** in i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 2, and the correlative **παρέλαβες**, Col. iv. 17, and even more by the contrast here between it and "the knowledge falsely so called".

ἐκτρεπόμενος: *turning away from, devitans.*

τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας: In 2 Tim. ii. 16 the Vulg. has *vaniloquia.* The rendering *vocum novitates* found here in Vulg. and O.L. represents the variant **καινοφωνίας.** The term does not differ much from **ματαιολογία**, i. 6, which is also rendered *vaniloquium.*

ἀντιθέσεις: In face of the general anarthrous character of the Greek of these epistles it is not certain that the absence of an article before **ἀντιθ.** proves that it is qualified by **βεβήλους.** The meaning of **ἀντιθ.** is partly fixed by **κενοφωνίας**, to which it is in some sort an explanatory appendix; but it must finally depend upon the signification we attach to **τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως.** The epithet **ψευδων.** is sufficient to prove that **γνῶσις** was specially claimed by the heretics whom St. Paul has in his mind. That it should be so is in harmony with the other notices which we find in these epistles suggestive of a puerile and profitless intellectual subtlety, as opposed to the practical moral character of Christianity. We are reminded of the contrast in 1 Cor. viii. 1, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love buildeth up". Hort (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 139 *sqq.*) proves that **γνῶσις** here and elsewhere in N.T. (Luke xi. 52; Rom. ii. 20 *sq.*) refers to the special lore of those who interpreted mystically the O.T., especially the Law. Knowledge which is merely theoretical. the knowledge of God professed by those who "by their works deny Him" (Tit. i.

γνώσεως, 21. ἥν τινες [w] ἐπαγγελλόμενοι [x] περὶ [x] τὴν [x] πίστιν [y] ἠστόχησαν.

Ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.[1]

w 1 Tim. ii. 10.
x 1 Tim. i. 19, 2 Tim. iii. 8.
y See 1 Tim. i. 6.

[1] So ℵAFgrGP, 17, g (*vobiscum t tecum*) boh.; **μετὰ σοῦ** DKL, d, e, f, vg., syrr., arm.; sah. om. **ἡ χάρ.—ὑμῶν**; add **ἀμήν** ℵcDbcKLP, e, f, vg., syrr., boh.

ℵ, 17 add **πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾱ**. To this D adds, **ἐπληρώθη· ἄρχεται πρὸς Τιμόθεον β̄**, similarly FG. A, etc., have **πρὸς Τιμόθεον ᾱ ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας**; to which K adds, **ἥτις ἐστὶ μητρόπολις Φρυγίας τῆς Πακατιανῆς**, similarly L. P has a subscription like that of A, substituting **Νικοπόλεως** for **Λαοδικείας**.

16), is not real knowledge. The **ἀντιθέσεις** then of this spurious knowledge would be the dialectical distinctions and niceties of the false teachers. Perhaps *inconsistencies* is what is meant. For an example of **ἀντίθετος** in this sense, see Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 275. Something more definite than (*a*) *oppositions*, *i.e.*, *objections* of opponents (so Chrys. Theoph. and von Soden, who compares **ἀντιδιατιθεμένους**, 2 Tim. ii. 25) is implied; but certainly not (*b*) the formal categorical oppositions between the Law and the Gospel alleged by Marcion.

Ver. 21. **τινες**: See note on i. 3.

ἐπαγγελλόμενοι: See note on ii. 10.

περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν: See notes on i. 6, 19, and reff.

μεθ' ὑμῶν: An argument in support of the **μετὰ σοῦ** of the Received Text is that **μεθ' ὑμῶν** is indisputably the right reading in the corresponding place in 2 Tim. and Tit., and might have crept in here by assimilation. Ell. has reason on his side when he maintains that the plural here is not sufficient to prove that the epistle as a whole was intended for the Church. "The study of papyri letters will show that the singular and the plural alternated in the same document with apparently no distinction of meaning" (Moulton, *Expositor*, vi., vii. 107). The colophon in the T.R., "The First to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana," has a double interest: as an echo of the notion that this is the Epistle from Laodicea (Col. iv. 16), a notion sanctioned by Theophyl.; and the mention of Phrygia Pacatiana proves that the author of the note lived after the fourth century, towards the close of which that name for Phrygia Prima came into use.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ Β̄

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a] ἀπόστολος [a] Χριστοῦ [a] Ἰησοῦ [1] [b] διὰ [b] θελήματος [b] Θεοῦ κατ᾽ [c] ἐπαγγελίαν [c] [d] ζωῆς τῆς [d] ἐν [d] Χριστῷ [d] Ἰησοῦ 2. Τιμοθέῳ [e] ἀγαπητῷ [e] τέκνῳ· χάρις, [f] ἔλεος, εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ [2] τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

3. [g] Χάριν [g] ἔχω τῷ Θεῷ,[3] ᾧ [h] λατρεύω ἀπὸ [i] προγόνων ἐν [k] καθαρᾷ

a See 1 Tim. i. 1.
b Rom. xv. 32, 1 Cor. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 1, viii. 5, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 1.
c 1 Tim. iv. 8.
d Rom. viii. 2.
e 1 Cor. iv. 14, 17, Eph. v. 1, see 1 Tim. i. 2.
f See 1 Tim. i. 2.
g See 1 Tim. i. 12.
h Acts xxiv. 14, xxvii. 23, Rom. i. 9, Phil. iii. 3.
i See 1 Tim. v. 4.
k 1 Tim. iii. 9.

[1] Ἰησ. Χριστ. AL, 37, most others, vg., go., syr^{hcl}, arm.

[2] So ℵ^{c}ADFGKL, d, f, g, vg., go., sah., boh., syr^{hcl}, arm.; Κυρίου Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵ*, 17, 37 (so also two cursives, syr^{pesh}, which om. foll. τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν).

[3] Add μου D*, 17, one other, d, e, fuld., go., sah.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1, 2. Salutation.

Ver. 1. **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.** See note on 1 Tim. i. 1.

διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ: This formula is found also in 1 and 2 Cor. Eph. and Col. See note on 1 Tim. i. 1, where it is pointed out that while the same **ἐπιταγή** may be said to be issued by God the Father and God the Son, **θέλημα** is always used of the Father's eternal purpose as regards the salvation of man (Rom. ii. 18, xii. 2; 2 Cor. viii. 5; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 5, 9, 11; Col. i. 9, iv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 18, etc.). St. Paul believed that his own commission as an apostle was a part of God's arrangements to this end, one of the ways in which the Will manifested itself.

κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς, κ.τ.λ.: To be connected with **ἀπόστολος**. His apostleship was *for the accomplishment of the promise*, etc. See Rom. i. 5, **ἐλάβομεν . . . ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**. For the force of **κατά** with acc. see Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 502. The notion is more largely expressed in the corresponding passage of Tit. (i. 2), **ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο . . . θεός**. We must not suppose that there is any limitation in the reference of the expression here. The mention of "the promise of the life which is in Christ Jesus" (Gal. ii. 19, 20) is not intended as a consolation to Timothy (as Chrys., Bengel), nor was it even specially suggested by his own near approaching death. The preciousness of that promise is never wholly absent from the minds of Christians; though of course it comes to the surface of our consciousness at crises when death is, or seems to be, imminent.

Ver. 2. **ἀγαπητῷ**: On the variation here from **γνησίῳ**, which occurs in 1 Tim. i. 2 and Tit. i. 4, see the note in the former place. Ver. 5 ("the unfeigned faith that is in thee") proves that St. Paul did not wish to hint that Timothy had ceased to be his **γνήσιον τέκνον**. Timothy is St. Paul's **τέκνον ἀγαπητόν** also in 1 Cor. iv. 17. **ἀγαπητός** is complete in itself: it does not require the explanatory addition, **ἐν πίστει**, or **κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν**.

χάρις, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

Vv. 3-7. I know that your weak point is deficiency in moral courage. Be braced, therefore, by the assurance that I am constantly thinking with thankfulness and prayer about your genuine and inborn faith; and by the fact that the gift of the Holy Spirit which you received at ordination was that of power and love and discipline.

Ver. 3. **χάριν ἔχω**: The expression of thanksgiving in the exordium of an

[k] συνειδήσει, ὡς [l] ἀδιάλειπτον [m] ἔχω τὴν περὶ σοῦ [m n] μνείαν ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσίν μου νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, 4. [o] ἐπιποθῶν [o] σε [o] ἰδεῖν, [p] μεμνημένος σου τῶν δακρύων, ἵνα χαρᾶς [q] πληρωθῶ, 5. [r] ὑπόμνησιν λαβὼν [1]

l Rom. ix. 2, not LXX.
m 1 Thess. iii. 6.
n Rom. i. 9, Eph. i. 16, Phil. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2, iii. 6, Philem. 4.
o Rom. i. 11, Phil. ii. 26, 1 Thess. iii. 6.
p 1 Cor. xi. 2, Matt. (3), Luke (6), John (3), Acts (2), Heb. (4, of which 3 are O.T.), 2 Pet. (1), Jude (1), Rev. (1).
q Here only in Pastorals.
r Ps. lxx. (lxxi.) 6, Wisd. xvi. 11, 2 Macc. vi. 17, 2 Pet. i. 13, iii. 1 only.

[1] λαμβάνων ℵᶜDKL.

epistle is usually prefaced by St. Paul with **εὐχαριστῶ** (Rom. i. 8, 1 Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, Philem. 4; **εὐχαριστοῦμεν** Col. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2; **οὐ παύομαι εὐχαριστῶν**, Eph. i. 16; **εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν**, 2 Thess. i. 3). A comparison of these passages makes it evident that **χάριν ἔχω** is to be connected with **ὑπόμνησιν λαβών, κ.τ.λ.**; **ὡς ἀδιάλειπτον—πληρωθῶ** being a parenthetical account of St. Paul's state of mind about his absent friend, while **μεμνημένος—δακρύων** is also a parenthetical clause. The thanksgiving is for the grace of God given to Timothy (*cf.* esp. 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3); and the expression of thankfulness is called forth whenever St. Paul calls him to mind, unceasingly in fact. The use of **χάριν ἔχω** in 1 Tim. i. 12 is not a parallel case to this. The phrase is quoted from the papyri by Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 283.

ᾧ λατρεύω ἀπὸ προγόνων κ.τ.λ.: Two thoughts are in St. Paul's mind: (*a*) the inheritance of his religious consciousness from his forefathers, and (*b*) the continuity of the revelation of God; the same light in the New Covenant as in the Old, only far brighter.

If St. Paul had been asked, When did you first serve God? he would have answered, Even before God separated me from my mother's womb for His service. St. Paul was conscious that he was the result of generations of God-fearing people. His inborn, natural instincts were all towards the service of God. (See Acts xxii. 3, xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5).

Moreover St. Paul always maintained that the Gospel was the divinely ordained sequel of Judaism; not a new religion, but the fulfilment of "the promise made of God unto our fathers" (Acts xxvi. 6; see also xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14).

ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει: Compare the claim he makes, Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Cor. i. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 10; and for the language here see note on 1 Tim. i. 5. **ὡς** is best rendered *as* (Winer-Moulton, *Gram.* p. 561, where Matt. vi. 12, Gal. vi. 10 are cited in illustration). The R.V. *how* (so Alf.) implies that the cause for thankfulness is the unceasing nature of St. Paul's remembrance of Timothy; the A.V. *that* (*quod*, Vulg.) refers the cause to the remembrance itself. Rom. i. 9 is not a parallel instance of **ὡς**.

ἀδιάλειπτον—δεήσεσίν μου: A regular epistolary formula, as is evidenced by the papyri; though no doubt in St. Paul's case it corresponded to reality. See his use of it in reff. and Dean Armitage Robinson, *Ephesians*, pp. 37 *sq.*, 275 *sqq.* esp. p. 279, *sq.* on the formula **μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι**, from which this passage is a remarkable variation.

νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας is connected by the R.V. with **ἐπιποθῶν**. In 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10, the phrase unquestionably is connected with what follows. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. v. 5 it comes at the end of a clause; and in this place the A.V. connects it with **ταῖς δεήσεσίν μου**. This is certainly right, on the analogy of 1 Thess. iii. 10, where see Milligan's note. Alf. and Ell. connect it with **ἀδιάλειπτον ἔχω**.

ἐπιποθῶν σε ἰδεῖν: a Pauline expression. See reff. **ἰδεῖν** is not expressed in 2 Cor. ix. 14, Phil. i. 8, ii. 26.

Ver. 4. **μεμνημένος—δακρύων**: Parenthetical. St. Paul's longing was made keener by his recollection of the tears Timothy had shed at their last parting. So Chrys. fixes the occasion. We are reminded of the scene at Miletus, Acts xx. 37. Bengel, comparing Acts xx. 19, thinks that reference is rather made to an habitual manifestation of strong emotion. At that time, and in that society, tears were allowed as a manifestation of emotion more freely than amongst modern men of the West.

χαρᾶς πληρωθῶ: For **πληρόω** with a genitive, *cf.* Rom. xv. 13, 14. It takes a dat., Rom. i. 29, 2 Cor. vii. 4, *cf.* Eph. v. 18; an acc., Phil. i. 11, Col. i. 9.

Ver. 5. **ὑπόμνησιν λαβών**: *Having been reminded.* Not to be connected

τῆς ἐν σοὶ [s] ἀνυποκρίτου πίστεως, ἥτις [t] ἐνῴκησεν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ [u] μάμμῃ σου Λωΐδι καὶ τῇ μητρί σου Εὐνίκῃ, [v] πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί. 6. [w] δι' [w] ἣν [w] αἰτίαν [x] ἀναμιμνήσκω σε [y] ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ

s See 1 Tim. i. 5. t See note. u 4 Macc. xvi. 9 only. v Rom. viii. 38, xiv. 14, xv. 14, ver. 12. w Luke viii. 47, Acts xxii. 24, 2 Tim. i. 12, Tit. i. 13, Heb. ii. 11. x 1 Cor. iv. 17. y Gen. xlv. 27, 1 Macc. xiii. 7 only.

with the clause immediately preceding, as R.V.m. ὑπόμνησις, a *reminder*, *i.e.*, an act of recollection specially excited by a particular person or thing, thus differs from ἀνάμνησις, which is self-originated (so Ammonius Grammaticus, quoted by Bengel). Ell. compares for the thought Eph. i. 15. For this use of λαμβάνω, *cf.* Rom. vii. 8, 11 (ἀφορμὴν λ.), Heb. ii. 3 (ἀρχὴν λ.), xi. 29, 36 (πεῖραν λ.), 2 Pet. i. 9 (λήθην λ.). The fact that St. Paul received this reminder of Timothy's faith suggests that there were other aspects of his conduct—possibly as an administrator—which were not wholly satisfactory. His unfeigned faith made up for much.

ἥτις ἐνῴκησεν κ.τ.λ.: ἐνοικέω is used in Rom. viii. 11 and 2 Tim. i. 14 of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and in Col. iii. 16 of the Word of Christ. In 2 Cor. vi. 16, ἐνοικήσω is added in the quotation from Lev. xxvi. 12 to ἐνπεριπατήσω. Tisch. and W.H. read ἐνοικοῦσα for οἰκοῦσα in Rom. vii. 17. Timothy's faith was hereditary as St. Paul's was. πρῶτον does not mean that Lois was the first of her family to have faith, but that it dwelt in her, to St. Paul's knowledge, before it dwelt in Timothy. It is to be observed that it is implied that the faith of God's people before Christ came is not different in kind from faith after Christ has come.

μάμμῃ: an infantile equivalent in early Greek for μήτηρ, is used in later Greek for τήθη, *grandmother*. It occurs, *e.g.*, in 4 Macc. xvi. 9, οὐκ ὄψομαι ὑμῶν τέκνα, οὐδὲ μάμμη κληθεῖσα μακαρισθήσομαι. See also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 561.

Λωΐδι: Since Timothy's father was a Greek, and his mother a Jewess (Acts xvi. 1), we may conclude that Lois was the mother of Eunice (see art. in Hastings' *D. B.*).

Εὐνίκῃ: See art. in Hastings' *D. B.*, where Lock notes that the curious reading of cursive 25 in Acts xvi. 1, υἱὸς γυναικός τινος Ἰουδαίας χήρας, and the substitution of χήρας for Ἰουδαίας in Gig., fuld. "may embody a tradition of her widowhood".

πέπεισμαι: The other examples of St. Paul's use of this word (see reff.) give no support to the notion of Thdrt. (followed by Alf.) that πέπεισμαι here has the force of our *I am sure*, *I am certain*, when we wish to hint gently that we desire reassurance on the point about which we express our certainty. In all the places in which St. Paul uses πέπεισμαι he is anxious to leave no doubt as to his own certitude. Nevertheless, in this case, it was quite possible for him to be perfectly certain that unfeigned faith animated Timothy, and at the same time to have misgivings (ver. 7) as to Timothy's moral courage in dealing with men. We supply ἐνοικεῖ after σοί.

Ver. 6. δι' ἣν αἰτίαν: not so much "because I am persuaded of thine unfeigned faith" (Theoph., Thdrt.), as, "because this faith does of a surety dwell in thee". We are most fruitfully stimulated to noble action, not when we know other people think well of us, but when their good opinion makes us recognise the gifts to us of God's grace. Faith, as well as salvation, is the gift of God, Eph. ii. 8. Except in this phrase (see reff. and Acts xxviii. 20), αἰτία is not found elsewhere in Paul. It is common in Matt., Mark, John, and Acts.

ἀναζωπυρεῖν: In both places cited in reff.—the only occurrences in the Greek Bible—the verb is intransitive: *his*, or *their*, *spirit revived*. Chrys. well compares with the image suggested by ἀναζωπυρεῖν ("stir into flame,") "quench not the Spirit," 1 Thess. v. 19, where by "the Spirit" is meant His charismatic manifestations of every kind. It is interesting to note in this connexion that ἀναζωπυρεῖν φαντασίας is opposed to σβεννύναι in M. Antoninus, vii. 2 (quoted by Wetstein).

τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ: This expression refers to the salvation of the soul by God's grace, in Rom. vi. 23, xi. 29. The narrower signification, as here, of a gift given to us to use to God's glory is χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. vii. 7, or more usually simply χάρισμα. The particular nature of the gift must be determined by the context. In this case it was a charisma that was exercised in a spirit not of fear-

[z] χάρισμα [z] τοῦ [z] Θεοῦ ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς [a] ἐπιθέσεως [a] τῶν [a] χειρῶν μου· 7. οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα [b] δειλίας,[1] ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ [c] σωφρονισμοῦ. 8. Μὴ οὖν [d] ἐπαισχυνθῇς τὸ [e] μαρτύριον [f] τοῦ [f] Κυρίου [f] ἡμῶν μηδὲ ἐμὲ τὸν [g] δέσμιον αὐτοῦ·

z See 1 Tim. iv. 14, and note here.
a See 1 Tim. iv. 14.
b Here only, N.T.
c Here only, not LXX.
d Mark viii. 38 = Luke ix. 26, Rom. i. 16, 2 Tim. i. 16, Heb. xi. 16, *cf.* ver. 12.
e See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
f See 1 Tim. i. 14.
g See note.

[1] **δουλείας** 238, two others, Didymus, Clem. Al., Chrys., by a confused recollection of Rom. viii. 15.

fulness. We can scarcely be wrong, then, if we suppose the charisma of administration and rule to be in St. Paul's mind rather than "the work of an evangelist" (ch. iv. 5). So Chrys., "for presiding over the Church, for the working of miracles, and for every service".

διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως—μου: See note on 1 Tim. iv. 14, where it is pointed out that we have no right to assume that hands were laid on Timothy once only. Thus Acts ix. 17 and xiii. 3 are two such occasions in St. Paul's spiritual life. There may have been others.

Ver. 7. **οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν**: The **γάρ** connects this statement with the exhortation preceding in such a way as to suggest that God's gift "to us" of a spirit of power is in the same order of being as the charisma imparted to Timothy by the laying on of St. Paul's hands. The question is, then, To whom is reference made in **ἡμῖν**? We can only reply, The Christian Society, represented by the apostles on the Day of Pentecost. (The aor. **ἔδωκεν** points to a definite occasion). Then it was that the Church began to receive the power, **δύναμις**, which had been promised (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8) by the Lord, and realised by the apostles collectively (Acts iv. 33; 1 Cor. iv. 20, v. 4), and individually (Acts vi. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 7, xii. 9). Whatever special charismata are bestowed on the ministers of the Church at ordination, they are a part of the general stream of the Pentecostal gift which is always being poured out by the ascended Lord.

πνεῦμα δειλίας: It is simplest to take **πνεῦμα** here as a comprehensive equivalent to **χάρισμα**, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 12, **ζηλωταί ἐστε πνευμάτων**. *God did not infuse into us fearfulness*, etc. The gen. after **πνεῦμα**, in this and similar cases, Rom. viii. 15 (**δουλείας, υἱοθεσίας**), xi. 8 (**κατανύξεως**), 1 Cor. iv. 21, Gal. vi. 1 (**πραΰτητος**), 2 Cor. iv. 13 (**πίστεως**), Eph. i. 17 (**σοφίας, κ.τ.λ.**), expresses the prominent idea, the term **πνεῦμα** adds the notion that the quality spoken of is not self-originated. The personal Holy Spirit is not meant unless the context names Him unambiguously, as in Eph. i. 13.

δειλία: *fearfulness, timidity, timor*. This is the right word here, as **δουλείας** is the right word in Rom. viii. 15. It is curious that in Lev. xxvi. 36, where B has **δουλείαν** A &c. have **δειλίαν**. See *apparat. crit.* There was an element of **δειλία** in Timothy's natural disposition which must have been prejudicial to his efficiency as a Church ruler. For that position is needed (*a*) force of character, which if not natural may be inspired by consciousness of a divine appointment, (*b*) love, which is not softness, and (*c*) self-discipline, which is opposed to all easy self-indulgence which issues in laxity of administration. **σωφρονισμοῦ**: *sobrietatis*. Better active, as R.V., *discipline*, first of self, then of others. See Blass, *Grammar*, p. 61.

Vv. 8—ii. 2. The leading thoughts in this section are (*a*) the Day of reward and judgment which is surely coming (12, 18), (*b*) the unreasonableness therefore of cowardly shame (8, 12, 16), and (*c*) the necessity that Timothy should guard the deposit and hand it on (14-ii. 2).

Be not ashamed, therefore, of the Gospel to which our Lord was not ashamed to testify; nor be ashamed of me, who am in prison because of testimony borne to Him and it. Share our sufferings in the strength given by God, whose power is displayed in the Gospel of life of which I was appointed a preacher. This is the direct cause of my present lot; but I am not ashamed; for I know the power of Him to whom I have committed myself in trust. Do you imitate His faithfulness: guard the deposit committed to you. I am not asking you to do more than some others have done. You know Onesiphorus and his work as well as I do. When all turned their backs on me, he was not ashamed to make inquiries for me; and, finding me in prison, he con-

ἀλλὰ [h] συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ, 9. τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ, οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν [i] πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ

h 2 Tim. ii. 3, not LXX.
i Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11.

stantly cheered me by his visits. May God bless him and his! Do you, then, welcome the strengthening grace of Christ, and provide for a succession of faithful teachers to preserve intact the sacred deposit of the faith.

Ver. 8. **μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῇς**: The Saying of Jesus (Mark viii. 38 = Luke ix. 26) was probably in St. Paul's mind. He alludes to it again, ii. 12. The aor. subj. with **μὴ** forbids the supposition that Timothy had actually done what St. Paul warns him against doing (Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 628, and J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. p. 122 *sq.*). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 14. Personal appeals are a feature of this epistle *cf.* ver. 13, ii. 3, 15, iii. 14, iv. 1, 2, 5.

τὸ μαρτύριον τ. Κυρίου: *Testimony borne by our Lord*, His words, His ethical and spiritual teaching, by which Christianity has influenced the ideals and practice of society. The gen. after **μαρτύριον** is best taken as subjective. See 1 Cor. i. 6, ii. 1; 2 Thess. i. 10.

τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14.

ἐμὲ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ: This does not mean *one made prisoner by the Lord*, but *one who belongs to the Lord and is a prisoner for His sake*. There is nothing figurative about **δέσμιος**. St. Paul calls himself **ὁ δέσμ. τ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** in Eph. iii. 1, **δέσμ. Χρ. Ἰησ.** Philem. 1 and 9. The idea is more clearly expressed in **ὁ δέσμ. ἐν Κυρίῳ** Eph. iv. 1. He is a prisoner; he is also "in Christ". The expression also suggests the thought that his earthly imprisonment is ordered by the Lord, not by man. The present captivity is alluded to again in ver. 16 and ii. 9. It is not the same figure as in 2 Cor. ii. 14, "God which always leadeth us in triumph in Christ" as His captives. See Lightfoot on Col. ii. 15.

συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: *Join us* [*the Lord and me*] *in our sufferings for the Gospel's sake.* More than once in this epistle St. Paul declares that he is suffering (**πάσχω**, ver. 12; **κακοπαθῶ**, ii. 9). He has said, "Be not ashamed . . . of me"; but he has just coupled the testimony of the Lord with his own; and further on (ii. 8) Jesus Christ is noted as the great illustration of the law, "No cross, no crown". See note there. It is best then to give a wider reference than **μοι** to the **συν** in **συνκακοπάθ.** The R.V., *Suffer hardship with the gospel* is needlessly harsh. The dat. **τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ** is the *dativus commodi*.

κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ must be connected with **συνκακοπάθ.**; and this suggests that the power of God here means *power given by God*, as in 2 Cor. vi. 7, 1 Pet. i. 5, "the power that worketh in us" (Eph. iii. 20), the assured possession of which would brace Timothy to suffer hardship. Alf. and Ell., following Bengel, take it subjectively: *the power of God displayed in our salvation* (as in Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 18, 24, ii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 4). But St. Paul could scarcely exhort Timothy to display a degree of fortitude comparable to God's active power. The next verse, **τοῦ σώσαντος, κ.τ.λ.**, is not a detailed description of God's power to save, but a recalling of the fact that Timothy had actually experienced God's saving grace in the past. This consideration would stimulate Timothy to play the man.

Ver. 9. **τοῦ σώσαντος, κ.τ.λ.**: The connexion, as has been just remarked, is that our recognition at our baptism of God's saving and calling grace—He saved us and called us at a definite point of time (aor.)—ought to strengthen our faith in the continuance in the future of His gifts of power to us. On the insistence in this group of epistles on God's saving grace, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4.

καλέσαντος κλήσει ἁγίᾳ: *To a holy calling*, *i.e.*, to a life of holiness, is less ambiguous than *with a holy calling*, which might mean "a calling uttered by a Holy One," or "in holy language". **κλῆσις** does not here mean *the invitation* (as in Rom. xi. 29), but, when qualified as here by an adj., it means the condition into which, or the purpose for which, we have been called (so **ἡ ἄνω κλ.**, Phil. iii. 14, **ἐπουράνιος κλ.**, Heb. iii. 1; and *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 20). We have been "called to be saints," Rom. i. 7, "called into the fellowship of God's Son," 1 Cor. i. 9.

οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα: The sentiment is more clearly expressed in Tit. iii. 5, **οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων . . . ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς.** There is an echo in both places of the controversy, now over, concerning works and grace. Perhaps **κατά** is used in this

Ἰησοῦ [k] πρὸ [k] χρόνων [k] αἰωνίων, 10. [l] φανερωθεῖσαν δὲ νῦν διὰ τῆς [m] ἐπιφανείας [n] τοῦ [n] σωτῆρος [n] ἡμῶν [n] Χριστοῦ [n] Ἰησοῦ,[1] [o] καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν [o] θάνατον [p] φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ [q] ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 11. [r] εἰς [r] ὃ [r] ἐτέθην [r] ἐγὼ [r] κῆρυξ [r] καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ [r] διδάσκαλος.[2]. 12. [s] δι' [s] ἣν [s] αἰτίαν καὶ ταῦτα [t] πάσχω· ἀλλ' οὐκ [u] ἐπαισχύνομαι· οἶδα γὰρ ᾧ πεπίστευκα, καὶ [v] πέπεισμαι ὅτι [w] δυνατός [w] ἐστιν τὴν [x] παραθήκην μου [x] φυλάξαι εἰς [y] ἐκείνην [y] τὴν

k Tit. i. 2, *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25.
l See note on 1 Tim. iii. 16.
m See 1 Tim. vi. 14.
n Tit. i. 4, ii. 13, iii. 6 (?).
o 1 Cor. xv. 26, Heb. ii. 14.
p 1 Cor. iv. 5, Eph. iii. 9.
q Wisd. (2), 4 Macc. (2), Rom. ii. 7, 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, 53, 54, Eph. vi. 24.
r See 1 Tim. ii. 7.
s See ver. 6.
t Here only in Pastorals.
u Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 6, *cf.* ver. 8.
v See ver. 5.
w Luke xiv. 31, Rom. iv. 21, xi. 23, Tit. i. 9, *cf.* Heb. xi. 19, Jas. iii. 2.
x See 1 Tim. vi. 20.
y 2 Thess. i. 10, 2 Tim. i. 18, iv. 8.

[1] So ℵ*AD*, d, e, sah.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵᶜCDᶜFGKLP, all cursives, f, g, vg., go., boh., syrr., arm.

[2] Add ἐθνῶν (from 1 Tim. ii. 7), all except ℵ*A, 17.

clause to mark more vividly the antithesis to the next, **κατὰ ἰδ. πρόθ.**, in which its use is more normal. See Eph. ii. 8, **οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον.**

ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν, κ.τ.λ.: The grace in which the divine purpose for man expresses itself was given to mankind before times eternal; mankind, sons of God, being summed up, concentrated, in the Son of God, whom we know now as Christ Jesus. In Him was present, germ-wise, redeemed humanity, to be realised in races and individuals in succeeding ages.

We have here the same teaching about the Church and Christ as is more fully given in Ephesians and Colossians (see especially Eph. i. 4). In Rom. xvi. 25 the antithesis between a reality veiled in the past and now unveiled, or manifested, is expressed in language very similar to that of the passage before us: **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν.**

πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων: expresses the notion of that which is anterior to the most remote period in the past conceivable by any imagination that man knows of.

Ver. 10. **φανερωθεῖσαν**: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 16. Bengel calls attention to the fit juxtaposition of *illustria verba:* **φανερωθεῖσαν, ἐπιφανείας, φωτίσαντος.**

διὰ τῆς ἐπιφανείας, κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The **ἐπιφάνεια** here must not be referred to the Incarnation, considered as having taken place at a particular moment in time. It includes it; the **ἐπιφάνεια** began then; and will be continued, becoming ever brighter and clearer, until its consummation, to which the term **ἐπιφάνεια** is elsewhere restricted.

καταργήσαντος: We cannot, because of the absence of an article before the participles, safely translate, *when he brought to nought*, rather than, *who brought to nought. Abolished* does not express the truth. Christians all "taste of death" as their Master did (John viii. 52, Heb. ii. 9), though they do not "see" it; and they are confident that they too will be "saved out of death" (Heb. v. 7). Death for them has lost its sting (Heb. ii. 14, 15). It need not cause any difficulty that here the undoing of death is spoken of as past, whereas in 1 Cor. xv. 26, 54, it is "the last enemy that shall be abolished" (see Rev. xx. 14). We have a parallel in John xvi. 11, "The prince of this world hath been judged".

τὸν θάνατον: Alf., following Bengel, sees a special force in the art. "as if he had said *Orcum illum*".

φωτίσαντος: To be connected with **διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.** The Gospel is that by which the presence of Christ, the light, is apprehended. That light does not create life and incorruption: it displays them.

ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν: *Immortality* or *Incorruption* defines the *life* more clearly.

Ver. 11. **εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην, κ.τ.λ.**: See 1 Tim. ii. 7, where these words are also found, and the note on 1 Tim. i. 11.

Ver. 12. **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν**: *i.e.*, because I am a preacher of the Gospel. *Cf.* Gal. v. 11.

οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι: *Non confundor. I am not disappointed of my hope*, as in ref.

πεπίστευκα . . . πέπεισμαι: The perfects have their usual force. For **πέπεισμαι** see Rom. viii. 38 and note on ver. 5.

τὴν παραθήκην μου is best taken as *that which I have deposited for safe*

[y] ἡμέραν. 13. [z] Ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε [a] ὑγιαινόντων [a] λόγων ὧν παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας ἐν [b] πίστει [b] καὶ [b] ἀγάπῃ [b] τῇ [b] ἐν [b] Χριστῷ [b] Ἰησοῦ. 14. τὴν καλὴν [c] παραθήκην[1] [c d] φύλαξον διὰ Πνεύματος [e] Ἁγίου τοῦ [e] ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν. 15. Οἶδας τοῦτο ὅτι [f] ἀπεστράφησάν με

z See 1 Tim. i. 16.
a See 1 Tim. vi. 3.
b 1 Tim. i. 14.
c See 1 Tim. vi. 20.
d See 1 Tim. v. 21.
e Rom. viii. 11.
f Matt. v. 42, 2 Tim. iv. 4, Tit. i. 14, Heb. xii. 25.

[1] παρακαταθήκην 47, many others.

keeping. *Cf*. the story of St. John and the robber from Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives*, § 42, quoted by Eus. *H.E.* iii. 23, **τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀπόδος ἡμῖν.** Here it means "my soul" or "myself," *cf*. Ps. xxx. (xxxi.) 6, **εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου,** Luke xxiii. 46, 1 Pet. iv. 19, 1 Thess. v. 23. This explanation of **παραθήκην** harmonises best with **ἐπαισχύνομαι, πεπίστευκα,** and **φυλάξαι.** The whole verse has a purely personal reference. Nothing but a desire to give **παραθήκη** the same meaning wherever it occurs (1 Tim. vi. 20, *q.v.*; 2 Tim. i. 14) could have made Chrys. explain it here as "the faith, the preaching of the Gospel". So R.V.m., *that which he hath committed unto me*. "Paulus, decessui proximus, duo deposita habebat: alterum Domino, alterum Timotheo committendum," Bengel. This exegesis compels us to refer **ᾧ** to God the Father.

εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν: The day of judgment and award, 1 Cor. iii. 13.

Ver. 13. **ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε**: A resumption of the exhortation which was broken off in ver. 9. This command is strictly parallel to that which follows: **ὑποτ. ὑγιαιν.—ἤκουσας** corresponds to, and is the external expression of, **τὴν καλ. παραθήκην; ἔχε** corresponds to **φύλαξον**; and **ἐν πίστει—Ἰησοῦ** to **διὰ—ἡμῖν.**

ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων: The gen. is that of apposition: *a pattern*, *sc*. of faith, *expressed in sound words*. The phrase marks an advance on the **μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως** (Rom. ii. 20) or **μόρφ. εὐσεβείας** (2 Tim. iii. 5). It happily suggests the power of expansion latent in the simplest and most primitive dogmatic formulas of the Christian faith.

ἔχε has the same strengthened signification as in 1 Tim. i. 19, where see note.

ὑγιαινόντων λόγων: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ὧν . . . ἤκουσας: Alf. notes that the use of **ὧν** rather than **ἣν** shows that **ὑγιαιν. λόγ.** and not **ὑποτύπ.** is the chief thing in St. Paul's mind. It is obvious that Timothy could not have *heard* the **ὑποτύπωσις,** which is a concept of the mind expressed in many sound words heard on various occasions. As to the translation, von Soden agrees with Hort, who insists on "the order, the absence of **τὴν,** and the use of **ἔχε**" as compelling us to render, "Hold as a pattern," etc. This rendering would favour Hort's conjecture that "ΩΝ is a primitive corruption for ON," *i.e.*, "Hold as a pattern of sound words the word which thou hast heard," etc. But the absence of the article is such a marked feature in the Pastorals that no argument can be based on it here.

Bengel calls attention to the change in order in ii. 2. Here, **παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας,** the emphasis being on St. Paul's personal authority; there, **ἤκουσας παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ,** because of the antithesis between **ἤκουσας** and **παράθου.**

ἐν πίστει, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. i. 14. This clause must be joined with **ἔχε,** not with **ἤκουσας,** nor with **ὑγιαιν. λόγ.** only: *as given in faith*, etc. (von Soden),

Ver. 14. **τὴν καλὴν παραθήκην**: The faith, which is a **ὑποτύπωσις** in relation to the growing apprehension of it by the Church, is a **παραθήκη,** *deposit*, in the case of each individual. On the constant epithet **καλός** see 1 Tim. i. 18, and on **παραθήκη** 1 Tim. vi. 20. There is a special force in **καλήν** here, as distinguishing the precious faith from **τὴν παραθήκην μου** of ver. 12.

φύλαξον διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου: **φυλάσσειν** is more than **ἔχειν**: it implies here final perseverance; and that can only be attained through the Holy Spirit. God must co-operate with man, if man's efforts are to be successful. *Cf*. "Work out your own salvation . . . for it is God which worketh in you" (Phil. ii. 12, 13).

Πνεύματος Ἁγίου: This verse and Tit. iii. 5 are the only places in the Pastorals in which the Holy Spirit is mentioned.

Ver. 15. **οἶδας τοῦτο**: There is a personal appeal for loyalty in this reminder. The whole paragraph, with its examples cited of disloyalty and loyalty, was intended as an object lesson to Timothy.

πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ὧν ἐστὶν Φύγελος καὶ Ἑρμογένης. 16. [g] δῴη [g] ἔλεος ὁ Κύριος τῷ Ὀνησιφόρου οἴκῳ· ὅτι πολλάκις με [h] ἀνέψυξεν καὶ τὴν [i] ἅλυσίν μου οὐκ [k] ἐπαισχύνθη,[1] 17. ἀλλὰ γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ [l] σπουδαίως[2] ἐζήτησέν με καὶ εὗρεν—18. δῴη αὐτῷ ὁ

g Deut. xiii. 17 (18), Josh. xi. 20, Isa. xlvii. 6, Jer. xvi. 13, xlix. (xlii.) 12, Mic. vii. 20. h Here only, N.T. i Eph. vi. 20. k See ver. 8. l Luke vii. 4, Phil. ii. 28, Tit. iii. 13.

[1] ἐπῃσχύνθη ℵ*K. [2] σπουδαιότερον DcKL; σπουδαιοτέρως A, two cursives.

ἀπεστράφησάν με: The reff., with the exception of chap. iv. 4, are parallel to this use of the verb.

πάντες must not be pressed: it is the sweeping assertion of depression. If it had been even approximately true, Timothy would have had no church to administer. On the other hand, something less serious than apostasy from the faith may be alluded to, such as personal neglect of the apostle (*cf.* iv. 16, **πάντες με ἐγκατέλειπον**, and the contrast of Onesiphorus' conduct with theirs in the next verse), a thing which to us who see St. Paul through the halo of centuries of veneration seems painfully hard to understand. But it is abundantly plain that apostles did not during their lifetime receive that universal and unquestioning reverence from their fellow-Christians which we would have antecedently supposed could not have been withheld from them. *Cf.* 3 John 9.

οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ: Asia means the Roman province, which included Mysia, Lydia, Caria, great part of Phrygia, the Troad, and the islands off the coast.

This statement is most naturally explained of a defection in Asia of natives of Asia. Plummer conjectures that St. Paul had applied by letter from Rome for help to some leading Asiatic Christians, and had been refused. Of course it is possible that St. Paul refers to something that had taken place in Rome (so Bengel, who compares chap. iv. 16). But *all who are in Asia* would be a strange way of referring to some Asiastics who had been in Rome and had returned to Asia; and though **οἶδας τοῦτο** is naturally understood as mentioning something of which Timothy had knowledge only by report, we cannot be sure that St. Paul intended here to distinguish **οἶδας** from **γινώσκεις**. Perhaps the defection had taken place during an absence of Timothy from Asia. Nothing else is known certainly of Phygelus and Hermogenes.

Ver. 16. **δῴη ἔλεος, κ.τ.λ.**: **δίδωμι ἔλεος**, like **εὑρίσκω ἔλεος**, is a Hebraism. See reff. The correlative, **λαμβάνω ἔλεος** occurs Heb. iv. 6. **ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά τινος** (Luke i. 72, x. 37; Jas. ii. 13) is a similar phrase. Here, we should say, *May God bless so and so.* **ἔλεος** does not correspond to any special sin.

τῷ Ὀν. οἴκῳ: This household is saluted in iv. 19. It is most natural to suppose that Onesiphorus himself was dead, both from this expression and from the pious wish in ver. 18. Prayer for living friends is normally and naturally in regard to objects which will be realised here in earth. The evidence of 2 Macc. xii. 44, 45, proves that an orthodox Jew of our Lord's time could have prayed for the dead. A full discussion of the question must embrace a consideration of the final cause of prayer, and of the nature of that which we call death. See reff. to recent literature on this subject in Milligan's art. *Onesiphorus* in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀνέψυξεν: The comprehensive term *refresh* expresses the notion admirably. They are "the blessed of God the Father" to whom the King shall say, "I was in prison, and ye came unto me" (Matt. xxv. 36. See Heb. x. 34, xiii. 3). For St. Paul's appreciation of the pleasures of friendly intercourse, see Rom. xv. 32, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 13, Philem. 7, 20.

ἐπαισχύνθη: For other examples of the absence of the temporal augment *cf.* Luke xiii. 13 (**ἀνορθώθη** A B D, etc.); xxiv. 27, John vi. 18, Acts ii. 25, Rom. ix. 29 (**ὁμοιώθημεν** A F G L P).

Ver. 17. **γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ**: The reference is most likely to the apostle's first Roman imprisonment, Eph. vi. 20. Whichever it was, **πολλάκις** implies that it had lasted some time.

Ver. 18. It is immaterial whether we explain **ὁ Κύριος**, in this verse, of God the Father, the source of judgment, or of God the Son, the instrument of judgment. It is far-fetched to suppose that the repeated **Κύριος . . . Κυρίου** refer to different divine Persons. Huther's expl., followed by Alf., seems the best, that **δῴη ὁ Κύριος** had become so completely a for-

Κύριος [m] εὑρεῖν [m] ἔλεος παρὰ Κυρίου [1] ἐν [n] ἐκείνῃ [n] τῇ [n] ἡμέρᾳ—καὶ ὅσα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ [o] διηκόνησεν, βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις.

II. 1. Σὺ οὖν, [a] τέκνον μου, [b] ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 2. καὶ ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων ταῦτα [c] παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις οἵτινες [d] ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ

m Gen. xix. 19, Num. xi. 15, Judg. vi. 17, Dan. LXX, iii. 39 (TH. iii. 38), ix. 3.
n See ver. 12.
o 1 Pet. i. 12, iv. 10, with acc.
a See 1 Tim. i. 2.
b See 1 Tim. i. 12.
c See 1 Tim. i. 18.
d 1 Cor. xv. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 5.

[1] θεῷ D*, d, e.

mula that the recurrence did not seem harsh.

καὶ ὅσα κ.τ.λ.: This clause is an afterthought.

διηκόνησεν: The verb is used with a perfectly general reference here, as in Heb. vi. 10.

βέλτιον: The comparative here is intensive or elative. See Blass, *Grammar*, pp. 33, 141, 142. Other examples are in 1 Tim. iii. 14 (Tisch.) and in the Received Text of ver. 17 of this chapter.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. **σύ**: emphatic, as in 1 Tim. vi. 11 and ch. iii. 10; but the appeal is not primarily that Timothy should imitate Onesiphorus, or learn by the example of Phygelus and Hermogenes, but rather marks the intensity of the apostle's anxiety for the future conduct of Timothy in the Church; and similarly **οὖν** is resumptive of all the considerations and appeals for loyalty in chap. i.

τέκνον: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν, κ.τ.λ.: The thought is resumed from i. 8, 9, and expanded in vv. 3-13. The closest parallel is that in Eph. vi. 10, **ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ, κ.τ.λ.** See note on 1 Tim. i. 12 and reff., esp. Rom. iv. 20, Phil. iv. 13. Although the verb is passive, as indicated in the R.V., those who are, or who are exhorted to be, strengthened are not merely passive recipients of an influence from without. The act of reception involves man's co-operation with God. Compare "Abide in me, and I in you" (John xv. 4). The perfection of God's power is conditioned by the weakness of man (2 Cor. xii. 9).

τῇ χάριτι τῇ ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.: The two passages, 2 Cor. xii. 9, and Eph. vi. 10, alluded to in the last note, explain this. *Grace* here has its simplest theological meaning, as the divine help, the unmerited gift of assistance that comes from God.

Ver. 2. St. Paul is here contemplating an apostolical succession in respect of teaching rather than of administration. It is natural that in the circumstances of the primitive Church the building up of converts in the faith should have occupied a larger place in the Christian consciousness than the functions of an official ministry; but the historical continuity of the ministry of order is of course involved in the direction here. St. Paul would have been surprised if any other conclusion had been drawn from his words. In any case, the Providence of God sees further than do His servants.

ἃ ἤκουσας παρ' ἐμοῦ: See note on i. 13.

διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων: not *per multos testes* (Vulg.), but *coram multis testibus* (Tert. *de Praescript.* 25). The usual Greek for "in the presence of witnesses" is **ἐπὶ μαρτύρων**; but **διὰ θεῶν μαρτύρων** is quoted from Plutarch (see Field, *in loc.*).

The **διὰ** is that of accompanying circumstances. The reference is to a solemn *traditio* of the essentials of the faith on the occasion of Timothy's ordination, rather than his baptism. The former reference seems clear from the parallel drawn between St. Paul's committal of the faith to Timothy and Timothy's committal of it to others. On the other hand, a comparison of 1 Tim. vi. 12 favours the view that this refers to a formal public instruction at baptism. Reasons have been already suggested against the identification of the laying-on of hands of 1 Tim. iv. 14 with that of 2 Tim. i. 6. Otherwise it would be natural to suppose that the *many witnesses* were the members of the presbytery who were joined with St. Paul in the ordination of Timothy. But there is no reason why the reference should be thus restricted. The action was a public one, "in the face of the Church". So Chrys., "Thou hast not heard in secret, nor apart, but in the presence of many, with all openness of speech". The view of Clem. Alex.

ἑτέρους διδάξαι. 3. [e]Συνκακοπάθησον[1] ὡς καλὸς [f]στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.[2] 4. οὐδεὶς [g]στρατευόμενος [h]ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ [i]βίου [k]πραγματίαις, ἵνα τῷ [l]στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ. 5. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ [m]ἀθλῇ τις, οὐ [n]στεφανοῦται ἐὰν μὴ [o]νομίμως [m]ἀθλήσῃ. 6. τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν [p]μεταλαμβάνειν.

e See 2 Tim. i. 8.
f Here only in Paul.
g See 1 Tim. i. 18.
h 2 Pet. ii. 20 only, N.T.
i See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
k Here only, N.T.
l Here only, not LXX.
m Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Heb. x. 32.
n Heb. ii. 7, 9 only, N.T.
o See 1 Tim. i. 8.
p Acts. ii. 26, xxvii. 33, 34, Heb. vi. 7, xii. 10.

[1] σὺ οὖν κακοπάθ. CcDcKL, syrhcl-txt, go. [2] Ἰησ. Χριστ. DcKL, syrpesh.

(*Hypot.* vii. ed. Potter, ii. p. 1015) that the πολλοὶ μάρτυρες mean testimonies from the Law and the Prophets is only a curiosity of exegesis.

παράθου: See note on 1 Tim. 18.

πιστοῖς: *trustworthy*, carries on the figure of the faith as a deposit. It is possible, as Bengel suggests, that the injunctions in vv. 14-21 have reference to these ministers.

ἱκανοί: *qualified*. See reff. **δυνατός**, in Tit. i. 9, expresses capability as proved by experience.

Vv. 3-13. The condition of all success is toil; toil which may involve pain. Think of the price of a soldier's victory, the conditions of an athlete's crown, of a field-labourer's wage. Our Lord Jesus Himself, as man, is the great Exemplar of this law. I am another. This is a faithful saying; and therefore we sing, "We shall live with Him because we died with Him, etc.".

Ver. 3. **συνκακοπάθησον**: *Take thy part in suffering hardship* (R.V.m.). This general reference is better than to supply μοι, as R.V. See note on i. 8. **στρατιώτης**: *cf.* συνστρατιώτης, Phil. ii. 25, Philem. 2.

Ver. 4. **στρατευόμενος**: *militans Deo* (Vulg.). *Soldier*, in the sense of a person belonging to the army, not *soldier on service*, as R.V., which makes the same error in Luke iii. 14 marg. (See *Expositor*, vi., vii. 120).

ἐμπλέκεται: *implicat se* (Vulg.). The verb is used in a similar metaphor, 2 Pet. ii. 20, but in a more adverse sense than here. A soldier, who is bound to go anywhere and do any thing at the bidding of his captain, must have no ties of home or business. The implied counsel is the same as that given in 1 Cor. vii. 26-34, with its warnings against distraction between the possibly conflicting interests of the Lord and of this life. Note the use of ἀρέσκω in 1 Cor. vii. 32-34.

ἀρέσῃ: *that he may be of use to* (see Milligan on 1 Thess. ii. 4).

Ver. 5. The sequence of images here—the soldier, the athlete, the field-labourer—affords an interesting illustration of repetition due to association of ideas. The soldier and the field-labourer are combined in 1 Cor. ix. 7-10; the athlete appears in 1 Cor. ix. 24 *sqq.* And the present passage has light thrown upon it from the earlier epistle, in which the various figures are more fully developed.

The connexion between the thought of the soldier and the athlete lies in the word **νομίμως** (see note on 1 Tim. i. 8); and the exact force of **νομίμως** will appear from a reference to 1 Cor. ix. 25, "Every man that striveth in the games is temperate in all things". No one can be said to comply with the rules of the contest who has not undergone the usual preliminary training. One illustration from those cited by Wetstein will suffice, that from Galen, *comm. in Hippocr.* i. 15: **οἱ γυμνασταὶ καὶ οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀρίστου τὸν ἄρτον μόνον ἐσθίουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου τὸ κρέας.**

Ver. 6. The difficulty in this verse is that the principle here laid down seems to be employed in 1 Cor. ix, 7, 9, as an argument from analogy in support of the liberty of Christian ministers to enjoy some temporal profit from their spiritual labours; whereas here St. Paul is urging a temper of other-worldliness. It is sufficient to say that there is no practical inconsistency between the two passages; "each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that". There is a time to insist on one's liberty to "use the world," and there is a time to warn ourselves and others that self-repression is necessary to keep ourselves from "using it to the full". The main connexion here lies in the word **κοπιῶντα**, which is emphatic; while **πρῶτον**,

7. **νόει ὃ**[1] **λέγω· δώσει**[2] **γάρ σοι ὁ Κύριος** [q] **σύνεσιν ἐν πᾶσιν.** 8. [r] **μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ,** [s] **κατὰ** [s] **τὸ** [s] **εὐαγγέλιόν** [s] **μου·** 9. **ἐν ᾧ** [t] **κακοπαθῶ μέχρι** [u] **δεσμῶν ὡς** [v] **κακοῦργος· ἀλλὰ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεται.**

q Mark xii. 33, Luke ii. 47, 1 Cor. i. 19, Eph. iii. 4, Col. i. 9, ii. 2.
r Matt. xvi. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 9, Rev. xviii. 5 (with acc.).
s Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25.
t Jonah iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 5, Jas. v. 13, only.
u Acts xx. 23, xxvi. 29, Phil. i. 7, 13, 14, 17, Col. iv. 18, Philem. 10, 13.
v Luke xxiii. 32, 33, 39.

[1] So ℵ*ACF^gr GP, 17, g go., syr^pesh; ἃ ℵ^c DKL, d, e, f, vg., boh., syr^hcl, arm.
[2] δῴη C^c KLP.

which is also emphatic, expresses in the illustration from the **γεωργός** the idea corresponding to **τῷ στρατ. ἀρέσῃ**, and to **στεφανοῦται** in the others respectively. The labourer receives his hire, no matter how poor the crop may be: his wages are the first charge on the field. *Cf.* **γῆ . . . τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται** (Heb. vi. 7); his reward is sure, but then he must really labour. "The fruits" are the reward of faithful labour in the Lord's vineyard, the "well done!" heard from the Captain's lips, "the crown of glory that fadeth not away". We must not press all the details of an allegory.

Ver. 7. **νόει ὃ λέγω**: *Intellige quae dico* (Vulg.), *Grasp the meaning*, cautionary and encouraging, of these three similes. *Cf.* "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say" (1 Cor. x. 15), and the use of the verb in 1 Tim. i. 7.

δώσει, κ.τ.λ.: If you have not sufficient wisdom to follow my argument, "ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally" (Jas. i. 5).

μνημόνευε Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν—Δαυείδ: These words form rather the conclusion of the preceding paragraph than the beginning of a new one. St. Paul in pressing home his lesson, passes from figures of speech to the great concrete example of suffering followed by glory. And as he has, immediately before, been laying stress on the certainty of reward, he gives a prominent place to **ἐγηγερμένον ἐκ νεκρῶν.** Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, "Himself man" (1 Tim. ii. 5), is the ideal soldier, athlete, and field-labourer; yet One who can be an example to us. It is not the resurrection as a doctrinal fact (A.V.) that St. Paul has in mind, but the resurrection as a personal experience of Jesus Christ, the reward He received, His being "crowned with glory and honour, because of the suffering of death" (Heb. ii. 9). It is not **τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν** (Acts xvii. 18), but **Ἰησοῦν ἐγηγερμένον**, the perfect (as in 1 Cor. xv. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20) preserving the notion of the permanent significance of that personal experience of Jesus. In the other passage, Rom. i. 3, in which St. Paul distinctly alludes to our Lord's human ancestry, the phrase **τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυείδ** has a directly historical and polemical intention, as expressing and emphasising the human nature of Christ in antithesis to His Divinity. Here **ἐκ σπερμ. Δ.** merely expresses the fact of His humanity. We cannot affirm with certainty that the phrase has the Messianic import that *Son of David* has in the Gospels.

κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου: *The Gospel preached by me.* See reff., and **τὸ εὐ. τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ** (Gal. i. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 1), which of course is identical in substance with **τὸ εὐ. . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ** (1 Tim. i. 11). The verity both of Christ's humanity and of His resurrection was emphasised in the Gospel preached by St. Paul. This is brought out by the punctuation of R.V.

Ver. 9. **ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ**: *in which sphere of action*, *cf.* Rom. i. 9, 2 Cor. x. 14, Phil. iv. 2. The connexion seems to be that St. Paul is now indicating that he himself, in his degree, is an imitator of Jesus Christ.

ὡς κακοῦργος (see reff.): *malefactor* (R.V.). *Evil doer* (A.V.) does not so vividly express the notion of criminality implied in the word. Ramsay notes that the use of this word here marks "exactly the tone of the Neronian period, and . . . refers expressly to the *flagitia*, for which the Christians were condemned under Nero, and for which they were no longer condemned in A.D. 112" (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 249). Compare 1 Pet. iv. 15.

ἀλλὰ—οὐ δέδεται: We have the same contrast between the apostle's own restricted liberty and the unconfinable range of the Gospel in Phil. i. 12, 14, and 2 Tim. iv. 17. There is no reference, as

10. διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τοὺς [w] ἐκλεκτούς, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας [x] τύχωσιν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μετὰ [y] δόξης [y] αἰωνίου.[1] 11. [z] πιστὸς [z] ὁ [z] λόγος· εἰ γὰρ [a] συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ [b] συνζήσομεν· 12. εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ [c] συνβασιλεύσομεν· εἰ [d] ἀρνησόμεθα,[2] κἀκεῖνος

w See note.
x Luke xx. 35, Acts xxiv. 3, xxvi. 22, xxvii. 3, Heb. viii. 6, xi. 35.
y 1 Pet. v. 10.
z See 1 Tim. i. 15.
a Ecclus. xix. 10, Mark xiv. 31, 2 Cor. vii. 3 only.
b Rom. vi. 8, 2 Cor. vii. 3, not LXX.
c 1 Esd. viii. 26, 1 Cor. iv. 8 only.
d See 1 Tim. v. 8.

[1] οὐρανίου f, vg., syrhcl-mg, arm.

[2] ἀρνούμεθα ℵcDKLP, d, e.

Chrys. supposes, to the liberty permitted to St. Paul to preach the kingdom of God in his prison, as during the first imprisonment (Acts xxviii. 30, 31). The clause here is a natural reflective parenthetical remark.

Ver. 10. **διὰ τοῦτο**: The knowledge that others had been, and were being, saved through his ministry was regarded by St. Paul as no small part of his reward. Thus, the Churches of Macedonia were his "crown," as well as his "joy" (Phil. iv. 1, 1 Thess. ii. 19). He had already in sight his "crown of righteousness". This consideration suggests that we should refer **διὰ τοῦτο** to what follows rather than to what immediately precedes (**ὁ λόγος . . . δέδεται**). So Alf., who cites in illustration Rom. iv. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, 1 Tim. i. 16, Philem 15. On this view, we have completely displayed the conformity of Jesus Christ and of St. Paul to the conditions of success exemplified in the soldier, the athlete, and the field-labourer.

πάντα ὑπομένω: as Love does, 1 Cor. xiii. 7. Ellicott rightly points out that Christian endurance is active, not passive: pain is felt as pain, but is recognised as having a moral and spiritual purpose.

διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς: St. Paul was much sustained by the thought that his labours and sufferings were, in the providence of God, beneficial to others (2 Cor. i. 6, xii. 15; Eph. iii. 1, 13; Phil. ii. 17; Col. i. 24; Tit. i. 1). "The elect" are those who, in the providence of God's grace, are selected for spiritual privileges with a view directly to the salvation of others, as well as of themselves. The absolute phrase as here is found in Matt. xxiv. 22, 24 = Mark xiii. 20, 22; **οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ αὐτοῦ** in Matt. xxiv. 31 = Mark xiii. 27 (?), Luke xviii. 7; **ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ** in Rom. viii. 33, Col. iii. 12, Tit. i. 1; **ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ** in Rom. xvi. 13.

καὶ αὐτοί: *they also* (as well as I). It would be no Paradise to St. Paul "to live in Paradise alone". Compare his supreme expression of selflessness in Rom. ix. 3.

σωτηρίας μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου: Salvation may be enjoyed in part in this life; it will be consummated in eternal glory. See ref., and 2 Cor. iv. 17.

Ver. 11. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος**: The teaching or saying referred to is "the word of the cross" as set forth by simile and living example in the preceding verses, 4-11. So R.V.m. This is an exactly parallel case to 1 Tim. iv. 9. Here, as there, **γάρ** introduces a reinforcement of the teaching.

εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν, κ.τ.λ.: The presence of **γάρ** does not militate against the supposition that we have here a fragment of a Christian hymn. A quotation adduced in the course of an argument must be introduced by some inferential particle; see on 1 Tim. iv. 10. On the other hand, it is questionable if **εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, κ.τ.λ.** is suitable in tone to a hymn; and St. Paul's prose constantly rises to rhythmical cadences, *e.g.*, Rom. viii. 33 *sqq.*, 1 Cor. xiii. We have here contrasted two crises, and two states in the spiritual life: **συναπεθάνομεν** and **ἀρνησόμεθα** point to definite acts at definite times; while **ὑπομένομεν** and **ἀπιστοῦμεν** indicate states of being, more or less prolonged.

εἰ συναπεθάνομεν καὶ συνζήσομεν: The two verbs are coupled also in 2 Cor. vii. 3; but the actual parallel in thought is found in Rom. vi. 4, 5, 8. *We died* (aor., R.V.) with Christ at our baptism (Rom. vi. 8; Col. iii. 3), which, as normally administered by immersion, symbolises our burial with Christ and our rising again with Him to newness of life (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12). The future, **συνζήσομεν**, must not be projected altogether into the resurrection life; it includes and is completed by that; and no doubt the prominent notion here is of the life to come; but here, and in Rom. vi. 8, it is implied that there is a beginning of eternal life even while we are in the flesh, *viz.* in that newness of life to which we are called, and for which we are enabled, in our baptism.

Ver. 12. **εἰ ὑπομένομεν καὶ συνβασι-**

[d] ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς· 13. εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνος πιστὸς μένει· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ [1] ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται.

14. Ταῦτα [e] ὑπομίμνησκε, [f] διαμαρτυρόμενος [g] ἐνώπιον [g] τοῦ [g] Θεοῦ,[2] μὴ [h] λογομαχεῖν,[3] ἐπ᾽[4] οὐδὲν [i] χρήσιμον, ἐπὶ [k] καταστροφῇ τῶν

e Tit. iii. 1, John xiv. 26, 2 Pet. i. 12, Jude 5.
f See 1 Tim. v. 21.
g See 1 Tim. ii. 3.
h Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 4.
i Here only, N.T.
k 2 Pet. ii. 6 only, N.T.

[1] Om. γὰρ ℵcK, d, e, vg., go., syrhcl, arm.

[2] So ℵCFG, 37, 67*, 80, 238, and about thirteen other cursives, f, g, boh., syrhcl-mg, arm.-ap.-Gb., Chrys., Thphyl., Amb., Pelag.; Κυρίου ADKLP, most cursives, d, e, vg., go., syrpesh et hcl-txt, arm.-ap.-Treg., Chrys., Euthal., Thdrt., Dam., Thphyl., Ambrst., Prim.

[3] λογομάχει AC*, d, e, f, g, vg.

[4] εἰς ℵcDKL.

λεύσομεν: See Matt. xxv. 34; Luke xxii. 28, 29; Acts xiv. 22; Rom. viii. 17; 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. i. 6, xx. 4.

εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, κ.τ.λ.: An echo of our Lord's teaching, Matt. x. 33. See also 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude 4. "The *future* conveys the ethical possibility of the action" (Ell.)

Ver. 13. **εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν**: It is reasonable to hold that the sense of **ἀπιστέω** in this place must be determined by the antithesis of **πιστὸς μένει**. Now **πιστός**, as applied to God, must mean *faithful* (Deut. vii. 9); one who "keepeth truth for ever" (Ps. cxlvi. 6; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; Heb. x. 23, xi. 11). There is the same contrast in Rom. iii. 3, "Shall their want of faith (**ἀπιστία**) make of none effect the faithfulness (**πίστιν**) of God?" But while we render **ἀπιστοῦμεν**, with R.V., *are faithless*, we must remember that unreliability and disbelief in the truth were closely allied in St. Paul's conception of them.

ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ—οὐ δύναται: Being essentially the unchangeable Truth, He cannot be false to His own nature, as we, when **ἀπιστοῦμεν**, are false to our better nature which has affinity with the Eternal. A lie in word, or unfaithfulness in act, is confessedly only an expedient to meet a temporary difficulty; it involves a disregard of the permanent element in our personality. The more a man realises the transitory nature of created things, and his own kinship with the Eternal, the more unnatural and unnecessary does falsity in word or deed appear to him. It is therefore inconceivable that God should lie (Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Mal. iii. 6; Tit. i. 2; Heb. vi. 18). The application of the clause here is not that "He will not break faith with us" (Alf.), but that the consideration of our powerlessness to affect the constancy of God our Father should brace us up to exhibit moral courage, as being His "true children".

Vv. 14-26. Discourage the new false teaching by precept and example. There is no need, however, that you should despair of the Church. It is founded upon a rock, in spite of appearances. Take a broad view of the case: the Church is not the special apartment of the Master from which things unseemly are banished; it is a great House with places and utensils for every need of life. This great House differs from those of earth in that provision is made for the promotion of the utensils from the basest use to the Master's personal service.

Ver. 14. **ταῦτα** has special reference to the issues of life and death set out in vv. 11-13. There is no such prophylactic against striving about words as a serious endeavour to realise the relative importance of time and of eternity. "He to whom the eternal Word speaks is set at liberty from a multitude of opinions" (*De Imitatione Christi*, i. 3).

ὑπομίμνησκε: *sc.* **αὐτούς**, as in Tit. iii. 1.

διαμαρτυρόμενος: See on 1 Tim. v. 21.

ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ: It is an argument in favour of this reading that **ἐνώπιον Κυρίου** only occurs once in Paul (in a quotation), in 2 Cor. viii. 21.

λογομαχεῖν: See on 1 Tim. vi. 4.

ἐπ᾽ οὐδὲν χρήσιμον and **ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ τῶν ἀκουόντων** are coordinate, and describe the negative and the positive results of **λογομαχία**. The subject of this **λογομαχία** is probably identical with that of the **μάχαι νομικαί** of Tit. iii. 9, which were "unprofitable and vain".

ἐπὶ καταστροφῇ, κ.τ.λ.: contrast **λόγος . . . ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας**, Eph. iv. 29; and compare the antithesis

ἀκουόντων. 15. [l] σπούδασον σεαυτὸν [m] δόκιμον [n] παραστῆσαι τῷ Θεῷ, ἐργάτην [o] ἀνεπαίσχυντον, [p] ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας. 16. τὰς δὲ [q] βεβήλους [q] κενοφωνίας [1] [r] περιΐστασο· [s t] ἐπὶ [s t] πλεῖον

l 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21, Tit. iii. 12, verb also Gal. (1), Eph. (1), 1 Thess. (1), Heb. (1), 2 Pet. (3). m Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10, 1 Cor. xi. 19, 2 Cor. x. 18. xiii. 7, Jas. i. 12. n Matt. xxvi. 53, Luke ii. 22, Acts i. 3, ix. 41, xxiii. 33, Rom. vi. 13, 16, 19, xii. 1, 1 Cor. viii. 8, 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2, Eph. v. 27, Col. i. 22, 28. o Here only, not LXX. p Prov. iii. 6, xi. 5 only. q 1 Tim. vi. 20, see 1 Tim. i. 9. r Tit. iii. 9. s Acts iv. 17, xx. 9, xxiv. 4. t 2 Tim. iii. 9.

[1] καινοφωνίας FG, *novitates vocum* or *verborum* d, e, g, m50. See 1 Tim. vi. 20.

between καθαίρεσις and οἰκοδομή in 2 Cor. xiii. 10.

It should be added that ἐπ' οὐδὲν χρήσιμον is connected closely with λογομαχεῖν (or λογομάχει) by Cyr. Alex., Clem. Alex., and the Bohairic version. The Clementine Vulg. renders unambiguously, *ad nihil enim utile est;* so F.G. add γάρ.

In addition to the weight of adverse textual evidence against the reading λογομάχει, it is open to the objections that ταῦτα—θεοῦ, disconnected with what follows, is a feeble sentence; and that μαρτύρομαι and διαμαρτύρομαι in Paul are always followed and completed by an exhortation, *e.g.*, Eph. iv. 17; 1 Tim. v. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 1.

Ver. 15. σπούδασον: *Give diligence to present thyself* (as well as thy work) *to God, approved.*

ἀνεπαίσχυντον: Chrys. takes this to mean *a workman that does not scorn to put his hand to anything;* but it is better explained as *a workman who has no cause for shame when his work is being inspected.* In any case, the word must be so explained as to qualify ἐργάτης naturally; and therefore it cannot be interpreted by a reference to i. 8 (μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῇς), of the shame that may deter a man from confessing Christ.

ὀρθοτομοῦντα: ὀρθοτομέω is found in reff. as the translation of ישׁר (Piel) *direct, make straight, make plain.* "He shall direct thy paths," "The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way". This use of the word suggests that the metaphor passes from the general idea of a workman to the particular notion of the minister as one who "makes straight paths" (τροχιὰς ὀρθάς) for the feet of his people to tread in (Heb. xii. 13). *The word of truth* is "The Way" (Acts ix. 2, etc.). Theodoret explains it of a ploughman who drives a straight furrow. Similarly R.V. m. (1), *Holding a straight course in the word of truth.* Chrys., of cutting away what is spurious or bad. Alf. follows Huther in supposing that the idea of cutting has passed out of this word, as it has out of καινοτομεῖν, and renders, *rightly administering*, as opposed to "adulterating the word of God" (2 Cor. ii. 17). Other examples of words which have wholly lost their derivational meaning are πρόσφατος and συκοφαντέω. The imagery underlying the A.V., R.V.m. (2), *rightly dividing*, is either that of the correct cutting up of a Levitical victim (Beza), or a father (Calvin), or steward (Vitringa), cutting portions for the food of the household. The R.V., *handling aright*, follows the Vulg., *recte tractantem*, and gives the general sense well enough. The use of ὀρθοτομία in the sense of *orthodoxy*, in Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. xvi., and Eus. *H. E.* iv. 3, is probably based on this passage.

Ver. 16. κενοφωνίας: See on 1 Tim. vi. 20. Here, as Bengel suggests, κενο- is contrasted with ἀληθείας, φωνίας with λόγον.

περιΐστασο: *shun, devita,* "*Give them a wide berth*" (Plummer), also in Tit. iii. 9. In these places περιΐστασθαι has the same meaning as ἐκτρέπεσθαι, 1 Tim. vi. 20. In fact Ell. cites from Lucian, *Hermot.* § 86, ἐκτραπήσομαι καὶ περιστήσομαι, where the two verbs are evidently used as indifferent alternatives. Where περιΐστημι elsewhere occurs (N.T.), *viz.*, John xi. 42, Acts xxv. 7, it means "to stand around".

ἐπὶ πλεῖον, κ.τ.λ.: Those who utter "babblings" (subject of προκόψουσιν) are not, as is sometimes supposed, merely negatively useless; they are positively and increasingly mischievous. In iii. 9, οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον, the situation is different. When a man's ἄνοια has become manifest to all, he has lost his power to do mischief to others; on the other hand there is no limit to the deterioration of "evil men and impostors" in themselves, προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον (iii. 13).

ἀσεβείας: genitive after ἐπὶ πλεῖον. The commentators compare Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2, 3. προὔκοψαν εἰς τοσοῦτον

γὰρ [t][u]προκόψουσιν [v]ἀσεβείας· 17. καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς [w]γάγγραινα [x]νομὴν ἕξει· ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φιλητός, 18. οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν [y]ἠστόχησαν, λέγοντες[1] ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι, καὶ [z]ἀνατρέπουσιν τήν τινων πίστιν. 19. ὁ [a]μέντοι [b]στερεὸς [c]θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν, ἔχων τὴν [d]σφραγῖδα ταύτην, Ἔγνω Κύριος τοὺς

u Luke ii. 52, Rom. xiii. 12, Gal. i. 14, 2 Tim. iii. 9, 13, not LXX.
v Rom. i. 18, xi. 26, Tit. ii. 12, Jude 15, 18.
w Here only, not LXX. x John x. 9 only, N.T. y See 1 Tim. i. 6. z John ii. 15, Tit. i. 11 only, N.T. a John (5), Jas. ii. 8. Jude 8. b Heb. v. 12, 14, 1 Pet. v. 9. c See 1 Tim. vi. 19. d Rom. iv. 11, 1 Cor. ix. 2, Rev. ix. 4, etc.

[1] Ins. τὴν ACDKLP, and almost all other authorities; om. τὴν ℵFG, 17.

παρανομίας. Charles thinks **προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ κακῷ ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ**, *Test. of Twelve Patriarchs*, Judah, xxi. 8, the source of this phrase; but it is merely a parallel.

Ver. 17. **ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει**: *spread*, R.V.m., *ut cancer serpit*, Vulg. Ell. compares Ovid. *Metam.* ii. 825, "solet immedicabile cancer Serpere, et illaesas vitiatis addere partes". Alf. supplies many illustrations of **νομή** as "the medical term for the consuming progress of mortifying disease".

Harnack (*Mission*, vol. i., pp. 114, 115) illustrates copiously this conception of moral evil from the writings of the early fathers.

Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος. This Hymenaeus is perhaps the same as he who is mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20. Of Philetus nothing is known from other sources.

Ver. 18. **οἵτινες** implies that Hymenaeus and Philetus were only the more conspicuous members of a class of false teachers.

περὶ—ἠστόχησαν: See notes on 1 Tim. i. 6, 19.

λέγοντες, κ.τ.λ.: There can be little doubt that the false teaching here alluded to was akin to, if not the same as, that of some in Corinth a few years earlier who said, "There is no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 12). What these persons meant was that the language of Jesus about eternal life and a resurrection received its complete fulfilment in our present conditions of existence, through the acquisition of that more elevated knowledge of God and man and morality and spiritual existence generally which Christ and His coming had imparted to mankind. This sublimest knowledge of things divine is, they said, a resurrection, and the only resurrection that men can attain unto. These false teachers combined a plausible but false spirituality, or sentimentality, with an invincible materialism; and they attempted to find support for their materialistic disbelief in the resurrection of the body in a perverse misunderstanding of the Christian language about "newness of life" (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12, iii. 1). "Esse resurrectionem a mortuis, agnitionem ejus quae ab ipsis dicitur veritatis" (Irenæus, *Haer.* ii. 31, 2; *cf.* Tert. *de Resurr.* 19); an achieved moral experience, in fact; not a future hope. The heresy of Marcion, on the other hand, while denying the future resurrection of the body, affirmed positively the immortality of the soul; *cf.* Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 80. "Marcion enim in totum carnis resurrectionem non admittens, et soli animae salutem repromittens, non qualitatis sed substantiae facit quaestionem" (Tert. *adv. Marcionem*, v. 10).

τινων: See note on 1 Tim. i. 3.

Ver. 19. "We will not fear. The city of God . . . shall not be moved" (Ps. xlvi. 2, 4; *cf.* Heb. xii. 28). The Church of the New Covenant is like the Church of the Old Covenant: it has an ideal integrity unaffected by the defection of some who had seemed to belong to it. "They are not all Israel, which are of Israel. . . . All Israel shall be saved" (Rom. ix. 6, xi. 26). "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us" (1 John ii. 19). The Church, as existing in the Divine Knowledge, not as apprehended by man's intellect, is *the firm foundation of God* (R.V.), *i.e.*, that which God has firmly founded. It is called here **θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ** rather than **οἶκος τ. θεοῦ**, so as to express the better its immobility, unaffected by those who **ἀνατρέπουσι, κ.τ.λ.**; *cf.* **στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας** (1 Tim. iii. 15). There can hardly be an allusion to the parable with which the Sermon on the Mount closes, Luke vi. 48, 49. With **στερεός** compare the use of **στερεόω**, Acts xvi. 5, and of **στερέωμα**, Col. ii. 5.

ἔχων τὴν σφραγῖδα: It was noted on

ὄντας αὐτοῦ, καὶ [e] Ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ [f] ὀνομάζων τὸ [f] ὄνομα Κυρίου.[1] 20. ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔστιν μόνον σκεύη χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ ἀλλὰ καὶ [g] ξύλινα καὶ [h] ὀστράκινα, καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν ἃ δὲ

e See 1 Tim. iv. 1.
f Acts xix. 13, Rom. xv. 20, Eph. i. 21.
g Rev. ix. 20
h 2 Cor. iv. 7.

[1] **Χριστοῦ** a few cursives.

1 Tim. vi. 19 that in the two places in which **θεμέλιος** occurs in the Pastorals, there is a condensation of expression resulting in a confusion of metaphor. Here the apostle passes rapidly from the notion of the Church collectively as a foundation, or a building well founded, to that of the men and women of whom it is composed, and who have been sealed by God (see reff. and also Ezek. ix. 4; John vi. 27; 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, 4, 5-8). They are marked by God so as to be recognised by Him as His; and this mark also serves as a perpetual reminder to them that "they are not their own," and of their consequent obligation to holiness of life (1 Cor. vi. 19, 20). There is no allusion to the practice of carving inscriptions over doors and on pillars and foundation stones (Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20; Rev. xxi. 14). The one seal bears two inscriptions, two mutually complementary parts or aspects: (*a*) The objective fact of God's superintending knowledge of His chosen; (*b*) the recognition by the consciousness of each individual of the relation in which he stands to God, with its imperative call to holiness.

Ἔγνω Κύριος κ.τ.λ.: The words are taken from Num. xvi. 5, **ἐπέσκεπται καὶ ἔγνω ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ**, "In the morning the Lord will shew who are His". The intensive use of *know* is lilustrated by Gen. xviii. 19, Ex. xxxiii. 12, 17, Nah. i. 7, John x. 14, 27, 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12, xiv. 38, R.V.m., Gal. iv. 9.

Ἀποστήτω κ.τ.λ.: The language is perhaps another echo of the story of Korah: **Ἀποσχίσθητε ἀπὸ τῶν σκηνῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν σκληρῶν τούτων . . . μὴ συναπόλησθε ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς Κόρε** (Num. xvi. 26, 27). But Isa. lii. 11 is nearer in sentiment, **ἀπόστητε ἀπόστητε, ἐξέλθατε ἐκεῖθεν καὶ ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅψησθε, . . . οἱ φέροντες τὰ σκεύη Κυρίου**, *cf.* Luke xiii. 27. Also Isa. xxvi. 13, **Κύριε, ἐκτὸς σοῦ ἄλλον οὐκ οἴδαμεν, τὸ ὄνομά σου ὀνομάζομεν.** The spiritual logic of the appeal is the same as that of Gal. v. 25, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk". Bengel thinks that **ἀπὸ ἀδικίας** is equivalent to **ἀπὸ ἀδίκων**, the abstract for the concrete; *cf.* ver. 21, "purge himself from these".

Ver. 20. Although the notional Church, the *corpus Christi verum*, is unaffected by the vacillation and disloyalty of its members, nevertheless (**δὲ**) the Church as we experience it contains many unworthy persons, the recognition of whom as members of the Church is a trial to faith. The notional Church is best figured as a foundation, which is out of sight. But the idea of the superstructure must be added in order to shadow forth the Church as it meets the eye. It is a house, a Great House too, the House of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), and therefore containing a great variety of kinds and quality of furniture and utensils. On **οἰκία**, a whole house, as distinguished from **οἶκος**, which might mean a set of rooms only, a dwelling, see Moulton in *Expositor*, vi., vii. 117. There are two thoughts in the apostle's mind, thoughts which logically are conflicting, but which balance each other in practice. These are: (1) the reality of the ideal Church, and (2) the providential ordering of the actual Church. Until the drag-net is full, and drawn up on the beach, the bad fish in it cannot be cast away (Matt. xiii. 47, 48). This is the view of the passage taken by the Latin expositors, *e.g.*, Cyprian, *Ep.* lv. 25. The explanation of the Greek commentators, that by the "great house" is meant the world at large, is out of harmony with the context. It is to be observed that St. Paul expresses here a milder and more hopeful view of the unworthy elements in the Church than he does in the parallel passage in Rom. ix. 21, 22. There "the vessels unto dishonour" are "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction". Here they are all at least in the Great House, and all for some use, even if for less honourable purposes than those served by the vessels of gold and silver; and the next verse suggests that it is perhaps possible for that which had been a "vessel unto dishonour" to become fit for honourable use in the Master's personal service. We are reminded of the various qualities of superstructure mentioned in 1 Cor. iii. 12, "gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay,

εἰς ἀτιμίαν. 21. ἐὰν οὖν τις [i] ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, ἡγιασμένον,[1] [k] εὔχρηστον τῷ [l] δεσπότῃ, εἰς [m] πᾶν [m] ἔργον [m] ἀγαθὸν [n] ἡτοιμασμένον. 22. τὰς δὲ [o] νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας [p] φεῦγε· [p] δίωκε δὲ δικαιοσύνην, [q] πίστιν, [q] ἀγάπην, εἰρήνην μετὰ[2] τῶν [r] ἐπικαλουμένων τὸν Κύριον ἐκ [s] καθαρᾶς [s] καρδίας. 23. τὰς δὲ [t] μωρὰς καὶ [u] ἀπαιδεύτους [t] [v] ζητήσεις [w] παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι γεννῶσι

i 1 Cor. v. 7.
k Prov. xxxi. 13, Wisd. xiii. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 11, Philem. 11 only.
l See 1 Tim. vi. 1.
m 2 Tim. iii. 17, Tit. i. 16, iii. 1, see 1 Tim. ii. 10.
n Rev. ix. 7, 15, with εἰς; *cf.* Tit. iii. 1.
o 3 Macc. iv. 8 only.
p See 1 Tim. vi. 11.
q See 1 Tim. i. 14.
r Acts vii. 59, ii. 21, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16, Rom. x. 12, 13, 14, 1 Cor. i. 2, 1 Pet. i. 17.
s See 1 Tim. i. 5.
t Tit. iii. 9.
u Here only, N.T.
v See 1 Tim. vi. 4.
w See 1 Tim. iv. 7.

[1] Ins. καὶ ℵ^c C*D^bc KLP, f, vg., sah., syr^hcl, arm.

[2] Ins. πάντων ACF^gr G, 17, 31, 73, three others (FG, 73 om. foll. τῶν), g, sah., syr^hcl. See 1 Cor. i. 2.

stubble". See also Wisd. xv. 7. Field, *Notes, in loc.*, suggests that **δεσπότης** here is best rendered *the owner*. See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 15 and vi. 1.

Ver. 21. St. Paul drops the metaphor. The general meaning is clear enough, that a man may become "heaven's consummate cup," **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς** (Acts ix. 15), if he "mistake not his end, to slake the thirst of God". When we endue the vessels with consciousness, it is seen that they may "rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things". The **τις** has been, it is implied, among the "vessels unto dishonour". "Paul was an earthen vessel, and became a golden one. Judas was a golden vessel, and became an earthen one" (Chrys.). Bengel supposes that the **ἐάν τις** is an exhortation to Timothy himself. This is suggested in R.V. of ver. 22, "But flee," etc. The reference in **τούτων** is not quite clear. It is best perhaps to explain it of the false teachers themselves, "vessels unto dishonour," rather than of their teaching or immoral characteristics, though of course this is implied. The thoroughness of the separation from the corrupting environment of evil company is expressed by the **ἐκ-** and **ἀπό**. Where **ἐκκαθαίρω** occurs again, 1 Cor. v. 7, the metaphor (leaven) also refers to the removal of a corrupting personal element. There the person is to be expelled; here the persons are to be forsaken. **ἡγιασμένον** is the equivalent in actual experience of the simile **σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν**, as **εἰς πᾶν—ἡτοιμασμένον** is of **εὔχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ**. Compare 1 Cor. vi. 11, "And such were some of you: but ye were washed [lit. washed yourselves], but ye were sanctified" (**ἡγιάσθητε**).

ἡτοιμασμένον: "Even though he do not do it, he is fit for it, and has a capacity for it" (Chrys.). *Cf.* Eph. ii. 10, **κτισθέντες. . . ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν**, and reff.

Ver. 22. **νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας**: "Every inordinate desire is a youthful lust. Let the aged learn that they ought not to do the deeds of the youthful". (Chrys.). This is sound exegesis; yet it is reasonable to suppose that Timothy was still of an age to need the warning in its natural sense. See 1 Tim. iv. 12. He has just been cautioned against errors of the intellect; he must be warned also (**δὲ**) against vices of the blood.

φεῦγε· δίωκε δέ, κ.τ.λ.: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 11.

εἰρήνην: to be joined closely with the following words, *cf.* Heb. xii. 14. While avoiding the company of evil men, he is to cultivate friendly relations with those who are sincere worshippers of the same God as himself. **οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸν Κύριον**, *i.e.*, Christ, is almost a technical term for Christians. See reff. It comes ultimately from Joel ii. 32 (iii. 5).

ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας is emphatic. See Tit. i. 15, 16.

Ver. 23. **ἀπαιδεύτους**: *ignorant*. An ignorant question is one that arises from a misunderstanding of the matter in dispute. Misunderstandings are a fruitful source of strife. *Cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 4.

παραιτοῦ: *refuse, i.e.*, Such questions will be brought before you: refuse to discuss them. The A.V., *avoid* might mean merely, Evade the necessity of meeting them.

γεννῶσι: There is no other instance of the metaphorical use of this word in the N.T.

μάχας: in the weaker sense of *contention, quarrel*, as in 2 Cor. vii. 5, Tit. iii. 9; but not Jas. iv. 1.

[x] **μάχας.** 24. **δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ** [y] **ἤπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας,** [z] **διδακτικόν,** [a] **ἀνεξίκακον,** 25. **ἐν** [b] **πραΰτητι** [c] **παιδεύοντα τοὺς** [d] **ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μή ποτε δώῃ**[1] **αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς** [e] **μετάνοιαν** [f] **εἰς** [f] **ἐπίγνωσιν** [f] **ἀληθείας,** 26. **καὶ** [g] **ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς** [h] **τοῦ** [h] **διαβόλου** [h] **παγίδος,** [i] **ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.**

III. 1. **Τοῦτο δὲ γίνωσκε**[2] **ὅτι ἐν** [a] **ἐσχάταις** [a] **ἡμέραις** [b] **ἐνστήσονται**

x 2 Cor. vii. 5, Tit. iii. 9, Jas. iv. 1.
y 1 Thess. ii. 7, not LXX.
z 1 Tim. iii. 2, not LXX.
a Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Wisd. ii. 19.
b 1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. x. 1, Gal. v. 23, vi. 1, Eph. iv. 2, Col. iii. 12, Tit. iii. 2, Jas. i. 21, iii. 13, 1 Pet. iii. 15.
c See 1 Tim. i. 20.
d Here only, not LXX.
e Rom. ii. 4, 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 (Paul).
f See 1 Tim. ii. 4.
g Here only, not LXX.
h 1 Tim. iii. 7.
i Luke v. 10 only, N.T.
a Acts ii. 17 (Joel iii. 1), Jas. v. 3, 2 Pet. iii. 3.
b 2 Thess. ii. 2, *cf.* Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26, Gal. i. 4, Heb. ix. 9.

[1] **δῷ** ℵcDcKLP, 17, many others.

[2] **γινώσκετε** A [FgrG, 17, one other **γινώσκεται**], 238, two others, g.

Ver. 24. **δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου**: here is used in its special application to the ministers of the Church. On the general teaching, see 1 Thess. ii. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 3, Tit. iii. 2.

ἤπιος, as Ell. notes, implies gentleness in demeanour, **πραΰτης** meekness of disposition. "*Gentle* unto all men, so he will be *apt to teach; forbearing* towards opponents, so he will be able to *correct*" (Bengel).

Ver. 25. **τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους**: They who err from right thinking are to be dealt with as tenderly and considerately as they who err from right living. *Cf.* Gal. vi. 1, **καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος.** See also chap. iv. 2, and reff. Field takes **ἀντιδιατίθεσθαι** as equivalent to **ἐναντίως διατίθεσθαι**, "to be contrariwise or adversely affected". Similarly Ambrosiaster, *eos qui diversa sentiunt*. Field notes that "the only other example of the compound verb is to be found in Longinus **περὶ ὕψους**, xvii. 1". The A.V. and R.V. take the word here as middle, *them that oppose themselves, eos qui resistunt* [veritati] (Vulg.). von Soden finds in this word the key to the meaning of **ἀντιθέσεις**, 1 Tim. vi. 20.

μήποτε (not elsewhere in Paul) = **εἴποτε.**

δώῃ: The subjunctive seems a syntactical necessity. See J. H. Moulton, *Grammar*, vol. i. pp. 55, 193, 194, Blass, *Grammar*, p. 213. On the other hand, W. H. text, and Winer-Moulton, *Grammar*, p. 374, read **δῴη**, optative.

μετάνοιαν: It is certainly implied that false theories in religion are not unconnected with moral obliquity and faulty practice. See Tit. i. 15, 16, iii. 11.

Ver. 26. **ἀνανήψωσιν** is to be connected with **εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.** Compare **ἐκνήψατε δικαίως**, 1 Cor. xv. 34. **ἐκείνου** then refers to **ὁ θεός**, and **θέλημα** will have its usual force as the Will of God (see 1 Pet. iv. 2): *That they who had been taken captive by the devil may recover themselves* (*respiscant*, Vulg.) *out of his snare, so as to serve the will of God.* This is Beza's explanation and that of von Soden (nearly), who compares **αἰχμαλωτίζοντες**, 2 Cor. x. 5. It has the advantage of giving a natural reference to **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** respectively, which are employed accurately in iii. 9. The paradoxical use of **ζωγρέω** in Luke v. 10 must not be taken as determining the use of the word elsewhere. Of the other explanations, that of the A.V. and Vulg., which supposes an inelegant but not impossible reference of both **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** to **τοῦ διαβόλου**, is preferable to the R.V., following Wetstein and Bengel, which refers **αὐτοῦ** back to **δοῦλον Κυρίου**, and dissociates **ἐζωγρημένοι** from **παγίδος**, with which it is naturally connected. The reference of **αὐτοῦ** and **ἐκείνου** to the same subject, as given in the A.V., is paralleled by Wisd. i. 16, **συνθήκην ἔθεντο πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι.**

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-9. Evil times are upon us; we have indeed amongst us specimens of the perennial impostor, worthy successors of Jannes and Jambres. The shortlived nature of their success, will be, however, patent to all.

Ver. 1. **ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται**: Although St. Paul had abandoned his once confident expectation that the Lord would come again during his own lifetime, it is plain that here, as in 1 Tim. iv. 1, he regards the time now present as part of the last days. See **ἀποτρέπου . . . εἰσιν οἱ ἐνδύνοντες**, vv. 5, 6. The prophetical form of the sentence is a

καιροὶ [c] χαλεποί· 2. ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι [d] φίλαυτοι, [e] φιλάργυροι, [f] ἀλαζόνες, [g] ὑπερήφανοι, [h] βλάσφημοι, γονεῦσιν [i] ἀπειθεῖς, [k] ἀχάριστοι, [l] ἀνόσιοι, 3. [m] ἄστοργοι, [n] ἄσπονδοι, [o] διάβολοι, [p] ἀκρατεῖς, [q] ἀνήμεροι, [r] ἀφιλάγαθοι, 4. [s] προδόται, [t] προπετεῖς, [u] τετυφωμένοι, [v] φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ [w] φιλόθεοι, 5. ἔχοντες [x] μόρφωσιν

c Matt. viii. 28 only, N.T., Wisd. iii. 19, xvii. 11, xix. 13, Isa. xviii. 2, 2 Macc. (3), 4 Macc. (3).
d Here only, not LXX.
e Luke xvi. 14, 4 Macc. ii. 8 only.
f Rom. i. 30 only, N.T.
g Luke i. 51, Rom. i. 30, Jas. iv. 6 = 1 Pet. v. 5 (Prov. iii. 4).
h 1 Tim. i. 13.
i Rom. i. 30, *cf.* Tit. i. 16, iii. 3.
k Luke vi. 35, Wisd. (1), Ecclus. (2), 4 Macc. (1).
l See 1 Tim. i. 9.
m Rom. i. 31, not LXX.
n Here only, not LXX.
o See 1 Tim. iii. 11.
p Prov. xxvii. 20 only.
q Here only, not LXX.
r Here only, not LXX, *cf.* Tit. i. 8.
s Luke vi. 16, Acts vii. 52.
t Acts xix. 36, Prov. x. 14, xiii. 3, Ecclus. ix. 18.
u See 1 Tim. iii. 6.
v Here only, not LXX.
w Here only, not LXX.
x Rom. ii. 20 only, not LXX.

rhetorical way of saying that things are going from bad to worse. The same account is to be given of 2 Pet. iii. 3; Jude 18. St. John says plainly, "It is the last hour" (1 John ii. 18). See note on 1 Tim. iv. 1.

ἐνστήσονται: *will be upon us, instabunt* (Vulg.).

χαλεποί: *grievous* (R.V.); but not necessarily *perilous* (A.V.) to those who feel their grievousness.

Ver. 2. **οἱ ἄνθρωποι**: *mankind* in general, not **οἱ ἄνδρες**. This list of human vices should be compared with that given in Rom. i. 29 *sqq.*; **ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἄστοργοι** are common to both passages. **φίλαυτοι** appropriately heads the array, egoism or self-centredness being the root of almost every sin, just as love which "seeketh not its own" (1 Cor. xiii. 5) is "the fulfilment of the law" (Rom. xiii. 10). **φιλαυτία** is used favourably by Aristotle in the sense of *self-respect* (*Nic. Eth.* ix. 8. 7). But "once the sense of sin is truly felt, self-respect becomes an inadequate basis for moral theory. So Philo (*de Prof.* 15) speaks of those who are **φίλαυτοι δὴ μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι**" (Dean Bernard, *in loc*).

φιλάργυροι: covetousness (**πλεονεξία**, Rom. i. 29) naturally springs from, or is one form of, selfishness; but we cannot suppose with Chrys. that there is a similar sequence intended all through.

Other compounds of **φιλ.-** in the Pastorals, besides the five that occur here, are **φιλάγαθος**, Tit. i. 8, **φίλανδρος, φιλότεκνος**, Tit. ii. 4, **φιλανθρωπία**, Tit. iii. 4, **φιλόξενος**, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8.

ἀλαζόνες, ὑπερήφανοι: *elati, superbi.* The **ἀλαζών**, *boastful*, betrays his character by his words; the **ὑπερήφανος**, *haughty*, more usually by his demeanour and expression.

βλάσφημοι: *abusive, railers* (R.V.); not necessarily *blasphemers* (A.V.).

γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς and **ἀχάριστοι** naturally go together; since, as Bengel observes, gratitude springs from filial duty.

Ver. 3. **ἄστοργοι**: *without natural affection, sine affectione.* This and the three preceding adjectives appear to have teference to domestic relations.

ἄσπονδοι: *implacable, sine pace* (*absque foedere*, Rom. i. 31); not *trucebreakers* (A.V.), which would be **ἀσύνθετοι**, Rom. i. 31; the **ἄσπονδος** refuses to treat with his foe at all.

διάβολοι: A.V.m. here and in Tit. ii. 3, has *makebates*. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 11.

ἀκρατεῖς: *without self-control* (R.V.) rather than *incontinent* (A.V.). The latter word has a purely sexual reference, whereas **ἀκρατεῖς**, as Chrys. notes, is used "with respect both to their tongue, and their appetite, and everything else". It is naturally coupled with **ἀνήμεροι**, *fierce, immites.* "Simul et molles et duri" (Bengel).

ἀφιλάγαθοι: *No lovers of good* (R.V.), the *good* being "things true, honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report" (Phil. iv. 8). The positive **φιλάγαθος**, Tit. i. 8, has the same reference. It is a characteristic of the heavenly Wisdom (Wisd. vii. 22). The A.V. in both places narrows the reference to persons: *Despisers of those that are good; A lover of good men.* The Vulg. *sine benignitate, benignum*, does not express the active positive force of the Greek. **φιλάγαθος** and **ἀφιλάργυρος** are applied to the Emperor Antoninus in a papyrus of ii. A.D. which also uses the term **ἀφιλοκαγαθία** (perh. = **ἀφιλοκαλοκαγαθία**) of Marcus Aurelius (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 376).

Ver. 4. **προδόται**: has no special reference to persecution of Christians.

τετυφωμένοι: See note on 1 Tim. iii. 6.

Ver. 5. **ἔχοντες** (see note on 1 Tim. i.

[y] εὐσεβείας τὴν δὲ [z] δύναμιν αὐτῆς [a] ἠρνημένοι· καὶ τούτους [b] ἀπο-τρέπου. 6. ἐκ τούτων γάρ εἰσιν οἱ [c] ἐνδύνοντες εἰς τὰς οἰκίας καὶ [d] αἰχμαλωτίζοντες [1] [e] γυναικάρια [f] σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις, [g] ἀγόμενα [h] ἐπιθυμίαις [h] [i] ποικίλαις, 7. πάντοτε μανθάνοντα καὶ μηδέποτε [k] εἰς [k] ἐπίγνωσιν [k] ἀληθείας [k] ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα. 8. ὃν τρόπον δὲ Ἰαννῆς

y See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
z 1 Cor. ii. 5, iv. 19, 20, 1 Thess. i. 5, Heb. vii. 16.
a See 1 Tim. v. 8.
b Here only, N.T., 4 Macc. i. 33, etc. c Here only, N.T. d Luke xxi. 24, Rom. vii. 23, 2 Cor. x. 5. e Here only, not LXX. f Prov. xxv. 22, Judith xv. 11, Rom. xii. 20. g Rom. ii. 4, viii. 14, 1 Cor. xii. 2, Gal. v. 18. h Tit. iii. 3. i Matt. iv. 24 (π. νόσοις) = Mark i. 34 = Luke iv. 40, Heb. ii. 4, xiii. 9, Jas. i. 2, 1 Pet. i. 6, iv. 10. k See 1 Tim. ii. 4.

[1] αἰχμαλωτεύοντες [Eph. iv. 8] D^cKL; add τὰ a few cursives.

19) μόρφωσιν, κ.τ.λ.: *Habentes speciem quidem pietatis.* We have an exact parallel in Tit. i. 16, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται. They were professing Christians, but nothing more; genuine Christians must also be professing Christians. This consideration removes any difficulty that may be felt by a comparison of this passage with Rom. ii. 20, where it is implied that it is a point in the Jew's favour that he has τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. The μόρφωσις, embodiment, is external in both cases, but not unreal as far as it goes. The ineffectiveness of it arises from the co-existence in the mind of him who "holds" it of some other quality that neutralises the advantage naturally derivable from the possession of the μόρφωσις in question. In this case, it was that they of whom St. Paul is speaking had a purely theoretical, academic apprehension of practical Christianity (εὐσέβεια, see 1 Tim. ii. 2), but a positive disbelief in the Gospel as a regenerating force. Compare what St. John says of the rulers who believed on Jesus but did not confess Him (John xii. 42, 43). They too were φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι. In *Romans* the case is similar: the possession of an admirable moral code did not make the Jew's moral practice better than that of the Gentile (see Sanday and Headlam on Rom. ii. 20). There is therefore no necessity to suppose with Lightfoot that "the termination -ωσις denotes the aiming after or affecting the μορφή" (*Journal of Class. and Sacr. Philol.* (1857), iii. 115).

δύναμιν: the opposition between μόρφωσις and δύναμις here is the same as that between δύναμις and σοφία in 1 Cor. ii. 5, or λόγος, 1 Cor. iv. 19, 20, 1 Thess. i. 5; see also Heb. vii. 16.

ἠρνημένοι: *To deny a thing* or *a person* involves always more than an act of the mind; it means carrying the negation into practice. See on 1 Tim. v. 8.

καί: perhaps refers back to ii. 22, 23.

Ver. 6. ἐνδύνοντες: *who insinuate themselves into houses* [which they overthrow], Tit. i. 11. "Observe how he shows their impudence by this expression, their dishonourable ways, their deceitfulness" (Chrys.). παρεισέδυησαν (Jude 4) and παρεισῆλθον (Gal. ii. 4) are similar expressions.

γυναικάρια: *Mulierculas.* Chrys. acutely implies that the victims of the crafty heretics were "silly women" of both sexes: "He who is easy to be deceived is a silly woman, and nothing like a man; for to be deceived is the part of silly women". St. Paul, however, refers to women only.

σεσωρευμένα ἁμαρτίαις: *overwhelmed*, rather than *burdened* (βεβαρημένα) (Field). Is there any contrast implied between the diminutive, indicating the insignificance of the women, and the load of sins which they carry? De Wette (quoted by Alf.), notes that a sin-laden conscience is easily tempted to seek the easiest method of relief.

ποικίλαις: There is no great difficulty in diverting them from the right path, for they are inconstant even in vice.

Ver. 7. πάντοτε μανθάνοντα: They have never concentrated their attention on any spiritual truth so as to have learnt it and assimilated it. They are always being attracted by "some newer thing," τι καινότερον (Acts xvii. 21), and thus their power of comprehension becomes atrophied.

μηδέποτε: For negatives with the participle, see Blass, *Grammar*, p. 255.

εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

Ver. 8. The apostle now returns from the γυναικάρια to their seducers, whom he compares to the magicians who withstood Moses and Aaron, both

καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς[1] [l]ἀντέστησαν Μωυσεῖ, οὕτως καὶ οὗτοι [l]ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἄνθρωποι [m]κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, [n]ἀδόκιμοι [o]περὶ [o]τὴν [o]πίστιν. 9. ἀλλ' οὐ [p]προκόψουσιν [p]ἐπὶ [p]πλεῖον, ἡ γὰρ [q]ἄνοια αὐτῶν [r]ἔκδηλος ἔσται πᾶσιν, ὡς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο. 10. [s]Σὺ [s]δὲ [t]παρηκολούθησάς[2] μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ [u]ἀγωγῇ,

l Acts xiii. 8, etc., Rom. ix. 19, xiii. 2, Gal. ii. 11, Eph. vi. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 15, etc. m Here only, N.T., *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 5. n Rom. i. 28, 1 Cor. ix. 27, 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7, Tit. i. 16, Heb. vi. 8. o 1 Tim. i. 19, vi. 21. p See 2 Tim. ii. 16. q Wisd. xv. 18, xix. 3, etc., Luke vi. 11 only, N.T. r 3 Macc. iii. 19, vi. 5 only. s See 1 Tim. vi. 11. t See 1 Tim. iv. 6. u Here only, N.T., Esth. (2), 2 Macc. (3), 3 Macc. (1).

[1] **Μαμβρῆς** FG, d, e, f, g, m50, vg., go.

[2] So ℵAC [FG, **ἠκολούθησας**], 17; **παρηκολούθηκας** DKLP. See 1 Tim. iv. 6.

in their hostility to the truth and in their subsequent fate. St. Paul is the earliest extant authority for the names; but of course he derived them from some source, written (Origen), or unwritten (Theodoret), it is immaterial which. But the former theory is the more probable. The book is called by Origen (*in Matt.* p. 916, on Matt. xxvii. 8), *Jannes et Mambres liber*, and is perhaps identical with *Pœnitentia Jamnis et Mambrae* condemned in the *Decretum Gelasii*. Pliny, whose *Natural History* appeared in A.D. 77, mentions Jannes along with Moses and Lotapis (or Jotapis) as Jewish Magi posterior to Zoroastes (*Hist. Nat.* xxx. 1). He is followed by Apuleius, *Apol.* c. 90. Numenius (quoted by Eusebius (*Prep. Ev.* ix. 8) mentions Jannes and Jambres as magicians who resisted Moses. In the Targ. of Jonathan on Ex. vii. 11, the names are given as ינים וימברים, Janis and Jamberes; but in the Talmud as יוחנא וממרא, Jochana and Mamre. It is generally agreed that Jannes is a form of Jochanan (Johannes), and that Jambres is from the Hiphil of מרה to rebel. For the legends associated with these names, see art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀντέστησαν: The same word is used of Elymas the Sorcerer, Acts xiii. 8. The **οὕτως** refers rather to the degree of their hostility than to the manner in which it was expressed, *i.e.*, by magical arts. At the same time, it is possible that magic was practised by the false teachers; they are styled impostors, **γόητες**, in ver. 13; and Ephesus was a home of magic. See Acts xix. 19.

κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν: *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 5, **διεφθαρμ. τὸν νοῦν**. This is the Pauline equivalent for the Platonic "lie in the soul". **κατεφθ.** is not coordinate with **ἀδόκ.**; the latter is the exemplification of the former.

ἀδόκιμοι: *reprobate*. The A.V.m. gives the word here, and in Tit. i. 16, an active force, *of no judgment*, *void of judgment*. For **περί** with the acc. see on 1 Tim. i. 19.

Ver. 9. **οὐ προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ πλεῖον**: There is only a verbal inconsistency between this statement and those in ii. 16 and iii. 13, where see notes. The meaning here is that there will be a limit to the success of the false teachers. They will be exposed, found out; those to whom that fact is apparent will not be imposed on any more. In ii. 16, the increasing impiety of the teachers and the cancerous growth of their teaching is alleged as a reason why Timothy should avoid them. In ver. 13, **προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον** does not indicate success in gaining adherents, but simply advance in degradation. "Saepe malitia, quum late non potest, profundius proficit" (Bengel).

ἄνοια: *dementia* (m50) is nearer the mark than *insipientia* (Vulg.).

ὡς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο: "Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods" (Ex. vii. 12); they failed to produce lice (viii. 18). "And the magicians could not stand before Moses because of the boils; for the boils were upon the magicians" (ix. 11). During the plague of darkness, "they lay helpless, made the sport of magic art, and a shameful rebuke of their vaunts of understanding" (Wisd. xvii. 7).

Vv. 10-17. I am not really uneasy about your steadfastness. You joined me as a disciple from spiritual and moral inducements only. The persecutions you saw me endure you knew to be typical of the conditions of a life of godliness. Stand in the old paths. Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures on which your growing mind was fed is never out of date as an equipment for the man of God.

Ver. 10: **παρηκολούθησας**: See on 1 Tim. iv. 6. *Thou didst follow* (R.V.)

τῇ [v] προθέσει, τῇ πίστει, τῇ [w] μακροθυμίᾳ, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ [x] ὑπομονῇ, 11. τοῖς [y] διωγμοῖς, τοῖς [z] παθήμασιν, οἷά μοι ἐγένετο ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, ἐν Λύστροις, οἵους [y] διωγμοὺς [a] ὑπήνεγκα· καὶ ἐκ πάντων με [b] ἐρύσατο ὁ Κύριος. 12. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ θέλοντες [c] [e] ζῆν [c] [d] εὐσεβῶς [1] [e] ἐν [e] Χριστῷ [e] Ἰησοῦ [f] διωχθήσονται. 13. πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ [g] γόητες [h] προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, [i] πλανῶντες καὶ [k] πλανώμενοι. 14. [l] σὺ [l] δὲ [m] μένε [m] ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ [n] ἐπιστώθης,

v Acts xi. 23, xxvii. 13.
w See 1 Tim. i. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 6, Gal. v. 22, Eph. iv. 2, Col. i. 11, iii. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 2, Heb. vi. 12, Jas. v. 10 (of man).
x See 1 Tim. vi. 11. y Acts xiii. 50, Rom. viii. 35, 2 Cor. xii. 10, 2 Thess. i. 4. z Rom. viii. 18, 2 Cor. i. 5, 6, 7, Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24, Heb. ii. 10, x. 32, 1 Pet. iv. 13, v. 9, etc., not LXX.
a 1 Cor. x. 13, 1 Pet. ii. 19, only, N.T. b Matt. vi. 13, Rom. xv. 31, 2 Cor. i. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Tim. iv. 17, 18, 2 Pet. ii. 7, 9. c Tit. ii. 12. d 4 Macc. vii. 21 only. e Rom. vi. 11, *cf.* Gal. ii. 20. f Matt. v. 10, 11, John xv. 20, 1 Cor. iv. 12, 2 Cor. iv. 9, Gal. v. 11, etc. g Here only, not LXX. h See 2 Tim. ii. 16. i Matt. xxiv. 4, 5, 11, 24 (= Mark xiii. 5, 6), 1 John i. 8, ii. 26, iii. 7, Rev. (7), etc. k Matt. xviii. 12, Tit. iii. 3, Heb. v. 2, 1 Pet. ii. 25, etc. l See 1 Tim. vi. 11. m See 1 Tim. ii. 15. n Here only, N.T.

[1] So ℵAP, 17, 37, two others; εὐσεβῶς ζῆν CDFGKL.

is susceptible of the meaning "Thou wert attracted as a disciple to me on account of". It is not necessarily implied that Timothy had copied his master in all these respects. The A.V., *Thou hast fully known*, follows the A.V. of Luke i. 3. This translation fails to bring out the appeal to Timothy's loyalty which underlies the passage. The aorist is appropriate here, because St. Paul is recalling to Timothy's recollection the definite occasion in the past when the youth cast in his lot with him. He is not thinking, as in 1 Tim. iv. 6, of Timothy's consistent discipleship up to the moment of writing. Bengel quotes aptly 2 Macc. ix. 27, παρακολουθοῦντα τῇ ἐμῇ προαιρέσει. (So cod. Venetus: A has συνσταθέντα for παρακολ.) This limitation of the reference explains why St. Paul mentions only the places in which he suffered on his first missionary journey.

διδασκαλίᾳ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἀγωγῇ: *conduct* (R.V.). The A.V., *manner of life* has perhaps reference to guiding principles of conduct rather than to the external expression of them, which is meant here.

προθέσει: For πρόθεσις in this sense of human purpose see reff. Here it means what St. Paul had set before himself as the aim of his life. In Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9 the word is used of God's eternal purpose for man.

ὑπομονῇ: See on 1 Tim. vi. 11.

Ver. 11. **Ἀντιοχείᾳ**: Acts xiii. 14, 45, 50; **Ἰκονίῳ**: Acts xiv. 1, 2, 5; **Λύστροις**: Acts xiv. 6, 19.

οἵους διωγμούς: There is no necessity to supply, with Alf., "Thou sawest".

καί: *and yet*. The verse is an echo of Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 18, ὁ Κύριος . . . ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτῶν ἐρύσατο αὐτούς. See also reff.

Ver. 12. This verse is an interesting example of the effect of association of ideas. St. Paul's teaching after his persecutions at Antioch, etc., had strongly emphasised this topic. St. Luke (Acts xiv. 22) actually repeats the very words used by the preachers, "Through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God". Consistency in the life in Christ must necessarily be always opposed by the world. **θέλοντες** is emphatic, as Ell. notes, "whose will is". *Cf.* Luke xiv. 28, John vii. 17.

εὐσεβῶς of course qualifies **ζῆν**, as in Tit. ii. 12. There is a similar extension of thought, from self to all, in iv. 8.

Ver. 13. **πονηροὶ δὲ**: The antithesis seems to be between the apparent discomfiture of those who wish to live in Christ (their persecution being after all almost a means conditional to their attaining their desire), and the paradoxical success of evil men; they advance indeed; but only in degradation; *proficient in peius* (Vulg.). See notes on ver. 9 and ii. 16.

γόητες, *impostors* (R.V.), *seductores*, exactly expresses the term. **γοητεία** occurs 2 Macc. xii. 24, where it means *trickery*.

πλανώμενοι: *cf.* Tit. iii. 3. Those who deceive others impair, in so doing, their sense of the distinction between truth and falsehood, and thus weaken their power of resistance to self-deceit, and to imposition by others.

προκόψουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον: See on ver. 9.

Ver. 14. **σὺ δὲ μένε**: Both **σύ** and **μένε** are in strong contrast to the **πονηροὶ**

εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων[1] ἔμαθες, 15. καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ [o] βρέφους [2] [p] ἱερὰ [q] γράμματα οἶδας τὰ δυνάμενά σε [r] σοφίσαι [s] εἰς [s] σωτηρίαν διὰ [t] πίστεως [t] τῆς [t] ἐν [t] Χριστῷ [t] Ἰησοῦ. 16. πᾶσα γραφὴ [u] θεόπνευστος

o Ecclus. (1), 1 Macc. (1), 2 Macc. (1), 3 Macc. (1), 4 Macc. (1), Luke (5), Acts vii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 2. p 1 Cor. ix. 13 only, N.T. q John vii. 15, Acts xxvi. 24. r Ps. xviii. (xix.) 7, civ. (cv.) 22, cxviii. (cxix.) 98. s Phil. i. 19, 2 Thess. ii. 13, 1 Pet. i. 5, ii. 2, *cf.* Rom. i. 16, x. 1, 10, 2 Cor. vii. 10, Heb. ix. 28, xi. 7. t 1 Tim. iii. 13. u Here only, not LXX.

[1] So ℵAC*FgrGP, 17, one other, d, e, g; τίνος CcDKL, f, vg., go., boh., syrr., arm.

[2] Ins. τὰ AC*DcKLP; om. τὰ ℵCbD*FG, 17, arm.

ἄνθρωποι and προκόψουσιν of ver. 13. The exhortation is illustrated by 2 John 9, πᾶς ὁ προάγων, καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει. The conservatism here enjoined concerns more especially the fundamental ethical teaching common to the Old Covenant and the New. For the idiom, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 15.

ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης: ἃ, supplied out of ἐν οἷς, is the direct object of ἔμαθες, and remoter object of ἐπιστώθης.

ἐπιστώθης: The Latin versions blunder here, *quae . . . credita sunt tibi.* This would be the translation of ἐπιστεύθης. πιστόομαί τι means *to have received confirmation of the truth of a thing.* Bengel, rendering "fidelis et firmus es redditus," compares Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 8, οὐκ ἐπιστώθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, and 37, οὐδὲ ἐπιστώθησαν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ αὐτοῦ.

εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες: It has to be remembered that St. Paul is speaking of moral, not intellectual, authority. The truths for which St. Paul is contending were commended to Timothy by the sanction of the best and noblest personalities whom he had ever known or heard of. The characters of Timothy's revered parent and teachers—of Eunice, Lois, the prophets, and Paul, to enumerate them in the order in which they had touched his life—had been moulded in a certain school of morals. Their characters had admittedly stood the test of life. What more cogent argument could Timothy have for the truth and reasonableness of their moral teaching?

Ver. 15. καὶ ὅτι: dependent on εἰδώς. For the change of construction, von Soden compares Rom. ix. 22, 23; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Timothy's knowledge of things divine was derived not merely from persons, but from sacred writings; and, perhaps, as Theophylact notes, the two points are emphasised: (*a*) that the persons were of no ordinary merit, and (*b*) that his knowledge of Scripture was conterminous with the whole of his conscious existence. He could not recall a period when he had not known sacred writings. This is the force of the hyperbolic ἀπὸ βρέφους.

ἱερὰ γράμματα: *sacras litteras, sacred writings* (R.V.). For this use of γράμματα see John vii. 15, and Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 383. The force of this peculiar phrase is that Timothy's A B C lessons had been of a sacred nature. The usual N.T. equivalent for *the Holy Scriptures* (A.V.) is αἱ γραφαί or ἡ γραφή (once γραφαὶ ἅγιαι, Rom. i. 2); but St. Paul here deliberately uses an ambiguous term in order to express vigorously the notion that Timothy's first lessons were in Holy Scripture. τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα is found in Josephus, *Antiq.* Prooem 3 and x. 10, 4, and elsewhere. *Cf.* παραναγνοὺς τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον (2 Macc. viii. 23). There may be also an allusion to γράμματα of the false teachers which were not ἱερά. See on next verse.

σοφίσαι: *instruere, cf.* Ps. xviii. (xix.) 8, ἡ μαρτυρία Κυρίου πιστή, σοφίζουσα νήπια. Also Ps. civ. (cv.) 22, cxviii. (cxix.) 98. The word is chosen for its O.T. reference, and also because of its strictly *educational* association.

εἰς σωτηρίαν: a constant Pauline phrase. See reff.

διὰ πίστεως: to be joined closely with σοφίσαι. *Cf. de Imitatione Christi*, iii. 2, "Let not Moses nor any prophet speak to me; but speak thou rather, O Lord God, who art the inspirer and enlightener of all the prophets; for thou alone without them canst perfectly instruct me, but they without thee will avail nothing. They may indeed sound forth words, but they do not add to them the Spirit. . . . They shew the way, but thou givest strength to walk in it," etc.

Ver. 16. In the absence of any extant Greek MS. authority for the omission of καί before ὠφέλιμος, we may assume that the early writers who ignored it did so from carelessness. The sentence then

καὶ[1] [v] ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς [w] ἐλεγμόν,[2] πρὸς [x] ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς [y] παιδείαν [z] τὴν [z] ἐν [z] δικαιοσύνῃ· 17. ἵνα [a] ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, [b] πρὸς [b] πᾶν [b] ἔργον [b] ἀγαθὸν [c] ἐξηρτισμένος. IV. 1. [a] Διαμαρτύρομαι[3] [b] ἐνώπιον [b] τοῦ [b] Θεοῦ καὶ[4] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[5]

v See 1 Tim. iv. 8. w Here only, N.T. x 1 Esd. viii. 52, 1 Macc. xiv. 34 only. y Eph. vi. 4, Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11. z Tit. iii. 5, cf. Eph. iv. 24. a Here only, not LXX. b See 2 Tim. ii. 21 and 1 Tim. ii. 10. c Exod. xxviii. 7, Acts xxi. 5 only. a See 1 Tim. v. 21. b See 1 Tim. ii. 3.

[1] Om. καί bef. ὠφέλιμος f, vg^{cle}. boh., syr^{pesh}.

[2] So ℵACFG, 31, 80, two others; ἔλεγχον DKLP.

[3] Ins. οὖν ἐγὼ D^{c}KL, syr^{hcl}.

[4] Ins. τοῦ Κυρίου D^{c}KL, go., syr^{pesh} and syr^{hcl} c.*

[5] Ἰησ. Χριστ. D^{c}KL, vg^{cle}, syrr., arm.

is best taken as a repetition and expansion of that which has just preceded; θεόπνευστος corresponding to ἱερά, and ὠφέλιμος, κ.τ.λ., to σοφίσαι, κ.τ.λ.: *Every writing which is inspired by God is also profitable.* γραφή of course has exclusive reference to the definite collection of writings which St. Paul usually designates as ἡ γραφή or αἱ γραφαί; but it is used here in a partitive, not in a collective sense. A parallel case is John xix. 36, 37, ἡ γραφή . . . ἑτέρα γραφή. Hence the rendering *writing* or *passage* is less free from ambiguity than *scripture* (R.V.). The nearest parallel to this *ascensive* use of καί, as Ellicott terms it, is Gal. iv. 7, εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος. See also Luke i. 36, Acts xxvi. 26, xxviii. 28, Rom. viii. 29.

θεόπνευστος: If there is any polemical force in this adj., it is in reference to heretical writings, the contents of which were merely intellectual, not edifying. In any case, the greatest stress is laid on ὠφέλιμος. St. Paul would imply that the best test of a γραφή being θεόπνευστος would be its proved serviceableness for the moral and spiritual needs of man. See Rom. xv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. This, the R.V. explanation of the passage, is that given by Origen, Chrys., Thdrt., syrr., the Clementine Vulg., *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad docendum etc.* [The true Vulg. text, however, is *insp. div. et utilis ad doc.*] The other view (A.V., R.V.m.), which takes καὶ as a simple copula, *Every Scripture is inspired and profitable*, is open to the objection that neither in the antecedent nor in the following context is there any suggestion that the inspiration of Scripture was being called in question; the theme of the passage being the moral equipment of the man of God. For this view are cited Greg. Naz., Ath. It is to be added that it is possible to render πᾶσα γραφή, *the whole of Scripture*, on the analogy of Matt. ii. 3, πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα (Eph. ii. 21 cannot be safely adduced as a case in point); but it is unnecessary and unnatural.

διδασκαλίαν (see notes on 1 Tim. i. 10) and ἐλεγμόν represent respectively positive and negative teaching. Similarly ἐπανόρθωσιν and παιδείαν have relation respectively to "the raising up of them that fall," and the disciplining the unruly; *ad corrigendum*, *ad erudiendum* (Vulg.).

τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ: a παιδεία *which is exercised in righteousness.* Compare the dissertation on the παιδεία Κυρίου, Heb. xii. 5 *sqq.* παιδεία in reff. is used in relation to children only.

Ver. 17. ἄρτιος: *perfectus*, *completely equipped* for his work as a Man of God. τέλειος would have reference to his performance of it.

ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος: see on 1 Tim. vi. 11. *The Man of God* has here a primary reference to the minister of the Gospel.

πρὸς πᾶν, κ.τ.λ.: see ii. 21; and, for this use of πρός, 1 Pet. iii. 15, 2 Cor. ii. 16, x. 4, Eph. iv. 29, Heb. v. 14; and on ἐξαρτίζω, Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 285.

Cf. the use of καταρτίζω, Luke vi. 40, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. v. 10.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-8. I solemnly charge you, in view of the coming judgment, to be zealous in the exercise of your ministry while the opportunity lasts, while people are willing to listen to your admonitions. Soon the craze for novelty will draw men away from sober truth to fantastic figments. Do you stand your ground. Fill the place which my death will leave vacant. My course is run, my crown is awaiting me. "My crown" did

τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν [1] ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ [2] τὴν [c] ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ· 2. κήρυξον τὸν λόγον, [d] ἐπίστηθι [e] εὐκαίρως [f] ἀκαίρως, ἔλεγξον, [g] ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον,[3] ἐν [h] πάσῃ [h] μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ. 3. ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς [i] ὑγιαινούσης

c See 1 Tim. vi. 14.
d Luke (7), Acts (11), 1 Thess. v. 3, 2 Tim. iv. 6.
e Ecclus. xviii. 22, Mark xiv. 11 only, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12.
f Ecclus. xxxv. (xxxii.) 4, only. *cf.* Phil. iv. 10.
g Matt. (7), Mark (9), Luke (12), Jude 9.
h See 1 Tim. i. 16 and 2 Tim. iii. 10.
i 1 Tim. i. 10 (*q.v.*), Tit. i. 9, ii. 1.

[1] κρῖναι FG, 17, 67**, six others. [2] κατὰ ℵcDcKLP, vgcle, go., syrr., arm.
[3] ἐπιτίμ. παρακαλ. ℵcACDgrKLP, syrhcl, arm.; παρακαλ. ἐπιτίμ. ℵ*FG, 37, one other, d, e, f, g, vg., go., boh.; om. παρακάλ. syrpesh.

I say? Nay, there is a crown for you, too, and for all who live in the loving longing for the coming of their Lord.

Ver. 1. **Διαμαρτύρομαι**: See on 1 Tim. v. 21. As the adjuration follows immediately on warnings against a moral degeneration which had already set in and would increase, it is appropriate that it should contain a solemn assurance of judgment to come.

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ μέλλοντος κρίνειν: This was a prominent topic in St. Paul's preaching (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5). **κρῖναι** is the tense used in the Creeds, as in 1 Pet. iv. 5. (Tisch. R.V.). See *apparat. crit.*

ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς: To be understood literally. See 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17.

τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν: *per adventum ipsius* (Vulg.). The acc. is that of the thing by which a person adjures, as in the case of **ὁρκίζω** (Mark v. 7; Acts xix. 13; *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 27). The use of **διαμαρτύρομαι** with an acc. in Deut. iv. 26, xxxi. 28, is different, **διαμαρτ. ὑμῖν σήμερον τόν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν.** "I call heaven and earth to witness against you." Heaven and earth can be conceived as personalities, *cf.* Ps. l. 4; not so the appearance or kingdom of Christ. On **ἐπιφάνεια** see note on 1 Tim. vi. 14.

βασιλείαν: The perfected kingdom, the manifestation of which will follow the second **ἐπιφάνεια.**

Ver. 2. **κήρυξον**: In 1 Tim. v. 21 **διαμαρτ.** is followed by **ἵνα** with the subj.; in 2 Tim. ii. 14 by the inf. Here the adjuration is more impassioned; hence the abruptness; this is heightened also by the aorists.

ἐπίστηθι: *Insta*, *Be at hand*, or *Be ready to act.* **ἐπίστ. εὐκ. ἀκ.** qualifies adverbially **κήρυξον**; while the following imperatives, **ἔλεγξον, κ.τ.λ.**, are various departments of "preaching the word".

εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως: *opportune*, *importune* (Vulg.). So few **καιροί** remain available (see next verse), that you must use them all. Do not ask yourself, "Is this a suitable occasion for preaching?" Ask rather, "Why should not this be a suitable occasion?" "Have not any limited season; let it always be thy season, not only in peace and security and when sitting in the Church" (Chrys.).

Similar expressions are cited by Bengel, *e.g.*, *digna indigna; praesens absens; nolens volens.* We need not ask whether the reasonableness, etc., has reference to the preacher or the hearers. The direction is to disregard the inclinations of both.

ἔλεγξον: Taking this in the sense *convict*, Chrys. comments thus on the three imperatives, "After the manner of physicians, having shown the wound, he gives the incision, he applies the plaister".

ἐπιτίμησον: "The strict meaning of the word is 'to mete out due measure,' but in the N.T. it is used only of censure". So Swete (on Mark i. 25), who also notes that with the exceptions of this place and Jude 9, it is limited to the Synoptists.

παρακάλεσον: See on 1 Tim. iv. 13.

ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ: This qualifies each of the three preceding imperatives; and **πάσῃ** belongs to **διδαχῇ** as well as to **μακρ.**, *with the utmost patience and the most painstaking instruction.*

διδαχῇ: "(*teaching*) seems to point more to the *act*, **διδασκαλία** (*doctrine*) to the *substance* or *result* of teaching" (Ell.). In the only other occurrence of **διδαχή** in the Pastorals, Tit. i. 9, it means *doctrine.*

Ver. 3. **ὑγιαινούσης διδασκαλίας**: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἰδίας: **ἴδιος** here, as constantly, has merely the force of a possessive pronoun. See on 1 Tim. iii. 4.

[l] διδασκαλίας οὐκ [k] ἀνέξονται, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας [1] ἑαυτοῖς [l] ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους [m] κνηθόμενοι τὴν [n] ἀκοήν, 4. καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν [n] ἀκοὴν [o] ἀποστρέψουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς [p] μύθους [q] ἐκτραπήσονται. 5. [r] σὺ [r] δὲ [s] νῆφε ἐν πᾶσιν, [t] κακοπάθησον, ἔργον ποίησον [u] εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τὴν διακονίαν σου [v] πληροφόρησον. 6. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη [w] σπένδομαι, καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῆς [x] ἀναλύσεώς μου [2]

k Heb. xiii. 22, etc.
l Here only, not LXX.
m Here only, not LXX.
n Matt. xiii. 14 = Acts xxviii. 26 (Isa. vi. 9), 1 Cor. xii. 17, 1 Thess. ii. 13, Heb. iv. 2, v. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 8.
o See 2 Tim. i. 15.
p See 1 Tim. i. 4.
q See 1 Tim. i. 6.
r See 1 Tim. vi. 11.
s 1 Thess. v. 6, 8, 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, v. 8, not LXX.
t See 2 Tim. ii. 9.
u Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11 only, not LXX.
v Luke i. 1, 2 Tim. iv. 17.
w Phil. ii. 17 only, N.T.
x Here only, not LXX.

[1] **ἐπιθυμίας τὰς ἰδίας** KL. [2] **ἐμῆς ἀναλύσεως** DKL.

ἐπισωρεύσουσιν: *coacervabunt* (Vulg.). "He shews the indiscriminate multitude of the teachers, as also their being elected by their disciples" (Chrys.).

κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν: *prurientes auribus* (Vulg.). The same general idea is expressed in **πάντοτε μανθάνοντα** (iii. 7). Their notion of a teacher was not one who should instruct their mind or guide their conduct, but one who should gratify their æsthetic sense. *Cf.* Ezek. xxxiii. 32, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, &c." The desire for pleasure is insatiable, and is increased or aggravated by indulgence; hence the heaping up of those who may minister to it. Ell. quotes appropriately from Philo, *Quod Det. Pot.* 21, **ἀποκναίουσι γοῦν [οἱ σοφισταὶ] ἡμῶν τὰ ὦτα.**

Ver. 4. The ears serve as a passage through which the truth may reach the understanding and the heart. Those who starve their understanding and heart have no use for the truth, and do not, as they would say, waste hearing power on it.

μύθους: See note on 1 Tim. i. 4.

Ver. 5. **νῆφε**: *Be sober* (R.V.). *Sobrius esto* (d). *vigila* (Vulg.) [but Vulg. Clem. inserts *sobrius esto* at end of verse]. So A.V., *watch*, and Chrys. *Sober* is certainly right in 1 Thess. v. 6, 8; but in 1 Pet. i. 13, iv. 7, and perhaps v. 8, *to be watchful* or *alert* seems more appropriate.

ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ: The office of evangelist is mentioned Acts xxi. 8, Eph. iv. 11. The evangelist was an itinerant preacher who had not the supervising functions of an apostle, nor the inspiration of a prophet; though both apostle and prophet did, *inter alia*, the work of evangelist. This was in all likelihood the work to which Timothy had originally been called. St. Paul here reminds him that in the faithful performance of what might seem to be subordinate duties lies the best preservative of the Church from error. Note, that the office of an episcopus is also an **ἔργον**, 1 Tim. iii. 1, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 10, Phil. ii. 30, Eph. iv. 12, 1 Thess. v. 13.

τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον: *fulfil*. According to Chrys., this does not differ from **πλήρωσον**. See Col. iv. 17, Acts xii. 25. For **διακονία**, *ministry* or service in general, see 1 Tim. i. 12.

Ver. 6. The connexion from ver. 3 seems to be this: The dangers to the Church are pressing and instant; they can only be met by watchfulness, self-sacrifice, and devotion to duty on the part of the leaders of the Church, of whom thou art one. As for me, I have done my best. My King is calling me from the field of action to wait for my reward; thou canst no longer look to me to take initiative in action. This seems to be the force of the emphatic **ἐγώ** and the connecting **γάρ**.

ἤδη σπένδομαι: *jam delibor* (Vulg.). The analogy of Phil. ii. 17, **σπένδ. ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ** (where see Lightfoot's note), is sufficient to prove that St. Paul did not regard his own death as a sacrifice. There the **θυσία** is the persons of the Philippian converts (*cf.* Rom. xii. 1, xv. 16) rendered acceptable by faith, and offered up by their faith. Here the nature of the **θυσία** is not determined, possibly not thought of, by the writer. The reason alleged by Chrys. for the absence here of the term **θυσία** is ingenious: "For the whole of the sacrifice was not offered to God, but the whole of the drink-offering was." It is immaterial to decide whether the imagery is drawn from the Jewish drink-offerings, or heathen libations. Lightfoot quotes interesting parallels from the dying words of Seneca: "stagnum calidae aquae introiit resper-

[y] ἐφέστηκεν. 7. [z] τὸν [z] καλὸν [z] ἀγῶνα[1] [z] ἠγώνισμαι, τὸν [a b] δρόμον [b c] τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν [d] τετήρηκα· 8. [e] λοιπὸν [f] ἀπόκειταί μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης [g] στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ Κύριος ἐν [h] ἐκείνῃ [h] τῇ [h] ἡμέρᾳ, ὁ [i] δίκαιος [i] κριτής· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν [k] ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ.

y See ver. 2. z See 1 Tim. vi. 12 and 1 Tim. iv. 10. a Acts xiii. 25. b Acts xx. 24. c Matt. x. 23, Luke xii. 50, xviii. 31, xxii. 37, John xix. 28, 30, Acts xiii. 29, 2 Cor. xii. 9, etc. d See 1 Tim. v. 22 and vi. 14. e 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 1. f Col. i. 5, etc. g 1 Cor. ix. 25, Jas. i. 12, 1 Pet. v. 4, Rev. ii. 10. h See 2 Tim. i. 12. i Ps. vii. 11, 2 Macc. xii. 6, 41. k See 1 Tim. vi. 14.

[1] ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν DKLP.

gens proximos servorum, addita voce, *libare se liquorem illum Jovi Liberatori*" (Tac. *Ann.* xv. 64), and from Ignatius, "Grant me nothing more than that I be poured out a libation (σπονδισθῆναι) to God, while there is yet an altar ready" (*Rom.* 2).

τῆς ἀναλύσεως: There is no figure of speech, such as that of striking a tent or unmooring a ship, suggested by ἀνάλυσις. It was as common a euphemism for death as is our word *departure*. See the verb in Phil. i. 23, and, besides the usual references given by the commentators, see examples supplied by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 266. The Vulg. *resolutionis* is wrong. Dean Bernard calls attention to the "verbal similarities of expression" between this letter to Timothy and *Philippians*, written when Timothy was with St. Paul, *viz.*, σπένδομαι, ἀνάλυσις here and ἀναλῦσαι, Phil. i. 23, and the image of the race; there (Phil. iii. 13, 14) not completed, here finished, v. 7.

ἐφέστηκεν: *instat* (Vulg.), *is come* (R.V.), *is already present*, rather than *is at hand* (A.V.), which implies a postponement. For similar prescience of approaching death compare 2 Pet. i. 14.

Ver. 7. **τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι**: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 12. The following τὸν δρόμον, κ.τ.λ., makes this reference to the games hardly doubtful.

τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα: *cursum consummavi* (Vulg.). What had been a purpose (Acts xx. 24) was now a retrospect. To say "My race is run," is not to boast, but merely to state a fact. The figure is also found in 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. The course is the race of life; we must not narrow it, as Chrys. does, to St. Paul's missionary travels.

τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα: As in ii. 21, St. Paul passes from the metaphor to the reality. For the force of τηρέω here, see note on 1 Tim. vi. 14; and *cf.* Rev. xiv. 12, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ. The faith is a deposit, παραθήκη, a trust which the Apostle is now ready to render up to Him who entrusted it to him. There is no real inconsistency between the tone of this passage and that of some in earlier epistles, *e.g.*, Phil. iii. 12, *sqq.* St. Paul is merely stating what the grace of God had done for him. A man does well to be distrustful as regards his use of the years of life that may remain to him; but when the life that he has lived has been admittedly lived "in the faith which is in the Son of God" (Gal. ii. 20), mock modesty becomes mischievous ingratitude.

Ver. 8. **λοιπόν**: *For what remains.* The R.V. renders it *besides* in 1 Cor. i. 16, *moreover* in 1 Cor. iv. 2. The notion of *duration* of future time is not in the word any more than in the French *du reste*. St. Paul means here "I have nothing more to do than to receive the crown". λοιπόν has the sense of *in conclusion* in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, 1 Thess. iv. 1, and does not differ from τὸ λοιπὸν as used in Phil. iii. 1, iv. 8, 2 Thess. iii. 1; or τοῦ λοιποῦ as used in Gal. vi. 17, Eph. vi. 10. The meaning of τὸ λοιπόν in 1 Cor. vii. 29, Heb. x. 13 is *henceforth*.

ἀπόκειται: *reposita est* (Vulg.). *Cf.* Col. i. 5, διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and, for the sentiment, 1 Pet. i. 4.

ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος: The whole context demands that this should be the possessive genitive, *The crown which belongs to*, or *is the due reward of*, *righteousness*, the incorruptible crown of 1 Cor. ix. 25. The verbal analogies of στέφ. τῆς ζωῆς, James i. 12, Rev. ii. 10, and στέφ. τῆς δόξης, 1 Pet. v. 4, support the view that it is the gen. of apposition; but it is difficult on this supposition to give the phrase an intelligible meaning. "Good works, which are the

9. [l m] Σπούδασον [m] ἐλθεῖν [m] πρός [m] με ταχέως· 10. Δημᾶς γάρ με [n] ἐγκατέλιπεν[1] ἀγαπήσας [o] τὸν [o] νῦν [o] αἰῶνα, καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην, Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν,[2] Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν[3]· 11.

l See 2 Tim. ii. 15.
m Tit. iii. 12.
n Josh. i. 5, Ps. xv. (xvi.) 10, xxi. (xxii.) 1, Isa. i. 4, 2 Cor. iv. 9, Heb. x. 25, 2 Tim. iv. 16.
o See I. Tim. vi. 17.

[1] So ℵ[D*] Ksil. most cursives; ἐγκατέλειπεν ACDbcFGLP, 17, 47*, one other.
[2] Γαλλίαν ℵC, 23, 31, 39, 73, 80, am*, Eus., *H. E.* iii. 4, 8.
[3] Δελματίαν C, 2, 67**, eleven others; Δερματίαν A.

fruits of Faith and follow after Justification . . . are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ" (Art. xii.). It is to be noted that **στεφ. τῆς δικ.** is applied to the golden fillet worn by the high priest in the *Tests. of Twelve Patriarchs*, Levi, viii. 2.

ἀποδώσει: *reddet* (Vulg.). As long as we agree to the statement that Moses **ἀπέβλεπεν εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν** (Heb. xi. 26), it seems trifling to dispute the retributive force of **ἀπο-** in this word. Of course "the reward is not reckoned as of debt, but as of grace". St. Paul could say, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense (**ἀνταποδοῦναι**) . . . to you that are afflicted rest with us" (2 Thess. i. 6, 7), see also Rom. ii. 6.

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ: see on i. 12.

ὁ δίκαιος κριτής: The notion expressed in this phrase goes back to Gen. xviii. 25. For the actual words, see reff.

οὐ μόνον δὲ . . . ἀλλὰ καί: see on 1 Tim. v. 13.

τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ: The **ἐπιφάνεια** here meant is the Second Coming of Christ. Those who love it do not fear it, for "there is no fear in love" (1 John iv. 18); they endeavour to make themselves increasingly ready and fit for it (1 John iii. 3); when they hear the Lord say, "I come quickly," their hearts respond, "Amen; come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii. 20). The perfect tense is used because their love will have continued up to the moment of their receiving the crown, or because St. Paul is thinking of them from the standpoint of the day of crowning.

Vv. 9-12. Come to me as speedily as you can. I am almost alone. Some of my company have forsaken me; others I have despatched on business. Bring Mark with you. I have use for him.

Ver. 9. **ταχέως**: more definitely expressed in ver. 21, "before winter".

Ver. 10. Demas had been a loyal fellow-worker of the apostle (Philem. 24; Col. iv. 14). Chrys. supposes that Thessalonica was his home. It is futile to discuss the reality or the degree of his blameworthiness. Possibly he alleged a call to Thessalonica. All we know is that St. Paul singles him out among the absent ones for condemnation.

ἐγκατέλιπεν: *dereliquit* (Vulg.), *forsook*, not merely *left*. See reff. The aorist points to a definite past occasion now in St. Paul's mind.

ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα: See 1 Tim. vi. 17. It is just possible that Bengel is right in seeing an intentional deplorable contrast ("luctuosum vide antitheton") between this expression and ver. 8.

εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην: Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 247) alleges other reasons for the supposition that Demas hailed from Thessalonica, *viz.*, He "is mentioned next to Aristarchus, the Thessalonian in Philem. 24, and . . . the name Demetrius, of which Demas is a contract form, occurs twice among the list of politarchs of that city".

Κρήσκης εἰς Γαλατίαν: *sc.* **ἐπορεύθη**. Crescens and Titus are not reproached for their absence. This passage, with the variant **Γαλλίαν** (see *apparat. crit.*), is the source of all that is said about Crescens by later writers.

Γαλατίαν: That this means the Roman province, or the region in Asia Minor (so *Const. Apost.* vii. 46) is favoured by the consideration that all the other places mentioned in this context are east of Rome. On the other hand, if we assume that St. Paul had recently visited Spain (Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 5; Muratorian Canon), it would naturally follow that he had visited Southern Gaul *en route;* and Crescens might plausibly be supposed to have gone to confirm the Churches there. So Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 4, Epiph. *Haeres.* li. 11, Theodore and Theodoret, h. l.

Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν: This statement suggests that Titus had only been a temporary deputy for St. Paul in Crete. On the spelling of the name Dalmatia in *apparat. crit.*, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 182.

Ver. 11. **Λουκᾶς**: Nothing can be more natural than that "the beloved

Λουκᾶς ἐστὶν μόνος μετ' ἐμοῦ. Μᾶρκον [p] ἀναλαβὼν ἄγε [1] μετὰ σεαυτοῦ· ἔστιν γάρ μοι [q] εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν. 12. Τυχικὸν δὲ ἀπέστειλα εἰς Ἔφεσον. 13. τὸν [r] φελόνην ὃν [s] ἀπέλιπον [2] ἐν Τρῳάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ ἐρχόμενος φέρε, καὶ τὰ [t] βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς [u] μεμ-

p Acts xx. 13, 14, xxiii. 31. q See 2 Tim. ii. 21. r Here only, not LXX. s 2 Tim. iv. 20, Tit. i. 5, Jude 6. t Luke iv. 17, 20, John xx. 30, xxi. 25, Gal. iii. 10, etc. u Here only, not LXX.

[1] ἄγαγε A, 31, 47, 238, five others.

[2] So ℵDKsil., many cursives; ἀπέλειπον ACFGLP.

physician" and historian should feel that he of all men was in his place beside St. Paul when the end was so nearly approaching. The **μόνος** is relative to fellow-labourers in the gospel. St. Paul had many friends in Rome (ver. 21).

Μᾶρκον: St. Paul was now completely reconciled to John Mark who had, before Col. iv. 10 was written, vindicated and justified the risk Barnabas had run in giving him a chance of recovering his character (see Acts xiii. 13, xv. 38). **ἀναλαβών**: *assume* (Vulg.). *Take up on your way*. *Assumere* is also the Latin in Acts xx. 14, xxiii. 31, but *suscipere* in xx. 13. It is implied that Mark was somewhere on the line of route between Ephesus and Rome; but we do not know the precise place.

ἄγε μετὰ σεαυτοῦ: This phrase is illustrated from the papyri by Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., v. 57.

εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν: As Mark was the **ἑρμηνευτής** of St. Peter, rendering his Aramaic into Greek, so he may have helped St. Paul by a knowledge of Latin. **διακονία**, however, does not necessarily include preaching. It is characteristic of St. Paul that he should not regard "the ministry which he had received from the Lord Jesus" as "accomplished" so long as he had breath to "testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts xx. 24).

Ver. 12. **Τυχικὸν δέ, κ.τ.λ.**: The **δέ** does not involve a comparison of Tychicus with Mark, as both **εὔχρηστοι** (so Ell.); but rather distinguishes the cause of Tychicus' absence from that of the others. Demas had *forsaken* the apostle; and Crescens and Titus had *gone*, perhaps on their own initiative; Tychicus had been *sent away* by St. Paul himself. For Tychicus, see Acts xx. 4, Eph. vi. 21, 22, Col. iv. 7, 8, Tit. iii. 12; and the art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

εἰς Ἔφεσον: If the emphasis in the clause lies on **ἀπέστειλα**, as has been just suggested, the difficulty of harmonising **εἰς Ἔφεσον** with the common belief that Timothy was himself in chief authority in the Church at Ephesus is somewhat mitigated. St. Paul had mentioned the places to which Demas, etc., had gone; and even on the supposition that St. Paul knew that Tychicus was with Timothy, he could not say, "I sent away Tychicus" without completing the sentence by adding the destination. This explanation must be adopted, if we suppose with Ell. that Tychicus was the bearer of *First Timothy*. If he were the bearer of *Second Timothy*, **ἀπέστειλα** can be plausibly explained as the epistolary aorist. On the other hand, there is no reason why we should assume that Timothy was at Ephesus at this time. Other local references, *e.g.*, i. 15, 18, and iv. 13 are quite consistent with a belief that he was not actually in that city. Perhaps "Do the work of an evangelist" (iv. 5) is an indication that he was itinerating.

Ver. 13. I want my warm winter cloak and my books.

τὸν φελόνην: The **φελόνης**, or **φαιλόνης**, by metathesis for **φαινόλης**, was the same as the Latin *paenula*, from which it is derived, a circular cape which fell down below the knees, with an opening for the head in the centre. (So Chrys. on Phil. ii. 30; Tert. *De orat.* xii.). The Syriac here renders it *a case for writings*, *a portfolio*, an explanation noted by Chrys., **τὸ γλωσσόκομον ἔνθα τὰ βιβλία ἔκειτο**. But this is merely a guess suggested by its being coupled with **βιβλία** and **μεμβράνας**.

Τρῳάδι: Even if Timothy was not in Ephesus, he was in Asia, and travellers thence to Rome usually passed through Troas. Perhaps St. Paul had been arrested at Troas, and had not been allowed to take his cloak, etc. This is a more plausible supposition than that he was making a hurried flight from Alexander, as Lock conjectures, Hastings' *D. B.*, iv. 775, *a*.

Κάρπῳ: See art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

τὰ βιβλία would be papyrus rolls in use for ordinary purposes, while the

βράνας. 14. Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ [v] χαλκεὺς πολλά μοι κακὰ [w] ἐνεδείξατο· —ἀποδώσει[1] αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ·—15. ὃν καὶ σὺ [x] φυλάσσου, [y] λίαν γὰρ [z] ἀντέστη[2] τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις. 16. Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου [a] ἀπολογίᾳ οὐδείς μοι [b] παρεγένετο,[3] ἀλλὰ πάντες

v Here only, N.T.
w Gen. l. 15, 17, etc., 2 Cor. viii. 24, Tit. ii. 10, iii. 2, Heb. vi. 10, 11.
x Luke xii. 15, Acts xxi. 25, 2 Pet. iii. 17.
y Matt. (4), Mark (4), Luke (1), 2 John 4, 3 John 3.
z See 2 Tim. iii. 8.
a Acts xxii. 1, xxv. 16, 1 Cor. ix. 3, 2 Cor. vii. 11, Phil. i. 7, 16, 1 Pet. iii. 15.
b Acts v. 21, xxi. 18, xxiii. 35, xxiv. 24, xxv. 7.

[1] So ℵACDFG, 17, 31, 37, 67**, 80, 108, nine others, f, g, vg$^{clem.}$, go., syr^{pesh}, boh. arm.; ἀποδῴη D^{c}K(δωει)L, most cursives, d, e, am., fuld.

[2] ἀνθέστηκε ℵ^{c}D^{c}KLP.

[3] συμπαρεγένετο ℵ^{c}DKLP.

more costly μεμβράναι contained, in all likelihood, portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, hence μάλιστα (see Kenyon, *Textual Crit. of N. T.* p. 22). We know that St. Paul employed in study the enforced leisure of prison (Acts xxvi. 24). We may note that, like Browning's Grammarian, he did not allow his normal strenuous life to be affected or diverted by the known near approach of death.

Vv. 14, 15. Beware of Alexander the smith.

Ver. 14. **Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ χαλκεύς**: It is probable that this is the Alexander mentioned in 1 Tim. i. 20, and it is possible that he may be the Jew of that name who was unwillingly prominent in the riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33, 34).

χαλκεύς: does not mean that he worked only in copper. The term came to be used of workers in any kind of metal (see Gen. iv. 22, LXX).

πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο: *Multa mala mihi ostendit* (Vulg.). His *odium theologicum* expressed itself in deeds as well as in words. For this use of ἐνδείκνυμαι, compare reff. Moulton and Milligan (*Expositor*, vii., vii. 282) cite from a papyrus of ii. A.D. πᾶσαν πίστιν μοι ἐνδεικνυμένῃ.

ἀποδώσει: The future indic. is certainly attested by a greater weight of external evidence than the optative. The moral question raised by the clause is quite independent of the mood and tense used: it is, Was the future punishment of Alexander, which St. Paul considered equitable, a matter of more satisfaction than distress to the apostle? The answer would seem to be, Yes. And, provided that no element of personal spite intrudes, such a feeling cannot be logically condemned. If God is a moral governor; if sin is a reality; those who know themselves to be on God's side cannot help a feeling of joy in knowing that evil will not always triumph over good. The sentiment comes from Deut. xxxii. 35, as quoted in Rom. xii. 19, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω. The exact wording is found in Ps. lxi. (lxii.) 13, σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. *Cf.* Ps. xxvii. (xxviii.) 4; Prov. xxiv. 12.

Ver. 15. **φυλάσσου**: For this sense of φυλάσσω with a direct object, see reff. We infer that Alexander was in Timothy's vicinity.

ἡμετέροις λόγοις: The λόγοι were expressions of doctrine common to all Christians with St. Paul; hence ἡμετέροις.

Vv. 16-18. I have spoken of my present loneliness. Yet I have no justification for depression; for since I came to Rome I have had experience, at my preliminary trial, that God is a loyal protector when earthly friends fail. And so I have good hope that He will bring me safe through every danger to His heavenly kingdom.

Ver. 16. The reference in *my first defence* seems at first sight somewhat uncertain, since ver. 17 states the issue of that "defence" to have been that "the message was fully proclaimed, and all the Gentiles heard it". This would agree with the circumstances of the trials before Felix and Festus, a direct result of which was that Paul was enabled to "bear witness also at Rome" (Acts xxiii. 11). On this view, the apostle would be recalling a signal past instance in which God had overruled evil for good. On the other hand, it is a fatal objection to this reference of the phrase that when he was at Cæsarea he seems to have been kindly treated by his friends as well as by the officials. And, moreover, the sentence reads like a piece of fresh information. This latter consideration is also an argument against referring it to the first Roman imprisonment (as Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 22), though the very similar sentiments of Phil. i. 12, 13, render the identification

με [c] ἐγκατέλιπον[1]·—μὴ αὐτοῖς [d] λογισθείη.—17. ὁ δὲ Κύριός μοι [e] παρέστη καὶ [f] ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ [g] τὸ [g] κήρυγμα [h] πληροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν[2] πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ [i] ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος.[3] 18. ῥύσεταί με ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς [k] ἔργου [k] πονηροῦ

c See ver. 10. d Rom. ii. 26, iv. passim., 2 Cor. v. 19, Gen. xv. 6, Ps. xxxi. (xxxii.) 2. e Acts xxvii. 23, Rom. xvi. 2. f See 1 Tim. i. 12. g 1 Cor. i. 21, Tit. i. 3. h See ver. i See 2 Tim. iii. 11. k John iii. 19, vii. 7, Col. i. 21, 1 John iii. 12.

[1] So ℵD*K^sil., most cursives; ἐγκατέλειπον ACD^bcFGLP.
[2] ἀκούσῃ KL. [3] Ins. καὶ D^cF^grGKLP, g, syrr.

plausible. But in this latter case again the language of *Philippians* has no traces of forsakenness. We decide therefore that St. Paul is here referring to the preliminary investigation (*prima actio*) which he underwent after he arrived at Rome a prisoner for the second time, and which resulted in his remand. He was now writing to Timothy during the interval between his remand and the second, and final, trial. But if we thus explain "my first defence," how are we to interpret **ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.**? The explanation will be suggested by a comparison of such passages as Rom. xv. 19, "From Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ"; Col. i. 23, "The gospel which . . . was preached in all creation". We annex a territory by the mere act of planting our country's flag on a small portion of its soil; so in St. Paul's thought a single proclamation of the gospel might have a spiritual, almost a prophetical, significance, immeasurably greater than could be imagined by one who heard it. "Una sæpe occasio maximi est momenti" (Bengel). It is to be noted too that **παρέστη** and **ἐνεδυνάμωσεν** refer to the occasion of the "first defence," and St. Paul does not say that the Lord set him free; so that we are obliged to explain **ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.** of St. Paul's bold assertion of his faith in Christ on that occasion, which however was a public one, not like his previous private teaching to those who came to him "in his own hired dwelling" (Acts xxviii. 30).

παρεγένετο: *adfuit* (Vulg.), *supported me as* "*advocatus*". The verb is used of appearing in a court of justice in reff. It simply means *to come* or *arrive* in 1 Cor. xvi. 3. This complaint is difficult to reconcile with ver 21. Perhaps here St. Paul is referring to old friends on whom he had a special claim.

Ver. 17. **παρέστη**: *The Lord was my* "*patronus*," *cf.* Rom. xvi. 2. But the word is used in a purely local sense of the felt presence of a Divine Being in reff. in Acts.

ἐνεδυνάμωσεν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 12.

πληροφορηθῇ: *impleatur* (Vulg.). As long as there had been no public proclamation of the gospel by Paul himself in Rome, the function of **κῆρυξ** had not been completely fulfilled by him.

ἐρύσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος: This is most naturally understood as an echo of Ps. xxi.(xxii.) 22, **σῶσόν με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος**. **ῥῦσαι** occurs in the verse preceding. And what follows in the LXX seems to point to the most satisfactory explanation of the apostle's meaning, **καὶ ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκερώτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου. διηγήσομαι τὸ ὄνομα σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, κ.τ.λ.** If St. Paul had not been strengthened to complete his **κήρυγμα**, his failure would have been his **ταπείνωσις**. As it was, he was delivered from that calamity, and enabled to declare God's name to the Gentiles. It is impossible, in view of **ἤδη σπένδομαι** (ver. 6), to suppose that delivery from death is implied. **πρώτῃ** (ver. 16) proves that the apostle was aware that a second trial was awaiting him, the issue of which he knew would be his execution. It is still more impossible to suppose that literal wild beasts are meant. Paul's Roman citizenship secured him from that degradation. The Greek commentators take "the lion" to mean Nero, "from his ferocity" (Chrys.). *Cf.* Esth. xiv. 13, of Ahasuerus; Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 6, 10, of Tiberius. It is no objection to this exegesis that the article is omitted before **λέοντος**, since, as we have seen, there is none in the Psalm. But deliverance from that lion's mouth would be equivalent to acquittal by the Roman government; and it is evident that St. Paul was well aware that his sentence had been only deferred.

Ver. 18. **ἔργου πονηροῦ**: The form of the clause may be modelled on the peti-

καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

l See ver. 13.
m See 2 Tim. ii. 15.

19. Ἄσπασαι Πρῖσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν καὶ τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον. 20. Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ· Τρόφιμον δὲ [1] ἀπέλιπον [1] ἐν Μιλήτῳ ἀσθενοῦντα. 21. [m] σπούδασον πρὸ χειμῶνος ἐλθεῖν.

[1] So ℵDFGK[sil.], most cursives; ἀπέλειπον CLP, 17, 31, 47*, one other.

tion in the Lord's Prayer, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ; but the addition of ἔργου proves that the deliverance spoken of is not from an external Evil Personality, but from a possible evil deed of the apostle's own doing. The expression has always a subjective reference. See reff. This exegesis is in harmony with the view taken above of "the mouth of the lion". Failure to be receptive of the strengthening grace of the Lord would have been, in St. Paul's judgment, an "evil deed," though others might easily find excuses for it. Chrys. takes a similar view of ἔργου πονηροῦ, but gives it a wider application: "He will yet again deliver me from every sin, that is, He will not suffer me to depart with condemnation". This view is also supported by what follows, σώσει, κ.τ.λ. At one moment the apostle sees the crown of righteousness just within his grasp, at another, while no less confident, he acknowledges that he could not yet be said "to have apprehended".

σώσει εἰς: *shall bring me safely to*, *salvum faciet* (Vulg.). "Dominus est et Liberator, 1 Thess. i. 10, et Salvator, Phil. iii. 20" (Bengel).

βασιλείαν . . . ἐπουράνιον: That the Father's kingdom is also the Son's is Pauline doctrine. ἐπουράνιος became a necessary addition to βασιλεία as it became increasingly evident that the kingdom of heaven which we see is very different from the kingdom of heaven to be consummated hereafter. It is difficult not to see a connexion between this passage and the doxology appended in primitive times to the Lord's Prayer, ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

ᾧ ἡ δόξα: The doxology, unmistakably addressed to Christ, need only cause a difficulty to those who maintain that "God blessed for ever" in Rom. ix. 5 cannot refer to Christ, because St. Paul was an Arian. Yet Rom. xvi. 27, 1 Pet. iv. 11, not to mention 2 Pet. iii. 18, Rev. i. 6. v. 13, are other examples of doxologies to the Son.

Vv. 19-22. Final salutations.

Ver. 19. **Πρῖσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν**: The same unusual order, the wife before the husband, is found in Rom. xvi. 3, Acts xviii. 18, 26, but not in Acts xviii. 2, 1 Cor. xvi. 19. "Probably Prisca was of higher rank than her husband, for her name is that of a good old Roman family [the Acilian gens]. Aquila was probably a freedman. The name does indeed occur as *cognomen* in some Roman families; but it was also a slave name, for a freedman of Maecenas was called (C. Cilnius) Aquila" (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 268, 269; see also Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 118 *sqq*.).

τὸν Ὀνησιφόρου οἶκον: Their names are inserted after Ἀκύλαν from the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, by the cursives 46 and 109: Λέκτραν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ Σιμαίαν καὶ Ζήνωνα τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 20. **Ἔραστος ἔμεινεν**: The name Erastus is too common to make probable the identification of this companion of St. Paul's and the οἰκονόμος, treasurer, of Corinth, who joins in the apostle's salutation in Rom. xvi. 23. It is not antecedently likely that a city official could travel about as a missionary. On the other hand, it is probable that this Erastus is the same as the companion of Timothy mentioned in Acts xix. 22. It is to be observed that St. Paul here resumes from ver. 12 his explanation of the absence from Rome of members of his company whose presence with their master at this crisis would have been natural. It is possible that Erastus and Trophimus were with St. Paul when he was arrested the second time, and that they remained in his company as far as Miletus and Corinth respectively.

Τρόφιμον: See Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29, and the art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

ἀσθενοῦντα: Paley's remark is never out of date, "Forgery, upon such an occasion, would not have spared a miracle" (*Horae Paul.* Philippians 2). Chrys. notes, "The apostles could not do everything, or they did not dispense miraculous gifts upon all occasions, lest more should be ascribed to them than was right".

Ver. 21. **πρὸ χειμῶνος**: "That thou

Ἀσπάζεταί σε Εὔβουλος καὶ Πούδης καὶ Λίνος καὶ Κλαυδία καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες.[1] 22. Ὁ Κύριος[2] μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου. ἡ χάρις μεθ' ὑμῶν.[3]

[1] Om. πάντες ℵ*, 17.

[2] So, ὁ Κύριος, ℵ*FgrG, 17, one other, g; ins. Ἰησοῦς A, 31, one other; ins. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ℵcCDKLP, d, e, f, vg., syrr., boh., arm.

[3] Ins. ἀμήν ℵcDKLP, d, e, vg., syrr.; add πρὸς Τιμόθεον ℵC, 17; πρὸς T. β' ἐπληρώθη D; ἐτελέσθη πρ. T. β' FG; πρ. T. β' ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Λαοδικείας A; πρ. T. β' ἐγράφει ἀπὸ Ῥώμης P; πρ. T. δευτέρα· τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα· ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, ὅτε ἐκ δευτέρου παρέστη Παῦλος τῷ Καίσαρι Ῥώμης Νέρωνι K, many cursives, similarly L.

be not detained," sc. by storm (Chrys.). This seems less urgent than ταχέως of ver. 9, and we may infer that St. Paul did not expect his final trial to take place for some months.

Εὔβουλος: Nothing else is known of this good man.

Πούδης καὶ Λίνος καὶ Κλαυδία: Lightfoot (*Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. i. pp. 76-79) has an exhaustive discussion of the various ingenious theories which, starting with the assumption that Pudens and Claudia were man and wife—a supposition opposed by the order of the names—have identified them with (1) Martial's congenial friend Aulus Pudens, to whom the poet casually "imputes the foulest vices of heathenism," and his bride Claudia Rufina, a girl of British race (*Epigr.* iv. 13, xi. 53), (2) "a doubtful Pudens and imaginary Claudia" who have been evolved out of a fragmentary inscription found at Chichester in 1722. This appears to record the erection of a temple by a Pudens with the sanction of Claudius Cogidubnus, who is probably a British king who might have had a daughter, whom he might have named Claudia, and who might have taken the name Rufina from Pomponia, the wife of Aulus Plautius, the Roman commander in Britain. This last supposition would identify (1) and (2). It should be added that in *Const. Apost.* vii. 46 she is mother of Linus. See also arts. *Claudia* and *Pudens* in Hastings' *D. B.*

Linus is identified by Irenæus with the Linus whom SS. Peter and Paul consecrated first Bishop of Rome (*Haer.* iii. 3). See also art. in Hastings' *D. B.*

Ver. 22. **μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματός σου**: This expression, with ὑμῶν for σου, occurs in Gal. vi. 18, Philem. 25; but in both those places it is "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with," etc. Here a very close personal association between the Lord and Timothy is prayed for. Dean Bernard compares the conclusion of the Epistle of Barnabas, ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν.

μεθ' ὑμῶν: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 21.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΙΤΟΝ

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δοῦλος Θεοῦ, [a] ἀπόστολος δὲ [a] Ἰησοῦ [a] Χριστοῦ [1] κατὰ πίστιν [b] ἐκλεκτῶν [b] Θεοῦ καὶ [c] ἐπίγνωσιν [c] ἀληθείας [d] τῆς [d] κατ' [d][e] εὐσέβειαν 2. ἐπ' [f] ἐλπίδι [f][g] ζωῆς [f][g] αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ

a See 1 Tim. i. 1.
b Rom. viii. 33, Col. iii. 12.
c See 1 Tim. ii. 4.
d 1 Tim. vi. 3.
e See 1 Tim. ii. 2.
f Tit. iii. 7.
g See 1 Tim. i. 16.

[1] Χριστ. Ἰησ. A, 108, two others, fuld., boh., syr[hcl]; om. Ἰησοῦ Dgr*.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-4. Salutation, in which the place of the Gospel in eternity and in time is largely expressed.

Ver. 1. **δοῦλος θεοῦ**: The only parallel to this phrase in the opening formula of any other epistle in the N.T. is James i. 1; but there it is, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." It is no less obvious than necessary to note that this variation from St. Paul's formula **δοῦλος Ἰησ. Χρ.** (Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1) would not be likely in a pseudepigraphic writing.

ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. The **δέ** is not merely copulative, as in Jude 1; but marks the antithesis between the two aspects of Paul's relationship to the Supreme: between God as known to his fathers, and as recently manifested in the sphere of history.

κατὰ πίστιν κ.τ.λ.: to be connected with **ἀπόστολος** only. It is natural to suppose that **κατά** has the same force here as in 2 Tim. i. 1, **κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς**, where see note. His apostleship was *for the confirmation of the faith of God's elect, and for the spreading of the knowledge*, etc., etc. We take **κατά** as = *for* or *in regard to*; and expand it according to the exigencies of the context. Here *God's elect* does not mean those whom God intends to select; but those who have been externally selected, and who consequently possess faith. See reff. and Acts xiii. 48. They do not need that it should be generated in them, but that it should be fostered. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 10. Contrast **ἀποστολὴν εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν**, Rom. i. 5, where the Gospel-propagation function of his apostleship is indicated.

The rendering here of the Vulg. and of the English versions, *according to the faith*, etc., *secundum fidem*, preserves the common meaning of **κατά**, but does not stand examination. St. Paul's office as apostle was not dependent in any way on the faith or knowledge of human beings, as it was on the will or command of God or Christ. The final cause of it was the faith and knowledge of men.

ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας: See on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

εὐσέβειαν: See on 1 Tim. ii. 2.

Ver. 2. **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κ.τ.λ.**: This is best taken in connexion with the preceding clause, **κατὰ πίστιν . . . εὐσέβειαν**. The faith and the knowledge there spoken of have as their basis of action, or energy, the hope of eternal life. *Cf.* 1 Tim. i. 16. Compare the use of **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι** in Acts xxvi. 6; Rom. iv. 18, viii. 20; 1 Cor. ix. 10. On the other hand, we must not exclude a remoter connexion with **ἀπόστολος**. A comparison of the parallel passage in 2 Tim. i. 1 suggests that the succession of clauses here, **κατὰ πίστιν . . . κηρύγματι**, is a full and detailed expansion of **κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν . . . ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ.**

ἀψευδής: *qui non mentitur.* See note on 2 Tim. ii. 13.

ἐπηγγείλατο: See Rom. i. 1, iv. 21; Gal. iii. 19.

ἐπηγγείλατο . . . πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, ἐφανέρωσεν δέ: The same antithesis is expressed in 2 Tim. i. 9, 10 (*q.v.*); Rom.

[h] ἀψευδὴς Θεὸς [l] πρὸ [l] χρόνων [l] αἰωνίων, 3. [k] ἐφανέρωσεν δὲ [l] καιροῖς [l] ἰδίοις τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν [m] κηρύγματι ὃ [n] ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ [o] κατ' [o] ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ [p] σωτῆρος [p] ἡμῶν [p] Θεοῦ, 4. Τίτῳ [q] γνησίῳ [r] τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν· χάρις καὶ [1] εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ [s] Χριστοῦ [s] Ἰησοῦ [2] [s] τοῦ [s] σωτῆρος [s] ἡμῶν.

5. [t] Τούτου [t] χάριν [u] ἀπέλιπόν [3] σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ [v] λείποντα

h Wisd. vii. 17 only. i See 2 Tim. i. 9. k Rom. xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, see 1 Tim. iii. 16 *note*. l See 1 Tim. ii. 6. m See 2 Tim. iv. 17. n See 1 Tim. i. 11. o See 1 Tim. i. 1. p See 1 Tim. i. 1. q See 1 Tim. i. 2. r See 1 Tim. i. 2. s See 2 Tim. i. 10. t Eph. iii. 1, 14, see 1 Tim. v. 14. u See 2 Tim. iv. 13. v Luke xviii. 22, Tit. iii. 13, Jas. i. 4, 5, ii. 15.

[1] ἔλεος ACbKL, syrhcl. [2] Κυρίου Ἰησ. Χριστ. DcFGKLP, f, g, syrr.
[3] κατέλιπόν ℵcDcK[LP, κατέλειπον].

xvi. 25; Col. i. 26. From different points of view, one may say that eternal life was promised, and given, to man in Christ before times eternal; though the revelation of this purpose and grace could not be made until man was prepared to receive it, **καιροῖς**, at seasons, occasions, epochs of time as relative to man's comprehension.

Ver. 3. **ἐφανέρωσεν τὸν λόγον**: For **φανερόω** see note on 1 Tim. iii. 16. We must observe that no N.T. writer speaks of a manifestation of the *gift* of eternal life (1 John i. 2 refers to the *personal* Incarnate Life). God's message concerning it, which is the revelation of a divine secret purpose, is manifested. See Col. iv. 4 in addition to the last reff. given on **ἐπηγγείλατο**. **περὶ ἧς** may be supplied bef. **ἐφανέρωσεν** (von Soden).

καιροῖς ἰδίοις: See on 1 Tim. ii. 6 and vi. 15. The rendering *his own seasons* suits the context here.

τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι: Note the distinction here indicated between the substance of the revelation (**λόγος**) given by God, and the form of it as expressible (**κήρυγμα**) by the human preacher. It is parallel to the use of **λόγος** and **λαλία** in John viii. 43.

ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ has **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ.** as its antecedent in 1 Tim. i. 11, where see note.

κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ: See note on 1 Tim. i. 1. There the order is **θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν**. Here **θεοῦ** is epexegetical of **σωτῆρος ἡμῶν**, as **Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ** is in chap. ii. 13. **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν** is to be taken with **ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ**, which is another way of expressing the notion of **ἀπόστολος**. On **σωτήρ** as a title of God, see notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4.

Ver. 4. **γνησίῳ τέκνῳ**: See note on 1 Tim. i. 2.

κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, like **ἐν πίστει** in 1 Tim. i. 2, qualifies **τέκνῳ**, but is less ambiguous than **ἐν πίστει**. It must not be restricted to a faith shared only by St. Paul and Titus; but, like the **κοινὴ σωτηρία** (Jude 3), it is common to all Christians who "have obtained a like precious faith with us" (2 Pet. i. 1).

χάρις κ.τ.λ.: See on 1 Tim. i. 2.

σωτῆρος: for the more usual **κυρίου**, 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2. The Father and the Son are here co-ordinated as Saviours.

Vv. 5-9. As I left you in Crete to carry out completely the arrangements for the organisation of the Church there, which I set before you in detail, let me remind you of the necessary qualifications of presbyters [since the presbyter is the basal element in the Church Society].

Ver. 5. **ἀπέλιπον**: The force of **ἀπολείπω** here will be apparent if we compare 2 Tim. iv. 13, 20. It means *to leave behind temporarily* something or someone; **καταλείπω** is often used of a permanent leaving behind. St. Paul's language favours the supposition that the commission given to Titus was that of a temporary apostolic legate rather than of a permanent local president.

ἐπιδιορθώσῃ: It is possible that **ἐπί** has here its original force, so as to imply that St. Paul had begun the correction of deficiencies in the Cretan Church, and that Titus was to carry it still further. (So Bengel.) It seems to have been taken in this sense by A.V.m., which renders **τὰ λείποντα** *things that are left undone*. If we may judge from this letter, Christianity was at this time in a very disorganised state in Crete. Titus is to ordain presbyters, as the foundation of a ministry; whereas the task committed to Timothy at Ephesus was to

[w] ἐπιδιορθώσῃ,[1] καὶ [x] καταστήσῃς [y] κατὰ [y] πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγώ σοι [z] διεταξάμην· 6. εἴ τίς ἐστιν [a] ἀνέγκλητος, [b] μιᾶς [b] γυναικὸς [b] ἀνήρ, τέκνα ἔχων πιστὰ μὴ ἐν [c] κατηγορίᾳ [d] ἀσωτίας ἢ [e] ἀνυπότακτα. 7. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον [a] ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς Θεοῦ [f] οἰκονόμον, μὴ [g] αὐθάδη, μὴ [h] ὀργίλον, μὴ [i] πάροινον, μὴ [i] πλήκτην, μὴ [k] αἰσχροκερδῆ, 8. ἀλλὰ [l] φιλόξενον, [m] φιλάγαθον, [n] σώφρονα, δίκαιον, [o] ὅσιον,

w Here only, not LXX.
x Matt. xxiv. 45, 47 (= Luke xii. 42, 44), xxv. 21, 23, Acts vi. 3, Heb. v. 1, vii. 28, viii. 3.
y Luke viii. 1, 4, Acts xv. 21, xx. 23.
z 1 Cor. vii. 17, ix. 14, xi. 34, xvi. 1.
a See 1 Tim. iii. 10.
b 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12.
c See 1 Tim. v. 19.
d Eph. v. 18, 1 Pet. iv. 4, *cf.* Luke xv. 13.
e See 1 Tim. i. 9.
f 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2, 1 Pet. iv. 10.
g 2 Pet. ii. 10 only, N.T.
h Here only, N.T.
i See 1 Tim. iii. 3.
k See 1 Tim. iii. 8.
l See 1 Tim. iii. 2.
m Wisd. vii. 22 only, *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 3.
n See 1 Tim. iii. 2.
o See 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] **ἐπιδιορθώσῃς** AD*FG (D* **ἐπανορθωσης**; FG **δειορθωσης**).

continue the organisation of presbyters (*episcopi*) and deacons which was already in full working order. It is significant that **καθίστημι** is used of the institution of a new order of ministry in Acts vi. 3. **καί** introduces the chief point in the **ἐπιδιόρθωσις**.

κατὰ πόλιν: *in every city*. See reff. The number of presbyters is not specified; the meaning is that the order of presbyters should be established all over the island.

σοι διεταξάμην: *disposui tibi* (Vulg.), appropriately used of a number of specific directions on one general subject. Compare Acts xxiv. 23, where the verb is used in reference to three distinct instructions given to the centurion in reference to Paul.

Ver. 6. **ἀνέγκλητος**: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

τέκνα πιστά: It must be supposed that a Christian father who has unbelieving children is himself a recent convert, or a very careless Christian. The fact that St. Paul did not think it necessary to warn Timothy that such men were not eligible for the presbyterate is a proof that Christianity was at this time more firmly established in Ephesus than in Crete.

μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα: It is significant that the moral requirements of the pastor's children are more mildly expressed in 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12. There it is the father's power to keep order in his own house that is emphasised; here the submission of the children to discipline and restraint.

Ver. 7. **τὸν ἐπίσκοπον**: On the use of the singular as a generic term see on 1 Tim. iii. 2. Here, where the thought is of the various official functions of the minister, the official title is appropriate.

ἀνέγκλητον: See notes on 1 Tim. iii. 2, 10.

θεοῦ οἰκονόμον: a steward appointed by God (Luke xii. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 17), in the house of God (1 Tim. iii. 15), to dispense His mysteries and manifold grace (1 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10). **θεοῦ** is emphatic, suggesting that the steward of such a Lord should conform to the highest ideal of moral and spiritual qualifications.

αὐθάδη: *self-assertive, arrogant*. Vulg. has here *superbum*, but more accurately in 2 Pet. ii. 10, *sibi placentes*.

ὀργίλον: *passionate*, *iracundum* (Vulg.). The **ὀργίλος** is one who has not his passion of anger under control.

πάροινον, πλήκτην: See on 1 Tim. iii. 3.

μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ: This negative quality is required in deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. Persons who are concerned in the administration of small sums must be such as are above the commission of petty thefts. There are no regulations here laid down for deacons; so we are entitled to conclude that in Crete, at this time, presbyters performed the duties of every Church office. Hence they should have the appropriate diaconal virtue. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 8. On the other hand, it may be objected against this inference that in 1 Pet. v. 2 **μὴ αἰσχροκερδῶς** is used of the spirit of the ideal presbyter.

Ver. 8. **φιλόξενον**: See on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

φιλάγαθον: In Wisd. vii. 22, the **πνεῦμα** which is in **σοφία** is **φιλάγαθον**, *loving what is good*. The epithets which immediately precede and follow **φιλάγαθον** in Wisd. have no reference to persons, with the exception of **φιλάνθρωπον**. It seems best, with the R.V., to give the words as wide a reference as possible; see on **ἀφιλάγαθοι**, 2 Tim. iii. 3.

[p] ἐγκρατῆ, 9. [q] ἀντεχόμενον τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν [r] πιστοῦ [r] λόγου, ἵνα [s] δυνατὸς [s] ᾖ καὶ παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ [t] διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ [t] ὑγιαινούσῃ καὶ τοὺς [u] ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν. 10. Εἰσὶν γὰρ πολλοὶ[1] [v] ἀνυπότακτοι, [w] ματαιολόγοι καὶ [x] φρεναπάται, μάλιστα[2] [y] οἱ [y] ἐκ [y] τῆς[3] [y] περιτομῆς, 11. οὓς δεῖ [z] ἐπιστομίζειν, οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους [a] ἀνα-

p Here only, N.T., *cf.* Acts xxiv. 25, Gal. v. 23, 2 Pet. i. 6, 1 Cor. vii. 9, ix. 25.
q Matt. vi. 24 = Luke xvi. 13, 1 Thess. v. 14, Isa. lvi. 4.
r See 1 Tim. i. 15.
s See 2 Tim. i. 12.
t 1 Tim. i. 10 (*q.v.*), 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. ii. 1.
u Acts xiii. 45, xxviii. 19, 22, Tit. ii. 9.
v See 1 Tim. i. 9.
w Here only, not LXX, *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 6.
x Here only, not LXX, but *cf.* Gal. vi. 3.
y Acts x. 45, xi. 2, Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11.
z Here only, not LXX.
a See 2 Tim. ii. 18.

[1] Ins. καὶ DFGKL, d, e, f, g, vg. [2] Ins. δὲ CDgr.
[3] So ℵCD*, 1, 17, one other; om. τῆς ADcFGKLP.

σώφρονα: See notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9 and iii. 2.

ἐγκρατῆ: The noun **ἐγκράτεια** occurs Acts xxiv. 25; Gal. v. 23; 2 Pet. i. 6, where to the rendering *temperance* the R.V.m. gives the alternative *self-control*. The verb **ἐγκρατεύομαι** in 1 Cor. vii. 9 is *to have continency*, but in 1 Cor. ix. 25 *to be temperate* generally. The word differs from **σώφρων** as having a reference to bodily appetites, while **σώφρων** has reference also to the desires of the mind. **ἐγκράτ.** concerns action, **σωφρ.** thought.

Ver. 9. **ἀντεχόμενον**: *holding firmly to.* **ἀντέχομαι** is stronger than **ἔχειν**, as used in a similar connexion, 1 Tim. i. 19, etc., etc. The R.V. *holding to* correctly suggests the notion of withstanding opposition, which is not so clearly felt in the A.V. *holding fast.* "Having care of it, making it his business" (Chrys.).

δυνατός: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 2.

τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου: *the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching.* It is indicative of the weakening of the phrase **πιστὸς λόγος** that St. Paul strengthens and defines it here by **κατὰ τὴν διδαχήν**. It was noted on 1 Tim. i. 15 that **πιστὸς λόγος** here means the totality of the revelation given in Christ; and **ἡ διδαχή** is to be taken passively, as equivalent to **ἡ διδασκαλία**, as employed in these epistles. It is tautological to take it actively, *the word which is faithful as regards the teaching of others;* for that is expressed in what follows.

παρακαλεῖν—ἐλέγχειν: *Cf.* 2 Tim iv. 2 for this combination. The shepherd must be able to tend the sheep, and to drive away wolves.

ὑγιαινούσῃ: See on 1 Tim. i. 10. **διδασκαλία** here, as frequently, is a body of doctrine. So R.V., *in the sound doctrine.* The A.V., *by sound doctrine*, would refer to the faith as applied in its various parts to particular needs.

τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας: It is only a coincidence that where this word occurs in Acts it is in reference to *Jewish* opponents of the Gospel.

Vv. 10-16. I have just mentioned rebuke as a necessary element in a presbyter's teaching. This is especially needful in dealing with Cretan heretics, in whom the Jewish strain is disagreeably prominent. Alike in their new-fangled philosophy of purity, and in their pretensions to orthodoxy, they ring false. Purity of life can only spring from a pure mind; and knowledge is alleged in vain, if it is contradicted by practice.

Ver. 10. The persons spoken of here were Christian Jews. **οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς** (without **τῆς**, see crit. note) has this meaning in reff. (in Acts x. 45 it is qualified by the addition of **πιστοί**). Rom. iv. 12, is not really an instance of the phrase. That they were at least nominally Christians is also implied by the epithet **ἀνυπότακτοι**. We cannot call those persons *unruly* on whose obedience we have no claim.

ματαιολόγοι: **ματαιολογία** occurs in 1 Tim. i. 6.

φρεναπάται: *seductores.* The verb occurs in Gal. vi. 3.

μάλιστα: it is probable that there were very few false teachers who were not "of the circumcision".

Ver. 11. **οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν**: *quos oportet redargui*, *whose mouths must be stopped* by the unanswerable arguments of the orthodox controversialist. This is the result hoped for from the "conviction," of ver. 9.

ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν: *pervert whole families* (Alf.); Moulton and Milligan give an apt illustration from a papyrus of second cent. B.C., **τῆς πατ-**

τρέπουσιν διδάσκοντες [b]ἃ [b]μὴ [b]δεῖ [c]αἰσχροῦ [d]κέρδους [e]χάριν. 12. εἶπέν[1] τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, [f]ἴδιος [f]αὐτῶν προφήτης, Κρῆτες ἀεὶ [g]ψεῦσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες [h]ἀργαί. 13. ἡ [i]μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής. [k]δι' [k]ἣν [k]αἰτίαν ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς [l]ἀποτόμως, ἵνα [m]ὑγιαίνωσιν [m]ἐν[2] [m]τῇ [m]πίστει, 14. μὴ [n]προσέχοντες Ἰουδαϊκοῖς

b 1 Tim. v. 13.
c 1 Cor. xi. 6, xiv. 35, Eph. v. 12, *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 8, 1 Pet. v. 2.
d Phil. i. 21, iii. 7.
e See 1 Tim. v. 14.
f Mark xv. 20 (Tisch.), 2 Pet. iii. 3.
g See 1 Tim. i. 10.
h See 1 Tim. v. 13.
i See 1 Tim. iii. 7.
k See 2 Tim. i. 6.
l Wisd. v. 22, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, *cf.* Rom. xi. 22 only.
m Tit. ii. 2, see 1 Tim. i. 10.
n See 1 Tim. i. 4.

[1] Ins. δὲ ℵ*G, f, g, boh; ins. γὰρ 115. [2] Om. ἐν ℵ*, 47, one other.

ρικῆς οἰκίας . . . ἔτι ἔνπροσθεν ἄρδην [ἀ]νατετραμμένης δι' ἀσ[ω]τίας (*Expositor*, vii., v. 269). This suggests the rendering *upset*. The whole family would be upset by the perversion of one member of it.

ἃ μὴ δεῖ: Normally, **οὐ** is used in relative sentences with the indicative. Other exceptions will be found in 2 Pet. i. 9, 1 John iv. 3 (T.R.). It is possible that the force of **μή** here is given by translating, *which* (*we think*) *they ought not*. If the teaching had been absolutely indefensible by any one, he would have said, **ἃ οὐ δεῖ**. See Blass, *Grammar*, p. 254.

αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν: The three reff. on **αἰσχροῦ**, the only other occurrences in N.T. of this adj., are instances of the phrase **αἰσχρόν ἐστι**. The reference is to the claim to support made by itinerating or vagrant prophets and apostles such as are referred to in the *Didache*, cc. 11, 12, and alluded to in 2 Cor. xi. 9-13. All such abuses would exist in an aggravated form in Crete, the natives of which had an evil reputation for **αἰσχροκέρδεια**, according to Polybius, **ὥστε παρὰ μόνοις Κρηταιεῦσι τῶν ἁπάντων ἀνθρώπων μηδὲν αἰσχρὸν νομίζεσθαι κέρδος.** (*Hist*. vi. 46. 3, cited by Ell.). They get a bad character also from Livy (xliv. 45), and Plutarch (*Paul. Aemil*. 23). The Cretans, Cappadocians, and Cilicians were **τρία κάππα κάκιστα.**

Ver. 12. **προφήτης**: It is possible that St. Paul applies this title to the author of the following hexameter line because the Cretan false teachers were self-styled prophets. There was a Cretan prophet once who told plain truths to his countrymen. The whole line occurs, according to Jerome, in the **περὶ χρησμῶν** of Epimenides, a native of Cnossus in Crete. The first three words are also found in the Hymn to Zeus by Callimachus, who is the prophet meant according to Theodoret; and the rest has a parallel in Hesiod, *Theogon*. 26, **ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον.** It is generally agreed that St. Paul was referring to Epimenides. This is the view of Chrys. and Epiph., as well as of Jerome. It was Epimenides at whose suggestion the Athenians are said to have erected the "anonymous altars," *i.e.*, **Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ** (Acts xvii. 23), in the course of the purification of their city from the pollution caused by Cylon, 596 B.C. He is reckoned a prophet, or predictor of the future, by Cicero, *de Divin*. i. 18, and Apuleius, *Florid*. ii. 15, 4. Plato calls him **θεῖος ἀνήρ** (*Legg*. i. p. 642 D).

ψεῦσται: The particular lie which provoked the poet's ire was the claim made by the Cretans that the tomb of Zeus was on their island. Here, the term has reference to **ματαιολόγοι**, etc.

γαστέρες ἀργαί: The R.V., *idle gluttons*, is more intelligible English than the A.V., *slow bellies*, but does not so adequately represent the poet's meaning. He has in his mind the belly, as it obtrudes itself on the beholder and is a burden to the possessor, not as a receptacle for food. Alf. quotes aptly Juvenal, *Sat*. iv. 107, "Montani quoque *venter* adest, abdomine tardus".

Ver. 13. **δι' ἣν αἰτίαν**: See on 2 Tim. i. 6.

ἀποτόμως: *severely*. The noun **ἀποτομία**, *severitas*, occurs Rom. xi. 22. See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vi. 192.

ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10. The intention of the reproof was not merely the securing of a controversial triumph, but "to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred, and are deceived". **ἵνα** expresses the object aimed at in the reproof, not the substance of it.

Ver. 14. **προσέχοντες**: see on 1 Tim. i. 4. The word implies the giving one's consent, as well as one's attention.

Ἰουδαϊκοῖς: This determines the

[o] μύθοις καὶ ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων [p] ἀποστρεφομένων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. 15. [q] πάντα [1] [q] καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς· τοῖς δε [r] μεμιαμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ [r] μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις. 16. Θεὸν [s] ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις [t] ἀρνοῦνται, [u] βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ [v] ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς [w] πᾶν [w] ἔργον [w] ἀγαθὸν [w] [x] ἀδόκιμοι.

o 1 Tim. i. 4.
p See 2 Tim. i. 15.
q Luke xi. 41, Rom. xiv. 20.
r John xviii. 28, Heb. xii. 15, Jude 8.
s See 1 Tim. vi. 12.
t See 1 Tim. v. 8.
u Prov. xvii. 15, Ecclus. xli. 5, 2 Macc. i. 27 only.
v Luke i. 17, 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. iii. 3.
w See 2 Tim. ii. 21 and 1 Tim. ii. 10.
x See 2 Tim. iii. 8.

[1] Ins. μὲν ℵ^{c}D^{c}KL, syr^{hcl}; ins. γὰρ boh, syr^{pesh}.

nature of the μῦθοι referred to in these epistles. See on 1 Tim. i. 4.

ἐντολαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀποστρεφομένων: We are naturally reminded of Mark vii. 7, 8, with its antithesis between the **ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων** and **ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ**, and Col. ii. 22, where the same passage of Isaiah (xxix. 13) is echoed. But here the antithesis is not so strongly marked. The commandments are depreciated, not because their authors are men, but because they are *men who turn away from the truth*, impure men (In 1 Tim. iv. 3 "they that believe and know the truth" are men whose thoughts are pure). *The truth* here, as elsewhere in the Pastorals, is almost a Christian technical term. It can hardly be doubted that the **ἐντολαί** referred to were of the same nature as those noted in Col. ii. 22, arbitrary ascetic prohibitions.

Ver. 15. **πάντα καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ.**: This is best understood as a maxim of the Judaic Gnostics, based on a perversion of the Saying **πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστιν** (Luke xi. 41. *Cf.* Rom. xiv. 20; Mark vii. 18.). St. Paul accepts it as a truth, but not in the intention of the speaker; and answers, **τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις κ.τ.λ.** The passage is thus, as regards its form, parallel to 1 Cor. vi. 12 *sqq.*, where St. Paul cites, and shows the irrelevancy of, two pleas for licence: "All things are lawful for me," and "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats". **τοῖς καθαροῖς** is of course the *dat. commodi*, *for the use of the pure, in their case*, as in the parallels, Luke xi. 41, 1 Tim. iv. 3; not *in the judgment of the pure*, as in Rom. xiv. 14.

τοῖς δὲ μεμιαμμένοις, κ.τ.λ.: The order of the words is to be noted: their moral obliquity is more characteristic of them than their intellectual perversion. The satisfaction of natural bodily desires (for it is these that are in question) is, when lawful, a pure thing, not merely innocent, in the case of the pure; it is an impure thing, even when lawful, in the case of "them that are defiled". And for this reason: their intellectual apprehension (**νοῦς**) of these things is perverted by defiling associations; "the light that is in them is darkness;" and their conscience has, from a similar cause, lost its sense of discrimination between what is innocent and criminal. That any action with which they themselves are familiar could be pure is inconceivable to them. "When the soul is unclean, it thinks all things unclean" (Chrys.). The statement that the conscience can be defiled is significant. While conscientious scruples are to be respected, yet, if the conscience be defiled, its dictates and instincts are unreliable, false as are the song-efforts of one who has no ear for music.

Ver. 16. **θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι**: "*We know God*"; that was their profession of faith. They "gloried in God," Rom. ii. 17. This is an allusion to the Jewish pride of religious privilege. Weiss points out that this phrase alone is sufficient to prove that the heretics in question are not the Gnostics of the second century (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 133). See the use of the phrase in Gal. iv. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 5. Compare 2 Tim. iii. 5, "Holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof"; also 1 John ii. 4. There is here the constant antithesis between words and deeds.

τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται: Their lives give the lie to their professions; "They acted as if this Supreme Being was a mere metaphysical abstraction, out of all moral relation to human life, as if He were neither Saviour nor Judge" (J. H. Bernard *comm. in loc.*).

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν: See note on 2 Tim. iii. 17.

ἀδόκιμοι: *worthless*, *unfit*. See note on 2 Tim. iii. 8.

II. 1. [a]Σὺ [a]δὲ λάλει ἃ [b]πρέπει τῇ [c]ὑγιαινούσῃ [c]διδασκαλίᾳ. 2. [d]πρεσβύτας [e]νηφαλίους εἶναι, [f]σεμνούς, [g]σώφρονας· [h]ὑγιαίνοντας [h]τῇ [h]πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ [i]ὑπομονῇ. 3. [k]πρεσβύτιδας [l]ὡσαύτως ἐν [m]καταστήματι [n]ἱεροπρεπεῖς,[1] μὴ [o]διαβόλους, μηδὲ[2] [p]οἴνῳ [p]πολλῷ [q]δεδουλωμένας, [r]καλοδιδασκάλους, 4. ἵνα [s]σωφρο-

a See 1 Tim. vi. 11. b See 1 Tim. ii. 10. c 1 Tim. i. 10 (*q.v.*), 2 Tim. iv. 3, Tit. i. 9. d Luke i. 18, Philem. 9. e See 1 Tim. iii. 2. f See 1 Tim. iii. 8. g See 1 Tim. iii. 2. h Tit. i. 13, see 1 Tim. i. 10. i See 1 Tim. vi. 11. k 4 Macc. xvi. 14 only. l See 1 Tim. ii. 9. m 3 Macc. v. 45 only. n 4 Macc. ix. 25, xi. 20 only. o See 1 Tim. iii. 11. p See 1 Tim. iii. 8. q Rom. vi. 18, 22, 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 19, Gal. iv. 3, 2 Pet. ii. 19. r Here only, not LXX. s Here only, not LXX.

[1] ἱεροπρεπεῖ CH**, 17, 31, 37, two others, d, e, f, g, m81, vg. (*in habitu sancto*), boh., syrr. (but not syrhcl-mg), arm.

[2] So ℵ*AC, 73; μὴ ℵcDFGHKLP, vg. See 1 Tim. iii. 8.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. In the face of this immoral teaching, do you constantly impress the moral duties of the Gospel on your people of every age and class. There is an ideal of conduct appropriate to old men and old women respectively—the latter have moreover special duties in the training of the young women—and young men. Enforce your words by personal example. Slaves, too, must be taught that they share in responsibility for the good name of the Gospel.

Ver. 1. **σὺ δὲ**: See reff., and note on 1 Tim. vi. 11. Titus is to be as active in teaching positive truth as the heretics were in teaching evil.

λάλει: emphasises the importance of oral teaching.

τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ: See on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Ver. 2. The heads of moral instruction which begin here are more unmistakably intended for the laity than are the similar passages in *Tim.* That it should devolve on the apostle's legate to give popular moral instruction is perhaps another indication of the less-developed state of the Church in Crete than in Ephesus and its neighbourhood.

πρεσβύτας: *senes*; sc. **παρακάλει** (ver. 6).

νηφαλίους: *sober*, *sobrii*; *temperate* (R.V.) in respect of their use of strong drink. Chrys. explains it *to be vigilant*, as does the Syriac, and A.V. m.; but the homely warning seems more appropriate. See note on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

σεμνούς: see note on 1 Tim. iii. 8.

σώφρονας: see notes on 1 Tim. ii. 9, and iii. 2. For **ὑγιαίνειν** followed by dat. see i. 13. **πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή** are constantly grouped together (see on 1 Tim. vi. 11); and this suggests that **πίστις** here is subjective, not objective, as in the similar phrase i. 13. See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

Ver. 3. **πρεσβύτιδας**: correlative to **πρεσβύτας**, as **πρεσβυτέρας** is to **πρεσβυτέρῳ** in 1 Tim. v. 1, 2.

ὡσαύτως: See on 1 Tim. ii. 9.

ἐν καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπεῖς: *reverent in demeanour*, R.V. **καταστολή** in 1 Tim. ii. 9 has an almost exclusive reference to dress. *Demeanour* (R.V.) is better than *behaviour* (A.V.), which has a wide reference to conduct, in all respects and on all occasions. *Deportment*, which includes a slight reference to dress, would be the best rendering, only that the word has become depreciated.

ἱεροπρεπεῖς perhaps = **ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν** (1 Tim. ii. 10); but in itself the word does not guarantee more than the appearance of reverence. Wetstein gives, among other illustrations, one from Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 8, 5), describing how Jaddua, the high priest, went out in procession from Jerusalem to meet Alexander the Great, **ἱεροπρεπῆ καὶ διαφέρουσαν τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ποιούμενος τὴν ὑπάντησιν.**

μὴ διαβόλους: See on 1 Tim. iii. 11, and 2 Tim. iii. 3.

δεδουλωμένας: The A.V., *not given to much wine*, makes no difference between this and **προσέχοντας**, which is the verb in the corresponding phrase, in the list of moral qualifications of deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 8. It is proved by experience that the reclamation of a woman drunkard is almost impossible. The best parallel to this use of **δουλόω** is 2 Pet. ii. 19, **ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ δεδούλωται.** *Cf.* also the other reff.

καλοδιδασκάλους: Not only "by discourse at home," as Chrys. explains, but by example.

Ver. 4. **σωφρονίζουσιν.** The only other examples of **ἵνα** with a pres. indic.

νίζουσιν[1] τὰς [t] νέας [u] φιλάνδρους εἶναι, [v] φιλοτέκνους, 5. [s] σώφρονας, ἁγνάς, [w] οἰκουργούς,[2] [x] ἀγαθάς, [y] ὑποτασσομένας [y] τοῖς [y] ἰδίοις [y] ἀνδράσιν, [z] ἵνα [z] μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ [z] βλασφημῆται. 6. τοὺς νεωτέρους [a] ὡσαύτως παρακάλει [b] σωφρονεῖν· 7. περὶ πάντα σεαυτὸν [c] παρεχόμενος [d] τύπον [e] καλῶν [e] ἔργων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ [f] ἀφθορίαν,[3]

t Positive here only in this sense. u Here only, not LXX. v 4 Macc. xv. 4, 5, 6, φιλοτεκνία also 4 Macc. (5) only. w Here only, not LXX. x Matt. xx. 15, Rom. v. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 18. y Eph. v. 22, Col. iii. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 34, Eph. v. 24. z See 1 Tim. vi. 1. a See 1 Tim. ii. 9. b Mark v. 15 (= Luke viii. 35), Rom. xii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 13, 1 Pet. iv. 7, not LXX. c See 1 Tim. i. 4, also Acts xvii. 31, xxii. 2, xxviii. 2. d See 1 Tim. iv. 12. e See 1 Tim. iii. 1. f Haggai ii. 18 (17) only.

[1] So א*AFGHP, two cursives; **σωφρονίζωσι** אcCDKL.

[2] So א*ACD*FG; **οἰκουρούς** אcDcHKLP, syr^hcl-mg-gr.

[3] **ἀδιαφθορίαν** אcDcL, syr^hcl-mg-gr; **ἀφθονίαν** FG.

in Paul are 1 Cor. iv. 6 (**φυσιοῦσθε**) and Gal. iv. 17 (**ζηλοῦτε**). These may be cases of an unusual formation of the subj., both being verbs in **-όω**. **γινώσκομεν**, 1 John v. 20, is another instance. *Train* is the excellent rendering of the R.V. The A.V., *teach . . . to be sober*, although an adequate rendering elsewhere, leaves **φιλάνδρους εἶναι** disconnected. Timothy is bidden (1 Tim. v. 2) **παρακαλεῖν . . . νεωτέρας** himself; but this refers to pastoral public monitions, not to private training in domestic virtues and duties, as here.

τὰς νέας: There is no other instance in the Greek Bible of **νέος**, in the positive, being applied to a young person; though it is common in secular literature. There is possibly a certain fitness in the word as applied here to recently married women, whom the apostle has perhaps exclusively in view.

φιλάνδρους: "This is the chief point of all that is good in a household" (Chrys.). One of the three things in which Wisdom "was beautified" is "a woman and her husband that walk together in agreement" (Ecclus. xxv. 1).

φιλοτέκνους: "She who loves the root will much more love the fruit" (Chrys.). **φιλάνδρῳ καὶ φιλοτέκνῳ** is cited from an "epitaph from Pergamum about the time of Hadrian" by Deissmann, who gives other references to secular literature. (*Bible Studies*, trans. p. 255 *sq.*).

Ver. 5. **οἰκουργούς**: *workers at home*. Field says that "the only authority for this word is Soranus of Ephesus, a medical writer, not earlier than the second century," **οἰκουργὸν καὶ καθέδριον διάγειν βίον**; but the verb is found in Clem. Rom., *ad Cor.* i. 1, **γυναιξίν . . . τὰ κατὰ τὸν οἶκον σεμνῶς οἰκουργεῖν ἐδιδάσκετε**. **οἰκουρούς**, *keepers at home*, *domum custodientes* (d m[81]) *domus curam habentes* (Vulg.), though constantly found in descriptions of virtuous women, is a less obviously stimulating epithet. Mothers who work at home usually find it a more absorbing pleasure than "going about from house to house" (1 Tim. v. 13). But the "worker at home" is under a temptation to be as unsparing of her household as of herself; and so St. Paul adds **ἀγαθάς**, *benignas*, *kind* (R.V.), rather than *good* (A.V.). For this force of **ἀγαθός**, see reff.

ἰδίοις: **ἴδιος** (see on 1 Tim. iii. 4) is not emphatic: it is simply, *their husbands*. The **ἴδιος** merely differentiates *husband* from *man*.

ἵνα μὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ βλασφημῆται: For **λόγος**, as used here, the more usual word is **ὄνομα** (from Isa. lii. 5). See reff. on 1 Tim. vi. 1; and also Jas. ii. 7, Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9. **ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας**, in 2 Peter ii. 2, is equivalent to **ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ** here. The practical worth of a religion is not unfairly estimated by its effects on the lives of those who profess it. If the observed effect of the Gospel were to make women worse wives, it would not commend it to the heathen; "for the Greeks judge not of doctrines by the doctrine itself, but they make the life and conduct the test of the doctrines" (Chrys.). See note on 1 Tim. v. 14.

Ver. 6. **ὡσαύτως**: see on 1 Tim. ii. 9.

Ver. 7. **περὶ πάντα** is joined with the preceding words by Jerome and Lucifer (*ut pudici* [*sobrii*] *sint in omnibus*), followed by Tischendorf and von Soden. For this use of **περί**, see on 1 Tim. i. 19. St. Paul's usual phrase is **ἐν παντί** (fifteen times in all; ten times in 2 Cor.; not in Pastorals), or **ἐν πᾶσιν** (ten times, five of which are in the Pastorals: 1 Tim. iii.

[g] σεμνότητα,[1] 8. λόγον [h] ὑγιῆ [i] ἀκατάγνωστον, ἵνα ὁ [k] ἐξ [k] ἐναντίας [l] ἐντραπῇ μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν[2] περὶ ἡμῶν[3] [m] φαῦλον. 9. δούλους ἰδίοις [n] δεσπόταις[4] ὑποτάσσεσθαι ἐν πᾶσιν, [o] εὐαρέστους εἶναι, μὴ [p] ἀντιλέγοντας, 10. μὴ[5] [q] νοσφιζομένους, ἀλλὰ [r] πᾶσαν [r] πίστιν[6]

g See 1 Tim. ii. 2. h See 1 Tim. i. 10. i 2 Macc. iv. 47 only. k Mark xv. 39 (different application). l 2 Thess. iii. 14. m John iii. 20, v. 29, Rom. ix. 11, 2 Cor. v. 10, Jas. iii. 16. n See 1 Tim. vi. 1. o Rom. xiv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 9. p See Tit. i. 9. q Acts v. 2, 3. r 1 Cor. xiii. 2.

[1] Ins. ἀφθαρσίαν D^{c}KL, 37, more than thirty others, syr$^{hcl\text{-}mg\ gr}$, arm; ins. ἁγνείαν C, 80, three others, syr^{hcl}, arm.

[2] λέγειν bef. φαῦλον KL. [3] ὑμῶν A, many cursives, boh.

[4] δεσπ. ἰδ. ADP, 238, four others, d, e, f, vg. [5] μηδὲ C^{b}D^{gr*}F^{gr}G^{gr}, 17.

[6] πίστ. πᾶσ. KL; πᾶσ. ἐνδεικ. πίστ. F^{gr}G g; om. πίστιν ℵ*, 17.

11; 2 Tim. ii. 7, iv. 5; Tit. ii. 9, 10); also εἰς πάντα, 2 Cor. ii. 9; κατὰ πάντα, Col. iii. 20, 22.

σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον: The middle is appropriate with **σεαυτὸν**; see reff. given by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, trans. p. 254; but with **ἀφθορίαν**, etc., the active would seem more natural, as in reff. For **τύπον**, see 1 Tim. iv. 12, and for **καλὰ ἔργα**, see 1 Tim. iii. 1. This exhortation, following **νεωτέρους κ.τ.λ.**, and also ver. 15, suggest that Titus was comparatively young.

διδασκαλία here is not *doctrine* (A.V.), but *teaching; thy doctrine* (R.V.), including the person of the teacher as well as what he says. See note on 1 Tim. i. 10.

ἀφθορίαν, σεμνότητα, *sincerity . . . impressiveness, integritatem . . . gravitatem.* See on 1 Tim. ii. 2. These refer respectively to the principles and the manner of the teacher, while **λόγον, κ.τ.λ.**, describes the matter of his teaching.

Ver. 8. **ἀκατάγνωστον**: *to which no exception can be taken.* See Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, Trans. p. 200. **ὑγιῆ** implies the conformity of the doctrine taught with the Church's standard (see note on 1 Tim. i. 10), while **ἀκατάγνωστον** has reference to the manner of its presentation to the hearer.

ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας: The heathen opponent, official or unofficial, **ὁ ἀντικείμενος** (1 Tim. v. 14), **οἱ ἀντιδιατιθέμενοι** (2 Tim. ii. 25), not the Devil himself (Chrys.).

ἐντραπῇ: *vercatur* (Vulg.); but *confundatur*, as in 2 Thess. iii. 14, would be a better rendering here. An antagonist who finds that he has no case "looks foolish," as we say.

φαῦλον: usually applied to actions. See reff. The clause means *having nothing evil to report concerning us:* not, as the English versions, *having no evil thing to say*, which might be explained as, "being unable to abuse us".

Ver. 9. **δούλους**: sc. **παρακάλει**, ver. 6. For the general topic, and the term **δεσπότης**, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 1.

ἐν πᾶσιν: joined as in text by Jerome, Ambrosiaster and m[93] with **ὑποτάσσ.** It is in favour of this that **ἐν πᾶσιν** elsewhere in the Pastorals (see note on ver. 7) is at the end of a clause; also that in similar contexts we have **ἐν παντί** (Eph. v. 24) and **κατὰ πάντα** (Col. iii. 22) joined with **ὑποτάσσω** and **ὑπακούω.**

εὐαρέστους: A Pauline word. Alf. notes that it is a servant's phrase, like the English "to give satisfaction". This acute remark brings the present passage into harmony with St. Paul's usage in the reff., in which it is used of persons, of men in their relation to God. **εὐάρεστον** is used of a sacrifice, "acceptable," in Rom. xii. 1, Phil. iv. 18; *cf.* Heb. xii. 28; **τὸ εὐάρεστον**, "that which is well pleasing," in Rom. xii. 2, Eph. v. 10, Col. iii. 20, Heb. xiii. 21. Jerome's view that **εὐαρ.** is passive, "contented with their lot," is not satisfactory.

μὴ ἀντιλέγοντας; *non contradicentes* (Vulg.). Ell. thinks that more is implied than pert answers (A.V. *answering again*); rather "thwarting their masters' plans, wishes, or orders". See ch. i. 9. This is the connotation of *gainsaying* (R.V., A.V.m.).

Ver. 10. **μὴ νοσφιζομένους**: *non fraudantes* (Vulg.), *not purloining.* The particular form of theft implied is the abstraction or retention for oneself, of a part of something entrusted to one's care.

πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν: *displaying the utmost trustworthiness.* There is a similar phrase in ch. iii. 2,

[s] ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθήν,[1] ἵνα τὴν διδασκαλίαν τὴν[2] τοῦ [t] σωτῆρος [t] ἡμῶν [t] Θεοῦ [u] κοσμῶσιν ἐν πᾶσιν.

11. [v] Ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ [w] χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ[3] [x] σωτήριος[4] πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις 12. [y] παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, ἵνα [z] ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν [a] ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς [b] κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας [c] σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ [d] εὐσεβῶς

s See 2 Tim. iv. 14.
t See 1 Tim. i. 1.
u See 1 Tim. ii. 9.
v Luke i. 79, Acts xxvii. 20, Tit. iii. 4.
w 2 Cor. viii. 9.
x Here only, N.T., Am. v. 22, Wisd. i. 14, 3 Macc. (2), 4 Macc. (2) only.
y See 1 Tim. i. 20.
z See 1 Tim. v. 8.
a See 2 Tim. ii. 16.
b Heb. ix. 1, not LXX.
c Wisd. ix. 11 only.
d See 2 Tim. iii. 12.

1 πᾶσαν ἐνδεικ. ἀγαθην ℵ*; πᾶσ. ἐνδεικ. ἀγάπην 17.
2 Om. τὴν KLP.
3 Ins. ἡ CcDbcKLP.
4 σωτῆρος ℵ*, τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν FG, f, g, vg. (am. om. ἡμῶν), boh.

πᾶσαν ἐνδεικ. πραΰτητα. See note on 2 Tim. iv. 14. On this use of **πᾶς**, see on 1 Tim. i. 15. **πίστιν** has a qualifying adj. elsewhere, *e.g.*, **ἀνυπόκριτος** (1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5. *Cf.* ch. i. 4. 2 Pet. i.; Jude 20), but the addition of another adj. after **πᾶς** is unusual. In Clem. Rom. 1 *Cor.* 26 **πίστις ἀγαθή** is rendered by Lightfoot *honest faith;* but *honest fidelity* would be an odd expression. Von Soden would give **ἀγαθή** here the sense of *kind, wishing well,* as in ver. 5, and as a contrast to **ἀντιλεγ.**, as **πίστιν** is to **νοσφ.** W.H. suggest that the original reading here was **πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγάπην.** See apparat. crit.

διδασκαλίαν: See note on 1 Tim. i. 10. **Θεοῦ** refers to God the Father. See i. 3. Von Soden takes it here as objective genitive; the **διδασκαλία** being set forth in vv. 11-14.

κοσμῶσιν: *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 9, **κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς . . . δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.** The **διδασκαλία,** though really practical, can be plausibly alleged to be mere theory; it must then, by good works, be rendered attractive to them that are without. *Cf.* Matt. v. 16, Phil. ii. 15.

Vv. 11-15. The justification of this insistence on the universal necessity for right conduct is the all-embracing scope of the saving grace of God, which has visibly appeared as a call to repentance, a help to amendment of life, and a stimulus to hope. Christ's gift of Himself for us constrains us to give ourselves wholly to Him. Insist on these things, as authoritatively as possible, in every department of your teaching.

Ver. 11. The emphatic word is **πᾶσιν.** The connexion is with what has immediately preceded. No rank or class or type of mankind is outside the saving influence of God's grace. Chrys. concludes a striking picture of the adverse moral environment of slaves with, "It is a difficult and surprising thing that there should ever be a good slave".

ἐπεφάνη: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 14. The grace of God (also iii. 7) is His kindness and love of man (iii. 4). It appeared (iii. 4) (*a*) as a revelation, in the Incarnation, and also (*b*) in its visible results; and so it is both *heard* and *recognised* (Col. i. 6). Accordingly Barnabas could *see* it at Antioch (Acts xi. 23). It is possible to *stand fast in it* (1 Pet. v. 12), and to *continue in it* (Acts xiii. 43). It is *given* to men, to be dispensed by them to others (Rom. i. 5, Eph. iii. 2. 7); and if men do not respond to it, they are said to *fall short of it* (Heb. xii. 15). Here it is described in its essential power and range, **σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρ.**, . . . *appeared, bringing salvation to all men* (so R.V.; A.V.m). This connexion of the words is favoured by the fact that **ἐπεφάνη** is used absolutely in iii. 4.

Ver. 12. **παιδεύουσα.** *erudiens* (Vulg.), *corripiens* (d). Grace is potentially **σωτήριος** as regards all men; actually its efficacy is seen in the disciplining of individuals one by one; **ἡμᾶς,** to begin with. See notes on 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 4, iv. 10. So Chrys. makes **ἵνα** depend on **ἐπεφάνη** more directly than on **παιδεύουσα**: "Christ came that we should deny ungodliness." The connexion, then, is **ἐπεφάνη . . . ἵνα . . . ζήσωμεν.** "The final cause of the Revelation in Christ is not *creed*, but *character*" (J. H. Bernard). It is of course possible (and this is the view usually held) to join **παιδεύουσα ἵνα**; the **ἵνα** introducing the object (*instructing us, to the intent that, denying*, etc., R.V.), not the content (*teaching us that denying*, etc., A.V.) of the **παιδεία.**

ἀρνησάμενοι . . . ζήσωμεν . . . προσ-

[d] ζήσωμεν ἐν [e] τῷ [e] νῦν [e] αἰῶνι, 13. [f] προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ [g] ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ [h] σωτῆρος

e See 1 Tim. vi. 17. f Mark xv. 43, Luke ii. 25, 38, xii. 36, xxiii. 51, Acts xxiii. 21, xxiv. 15, Heb. xi. 35, Jude 21. (It means *receive* in Luke xv. 2, Rom. xvi. 2, Phil. ii. 29, Heb. x. 34.) g See 1 Tim. vi. 14. h See 2 Tim. i. 10.

δεχόμενοι represent three successive stages in the Christian life. The force of the aorist participle must not be lost sight of, though it may be pedantic to mark it in translation. ἀρνησάμενοι κ.τ.λ., synchronises with the "death unto sin" which precedes the definite entry on newness of life, while προσδεχόμενοι expresses the constant mental attitude of those who are living that new life.

ἀρνησάμενοι: This indicates the renunciation of the Devil, of the vanity of this world, and of all the sinful lusts of the flesh. ἀρνέομαι means here *to repudiate, renounce all connexion with. Cf.* ἀποθέμενοι, 1 Pet. ii. 1. See on i Tim. v. 8.

τὴν ἀσέβειαν: εὐσέβεια being Christian practice (see below, εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν), ἀσέβεια is heathen practice, the non-moral life.

τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας: *saecularia desideria* (Vulg.), "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph. ii. 3), "the lusts of men" (1 Pet. iv. 2); opposed to σωφρ. καὶ δικαίως; such as have relation to no higher sphere than that of the visible world. They are analysed in 1 John ii. 16.

σωφρόνως: The reference of the three adverbs is well explained by St. Bernard: "*sobrie* erga nos; *juste* erga proximos; *pie* erga Deum".

Ver. 13. **προσδεχόμενοι κ.τ.λ.**, as already stated, describes the glad expectancy which is the ruling and prevailing thought in the lives of men looking for their Lord's return (Luke xii. 36), προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Jude 21). *Cf.* Rom. viii. 19; 1 Cor. i. 7; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. ix. 28; 2 Pet. iii. 12. Isa. xxv. 9 is the basal passage. *Cf.* Acts xxiv. 15, ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται. In this quotation ἐλπίδα is the mental act, while the relative ἣν is the realisation of the hope. ἐλπίς is also passive—the thing hoped for—in Gal. v. 5; Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1.

ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης: The Second Coming of Christ will be, as we are assured by Himself, "in the glory of His Father" (Matt. xvi. 27; Mark viii. 38). "We rejoice in the hope of the glory of God" (Rom. v. 2, a passage which supports the view that δόξης here is dependent on ἐλπίδα as well as on ἐπιφάνειαν). von Soden takes ἐπιφάνειαν as epexegetical of ἐλπίδα. The Second Coming of Christ may, therefore, be regarded as an ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης Θεοῦ, even though we should not speak of an ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Πατρός, while ἐπιφάνεια Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is normal and natural (see on 1 Tim. vi. 14). τῆς δόξης having then an intelligible meaning, we are not entitled to treat it as merely adjectival, *the glorious appearing* (A.V.). The genitival relation does not differ in this case from τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ in 2 Thess. ii. 8. See also note on 1 Tim. i. 11. Again, there does not seem any reason why τοῦ σωτῆρος, κ.τ.λ., here should not depend on ἐπιφάνειαν, on the analogy of 2 Tim. i. 10. This may be thought too remote. In any case, the conception of the Second Coming as an occasion of manifestation of two δόξαι, that of the Father and of the Son, is familiar from Luke ix. 26, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, κ.τ.λ. On the whole, then, we decide in favour of the R.V.m. in the rendering of this passage, *appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ*. The grammatical argument—"the identity of reference of two substantives when under the vinculum of a common article"—is too slender to bear much weight, especially when we take into consideration not only the general neglect of the article in these epistles but the omission of it before σωτήρ in 1 Tim. i. 1, iv. 10. Ellicott says that "μεγάλου would seem uncalled for if applied to the Father". To this it may be answered that (*a*) the epithet is not otiose here; as marking the majesty of God the Father it is parallel to the ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν, κ.τ.λ., which recalls the self-sacrificing love of the Son; both constituting the double appeal—to fear and to love—of the Judgment to come. (*b*) Again, St. Paul is nowhere more emphatic in his lofty language about God the Father than in these epistles; see 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 15, 16.

This is the only place in the N.T. in

i See 1 Tim. ii. 6.
k Luke xxiv. 21, 1 Pet. i. 18.

[h] ἡμῶν [h] Χριστοῦ [h] Ἰησοῦ,[1] 14. ὃς [i] ἔδωκεν [i] ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα [k] λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας, καὶ [l] καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν

l Acts xv. 9, 2 Cor. vii. 1, Eph. v. 26, Heb. ix. 14, Jas. iv. 8, 1 John i. 7, 9.

[1] So ℵ*FgrG, g, boh.; Ἰησ. Χριστ. ℵcACDKLP, all cursives, d, e, f, vg., syrr., arm.

which **μέγας** is applied to the true God, although it is a constant predicate of heathen gods and goddesses, *e.g.*, Acts xix. 28. (See Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, vii., vii. 563). In view of the fact that the most probable exegesis of Rom. ix. 5 is that **ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων, Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς, κ.τ.λ.** refers to Christ, it cannot be said that **ὁ μέγας Θεός**, as applied to Him, is un-Pauline. But the proofs that St. Paul held Christ to be God Incarnate do not lie in a few disputable texts, but in the whole attitude of his soul towards Christ, and in the doctrine of the relation of Christ to mankind which is set forth in his epistles. St. Paul's "declarations of the divinity of the Eternal Son" are not *studied*, as Ellicott admits that this would be if the R.V. rendering (*our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ*) be adopted. To this it may be added that the Versions, with the exception of the Aethiopic, agree with R.V.m. Ell. cites on the other side, of ante-Nicene writers, Clem. Alex., *Protrept.* § 7, and Hippolytus,—quoted by Wordsworth—besides the great bulk of the post-Nicene fathers. The text is one which would strike the eye of a reader to whose consciousness the Arian controversy was present; but it is safe to say that if it had read **τοῦ σωτῆρος**, the **μεγάλου** would have excited no comment. Consequently the papyri (all vii. A.D.) cited by J. H. Moulton (*Grammar*, vol. i. p. 84) "which attest the translation *our great God and Saviour* as current among Greek-speaking Christians" are too late as guides to St. Paul's meaning here. The similar problem in 2 Peter i. 1 must be discussed independently. At least, even if it be granted that the R.V. there is correct, and that 2 Peter i. 1 is an example of the transference to Christ of the language used of deified kings "in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times," it does not follow that the same account must be given of Tit. ii. 13.

Ver. 14. **ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν κ.τ.λ.**: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 6. As already observed, this is an appeal from the constraining love of Christ to the responding love of man.

λυτρώσηται: *deliver*. The language is borrowed from Psalm cxxix. (cxxx). 8 **αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ.** The material supplied by this passage for a discussion of the Atonement is contained in **ἔδωκεν . . . ἡμῶν**, not in **λυτρώσηται**. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. i. 14.

ἀνομίας: *Lawlessness* is the essence of sin (1 John iii. 4), self-assertion as opposed to self-sacrifice which is love. Love, which is self-sacrifice, is a dissolvent of self-assertion or sin. And to what degree soever we allow the love of Christ to operate as a controlling principle in our lives, to that degree we are delivered from **ἀνομία**, as an opposing controlling principle.

καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαόν: This is a pregnant expression for "purify and so make them fit to be his people". St. Paul has in mind Ezek. xxxvii. 23, "I will save them out of all their dwelling places, wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God", **ῥύσομαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν ὧν ἡμάρτοσαν ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ καθαριῶ αὐτοὺς καὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαὸν, κ.τ.λ.** There is in **καθαρίσῃ** an allusion to Holy Baptism, which is explicit in iii. 5. *Cf.* Eph. v. 26, **ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.**

λαὸν περιούσιον: *populum acceptabilem* (Vulg.). *A people for his own possession* (R.V.) is the modern equivalent of *a peculiar people* (A.V.). **λαὸς περιούσιος** is the LXX for עַם סְגֻלָּה. סְגֻלָּה means "a valued property, a peculiar treasure" (*peculium*), and occurs first in Exodus xix. 5, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me." Here the LXX inserts **λαός**, possibly from the references in Deut., in which the combination סגלה עם is found. סגלה alone occurs in Malachi iii. 17 (**εἰς περιποίησιν**) and in Ps. cxxxv. 4 (**εἰς περιουσιασμόν**). The LXX of Mal. iii. 17 is echoed in Eph. i. 14, **εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως**, (where see Dean Armitage Robinson's note) and 1 Pet. ii. 9, **λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν**, in which **λαός** is a reminiscence of the

[m] περιούσιον, [n] ζηλωτὴν [o] καλῶν [o] ἔργων. 15. ταῦτα λάλει καὶ παρακάλει καὶ ἔλεγχε μετὰ πάσης [p] ἐπιταγῆς· μηδείς σου [q] περιφρονείτω.

III. 1. [a] Ὑπομίμνησκε αὐτοὺς [b] ἀρχαῖς [1] [b c] ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι, [d] πειθαρχεῖν, [e f] πρὸς [e] πᾶν [e g] ἔργον [e g] ἀγαθὸν [f] ἑτοίμους εἶναι, 2. μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, [h] ἀμάχους εἶναι, [h] ἐπιεικεῖς, πᾶσαν [i] ἐνδεικνυμένους [k] πραΰτητα πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους. 3. Ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς [l] ἀνόητοι, [m] ἀπειθεῖς, [n] πλανώμενοι, [o] δουλεύοντες [p] ἐπιθυ-

m Exod. xix. 5, xxiii. 22, Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18.
n Acts xxi. 20, xxii. 3, 1 Cor. xiv. 12, Gal. i. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 13.
o See 1 Tim iii. 1.
p 1 Cor. vii. 6, 2 Cor. viii. 8.

q 4 Macc. vi. 9, xiv. 1 only. a See 2 Tim. ii. 14. b Luke xii. 11, xx. 20. c Luke xxiii. 7, Rom. xiii. 1, 2, 3. d Acts v. 29, 32, xxvii. 21. e See 2 Tim. ii. 21. f 1 Pet. iii. 15. g See 1 Tim. ii. 10. h See 1 Tim. iii. 3. i See 2 Tim. iv. 14. k See 2 Tim. ii. 25. l See 1 Tim. vi. 9. m 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 16, etc. n See 2 Tim. iii. 13. o Rom. vi. 6. p 2 Tim. iii. 6.

[1] Ins. καὶ D^cKLP, d, e, f, m94, vg., syrr., boh., arm.

LXX of the passages in Exod. and Deut. Perhaps **περιούσιος** refers to the treasure as laid up, while **περιποίησις** refers to it as acquired.

ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων: See Eph. ii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 15; Heb. x. 24.

Ver. 15. See on 1 Tim. iv. 12.

ταῦτα is best connected with **λάλει** only, and referred to the positive instructions of chap. ii., "the things which befit the sound doctrine"; while **παρακάλει** and **ἔλεγχε** represent the two main functions of the pastor. See i. 9.

ἐπιταγῆς: *authority, imperio;* **πάσης ἐπιτ·**: *in the most authoritative manner possible*; not to be connected with **ἔλεγχε** only.

μηδείς σου περιφρονείτω: another way of saying **μετὰ πάσης ἐπιταγῆς**. *Do not permit thine authority to be despised, Be consistent.* See 1 Tim. iv. 12.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-2. As your Cretan folk are naturally intractable, be careful to insist on obedience to the constituted authorities, and on the maintenance of friendly relations with non-Christians.

Ver. 1. With these instructions as to duty towards civil authority, compare Rom. xiii. 1 *sqq.*, 1 Pet. ii. 13 *sqq.* It is perhaps significant of the difference between Crete and the province of Asia, as regards respect for law, that in 1 Tim. ii. 1-3, reasons are given why we should pray for rulers, while here the more elementary duty of obedience is enjoined. Polybius (vi. 46. 9) remarks on the seditious character of the Cretans.

ὑπομίμνησκε: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 14.

ἀρχαῖς: **ἀρχαί** and **ἐξουσίαι** are coupled in this sense in Luke xii. 11; **ἀρχή** and **ἐξουσία** in the abstract, Luke xx. 20. The two words are coupled together as names for ranks of angels in Eph. iii. 10, vi. 12, Col. i. 16, ii. 10, 15; with **δύναμις**, 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21; **ἀρχαί**, alone, Rom. viii. 38.

πειθαρχεῖν: (*dicto obedire*) is best taken absolutely, and with a wider reference than the preceding clause: *i.e.*, as R.V., *to be obedient*, rather than merely *to obey magistrates* (A.V.).

πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν. See reff.

Ver. 2. **ἀμάχους . . . ἐπιεικεῖς**: coupled as qualifications of the episcopus, 1 Tim. iii. 3.

πᾶσαν πραΰτητα: *the greatest possible meekness.* Compare Eph. iv. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 15.

Vv. 3-7. Cretans who hear this epistle need not feel hurt as though I were thinking of them with exceptional severity. We were such ourselves until we came to know the love of God, unmerited and saving and sanctifying and perfecting.

Ver. 3. **ἦμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς**: The connexion is: you need not suppose that it is hopeless to imagine that these wild Cretan folk can be reclaimed. We ourselves are a living proof of the power of God's grace. Eph. ii. 3 *sqq.* is an exact parallel. *Cf.* also 1 Cor. vi. 11, Eph. v. 8, Col. iii. 7, 1 Pet. iv. 3.

ἀνόητοι: *insipientes, foolish*, in the sense in which the word is used in Proverbs (*e.g.* xvii. 28), *without understanding of spiritual things.*

πλανώμενοι: The analogy of 2 Tim. iii. 13 suggests that this is passive, *deceived*, not neuter, *errantes* (Vulg.), though of course there are many ex-

μίαις καὶ [q] ἡδοναῖς [p] ποικίλαις, ἐν [r] κακίᾳ καὶ [r] φθόνῳ [s] διάγοντες, [t] στυγητοί, [u] μισοῦντες [u] ἀλλήλους. 4. ὅτε δὲ ἡ [v] χρηστότης καὶ ἡ [w] φιλανθρωπία [x] ἐπεφάνη τοῦ [y] σωτῆρος [y] ἡμῶν [y] Θεοῦ, 5. οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ [1] ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς ἀλλὰ [z] κατὰ [z] τὸ [z] αὐτοῦ [z] ἔλεος [2] ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ [3] [a] λουτροῦ [b] παλινγενεσίας καὶ [c] ἀνακαι-

q Luke viii. 14, Jas. iv. 1, 3, 2 Pet. ii. 13. r Rom. i. 29, 1 Pet. ii. 1. s See 1 Tim. ii. 2. t Here only, not LXX. u Matt. xxiv. 10. v Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22 *ter*., Eph. ii. 7 (Paul elsewhere 4 times). w Acts xxviii. 2 only, N.T., Esth. (1). 2 Macc. (2), 3 Macc. (2). x See Tit. ii. 11. y See 1 Tim. i. 1. z 1 Pet. i. 3. a Eph. v. 26 only, N.T., Cant. iv. 2, vi. 5, Ecclus. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 25. b Matt. xix. 28 only, not LXX. c Rom. xii. 2 only, not LXX, *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16, Col. iii. 10.

[1] ὧν CbDcKLP. [2] τὸν . . . ἔλεον DbcKL. [3] Ins. τοῦ A.

amples of this latter sense in the N.T.

ποικίλαις: See note on 2 Tim. iii. 6.

διάγοντες: *sc* βίον, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2.

στυγητοί κ.τ.λ.: *odibiles, odientes invicem* (Vulg.). This marks the stage of degradation, before it becomes hopeless: when vice becomes odious to the vicious, stands a self-confessed failure to produce happiness.

Ver. 4. **χρηστότης καὶ φιλανθρωπία**: (*benignitas . . . humanitas*) is a constant combination in Greek. See many examples supplied by Field. Here it expresses the notion of John iii. 16, **οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον κ.τ.λ.** and of Eph. ii. 4-6. Perhaps also, as von Soden suggests, the kindness of God is here contrasted with the unkindness of men to each other; *cf.* Eph. iv. 31, 32. **χρηστότης** is a Pauline word, used of God also in reff. **φιλανθρωπία** is especially used of the beneficent feelings of divine beings towards men; more rarely of the relations between man and man, as in Acts xxviii. 2. Diogenes Laert., quoted by Alf., distinguishes three kinds of **φιλανθρ.** (1) geniality of manner, (2) helpfulness, (3) sociability.

ἐπεφάνη: See note on 1 Tim. vi. 14.

τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ: **θεοῦ**, as in i. 3, ii. 10, is epexegetical of **σωτῆρος**.

Ver. 5. The **ἡμεῖς** and **ἡμᾶς** refer to the same persons as those mentioned in verse 3, *i.e.*, the apostles and those who have had a similar experience. The verse may be paraphrased as a statement of fact thus:—God saved us by Baptism, which involves two complementary processes, (*a*) the ceremony itself which marks the actual moment in time of the new birth, and (*b*) the daily, hourly, momently renewing of the Holy Spirit, by which the spiritual life is supported and fostered and increased. And the moving cause of this exceeding kindness of God was not any merits of our own, but His mercy

οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων: **ἐκ** here, as in Rom iii. 30, expresses the source. See also the emphatic repetition in Gal. ii. 16 of **οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου.** The **δικαιοσύνη** here is that which we can call our own, **ἡ ἐκ νόμου** (Phil. iii. 9). Its existence as **δικαιοσύνη** must not be denied; but it does not pass as current coin in the kingdom of God. It has indeed no saving value whatever. Accordingly there is no question here as to whether we did, or did not do, works which are **ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ**. "Not the labours of my hands can fulfil *Thy* law's demands." See note on 2 Tim. i. 9.

Bengel, comparing Deut. ix. 5, refers the negative to each term in the clause: we had not been **ἐν δικ.**; we had not done **ἔργα ἐν δικ.**; we had no works through which we could be saved. But this exegesis is too much affected by the controversies of the sixteenth century. The A.V., *which we have done*, confuses the thought by a suggestion that the works referred to are those "after justification".

τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ: **δικαιοσύνη** is the sphere in which the works were done, and to which they are related.

κατὰ . . . ἔλεος: The phraseology is borrowed from Ps. cviii. (cix.) 26, **σῶσόν με κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου.** A remarkable parallel is furnished by 1 Pet. i. 3, **ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς**; and also by 2 Esdr. viii. 32, "For if thou hast a desire to have mercy upon us, then shalt thou be called merciful, to us, namely, that have no works of righteousness".

ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς: The N.T. seldom diverts attention from the main lesson to be taught from time to time by noting qualifications, even necessary ones. Here St. Paul is speaking only about the efficient and instrumental and formal causes of salvation, without any thought of man's part in co-operation with God. It is as when teaching the principles of

νώσεως[1] Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, 6. οὗ [d] ἐξέχεεν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς [e] πλουσίως διὰ [f] Ἰησοῦ [f] Χριστοῦ [f] τοῦ [f] σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, 7. ἵνα [g] δικαιωθέντες [g] τῇ [g] ἐκείνου [g] χάριτι [h] κληρονόμοι γενηθῶμεν[2] κατ᾽ [i] ἐλπίδα [i k] ζωῆς [i k] αἰωνίου. 8. [l] Πιστὸς [l] ὁ [l] λόγος· καὶ περὶ τούτων [m] βούλομαί σε

d Acts ii. 17, 18, 33 (=Joel iii. 1). e See 1 Tim. vi. 17. f See 2 Tim. i. 10. g Rom. iii. 24. h Rom. iv. 14, viii. 17, Gal. iii. 29, iv. 7, Heb. vi. 17, Jas. ii. 5. i Tit. i. 2. k See 1 Tim. i. 16. l See 1 Tim. i. 15. m See 1 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] Ins. διὰ D*FG, d, e, g. [2] γενώμεθα ℵ^{c}D^{c}KL.

mechanics, we do not confuse the beginner's mind by making allowances for friction, etc. Here, as in Rom. vi. and 1 Pet. iii. 21, it is assumed that man co-operates with God in the work of his own salvation. On the force of the aorist, ἔσωσεν, see note on 1 Tim. ii. 4.

διὰ λουτροῦ: *the washing*. **λουτρόν** may mean the *water used for washing*, or *the process itself of washing*. The R.V.m. *laver* would be **λουτήρ**. See Dean Armitage Robinson's note on Eph. v. 26.

παλινγενεσίας: This defines the nature of the **λουτρόν** which God employs as His instrument in effecting the salvation of man; not any **λουτρόν** whatever, but that of new birth. It is sufficient to observe here that much of the controversy about regeneration might have been avoided had men kept before them the analogy of natural birth, followed as it is immediately, not by vigorous manhood, but by infancy and childhood and youth.

ἀνακαινώσεως: The genitive **ἀνακαινώσεως** depends on **διὰ** (which is actually inserted in the Harclean Syriac; so R.V.m., *and through renewing*), not on **λουτροῦ**, as apparently Vulg., *per lavacrum regenerationis et renovationis Spiritus Sancti*, f. Boh. Arm., followed by R.V. The **λουτρόν**, *the washing*, secures a claim on the Holy Spirit for *renewing*, just as birth gives a child a claim on society for food and shelter; but unless we are compelled to do otherwise, it is best to keep the two notions distinct. Birth, natural or spiritual, must be a definite fact taking place at a particular moment; whereas renewing is necessarily a subsequent process, constantly operating. Without this renewing the life received at birth is at best in a state of suspension. The references to **ἀνακαίνωσις** and **ἀνακαινοῦν**, and the similar passage, Eph. iv. 23, show that the terms are always used of those who are actually living the Christian life.

Ver. 6. **οὗ ἐξέχεεν**: Joel iii. 1 (ii. 28) is the passage alluded to. *Cf.* in addition to reff. given above, Acts x. 45, Rom. v. 5, Gal. iv. 6. The **οὗ** refers of course to **πνεύματ. ἁγ.** by attraction, not to **ἀνακαινώσεως**. All gifts of the Holy Spirit that come through Jesus Christ are a continuation of the Pentecostal outpouring. The aorist is due to the Apostle's thought of that occasion, although the **ἡμᾶς** shows that the immediate reference is to the experience of St. Paul and other Christians.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: to be connected with **ἐξέχεεν**. See John xv. 26, Acts ii. 33. The finished work of Jesus Christ was the necessary pre-condition to His effusion of the Holy Spirit.

Ver. 7. **ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.**: It is not quite certain, whether this expresses the object of **ἐξέχεεν** or of **ἔσωσεν**. The former connexion brings out best the climax of the passage. **κληρονόμοι** marks the highest point to which man can attain in this life. See reff. The two preceding stages are marked by **λουτρὸν παλινγενεσίας** and **ἀνακαίνωσις**, while **δικαιωθέντες . . . χάριτι** is an expression in theological language of the simpler **κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς**. The grace by which man is justified is usually spoken of as that of God the Father, Rom. iii. 24; and so **ἐκείνου**, not **αὐτοῦ**, is used as referring to the remoter antecedent.

κληρονόμοι: According to the analogy of the other passages where it occurs, this word is best taken absolutely; or, if the notion must be completed, we may understand **θεοῦ**. The term would not need any elucidation to one of St. Paul's company. It is also an argument against connecting **κληρ. ζωῆς αἰωνίου** (R.V.m) that **ἐλπὶς ζωῆς αἰωνίου** occurs in i. 2; and Gal. iii. 29, **κατ᾽ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρ.**, is parallel.

Vv. 8-11. To sum up what I have been saying: Belief in God is not a matter of theory or of speculation, but of practice; it must be accompanied by good works. This true religion unites the beautiful and the profitable. On the other hand, foolish speculations and controversies about the law are profitless

[n] διαβεβαιοῦσθαι, ἵνα [o] φροντίζωσιν [p] καλῶν [p] ἔργων [p] προΐστασθαι οἱ [q r] πεπιστευκότες [1] [r] Θεῷ. [s] ταῦτά ἐστιν [2] [s] καλὰ καὶ [t] ὠφέλιμα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 9. [u] μωρὰς δὲ [u v] ζητήσεις καὶ [w] γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔρεις [3] καὶ [x] μάχας [y] νομικὰς [z] περιίστασο, εἰσὶν γὰρ [a] ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι. 10. [b] αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν [c] νουθεσίαν [4]

n 1 Tim. i. 7, not LXX.
o Here only, N.T.
p Tit. iii. 14, see 1 Tim. iii. 1.
q Acts xv. 5, xviii. 27, xix. 18, xxi. 20, 25.
r Gen. xv. 6 (Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6, Jas. ii. 23), 1 John v. 10. s *Cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 3. t See 1 Tim. iv. 8. u 2 Tim. ii. 23. v See 1 Tim. vi. 4. w See 1 Tim. i. 4. x See 2 Tim. ii. 23. y Here only in this sense (see ver. 13), not LXX. z See 2 Tim. ii. 16. a Heb. vii. 18, Prov xxviii. 3, Wisd. i. 11, Isa. xliv. 10, Jer. ii. 8 only. b Here only, not LXX. c 1 Cor. x. 11, Eph. vi. 4, Wisd. xvi. 6 only.

[1] Ins. τῷ most cursives. [2] Ins. τὰ D^c^KLP.

[3] So ℵ^c^ACKLP, d, e, f, g, m50, vg, boh, syrr, arm; ἔριν ℵ* [D^gr^F^gr^G^gr^, ερειν], Jerome once.

[4] μίαν νουθ. καὶ [ἢ] δευτ. D^c^F^gr^G [D*, d, e, καὶ δύο], g; om. καὶ δευτέραν MSS. known to Jerome, m50, Iren. lat., Pamph. lat., Ruf., Tert., Cyp., Lucif., Aug., Amb., Ambrst.

and unpractical. Do not parley long with a confirmed schismatic. If he does not yield to one or two admonitions, reject him altogether. It is beyond your power to set him right.

Ver. 8. **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος.** Here it is evident that **ὁ λόγος** does not refer to any isolated Saying, but to the doctrinal statement contained in verses 4-7 regarded as a single concept—as we, when we speak of *The Incarnation*, sum up in one term a whole system of theology—while **τούτων** refers to the various topics indicated in that statement, not to the practical teaching of ii. 1—iii. 7.

βούλομαι: see note on 1 Tim. ii. 8.

διαβεβαιοῦσθαι: Here the Vulg. has *confirmare*; d has *affirmare*, as in 1 Tim. i. 7, where see note.

ἵνα: It is most significant and suggestive that the apostle held that good works were most certainly assured by a theology which gives special prominence to the free unmerited grace of God. This is made plainer in the R.V. (*to the end that*), than in the A.V. (*that*).

φροντίζωσιν: *curent* (am.), *curam habeant* (fuld).

καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: *occupy themselves in good works*, *bonis operibus praeesse* (Vulg.). *Prostare* would have been a better translation, since the **πρό** in this use of **προΐστασθαι** is derived from bodily posture rather than from superiority in station. "From the practice of the workman or tradesman *standing before* his shop for the purpose of soliciting customers . . . we arrive at the general meaning of *conducting* or *managing any matter of business*." So Field, who also points out that the R.V. m., *profess honest occupations* (similarly A.V.m on ver. 14) is open to the serious objection that **καλὰ ἔργα** everywhere else in N.T., as well as in secular authors, means "good works" in the religious or moral sense.

οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ: This simple phrase is used designedly in order to express the notion that profession of the recently revealed Gospel is indeed merely a logical consequence and natural development of the older simple belief in God.

ταῦτα: The antithesis in the following **μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις** proves that *these things* refers to the subject-matter of Titus' pronouncements (**διαβεβαιοῦσθαι**), and means *this enforcement of practical religion*.

καλά: is to be taken absolutely, as in the parallel 1 Tim. ii. 3, and is not to be connected with **τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**.

Ver. 9. **ζητήσεις** and **γενεαλογίαι** are associated together in 1 Tim. i. 4 (where see notes). Here they are co-ordinated; there the **γενεαλογίαι** are one of the sources whence **ζητήσεις** originate. The nature of the **ἔρεις** here deprecated is determined by the context. **ἔρεις** indicate the spirit of contentiousness; **μάχαι** the conflicts as heard and seen. On **μάχαι**, see 2 Tim. ii. 23. The **μάχαι νομικαί** are no doubt the same as the **λογομαχίαι** of 1 Tim. vi. 4. Speaking broadly, the controversy turned on the attempt to give a fictitious permanence to the essentially transient elements in the Mosaical Law.

περιΐστασο: See note on 2 Tim. ii. 16.

μάταιοι: Here, and in James i. 26, **μάταιος** is an adjective of two terminations; yet **ματαία** occurs 1 Cor. xv. 17; **ματαίας**, 1 Peter i. 18.

Ver. 10. **αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον**: St.

[d] παραιτοῦ, 11. εἰδὼς ὅτι [e] ἐξέστραπται ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ ἁμαρτάνει, ὢν [f] αὐτοκατάκριτος.

12. Ὅταν πέμψω Ἀρτεμᾶν πρός σε ἢ Τυχικόν, [g] σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρός με εἰς Νικόπολιν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ [h] κέκρικα [i] παραχειμάσαι. 13.

d See 1 Tim. iv. 7.
e Deut. xxxii. 20, etc., here only, N.T
f Here only, not LXX.
g See 2 Tim. ii. 15.
h Acts iii. 13, xx. 16, xxv. 25, xxvii. 1, 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37, 2 Cor. ii. 1.
i Acts xxvii. 12, xxviii. 11, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, not LXX.

Paul passes from the reprehensible opinions to the man who propagates them. He is the same kind of man as the **φιλόνεικος** of 1 Cor. xi. 16; or "he that refuseth to hear the church" of Matt. xviii. 17; he is of "them which cause divisions and occasions of stumbling," Rom. xvi. 17. The term **αἵρεσις** is applied in a non-offensive sense to the sects of Judaism, Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxvi. 5. St. Luke represents the Jews as so speaking of the Christian Church (Acts xxiv. 5, xxviii. 22), and St. Paul as resenting this application of the term (Acts xxiv. 14). The Apostle himself uses the word in an unfavourable sense (1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20), as does 2 Pet. ii. 1. A comparison of 1 Cor. xi. 19 with 1 John ii. 19 suggests that **αἵρεσις** involved the formation of a separate society (so R.V.m. here, *factious*), not merely the holding of aberrant opinions, or the favouring a policy different from that of the Church rulers. The **νουθεσία** addressed to a member of such a **αἵρεσις** would be of the nature of a verbal remonstrance, pointing out the essentially unchristian character of needless separation. It is evident that the **αἱρετικὸς ἄνθρωπος** would be beyond any Church discipline. The permission of a second attempt at reconciliation is probably not unconnected with our Lord's counsel, Matt. xviii. 15.

παραιτοῦ: *Have nothing to do with him*. See note on 1 Tim. iv. 7. The word does not necessarily imply any formal excommunication. Such procedure would be unnecessary. Excommunication has no terrors for those who deliberately separate themselves. "Monere desine. quid enim iuvat? laterem lavares" (Bengel).

Ver. 11. **εἰδώς**: *since thou mayest know*.

ἐξέστραπται: *subversus est*. Argument with a man whose basal mental convictions differ from your own, or whose mind has had a twist, is mere waste of breath.

αὐτοκατάκριτος: *proprio iudicio condemnatus* (Vulg.). He is self-condemned because his separation from the Church is due to his own acknowledged act. He cannot deny that his views are antagonistic to those which he once accepted as true; he is condemned by his former, and, as St. Paul would say, his more enlightened self.

Vv. 12-14. Come to me, as soon as you can be spared. Forward Zenas and Apollos. Let our friends in Crete remember that fruitfulness in good works is the one thing needful for them.

Ver. 12. **ὅταν πέμψω πρός σε**: It is natural to suppose that Artemas or Tychicus would take the place of Titus as apostolic legate in Crete. This temporary exercise of apostolic superintendence marks a stage in the development of monarchical local episcopacy in the later sense.

Ἀρτεμᾶν: The name is "Greek, formed from Ἄρτεμις perhaps by contraction from Artemidorus, a name common in Asia Minor" (W. Lock, art. in Hastings' *D. B.*).

Τυχικόν: See note on 2 Tim. iv. 12.

Νικόπολιν: The subscription in the later MSS. at the end of the epistle, **ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας**, follows the Greek commentators (Chrys., Theod., etc.), in identifying this Nicopolis with that in Thrace, on the Nestus; but makes a stupid mistake in not perceiving that **ἐκεῖ** proves that St. Paul was not at Nicopolis when the letter was written. If we suppose that the situation of St. Paul, when writing 2 Tim., must have been somewhere between Dalmatia, Thessalonica, Corinth, Miletus, Ephesus and Troas, then Nicopolis *ad Nestum* would meet the needs of the case. But the more important Nicopolis in Epirus has found more favour with modern scholars (see art. by W. M. Ramsay in Hastings' *D.B.*).

παραχειμάσαι: It is possible that the winter is that mentioned in 2 Tim. iv. 21. The apostle was not always permitted to exercise the gift of prophecy, in the sense of being able to foretell future events. From this point of view, *There I have determined to winter* may be compared with the earlier *I know that ye all . . . shall see my face no more* (Acts xx. 25).

Ver. 13. **νομικόν**: In the absence of

Ζηνᾶν τὸν [k] νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλὼν[1] [l] σπουδαίως [m] πρόπεμψον, ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς [n] λείπῃ.[2] 14. μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ [o] οἱ [o] ἡμέτεροι [p q] καλῶν [p q] ἔργων [p] προΐστασθαι εἰς τὰς [r] ἀναγκαίας [s] χρείας, ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν [t] ἄκαρποι. 15. Ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ πάντες· ἄσπασαι τοὺς [u] φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς [v] ἐν [v] πίστει. Ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.[3]

k Matt. xxii. 35, Luke (7), cf. ver. 9. l See 2 Tim. i. 17. m Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5, Rom. xv. 24, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, 3 John 6. n See Tit. i. 5. o Here only. p Ver. 8. q See 1 Tim. iii. 1. r Acts x. 24, 1 Cor. xii. 22. s Acts vi. 3, xx. 34, xxviii. 10, Rom. xii. 13, Eph. iv. 29, Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16, 19. t 2 Pet. i. 8, Matt. xiii. 22 (= Mark iv. 19), 1 Cor. xiv. 14, Eph. v. 11, Jude 12. u Matt. (5), Mark (1), Luke (2), John (13), 1 Cor. xvi. 22, Rev. (2). v See 1 Tim. i. 2.

[1] So ℵ*DbH* one cursive; Ἀπολλωνα FG; g (*apollo t apollonem*); Ἀπολλώ CD*cH**KLP, d, e, f, vg.

[2] λίπῃ ℵD*, 37, 47*, about thirteen others.

[3] Ins. ἀμήν ℵcDbcFGHKLP, e, f, g, vg. (not fuld.), syrr.

Add πρὸς Τίτον ℵC, 17, to which D adds ἐπληρώθη; AP add ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως; FG have ἐτελέσθη ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Τίτον; K has πρὸς Τίτον τῆς Κρητῶν ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα, ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας. Similarly HL.

any example of this word being used as the equivalent of *legisperitus* (Vulg.), *jurisconsultus* or *jurisperitus*, it seems best to assume that Zenas was a **νομικός** in the usual N.T. sense, an expert in the Mosaic Law.

Ἀπολλὼν: For Apollos, see article in Hastings' *D. B.*

πρόπεμψον: *set forward on their journey*, *praemitte*; but *deduco* is the rendering where the word occurs elsewhere. See reff.

Ver. 14. The **δέ** does not mark an antithesis between **οἱ ἡμέτεροι** and the persons who have just been mentioned, but is rather resumptive of verse 8; repeating and emphasising at the close of the letter that which St. Paul had most at heart, the changed lives of the Cretan converts. **οἱ ἡμέτεροι** of course means *those of our faith* in Crete.

καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι: See on verse 8.

εἰς τὰς ἀναγκαίας χρείας: The best commentary on this expression is 1 Thess. iv. 9-12. Although **καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι** does not mean *to profess honest occupations*, yet it is plain from St. Paul's letters that he would regard the earning one's own bread respectably as a condition precedent to the doing of good works. The *necessary wants* to which allusion is made are the maintenance of oneself and family, and helping brethren who are unable to help themselves (Acts xx. 35; Rom. xii. 13; Eph. iv. 28). This view is borne out by the reason which follows, **ἵνα μὴ ὦσιν ἄκαρποι.** See John xv. 2, Phil. iv. 17, Col. i. 10, 2 Pet. i. 8.

Ver. 15. Final Salutation.

οἱ μετ' ἐμοῦ: The preposition is different elsewhere in Paul: **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοί**, Gal. i. 2; **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ ἀδελφοί**, Phil. iv. 21. **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ** is a constant phrase in the Synoptists. There is a similar use of **μετά** in Acts xx. 34 (a speech of St. Paul's), and in 2 Tim. iv. 11.

τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἡμᾶς ἐν πίστει; *The faith* (see note on 1 Tim. i. 2) is that which binds Christians together more or less closely. Timothy and Titus were St. Paul's **τέκνα ἐν πίστει**; others were more distantly related to him, though of the same family, "the household of faith".

Dean Armitage Robinson (*Ephesians*, p. 281) gives several examples from papyri of similar formulas of closing, especially two, which read, **ἀσπάζου . . . τοὺς φιλοῦντες σε** (or **ἡμᾶς**) **πρὸς ἀληθίαν.** This suggests the rendering here, *those who love us truly*.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO

PHILEMON

INTRODUCTION.

§ I. *Authorship, Place and Date.*—The external evidence for the authenticity of this Epistle is sufficiently strong; it is included among the Pauline writings in the collection of Marcion; Tertullian mentions this in his *Adv. Marc.* v. 42. It is also mentioned, in connexion with the Pastoral Epistles, in the Muratorian Fragment. Origen ascribes it to St. Paul (*Hom. in Matth.* xxxiii., xxxiv.); Eusebius reckons it among the ὁμολογούμενα (*H. E.* iii. 25); Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle, mentions the fact that its genuineness was disputed by some because it did not treat of doctrinal matters; he holds that it would not have been received by the Church from the beginning unless it had been St. Paul's. The fact that it is not mentioned in the sub-apostolic literature cannot excite suspicion, for its shortness and the character of its contents sufficiently account for this non-mention. The internal evidence is equally strong; the Epistle bears the impress of the Pauline spirit throughout; and one has only to compare the vocabulary and style with those of the other Pauline Epistles to be convinced at once that St. Paul wrote it. Very few among modern scholars reject its Pauline authorship; van Manen, for example, finds a difficulty in the "surprising mixture of singular and plural both in the persons speaking and in the persons addressed. This double form points at once to some peculiarity in the composition of the Epistle. It is not a style that is natural to any one who is writing freely and untrammelled, whether to one person or many" (*Encycl. Bibl.* col. 3695). Such a futile objection is self-condemnatory; but he continues: "Here, as throughout the discussion, the constantly recurring questions as to the reason for the selection of the forms, words, expressions adopted, find their answer in the observation that the Epistle was written under the influence of a perusal of 'Pauline' epistles, especially of those to the Ephesians and Colossians" (*ibid.*). That is as much as to say that the fact that a writer is writing in his usual style is presumptive evidence that his style is being imitated by someone else! The minute verbal comparisons which van Manen tabulates between this and the other

Pauline (he would write 'Pauline') Epistles constitutes a strong proof of identity of authorship between them. Objectors like the writer mentioned are, of course, exceptional; as Jülicher says, "the all but universal judgment is that Philemon belongs to the least doubtful part of the Apostle's work" (*Intr. to the N. T.* p. 127).

The *Place* of writing and the *Date* of the Epistle are mutually determining; St. Paul was in prison when he wrote it, therefore the Epistle must have come either from Cæsarea (Acts xxiv.-xxvi.), or from Rome (Acts xxviii. 30); the time of these two imprisonments was A.D. 58-63; the vast majority of writers are agreed that the group of Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians and to Philemon were written from Rome (see, for the reasons for this view, Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 30 ff.); this would narrow the date of our Epistle down to somewhere between A.D. 60-63. As to the question whether Philemon was written early or late within this period, this depends upon the answer to the question as to whether the Epistle to the Philippians should be placed early in the Roman captivity and the three other Epistles later, or *vice versa*, for it is generally allowed that the Epistle to the Philippians stands alone, the other three were written and despatched at or about the same time. For a full discussion of these questions reference must be made to Lightfoot's *Philippians*, pp. 30-46; here it will have to suffice to say that the most probable year for the date of *Philemon* is A.D. 62.

§ II. *Occasion and Contents.*—Although the Epistle is not the only one of St. Paul's addressed to an individual which has come down to us, it is the only one of a, mainly, *private* character; for although in the opening salutation Apphia, Archippus and the Church in Philemon's house are addressed as well as Philemon himself, nevertheless the contents of the Epistle deal with a personal matter. The nearest parallel in the N.T. is 3 John, addressed to "Gaius the beloved". The Epistle is an appeal made by St. Paul to Philemon on behalf of the runaway slave, Onesimus. Philemon was a citizen of Colossæ (*cf.* Col. iv. 17, Philem. 2, 10-12, and see Col. iv. 9); the Word was most likely preached here during the period which St. Paul spent at Ephesus, from which centre his influence extended widely (see Acts xix. 26, 1 Cor. xvi. 19); Philemon was among the converts made by St. Paul himself (see Philem. 19), and he evidently became a zealous worker, since St. Paul applies the title συνεργός to him; that he was loving and hospitable is clear from vv. 5-7.

Onesimus, the immediate cause of the Epistle, who had run away from his master, also became a convert of St. Paul's (ver. 10); from ver. 18 it would almost seem as though he had committed a theft;

if so, the reason of his having run away would have been fear of punishment. St. Paul's influence upon him must have been strong to have induced him to return. The name Onesimus, like Philemon, is Phrygian; for some reason or other Phrygian slaves were regarded with contempt: Φρὺξ ἀνὴρ πληγεὶς ἀμείνων καὶ διακονέστερος (mentioned by Vincent as being quoted by Wallon, *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, ii. 61, 62). The name was very commonly given to slaves, and appears over and over again on inscriptions as the name of a slave or a freedman.

The letter in which St. Paul intercedes for Onesimus was sent by Tychicus, who was going to Colossæ and Laodicæa with other letters from him to the churches there. Nothing could exceed the affectionate tactfulness displayed in the Epistle; the delicate way in which St. Paul combines the appeal to all that is best in Philemon with a gentle, yet distinct assertion of his own authority (see vv. 8, 9, 21) is very striking. The Epistle is a witness to the high demands which Christianity makes upon men; and the way in which it teaches the universal brotherhood of man together with the eternal truth that one man is better than another—or worse—and that therefore class distinctions lie within the nature of things; this is another side of its permanent value. The power of the Gospel and the noble character of St. Paul are the two notes sounded throughout; or, as Lightfoot so well expresses it, the special value of the Epistle lies in the fact that "nowhere is the social influence of the Gospel more strikingly exerted, nowhere does the nobility of the Apostle's character receive a more vivid illustration than in this accidental pleading on behalf of a runaway slave".

§ III. *Slavery, Jewish and Roman.*—The question of slavery so obviously suggests itself in connexion with this Epistle that a short section on the subject seems called for. It is not enough to refer only to Roman slavery, although Onesimus was a slave and Philemon a master under the Roman *régime;* for St. Paul was a Hebrew, and the Hebrew conception of slavery must, therefore, be taken into account as well. "Slavery was practised by the Hebrews under the sanction of the Mosaic law, not less than by the Greeks and Romans. But though the same in name, it was in its actual working"—and, we may add, in its whole theory and conception—"something wholly different" (Lightfoot, *Philemon*, p. 319). The Hebrew laws regarding slavery were exceedingly humane, for Hebrew slaves belonged to the Covenant people, for which reason also they were regarded as members of their owner's family; they therefore had their social, as well as their religious rights. A Hebrew slave could not be kept

as such for more than six years at the outside, unless he himself wished it; the laws concerning the redemption of a slave are very explicit. But owing to the conditions of society in ancient times there can be no doubt that a slave was, as a rule, much better off in a servile condition than if he were free; it was for this reason that the Hebrews had a special law laying down the procedure in the case of those who desired to continue bondmen "for ever". According to Jer. xxxiv. 8-24, however, permanent enslavement of Hebrew men and women is strongly denounced as a sin which will bring about national disaster. According to Lev. xxv. 45, 46, the Hebrew was permitted to buy Gentile slaves, who became personal property and were inherited by the owner's children. But the owner's power over his slaves was strictly limited by the law; if he punished a slave in such a way as to cause permanent bodily injury the slave gained his freedom as compensation; if a master chastised his slave so as to cause his death, he was treated as a murderer. Then, again, according to Hebrew law, a slave who had escaped was not to be delivered up again to his master. St. Paul cannot, of course, be accused of having broken this law in the case of Onesimus, since the latter returned voluntarily; but it is, however, possible that when St. Paul wrote, "For perhaps he was therefore parted from thee for a season, that thou shouldest have him for ever," he had in mind the law of the slave's voluntary return to his master in order to remain his "bondman for ever" (Deut. xv. 16, 17), and thought of how that law had been "fulfilled" by the teaching of Christ (see Matt. v. 17).

Much ancient traditional matter is contained in Talmudical writings; it is, therefore, interesting to note one or two *data* in these on the subject of slaves; it is said, for example, that the master of a Hebrew slave (man or woman) must place him on an equality with himself "in meat and drink, in lodging and bed-clothes, and must act towards him in a brotherly manner," so that a saying is preserved in *Kiddushin*, 20*a* that, "whosoever buys a Hebrew slave buys a master for himself". Again, the law concerning the escaped slave, referred to above, is in the Talmud construed as applying to one who flees from a place outside the Holy Land into it; but the slave must give the master from whom he has fled a bond for his value; if the master refuses to manumit the slave by deed, the court protects the former bondman in his refusal to serve further (*Gittin*, 45*a*). According to Rabbinical teaching a runaway slave who is recaptured must make good the time of his absence; if this is traditional and ancient law, which is very probable, it throws an interesting side-light upon our Epistle; in the first place, it may, in part, have been the reason for St. Paul's

insistence on the return of Onesimus to his master; and in the second place, it may have some bearing on the words in vv. 18, 19, "But if he hath wronged thee at all, or oweth thee aught, put that to mine account; I Paul write it with mine own hand, I will repay it"; these last words are perhaps meant literally, the reference being to manual labour, or the like, which St. Paul was prepared to undertake in order to make up for the time lost by Onesimus, this lost time having presumably occasioned loss to Philemon. For the above see further Exod. xxi. 2-11, Lev. xxv. 39-54, Deut. xv. 12-18, xxiii. 16, 17 (15, 16 R.V.); Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. des Judenthums* i. p. 947; *Jewish Encycl.* xi. 404 ff.

These few *data* are sufficient to show the spirit of mercy and fellow-feeling which characterised Jewish slavery.

Utterly different from this was the Roman system; this is well described in Lighfoot's *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 320 ff., and with great minuteness in Wallon's *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité* (2nd ed.), which is the chief authority on the subject. For details concerning slavery in the Roman empire recourse must be had to these works; and for a description of the appalling moral effects of the institution upon both masters and slaves, see Vincent's *Commentary*, pp. 163 ff. While there were undoubtedly exceptions, cp., *e.g.*, the letter written by the younger Pliny (Ep. ix. 21), quoted by Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 316, the general rule was that the Roman system was, practically, the antithesis of the Jewish.

St. Paul's attitude towards slavery must be understood in the light of the Jewish system; this contained within itself the germs of the Christian conception of man, which was bound sooner or later to prove fatal to slavery. "When the Gospel taught that God had made all men and women upon earth of one family; that all alike were His sons and His daughters; that, whatever conventional distinctions human society might set up, the supreme King of Heaven refused to acknowledge any; that the slave, notwithstanding his slavery, was Christ's freedman, and the free, notwithstanding his liberty, was Christ's slave; when the Church carried out this principle by admitting the slave to her highest privileges, inviting him to kneel side by side with his master at the same holy table; when, in short, the Apostolic precept that 'in Christ Jesus is neither bond nor free' was not only recognised, but acted upon, then slavery was doomed" (Lightfoot, *op. cit.* p. 325).

§ IV. *Literature*:—

Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, 1884.

Von Soden, "Philemon," in Holtzmann's *Hand Kommentar*, 1891.

Vincent, "Philemon," in the *International Critical Commentary*, 1897.

The articles on Philemon in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible* and Cheyne's *Encycl. Biblica*.

For the abbreviations in the Apparatus Criticus see the Introduction to *St. James*. The Greek text is that published by Nestle, 1907.

ΠΡΟΣ ΦΙΛΗΜΟΝΑ[1]

1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a] δέσμιος[2] Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ [b] ἀδελφὸς Φιλήμονι τῷ [c] ἀγαπητῷ[3] καὶ [d] συνεργῷ ἡμῶν, 2. καὶ Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ [e] ἀδελφῇ[4] καὶ [f] Ἀρχίππῳ τῷ [g] συνστρατιώτῃ ἡμῶν καὶ [h] τῇ κατ'

a Acts xxiii. 18, Eph. iii. 1.
b Col. i. 1.
c Acts xv. 25, Rom. xvi. 9.
d Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, Phil. ii. 25, Col. iv. 11, 3 John 8.
e Rom. xvi. 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 5.
f Col. iv. 9, 17, 2 Tim. ii. 3.
g Phil. ii. 25, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 3.
h Col. iv. 15.

[1] επιστολη πρ. φιλ. KL. [2] αποστολος D*E*; δουλος 33[a].

[3] + αδελφω D*E.

[4] αγαπητη DKL, rec.; + charissimae Vulg., Pesh., Syr[hark], Chrys., Theod., Dam.

Ver. 1. **δέσμιος Χρ. Ἰησ.**: to St. Paul an even more precious title than the usual official **ἀπόστολος Χρ. Ἰησ.**; *cf.* v. 13, **ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγ.**, "they were not shackles which self had riveted, but a chain with which Christ had invested him; thus they were a badge of office . . . " (Lightfoot) This title of honour is chosen, and placed in the forefront of the Epistle, not with the idea of touching the heart of Philemon, but rather to proclaim the bondage in which every true Christian must be, and therefore also the "beloved fellow-worker" Philemon. The title is meant, in view of what follows in the Epistle, to touch the conscience rather than the heart.—**Τιμόθεος**: associated with St. Paul in Acts xix. 22, 2 Cor. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, Col. i. 1; his mention here points to his personal friendship with Philemon.—**ὁ ἀδελφός**: often used by the Apostle when he desires to be especially sympathetic; here, therefore, the emphasis is intended to be upon the thought of the brotherhood of all Christians; this is significant in view of the object of the Epistle.—**Φιλήμονι**: See Intr., § II. —**συνεργῷ**: when they had worked together cannot be said with certainty; perhaps in Ephesus or Colossae. Probably what is meant is the idea of all Christians being fellow-workers.

Ver. 2. **Ἀπφίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ**: A Phrygian name, often occurring on Phrygian inscriptions. It is most natural to suppose that she was the wife of Philemon; but she must have occupied also, most likely, a quasi-official position in the Church; **τῇ ἀδελφῇ**, coming between **συνεργῷ** and **συνστρατιώτῃ**, suggests this, especially when one remembers the important part the ministry of women played in the early Church, *cf.* the labours, *e.g.*, of Mary, Tryphaena and Tryphosa, Persis, in connexion with whom the semi-technical term **κοπιᾶν** is used (see 1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, for the use of this word), and Prisca; on the whole subject see Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i., pp. 122 f., 161 f., 363 f. (1908).—**Ἀρχίππῳ**: there is nothing to show that he was the son of Philemon, rather the contrary, for why should the son be addressed in a letter which dealt with one of his father's slaves? The inclusion of his name must be due to the fact that he occupied an important position in the local church (*cf.* the words which follow in the text), which was thus, in a certain sense, included in the responsibility with regard to Onesimus. Archippus occupied, apparently, a more important position than Philemon (see Col. iv. 17, **βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν Κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς**,—if Philemon had occupied any such official position mention would certainly have been made of it), but this would be most unlikely to have been the case if the latter had been the father of the former. It is more

οἶκόν σου ἐκκλησίᾳ[h]· 3. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν[1] καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 4. [1]Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου[1] πάντοτε [k]μνείαν σου ποιούμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου,[k] 5. ἀκούων σου τὴν [l]ἀγάπην καὶ [m]τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις[m] [n]πρὸς[2] τὸν κύριον

i Rom. i. 18, 1 Cor. i. 4, Phil. i. 3, 1 Thess. i. 2, 2 Thess. i. 3.
k Rom. i. 10, Eph. i. 16, 1 Thess. i. 2.
l Phil. i. 9.
m 1 Tim. i. 19.
n *Cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8.

[1] Om. ℵ[1]. [2] εις ACD*, WH.

natural to regard him as the head of the local Church, who lived in the house where the members met for worship (*cf.* Theodoret's words, quoted by Lightfoot: **ὁ δὲ Ἄρχιππος τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτῶν ἐπεπίστευτο**). — **συνστρατιώτῃ**: only elsewhere in N.T., Phil. ii. 25, but for the metaphor *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, 1 Tim. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 3, 4,—**καὶ τῇ κατ' οἶκον . . .**: *Cf.* Acts xii. 12, Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15. Up to the third century we have no certain evidence of the existence of church buildings for the purposes of worship; all references point to private houses for this. In Rome several of the oldest churches appear to have been built on the sites of houses used for Christian worship; see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 421, who quote this interesting passage from the *Acta Justini Martyris*, § 2 (Ruinart): "Quaesivit Praefectus, quem in locum Christiani convenirent. Cui respondit Justinus, eo unumquemque convenire quo vellet ac posset. An, inquit, existimas omnes nos in eundem locum convenire solitos? Minime res ita se habet . . . Tunc Praefectus: Age, inquit, dicas, quem in locum conveniatis, et discipulos tuos congreges. Respondit Justinus: Ego prope domum Martini cuiusdam, ad balneum cognomento Timiotinum, hactenus mansi."

Ver. 3. **χάρις . . . εἰρήνη**: *Cf.* Rom. i. 7, the usual Pauline greeting (exc. I. 2 Tim.); it is a combination of the Greek salutation, **χαίρειν**, and the Hebrew one, שָׁלוֹם. In the N.T. the word **εἰρήνη** expresses the spiritual state, which is the result of a right relationship between God and man. According to Jewish belief, the establishment of peace, in this sense, was one of the main functions of the Messiah (*cf.* Luke ii. 14), it was herein that His mediatorial work was to be accomplished. —**πατρὸς**: see note on Jas. iii. 9. The phrase **ἀπὸ Θεοῦ . . . Χριστοῦ** expresses the essence of Judaism and Christianity.

Ver. 4. **πάντοτε**: belongs to **εὐχαριστῶ**, *cf.* Eph. i. 16, Phil. i. 3, Col. i. 3, 4.

Ver. 5. **ἀκούων**: probably from Epaphras, see Col. i. 7, 8, iv. 12 (Lightfoot). —**τὴν ἀγάπην . . .**: *i.e.*, the faith which thou hast towards the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love which thou showest to all the saints. "The logical order," says Lightfoot, "is violated, and the clauses are inverted in the second part of the sentence, thus producing an example of the figure called chiasm; see Gal. iv. 4, 5. This results here from the apostle's setting down the thoughts in the sequence in which they occur to him, without paying regard to symmetrical arrangement. The first and prominent thought is Philemon's love. This suggests the mention of his faith, as the source from which it springs. This again requires a reference to the object of faith. And then, at length, comes the deferred sequel to the first thought—the range and comprehensiveness of his love."—**πίστιν**: not "faithfulness," but "faith" (belief), *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 13, Gal. v. 6, 1 Thess. i. 3.—**πρὸς . . . εἰς**: the difference in these propositions is noteworthy, **πρὸς** refers to the "faith" to Christ-ward (*cf.* 1 Thess. i. 8), **εἰς** to the love to the saints; both are developed in vv. 6, 7.—**τοὺς ἁγίους**: St. Paul intends Onesimus to be thought of here. The original significance of the title **ἅγιος**, as applied to men, may be seen in such a phrase as, "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy" (Lev. xix. 2). To the Jew, like St. Paul, the corresponding root in Hebrew connoted the idea of something set apart, *i.e.*, consecrated to the service of God (*cf. e.g.*, Exod. xxii. 31 [29]). The **ἅγιοι** constituted originally the **ἐκκλησία**; and just as, according to the meaning underlying the Hebrew equivalent of the word **ἅγιος**, separation for God's service was the main conception, so, according to the root-meaning of **ἐκκλησία**, it connoted the idea of the body of those "called out," and thus separated from the world.

Ἰησοῦν[n] [1] καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς [o] ἁγίους, 6. ὅπως ἡ [p] κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου [q] ἐνεργὴς γένηται ἐν [r] ἐπιγνώσει παντὸς [2] ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ [3] ἐν ἡμῖν [4] εἰς Χριστόν· [5] 7. χαρὰν [6] γὰρ [7] πολλὴν ἔσχον [7] καὶ [s] παράκλησιν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, ὅτι τὰ [t] σπλάγχνα τῶν ἁγίων [u] ἀναπέπαυται διὰ σοῦ, [v] ἀδελφέ. 8. Διό, πολλὴν ἐν Χριστῷ [w] παρρησίαν ἔχων [8] [x] ἐπιτάσσειν σοι τὸ [y] ἀνῆκον. 9. διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην [9] μᾶλλον [z] παρακαλῶ, τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος [a] πρεσβύτης,

o Eph. i. 1, etc.
p Phil. ii. 1.
q 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 9, Gal. v. 6, Heb. iv. 12.
r 1 Cor. i. 6, Eph. i. 17, Col. i. 29.
s 2 Cor. vii. 4, 2 Thess. ii. 6.
t 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 2 Cor. vi. 12, vii. 13, 15, Phil. i. 8. u Matt. xi. 28, 1 Cor. xvi. 18, 2 Cor. vii. 13. v Gal. vi. 18. w 2 Cor. iii. 12, Eph. iii. 12, Phil. i. 20. x Mk. i. 27, vi. 27, 39, ix. 25. y Eph. v. 4, Col. iii. 18. z Eph. iv. 1. a Luke i. 18, Tit. ii. 2.

[1] + χριστον D[1], aeth. [2] + εργου FG, a, c, e, g, Vulg. [4] Om. AC.
[4] υμιν ℵFGP, curss., Syrr., Vulg[A], rec. [5] + Ιησουν ℵ[c]DFGKLP, m, Vulg.
[6] χαριν KL, a, Vulg[F], rec., Chrys., Theod., Dam., Thl.
[7—7] εχομεν πολλεν DCKL, a, m, Pesh., Syr[hark], Vulg[F], rec.; πολλεν εχω a.
[8] Habentes Vulg[F1]. [9] αναγκην A.

Ver. 6. **ὅπως**: belongs to **μνείαν σου ποιούμενος** . . . v. 5 is, as it were, in brackets. It would be more usual to have **ἵνα** here.—**κοινωνία**: the reference is to identity of faith; the fellowship among the saints, *cf.* Phil. i. 5. The word is used of a collection of money in Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 16.—**ἐν**: see 2 Cor. i. 6, Col. i. 29.—**ἐπιγνώσει**: the force of this word is seen in Phil. i. 9.—**παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ**: *cf.* Rom. xii. 2, xvi. 19, Col. i. 9.—**ἐν ἡμ. εἰς Χρ.**: it is not only a question of men who benefit by "every good thing," but also of the relationship to Christ; *cf.* Col. iii. 23.

Ver. 7. **ἔσχον**: the aorist expresses forcibly the moment of joy which St. Paul experienced when he heard this good news about Philemon.—**τὰ σπλάγχνα**: regarded as the seat of the emotions.—**ἀναπέπαυται**: the compound "expresses a temporary relief, the simple **παύεσθαι** expresses a final cessation" (Lightfoot).—**ἀδελφέ**: the place of the word here makes it emphatic, *cf.* Gal. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 1.

Ver. 8. **Διό**: *i.e.*, because of the good that he has heard concerning Philemon; he must keep up his reputation.—**ἐπιτάσσειν**: "to enjoin," or "command"; the word is used "rather of commanding which attaches to a definite office and relates to permanent obligations under the office, than of special injunctions for particular occasions" (Vincent).—**τὸ ἀνῆκον**: the primary meaning of the verb is that of "having arrived at," or "reached"; and, ultimately, that of fulfilling a moral obligation. The word occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Ephes. v. 4, Col. iii. 18.

Ver. 9. **τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς**: "**τοιοῦτος** can be defined only by a following adjective, or by **οἷος, ὅς, ὅσος**, or **ὥστε** with the infinitive; never by **ὡς**" (Vincent). It seems, therefore, best to take **τοιοῦτος ὢν** as referring to . . . **μᾶλλον παρακλῶ**, which is taken up again in the next verse; **ὡς Παῦλος . . . Ἰησοῦ** must be regarded as though in brackets; **τοιοῦτος ὢν** would then mean "one who beseeches".—**πρεσβύτης**: this can scarcely be in reference to age, for which **γέρων** would be more likely to have been used; besides, in Acts vii. 58, at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, the term **νεανίας** is applied to St. Paul. Lightfoot in his interesting note on this verse, says: "There is reason for thinking that in the common dialect **πρεσβύτης** may have been written indifferently for **πρεσβευτής** in St. Paul's time; and if so, the form here may be due, not to some comparatively late scribe, but to the original autograph itself or to an immediate transcript"; and he gives a number of instances of the form **πρεσβύτης** being used for **πρεσβευτής**. If, as seems very likely, we should translate the word "ambassador" here, then we have the striking parallel in the contemporary epistle to the Ephesians, vi. 20, **ὑπὲρ οὗ πρεσβεύω ἐν ἁλύσει**. Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 273) points out that both the verb **πρεσβεύω**, and the substantive **πρεσβευτής**, were used in the Greek Orient for expressing the title of the Legatus of the emperor. Accepting the meaning "ambassador" here, the significance of

b 1 Cor. iv. 14, Gal iv. 19, 1 Tim. i. 2.
c 1 Cor. iv. 15, Gal. iv. 19.
d Phil. i. 7.
e Col. iv. 9.
f Gal. i. 13.
g Col. i. 21.
h 2 Tim. ii. 21.
i Luke xxiii. 11.
k Luke iv. 22.

νυνὶ δὲ καὶ δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,[1] 10. παρακαλῶ σε περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ [b]τέκνου, ὃν [c]ἐγέννησα[2] ἐν τοῖς [d]δεσμοῖς,[3] [e]Ὀνήσιμον, 11. τὸν [f]ποτέ σοι ἄχρηστον [g]νυνὶ δὲ καὶ[4] σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ [h]εὔχρηστον, 12. ὃν [i][5]ἀνέπεμψά σοι, αὐτόν,[5] [6]τοῦτ' ἔστιν[6] τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα·[7] 13. ὃν ἐγὼ ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν [k]κατέχειν, ἵνα ὑπὲρ σοῦ μοι

[1] Om. Ιησου D[1]; Ιησου χριστου rec. [2] Pr. εγω A, m.

[3] + μου ℵ[c]CDEKLP, a, Syrr., rec.

[4] Om. και AKCDKLP, Pesh., rec., WH.

[5—5] ανεπεμψα· συ δε αυτον DE, a, rec.; remisi tibi. Tu autem illum Vulg.

[6—6] Ut Vulg[A]; id est Vulg[F].

[7] + προσλαβου CD, a, rec. (*cf.* v. 17); + suscipe Vulg.; the Pesh. reads "my son" for τα εμα σπλ.

the passage is much increased; for Christ's ambassador had the right to command, but in merely exhorting he throws so much more responsibility on Philemon. The word "ambassador" would be at least as strong an assertion of authority as "apostle"; to a Greek, indeed, more so.—**δέσμιος**: perhaps mentioned for the purpose of hinting that in respect of bondage his position was not unlike that of him for whom he is about to plead; *cf.* the way in which St. Paul identifies himself with Onesimus in vv. 12 . . . **αὐτόν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα**, and 17 . . . **ὡς ἐμέ**.—**Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**: belongs both to **πρεσβύτης** and to **δέσμιος**, *cf.* v. 1, Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 8.

Ver. 10. **ὃν ἐγέννησα**: *cf. Sanhedrin*, xix. 2 (Jer. Talm.), "If one teaches the son of his neighbour the Law, the Scripture reckons this the same as if he had begotten him" (quoted by Vincent).—**Ὀνήσιμον**: one would expect **Ὀνησίμου** it is attracted to **ὃν** . . . instead of agreeing with **τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου**. He is to be **ὀνήσιμος** in future, no longer **ἀνόνητος**.—**ἄχρηστον**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T., but used in the Septuagint, Hos. viii. 8, 2 Macc. vii. 5, Wisd. ii. 11, iii. 11, Sir. xvi. 1, xxvii. 19. As applied to Onesimus the reference must be to something wrong done by him; the fear of being punished for this was presumably his reason for running away from his master.—**νυνὶ δὲ**: a thoroughly Pauline expression, *cf.* v. 9, Rom. vi. 22, vii. 6, 17, xv. 23, 25, 1 Cor. v. 11, etc.—**εὔχρηστον**: only elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Tim. ii. 21, iv. 11.

Ver. 12. **ὃν ἀνέπεμψά σοι**: the aorist, in accordance with the epistolary style. It is clear from these words that Onesimus himself was the bearer of the letter, *cf.* Col. iv. 7-9. On St. Paul's insistence that Onesimus should return to his master, see Intr. § III.—**αὐτόν**: note the emphatic position of this word, *cf.* Eph. i. 22.—**ἐμά**: again emphatic in thus preceding the noun.

Ver. 13. **ἐγώ**: a further emphatic mode of expression.—**ἐβουλόμην**: **βούλεσθαι** connotes the idea of purpose, **θέλειν** simply that of willing. The differences between the tenses—**ἐβουλόμην** and **ἠθέλησα** (ver. 14)—is significant; "the imperfect implies a tentative, inchoate process; while the aorist describes a definite complete act. The will stepped in and put an end to the inclinations of the mind" (Lightfoot).—**κατέχειν**: "to detain," directly opposed to **ἀπέχῃς** in ver. 15. Deissmann (*Op cit.*, p. 222) points out that **κατέχω** is often used in papyri and on ostraka of *binding*, though in a magical sense.—**ὑπὲρ σοῦ**: "in thy stead," the implication being that Philemon is placed under an obligation to his slave; for the force of **ὑπὲρ** as illustrated on the papyri, etc., see Deissmann's important remarks on pp. 105, 241 ff. of his work already quoted.—**διακονῇ**: used in the Pauline Epistles both of Christian ministration generally (Rom. xi. 13; 1 Cor. xii. 5; Eph. iv. 12) and in special reference to bodily wants, such as alms can supply (1 Cor. xvi. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4).—**ἐν τοῖς δεσμ. τοῦ εὐαγγ.**: *i.e.*, the bonds which the Gospel had tied, and which necessitated his being ministered unto.—**τοῦ εὐαγγελίου**: see Mark i. 14, 15 and *cf.* Matt. iv. 23; Christ uses the word often in reference to the Messianic Era. "The earliest instances of the use of **εὐαγγέλιον** in the sense of a book would be: Did. 8, 11, 15 *bis*; Ign.

[l] διακονῇ ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 14. χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς [m] γνώμης οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ [n] ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθόν σου ᾖ ἀλλὰ κατὰ [1] ἑκούσιον. 15. [o] τάχα γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο [p] ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὥραν, ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν [q] ἀπέχῃς, 16. οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον [2] ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ δοῦλον,[2] [r] ἀδελφὸν [3] ἀγαπητόν, [s] μάλιστα ἐμοί, [t] πόσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον σοὶ καὶ [u] ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ [v] ἐν κυρίῳ. 17. εἰ οὖν με ἔχεις [w] κοινωνόν, [x] προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ. 18. εἰ δέ τι [y] ἠδίκησέν σε ἢ [z] ὀφείλει, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ [a] ἐλλόγα·[4] 19. [b] ἐγὼ Παῦλος ἔγραψα τῇ

l Matt. xxvii. 55, Acts xix. 22, Rom. xv. 25, Heb. vi. 10.
m Acts xx. 3.
n 2 Cor. ix. 7, Heb. vii. 12.
o Rom. v. 7.
p 1 Cor. vii. 11, 15.
q Matt. v. 16, vi. 2, Phil. iv. 18.
r Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7, 9.
s 1 Tim. iv. 10.
t Rom. xi. 12, 24.
u 1 Tim. iii. 16.
v Rom. xvi. 2, Phil. ii. 29.
w 1 Cor. x. 18, 20.
x Acts xxviii. 2, Rom. xiv. 1, 3, xv. 7.
y Matt. xx. 13, 1 Cor. vi. 8.
z Matt. xviii. 28.
a Rom. v. 13.
b Gal. vi. 11, 2 Thess. iii. 17.

[1] Om. D. [2—2] Om. F. [3] Om. ℵ[1]. [4] ελλογει KL, rec.

Philad. 5, 8 (Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 319).

Ver. 14. With the thought of this verse *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 7, 1 Peter v. 2.—**ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην**: "St. Paul does not say **κατὰ ἀνάγκην** but **ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην**. He will not suppose that it would really be constraint; but it must not even wear the *appearance* (**ὡς**) of being so. *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 17, **ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ**" (Lightfoot).

Ver. 15. **ἐχωρίσθη**: a very delicate way of putting it.—**πρὸς ὥραν**: *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 8, Gal. ii. 5.—**αἰώνιον**: there is no reason why this should not be taken in a literal sense, the reference being to Onesimus as **ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητόν**, not as **δοῦλον**.—**ἀπέχῃς**: *cf.* Phil. iv. 18, although the idea of restitution is prominent here, that of complete possession seems also to be present in view of **αἰώνιον** and **ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπ.**, but see further Intr., § III.

Ver. 16. **οὐκέτι ὡς δοῦλον**: no longer in the character of a slave, according to the world's acceptation of the term, though still a slave (see, however, the note on v. 21); but the relationship between slave and master were in this instance to become altered.—**πόσῳ δὲ μᾶλλον . . .**: *i.e.*, more than most of all (which he had been to St. Paul) to thee.—With the thought of the verse *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 2.

Ver. 17. **ἔχεις . . .**: for this use of **ἔχω** *cf.* Luke xiv. 18, Phil. ii. 29.—**κοινωνόν**: for the idea see Rom. xii. 13, xv. 26 f., 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13, Gal. vi. 6, Phil. iv. 15, 1 Tim. vi. 18, Heb. xiii. 16.—**προσλαβοῦ αὐτὸν ὡς ἐμέ**: *cf.* **τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα** in v. 12. An interesting parallel (given by Deissmann, *op. cit.* pp. 128 f.) occurs in a papyrus of the second century, written in Latin by a freedman, Aurelius Archelaus, to the military tribune, Julius Domitius: "Already once before have I commended unto thee my friend Theon. And now again, I pray thee, my lord, that he may be in thy sight as I myself" (ut eum ant' oculos habeas tanquam me).

Ver. 18. **εἰ δέ τι**: as Lightfoot says, the case is stated hypothetically, but the words doubtless describe the actual offence of Onesimus.—**ἐλλόγα**: only elsewhere in N.T. in Rom. v. 13; it occurs on the papyri (Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 52), "to reckon unto"; here, in the sense: "put it down to my account".

Ver. 19. **ἐγὼ Παῦλος**: "The introduction of his own name gives it the character of a formal and binding signature, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 21, Col. iv. 18, 2 Thess. iii. 17" (Lightfoot).—**ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ ἀποτίσω**: **ἔγρ.** epistolary aorist, *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 12, 1 John ii. 14, 21, 26. Deissmann (*op. cit.*, p. 239) calls attention to the large number of papyri which are acknowledgments of debt (Schuldhandschrift); a stereotyped phrase which these contain is, "I will repay," usually expressed by **ἀποδώσω**; in case the debtor is unable to write a representative who can do so expressly adds, "I have written this for him". The following is an example: ". . . which we also will repay . . . besides whatever else there is (**ἄλλων ὧν**) which we owe over and above . . . I, Papos, write it for him, because he cannot write". See also Deissmann's *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 67, under **χειρόγραφον**. It seems certain from the words **ἔγραψα . . .** (*cf.* also v. 21) that St. Paul wrote the whole of this epistle himself; this was quite exceptional, as he usually employed an

ἐμῇ χειρί, [b] ἀποτίσω· [c] ἵνα μὴ λέγω [c] σοι ὅτι καὶ σεαυτόν μοι προσοφείλεις.[1] 20. [d] ναί, ἀδελφέ, ἐγώ σου [e] ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ· ἀνάπαυσόν μου τὰ σπλάγχνα [f] ἐν Χριστῷ.[2] 21. [g] Πεποιθὼς τῇ [h] ὑπακοῇ σου ἔγραψά σοι, εἰδὼς ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἃ [3] λέγω ποιήσεις. 22. ἅμα δὲ καὶ [h] [i] ἑτοίμαζέ μοι [k] ξενίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι [l] διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν [m] χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν. 23. Ἀσπάζεταί [4] σε [n] Ἐπαφρᾶς ὁ [o] συναιχμάλωτός μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 24. [p] Μάρκος, [q] Ἀρίσταρχος,

c 2 Cor. ix. 4. d Phil. iv. 3. e Cf. Sir. xxx. 2. f Rom. xvi. 7, 9. g Phil. i. 14. h Rom. i. 5. 1 Cor. vii. 15, x. 5, 6, Heb. v. 8, 1 Pet. i. 2, 14, 22. i 2 Tim. ii. 21, 1 Cor. ii. 9, Heb. xi. 16. k Acts xxviii. 23. l Rom. xii. 3, Gal. i. 18, Phil. i. 19. m Acts iii. 14, xxvii. 24, 1 Cor. ii. 12. n Col. i. 7, iv. 12. o Rom. xvi. 7, Col. iv. 10. p Col. iv. 10. q Acts xxvii. 2.

1 + εν κυριω D*E*. 2 κυριω EK, a, rec.
3 ο DE, a, rec. 4 ασπαζονται KL, a, rec.

amanuensis; the quasi-private character of the letter would account for this. See, further, Lightfoot's note on Gal. vi. 11.—**ἀποτίσω**: a stronger form than the more usual **ἀποδώσω**. As a matter of fact St. Paul, in a large measure, had repaid whatever was due to Philemon by being the means whereby the latter received his slave back, but see Intr. § III.—**ἵνα μὴ λέγω σοι**: a kind of mental ejaculation, as though St. Paul were speaking to himself; the **σοι** does not properly belong to the phrase; *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 4.—**καὶ σεαυτόν**: the reference is to Philemon's conversion, either directly due to St. Paul, or else indirectly through the mission into Asia Minor, which had been the means whereby Philemon had become a Christian; in either case St. Paul could claim Philemon as his spiritual child in the sense that he did in the case of Onesimus (see v. 10).—**μοι προσοφείλεις**: "thou owest me over and above". See further, on **ὀφειλή**, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, p. 48, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 46, 239.

Ver. 20. **ναί**: *cf.* Phil. iv. 3, **ναὶ ἐρωτῶ καὶ σέ**.—**ἀδελφέ**: an affectionate appeal, *cf.* Gal. iii. 15, vi. 1-18.—**ἐγώ**: "The emphatic **ἐγώ** identifies the cause of Onesimus with his own" (Lightfoot).—**σου ὀναίμην**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T., it occurs once in the Septuagint (Ecclus. xxx. 2), and several times in the Ignatian Epp. (Eph. ii. 2, Magn. ii. 12, Rom. v. 2, Pol. i. 1, vi. 2). **Ὀν.** is a play on the name Onesimus, lit., "May I have profit of thee"; Lightfoot says that the common use of the word **ὀναίμην** would suggest the thought of filial offices, and gives a number of instances of its use. It is the only proper optative in the N.T. which is not in the third person (Moulton, *Grammar of N.T. Greek*, p. 195).—**ἀνάπαυσον**: see note on v. 7.—**ἐν Χριστῷ**: St. Paul refers to the real source from which the **ἀναπαύειν** gets its strength.

Ver. 21. **τῇ ὑπακοῇ σου**: a hint regarding the authority which St. Paul has a right to wield.—**ἔγραψα**: see note on v. 19.—**ὑπὲρ ἅ**: as it stands this is quite indefinite, but there is much point in Lightfoot's supposition that the thought of the manumission of Philemon was in St. Paul's mind; "throughout this epistle the idea would seem to be present to his thoughts, though the word never passes his lips. This reserve is eminently characteristic of the Gospel. Slavery is never directly attacked as such, but principles are inculcated which must prove fatal to it."—**λέγω**: note the tense here, a very vivid touch after **ἔγραψα**.

Ver. 22. **ἅμα** . . . *i.e.*, at the same time that he does what he is going to do for Onesimus. **ἑτοίμαζέ μοι**: Lightfoot's remark that "there is a gentle compulsion in this mention of a personal visit to Colossae," does not seem justified in view of the stress that St. Paul lays on Philemon's action being wholly voluntary, see vv. 10, 14; it is more probable that this is merely an incidental mention of what had been planned some time before, namely another missionary journey to Asia Minor and Greece (see Phil. ii. 24), without any thought of influencing Philemon's action thereby.—**ξενίαν**: only here and in Acts xxviii. 23, in the N.T.

Ver. 23. **συναιχμάλωτος**: lit. "a prisoner of war," used metaphorically like **συνστρατιώτης**, see note on ver. 2; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 7, where the word is used in reference to Andronicus and Junius.

Ver. 24. **Μάρκος**: *i.e.*, John Mark, *cf.* Acts xii. 25, xv. 37, Phil. iv. 10; he

[r] Δημᾶς, [r] Λουκᾶς, οἱ [s] συνεργοί μου. 25. Ἡ [t] χάρις τοῦ ⸆ κυρίου[1] ⸆Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ τοῦ [u] πνεύματος ὑμῶν.[2]

r Col. iv. 14.
s Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, 1 Cor. iii. 9.
t Col. iv. 18.
u Gal. vi. 18, Phil. iv. 23, 2 Tim. iv. 22.

[1] + ημων Vulg., rec. [2] + αμην ℵC, m, Vulg., rec.

Subscr.: προς Φιλημονα (και Απφιαν δεσποτας Ονησιμου και προς Αρχιππον το νδιακονον της εν Κολοσσαις εκκλησιας) εγραφη απο Ρωμης (δια Ονησιμου οικετου). [Αλλα δη και μαρτυς Χριστου γεγενηται ο μακαριος Ονησιμος εν τη Ρωμαιων πολει επι Τερτουλλου τηνικαυτα την επαρχικην εξουσιαν διεποντος τη των σκελων κλασει την ψηφον υπομεινας του μαρτυριον].

and Aristarchus were Jewish-Christians (Col. iv. 11).—**Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς**: Gentile Christians (*cf.* Acts xvi. 10, xx. 5, 6, xxi. 15, xxvii. 2); the former name is a contraction of Δημήτριος (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10).

Ver. 25. **Ἡ χάρις**: *cf.* Gal. vi. 18, 2 Tim. iv. 22.—**ὑμῶν**: the reference is both to those addressed by name in the opening of the Epistle, as well as to the members of the local Church, see verse 2. This final verse is a reiteration of the grace pronounced in verse 3.

THE EPISTLE

TO THE

HEBREWS

INTRODUCTION.

History of the Epistle. The early history of this Epistle has already been so fully narrated in various accessible volumes, that a bare outline may here suffice. Its chief interest is the illustration it gives of the difficulties which an anonymous book had to overcome before it won for itself a place in the Canon. The significance of the story of its fortunes may be gathered from the statement of Eusebius:[1] "Paul's fourteen Epistles are well known and undisputed. It is not indeed right to overlook the fact that some have rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, saying that it is disputed by the Church of Rome on the ground that it was not written by Paul." The Church, that is to say, looked with suspicion, or at any rate hesitation, on any candidate for canonical honours which had not the authentication of apostolic authorship. And although the Epistle to the Hebrews *really* won for itself a place in the Canon by its intrinsic merit, by its cardinal importance as the final adjustment of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as well as by its marked ability and felicitous style, yet it had to steal into its place under the cloak of an apostle, and it is doubtful whether it would have won universal acceptance had it not been attached, loosely enough it is true, to the collection of Paul's Epistles. Even though there was no certainty regarding its authorship in any part of the church, and in some parts a distinct and expressed conviction that it was not from the hand of Paul, yet obviously it was too rich a treasure to lose; and because it was not unworthy of the great apostle nor wholly alien from his way of thinking, it was allowed to attach itself to his Epistles, and so, happily, found a place in the Canon.

The difficulty to which Eusebius alludes, as experienced by the Western or Latin Church, was of ancient date. For although the earliest traces of the use of the Epistle are found in Clement of Rome (*c.* 96 A.D.) who betrays familiarity with it, yet no Western writer of the second century acknowledges it as canonical. It was not included in the collection of Pauline Epistles which Marcion

[1] *H. E.*, iii. 3.

formed in the first half of that century, and Tertullian, though objecting to his omission of the Pastoral Epistles, makes no remark upon his rejection of Hebrews. In the latter half of the century Roman opinion is represented by the Muratorian canon, which makes no mention of the Epistle at all, unless, as some have fancied, it is alluded to as that "ad Alexandrinos".[1] The prevalent Roman opinion is represented by the presbyter Caius who did not accept the Epistle as Pauline.[2] According to Photius, Hippolytus also denied the Pauline authorship; and in the earliest Old Latin Version the Epistle was omitted.

In the North African branch of the Latin Church not only was the Pauline authorship denied, but the Epistle was definitely ascribed to Barnabas. Tertullian (*De Pudic.*, c. 20) in citing Hebrews vi. 4-8 claims for the Epistle only a subordinate authority [" idoneum *confirmandi de proximo jure* disciplinam magistrorum "] because it was written not by an apostle, but by a "comes apostolorum," whom he unhesitatingly speaks of as Barnabas.

Meanwhile, however, in the Eastern Church the Pauline authorship was maintained. The Syrian Church accepted the Epistle into its earliest canon; and even if translated by a different and later hand than the other Epistles, this cannot be ascribed to any reluctance to receive it as canonical.[3] In Alexandria towards the close of the second century it is accepted as Pauline by Pantaenus and Clement.[4] But as criticism was cultivated with some diligence in this Church, it could not escape notice that both in its anonymity and in its style this Epistle differed from those of Paul. The absence of the usual Pauline address Pantaenus explained as due to the modesty of the Apostle, who would not even seem to usurp the place which belonged to the Lord Himself as Apostle of the Hebrews.[5] Clement accounted for the difference in style by the supposition that the Epistle was originally written by Paul in Hebrew and afterwards translated by Luke, while the absence of signature is referred to the natural fear lest the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles might repel Hebrew readers. The opinion in which the Church of Alexandria in general rested may be gathered from the words of Origen:[6] "If I

[1] "Fertur etiam ad Laodicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fictae ad haeresem Marcionis, et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest; fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit."

[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 20. Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.*, c. 59.

[3] Dr. Bewer (*A. J. T.*, April, 1900, p. 358) dates its introduction to the Syrian canon in the third century.

[4] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 14.

[5] Adopted by Jerome, *Ep. ad Gal.*

[6] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

gave my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are those of the Apostle, but the phrasing and composition are those of some one who remembered what the teacher had said. If then any church holds this Epistle to be Paul's, let it be commended for this. For not without reason (εἰκῇ) have our predecessors (οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες) handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote the Epistle, in truth God knows. The account that has reached us is, that some say it was written by Clement who became bishop of the Romans, while others ascribed it to Luke, the author of the Gospel and Acts."

Unsatisfactory as such a decision was, the idea that the Epistle was Paul's generally[1] prevailed over the whole Church, so that from the fifth century to the reformation, there were few who took the trouble to inquire. The conversion of the Latin Church to this opinion was mainly due to the influence of Augustine and Jerome. The formulæ under which the latter writer cited the Epistle reveal his personal dubiety. "The Epistle which, under the name of Paul, is written to the Hebrews." "He who writes to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul, or whoever else wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews." "The Apostle Paul in the Epistle to Hebrews, which the Latin custom does not receive." He mentions that the Greek writers accept it as Paul's, although many ascribe it either to Barnabas or Clement.[2] It would apparently, have taken little to persuade Jerome that the latter opinion was well-grounded, for he had himself noticed a striking similarity between the Epistle of Clement and that to the Hebrews.[3] In short, we find that Jerome acted in regard to this Epistle on the principle he carried through his formation of the Vulgate canon, the principle that it was better to include than to exclude a good book and that prevalent opinion must be allowed a great weight.

Instructive also is Augustine's treatment of the Epistle. Sometimes he reckons it among Paul's, sometimes he cites it anonymously ["epistola quae ad Hebraeos inscribitur," or "est"]; sometimes he calls attention to the doubts entertained regarding it by others, but professes that for his part he is moved by the authority of the Eastern Churches. The facile and uncritical spirit of the time is conspicuous in the manner in which the councils of North Africa dealt with this

[1] For exceptions in the Western Church, see Westcott On *the Canon*, p. 401.

[2] "Licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur," *Ep. ad. Dardanum*.

[3] "Clemens scripsit . . . utilem epistolam . . . quae mihi videtur characteri epistolae, quae sub Pauli nomine ad Hebraeos fertur, convenire," *De Vir. Illus.*, c. 15.

Epistle. In the council of Hippo in 393, while Augustine was still a presbyter, and in the third council of Carthage, held in 398, the prevalent dubiety regarding the authorship of Hebrews found expression in the enumeration of the New Testament books, "of the Apostle Paul, thirteen Epistles, of the same to the Hebrews, one". But in the fifth council of Carthage, in 419, where Augustine was also present, this feeble and meaningless distinction is abandoned and the enumeration boldly runs, "of the Epistles of Paul in number fourteen".

It is not easy to determine how much or how little we are justified in concluding from these early opinions and traditions. That the ecclesiastical voice gradually settled upon the great name of Paul, if it does not do much credit to the critical sagacity of the Early Church, at least shows that no other name was satisfactory. That Clement should have been mentioned as a possible author, naturally results from the abundant and free use he makes of the Epistle, as well as from his friendship with Paul, and his position as a writer of repute. That Paul's still more prominent ally, Barnabas, should have been credited with the Epistle was possibly the result of its quite superficial resemblance to the well-known and widely-read but spurious *Epistle of Barnabas*. Evidently, however, it is the Epistle itself which must divulge the secret of its authorship if we are at all to ascertain it.

Authorship. The bare reading of the Epistle suffices to convince us that the Pauline authorship may be set aside as incredible. The style is not Paul's, and this Apostle although using an amanuensis, undoubtedly dictated all his letters. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals a literary felicity not found elsewhere in the New Testament. The writer is master of his words, and perfectly understands how to arrange each clause so that every word shall play its full part in conveying with precision the meaning intended. He knows how to build up his sentences into concise paragraphs, each of which carries the argument one stage nearer to its conclusion. He avoids all irrelevant digressions. His earnestness of purpose never betrays him into carelessness of language, but only serves to give edge and point to its exact use. In all this he markedly and widely differs from the tempestuousness of Paul. As Farrar says: "The writer cites differently from St. Paul; he writes differently; he argues differently; he thinks differently; he declaims differently; he constructs and connects his sentences differently; he builds up his paragraphs on a wholly different model. St. Paul is constantly mingling two constructions, leaving sentences unfinished, breaking

into personal allusions, substituting the syllogism of passion for the syllogism of logic. This writer is never ungrammatical, he is never irregular, he is never personal, he never struggles for expression; he never loses himself in a parenthesis; he is never hurried into an anacoluthon. His style is the style of a man who thinks as well as writes in Greek; whereas St. Paul wrote in Greek but thought in Syriac." The same difference was felt by those who themselves used the Greek language. Thus Origen[1] says: "That the verbal style of the Epistle entitled 'to the Hebrews' is not rude like the language of the Apostle who acknowledged himself 'rude in speech,' that is, in expression; but that its diction is purer Greek, any one who has the power to discern differences of phraseology will acknowledge."[2]

But if the style puts it beyond question that Paul cannot have been the immediate author of the Epistle is it not possible to believe with Origen that "the thoughts are those of the Apostle"? This also must be answered in the negative. There is in the Epistle nothing discordant with Pauline doctrine, but its argument moves on different lines and in a different atmosphere from those with which the Apostle to the Gentiles makes us familiar. This is most readily discerned when we consider the attitude held by the two authors respectively to the fundamental idea of Jewish religion, the Law. Paul views the Mosaic economy mainly as a law commanding and threatening. The writer to the Hebrews views it rather as a vast congeries of institutions, observances and promises. To the one writer the Law is mainly juridical; to the other it is ceremonial. To the ardent spirit of Paul athirst for righteousness, the Law with its impracticable precepts had become a nightmare, the embodiment of all that barred access to God and life. The grace of Christianity throwing open the gates of righteousness was the antithesis and

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 25.

[2] "Diversity of style is more easily felt by the reader than expressed by the critic, without at least a tedious analysis of language; one simple and tangible test presents itself, however, in the use of connecting particles, inasmuch as these determine the structure of sentences. A minute comparison of these possesses therefore real importance in the differentiation of language. Now in the Epistles of St. Paul εἴ τις occurs fifty times, εἴτε sixty-three, ποτε (in affimative clauses) nineteen, εἶτα (in enumerations) six, εἰ δὲ καὶ, four, εἴπερ five, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ three, εἴγε four, μήπως twelve, μηκέτι ten, μενοῦνγε three, ἐάν eighty-eight times, while none of them are found in the Epistle except ἐάν and that only once (or twice), except in quotations. On the other hand, ὅθεν which occurs six times and ἐάνπερ which occurs three times in the Epistle are never used by St. Paul." Rendall's *Theol. of Hebrew Christianity*, p. 27.

abolition of the law. But to this writer, brought up in a more latitudinarian school and of a quieter temperament, the law was not this inexorable taskmaster, but rather a system of type and symbol foreshadowing the perfect fellowship with God secured by Christianity and revealed in Him. Both writers have the same question before them: What gives Christianity its power to bring men into harmony with God and thus constitutes it the universal, permanent religion? What precisely is the relation of this new form of religion to that out of which it sprang and which it supersedes? Paul boldly enounces the incompatibility of faith and works, of grace and merit, of Christianity and the Law. This writer, adopting a method and a view more likely to conciliate the Jew, aims at exhibiting the work of Christianity as that towards which the previous economy had been striving, that the two are essentially connected, and that without Christianity Judaism remains imperfect.[1]

So that Pfleiderer's remark is justified, when he says, "this is a thoroughly original attempt to establish the most essential results of Paulinism upon new presuppositions and in an entirely independent way—a way which proceeds upon lines of thought regarding the constitution of the universe which were widely spread amongst the educated people of that time, and which necessarily had far greater power of diffusing enlightenment than the dialectic of the old Pauline system which was so highly wrought up to an individual standpoint."[2]

Here and there the ideas and expressions of Paul seem to be coloured by the Alexandrian system and manner of thought, which, as Pfleiderer says, influenced the entire educated world of the time; but in the mind of Paul there lay a deeper soil in which had been sown the governing ideas of Palestinian or Pharisaic theology. The work and person of Christ are presented under different categories by the two writers: the priestly function, which is absent or almost so from the letters of Paul, dominates the thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In keeping with this, the idea of sacrifice which colours the whole of the latter Epistle, only occasionally emerges in the Pauline writings. So too it is the kingly state of the risen Christ which occupies the one writer, while in the mind of the other it is a priestly exaltation that is conspicuous. And thus the δικαιοῦν of Paul becomes in Hebrews ἁγιάζειν, or καθαρίζειν or τελειοῦν; and the leading religious terms "faith" "grace" and so forth have

[1] *Cf.* Ménégoz (*Théol. de l'ep. aux Heb.*, 190) "L'un abolit la Loi, l'autre la transfigure"; and p. 197, the one was revolutionist, the other evolutionist. See also Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, ii., p. 286 ff. Verhältniss zum Paulinismus.

[2] *Paulinism*, E. Tr., ii., 53.

one meaning in Paul and another in this Epistle. Evidently the suggestion that Luke was on this occasion Paul's interpreter is quite insufficient to satisfy the conditions.[1]

If the Epistle cannot be ascribed to Paul, must we fall back upon Tertullian's statement,[2] and accept Barnabas as the author? This solution cannot be said to have ever been prevalent in the early Church, notwithstanding the meagre references unearthed by Prof. Bartlet and Mr. Ayles. Over against these references may be set the significant words of Jerome, who designates this ascription of authorship as "juxta Tertullianum," apparently implying that in all his vast store of information he had found no one else holding this opinion. Origen, too, knows nothing of such a tradition. It was, however, revived in the seventeenth century by the Scottish scholar, Cameron, and in more recent times has found supporters in Ritschl, Weiss, Renan, Salmon and Vernon Bartlet.[3] Zahn, who formerly advocated the same authorship, is now less certain. The claims of Barnabas are also urged with fulness and force by Mr. Ayles in an essay devoted to this object.[4] There can be no doubt that Barnabas answers many of the requirements which must be met by any presumed author of the Epistle. He belonged to the circle of Paul and was a man of character and of capacity; he was a Levite and as such predisposed to consider the Christ and His work in its bearing on the Old Testament ritual;[5] he was a native of Cyprus where good Greek was spoken, and at the same time was well known and influential in the Church at Jerusalem. The tradition that Mark, his nephew, introduced the Gospel into Alexandria, might be pressed to indicate some connection with that centre of thought. This, however, tells also against his authorship, for it is unaccountable that Barnabas' name should have been lost in the Church where his nephew presided. It must also be kept in view that the association

[1] The similarities to the usage of Luke in the vocabulary of the Epistle have been examined with final thoroughness by Prof. Frederic Gardiner in the *Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis* for June 1887. See also Alexander's *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, 3rd ed., pp. 302-324; and W. H. Simcox in the *Expositor* for 1888.

[2] *De Pudicitia*, c. 20. "Extat enim et Barnabae titulus ad Hebraeos, adeo satis auctoritati viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiae tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6); et utique receptior apud ecclesias epistola Barnabae illo apocrypho Pastore moechorum."

[3] *Expositor*, 1902.

[4] *Destination, Date and Authorship of Ep. to Heb.* (Cambridge, 1899).

[5] For supposed mistakes regarding the Temple and its service, *cf.* Zahn, ii., 55,156.

of Barnabas with the Church at Jerusalem only tells in his favour if that be considered the destination of the Epistle. It is, of course, a mere accident that his designation, υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (Acts iv. 36) should correspond with the description of this Epistle as a λόγος παρακλήσεως (Heb. xiii. 22).

Harnack, who had previously[1] considered it probable that Barnabas was the author, has recently[2] in a forcible and brilliant manner urged the claims of Prisca and Aquila. In their favour are such points as these: that the letter proceeds from a highly cultured teacher, answering to the description given in Acts xviii. 26 of Aquila and Prisca; that it was written by one who belonged to the Pauline circle, as there is no doubt that this couple did (Rom. xvi. 3 συνεργοί); that the writer was associated with Timothy, as Aquila and Prisca were for eighteen months in Corinth as well as in Ephesus (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 19); that he belonged to one of the house-churches in Rome (to which presumably the Epistle was addressed) and that he had taught there—which corresponds with what we know of Aquila and Prisca (see Acts xviii. 2, Rom. xvi. 3); that behind the writer of the Epistle there is some one or more with whom he associates himself in a common "we," for in the letter there are not merely the literary "we" and the "we" which includes writer and readers, but a third use of the pronoun embracing some unnamed person or persons as uniting with the writer in what he says. "If on the ground of these arguments it be considered probable that the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be referred to this couple, it may then be asked whether Prisca or Aquila wrote it. And if the predominant position of the woman, witnessed by both Paul and Luke, be considered, as well as the incontestable fact that she was foremost in winning Apollos, the balance must incline in favour of her authorship." It is thus he accounts for the most paradoxical feature in the history of the Epistle, the loss of the author's name. This disappearance is at once accounted for, if Prisca was even partly the author, for Paul's prohibition of female teaching in the Church had taken deep root.

That there is in these arguments not merely ingenuity, but much that deserves consideration, will not be denied. Indeed, so careful and sound a scholar as Bleek almost convinced himself that Aquila was the author of the Epistle, and expresses surprise that his claims should not have been urged.[3] But there are grave difficulties in the

[1] *Chronologie*, p. 477-479.

[2] Preuschen's *Zeitschrift*, vol. i., 16-41.

[3] Hebräer-brief, i., 421, 422. Harnack's claim to originality [niemand an sie gedacht hat] is valid only so far as Prisca is concerned.

double, predominantly feminine authorship advocated by Harnack. A single authorship is unquestionably demanded by certain expressions in the Epistle, as τί ἔτι λέγω, xi. 32; ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν, xiii. 19; and the singulars in xiii. 22, 23. It is not possible to construe these singulars as referring to more than one writer: but it is quite possible to construe the plurals of the Epistle as referring to the single writer or to the writer uniting himself with his readers. And that this one writer should have been Prisca is certainly improbable, both on account of Paul's prohibition which so good a friend as Prisca would observe, and because the writer seems to have been one of the ἡγούμενοι, which Prisca could not have been. The impression made by the Epistle is that it proceeds from a masculine mind; and if the Epistle is due to either we should suppose Aquila was more likely to undertake such a task. The familiarity which existed between this couple and Apollos might be supposed to account for the Alexandrian colouring of the Epistle.

The name of Apollos was suggested by Luther[1] who apparently had either heard or read that this authorship had been advocated by others. It has received the suffrages of scholars so competent as Bleek, Tholuck, Hilgenfeld, Lünemann, Reuss, Pfleiderer, Alford, Farrar and Plumptre. In Acts xviii. 24 Apollos is described as an Alexandrian Jew, a learned man, mighty in the Scriptures, who had been instructed in the way of the Lord and who spoke and taught with accuracy the things concerning Jesus. Passing from Ephesus, where he first appears in Christian history, to Achaia "he helped them much who had believed through grace, and powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ". Paul also testifies to his influence as a teacher and probably indicates that his special function was that of carrying to maturity those who had already received the truth. The words "Paul planted, Apollos watered" bear this interpretation, and agree with what is said in Acts of his peculiar work. Certainly all this remarkably corresponds with the characteristics of the writer to the Hebrews, who certainly was a Jew of the Alexandrian school, a man of marked ability and culture, whose special training fitted him to build up in the faith and to find in the Scriptures

[1] "Autor Epistolae ad Hebraeos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo" (*Com. on Gen.*); and in his sermon on 1 Cor iii. 4 "the Ep. Heb. is certainly his" [Apollos']. In another sermon he says "Some suppose the Epistle to be Luke's, some refer it to Apollos" ["etliche meinen, sie sei S. Lucas, etliche S. Apollo"]. The most thorough presentation of the claim of Apollos is that by Plumptre in the first vol. of the *Expositor*.

proof that Jesus was the Christ. This, plainly, does not prove that Apollos was the author, but it lends plausibility to the hypothesis.

Destination. Here, again, however, we find the authorship implicated with the destination of the Epistle. The only places with which we know Apollos to have been connected are Ephesus, Corinth and Crete. The first named city was swarming with Jews and was also impregnated with Alexandrianism. Corinth resembled it in the former and possibly also in the latter characteristic, for the preaching of Apollos had certainly found in that city a very responsive hearing; and it is the only place in which we have any positive reason to believe that he resided for any length of time. But evidently he was a man who moved about (Tit. iii. 13); and it is not improbable that he may have visited Rome. Evidently, however, if we are to come any nearer to a determination of the authorship, we must first of all try to ascertain the destination of the letter.

We may put aside the idea that it was not addressed to any particular Church but was a homily written for all whom it might concern. This idea has been plausibly stated by Reuss. "The Epistle to the Hebrews," he says, "is not a letter properly so called written in view of a local necessity; and the few personal and circumstantial details added on the last page were certainly not the reasons which prompted the author to write. This book may have been already penned and actually concluded when occasion offered to make it useful to a particular circle of Christians and in reference to whom he may have added the 13th chapter. The 'Hebrews' whose name is inserted by the care of a later reader (also truly inspired) are not, as has been imagined, the members of some isolated community, as *e.g.*, the Church at Jerusalem; they are Jewish Christians in general, considered from a theoretical point of view." This view has been adopted by Lipsius and others, and at the first blush it may seem to have something to say for itself, for letters do not usually begin without giving the name of the writer and of his correspondents. But the idea that the entire document is a treatise written in the study without definite reference to any particular group of Christians, is contradicted not merely by the personal references of the 13th chapter, but by the occurrence throughout the Epistle of expressions which have no meaning if not so addressed. Indeed, no Epistle more exclusively concentrates itself upon a definite and actual condition, nor more definitely recognises that its readers have passed through and are passing through well-marked experiences.

The writer's references in v. 12; vi. 9; x. 32; xii. 4; could only have been made to a definite group of Christians.[1]

This consideration is sufficient to prove that the title πρὸς Ἑβραίους without further designation is too indefinite to have been affixed to his letter by the author himself. Weizsäcker, indeed, is extravagant when he brands the inscription as "the unhappy conjecture of a later time," but we may unhesitatingly adopt Robertson Smith's language, and say that it is "hardly more than a reflection of the impression produced on an early copyist". The suggestion of Prof. Nestle[2] that it may indicate that the Epistle was addressed to the συναγωγὴ Αἰβρέων or Ἐβρέων in Rome is interesting, but obviously if the writer of the Epistle had himself addressed it to a synagogue of Jewish Christians in Rome, he could not have written merely "to Hebrews," but must have more definitely identified them by some further designation. In short, we cannot from this address derive any assistance in determining the Church to which the Epistle was addressed.

But that the inscription is right in so far as it declares that the letter was destined for Hebrew Christians has generally, though not universally, been acknowledged. The scope of the Epistle presupposes a profound attachment to the Mosaic dispensation. Not only is the Old Testament the common ground from which material can be drawn and on which the discussion can proceed, but the argument is one which can scarcely be conceived as addressed to Gentiles. It may almost be said with Dr. Bruce: "If the readers were indeed Gentiles, they were Gentiles so completely disguised in Jewish ideas and wearing a mask with so pronounced Jewish features that the true nationality has been successfully hidden for nineteen centuries". Or more summarily we may say with Reuss: "For this writer there are no Gentiles". To Gentile ears some of the expressions used in the Epistle would be unintelligible, others would be offensive. To the former class belong such exhortations as, "Let us go forth unto Him without the camp"; to the latter, "Not of angels doth He take hold, but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold".

In spite of this, however, many eminent critics in recent times have reached the persuasion that the letter was addressed not to Hebrew, but to Gentile Christians. Schürer, Weizsäcker, von Soden, Jülicher, McGiffert are of this opinion. They are chiefly influenced by the consideration that the list of rudimentary doctrines

[1] See Burggaller's criticism of Wrede's "Das literarische Rätsel des Hebräerbriefes" in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift* for 1908.

[2] *Expository Times* for June, 1899.

given in chap. vi. are such as would rather be taught to Gentile catechumens than to Jewish converts. No doubt the doctrines there mentioned would be taught to Gentiles, but surely the contrast between faith in God and faith in dead works is peculiarly appropriate to Jews; and it was also the Jew rather than the Gentile who required explanation regarding the relation of Christian baptism to other lustrations. Besides, it must not be overlooked that the doctrines here enumerated are the "rudiments of Christ," and therefore nothing specifically Jewish could be mentioned. They are that common ground or "foundation" which underlay the specially Christian teaching.

Difficulty has also been found in the phrase ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος (iii. 12). This expression, it is felt, is more appropriate to a relapse to idolatry than to Judaism. But the very point of the whole Epistle is that an abandonment of Christianity is an abandonment of God; that in it God has finally spoken and that to neglect this revelation is to neglect God. In using this particular phrase the writer has not in view the end to which unbelief may lead them, but the fact that unbelief is apostasy from the living God, whether the unbeliever be Jew or Gentile.

These difficulties then are not insuperable, although they are possibly too cavalierly treated by Westcott, who pronounces that "the argument of von Soden, who endeavours to show that the Epistle was written to Gentiles, cannot be regarded as more than an ingenious paradox by any one who regards the general teaching of the Epistle in connection with the forms of thought in the Apostolic age".

Where, then, were these Jewish Christians resident? The places most generally approved are Jerusalem, Antioch, Cæsarea, Rome. In favour of the Jewish metropolis there is not much to be urged. To no Church on earth would it be so inappropriate to say that they had received the Gospel at second-hand (ii. 3). Many of its members must have been in direct communication with the Lord. Neither could it with any truth be said of the Church of Jerusalem that she had not been instrumental in teaching others (v. 12). This Church was also a poor community which itself required rather than afforded aid: whereas the society addressed in the Epistle had been conspicuous for charity (vi. 10; x. 34). It also seems most unlikely that if the Church at Jerusalem was addressed, no allusion should be made to the Temple. Neither is it probable that any one, himself a member of the Church at Jerusalem, should prefer Greek to Aramaic as his medium of communication.

As Antioch was the scene of a considerable part of the labours of

Barnabas it naturally suggests itself as the destination in connection with his supposed authorship of the Epistle. The Hebrew Christians in that city must have been very much in his care, and certainly they required some such exposition as is given in the Epistle, of the relation of Judaism to Christianity. And some critics, even while dismissing the claims of Barnabas, are inclined to find in Antioch the group of Jewish Christians to which the Epistle was addressed. Thus Mr Rendall[1] sums up his inquiry in the following terms: "To one of these great Syrian cities, perhaps to Antioch itself, I conceive the Epistle to have been addressed; for there alone existed flourishing Christian Churches, founded by the earliest missionaries of the Gospel, animated with Jewish sympathies, full of interest in the Mosaic worship, and glorying in the name of Hebrews; who nevertheless spoke the Greek language, used the Greek version of the Scriptures and numbered amongst their members converts who had, like the author, combined the highest advantages of Greek culture with careful study of the Old Testament and especially of the sacrificial Law." But could a Church which had actually started the great mission of Paul and Barnabas and in which other teachers abounded be open to the rebuke of chap. v. 11 ff.?

Recently critical opinion has decidedly veered towards Rome as the only possible destination. First suggested by Wetstein it is now advocated by Alford, Holtzmann, Zahn and many others. The clause in the Epistle which inevitably suggests this destination is the greeting in xiii. 24, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας "they of Italy (the Italians) salute you". This clause shows that the Epistle was either written from or to Italy. But it is difficult to believe that the words were intended to convey a greeting from Italians in their own country to the writer's correspondents. For if the writer was in Italy, he was in some particular locality, and this place he would more naturally have named instead of using the general term "Italy". Certainly the more natural and satisfactory interpretation of the words is that which supposes that the writer who himself is a member of the Church he addresses is surrounded by those who also recognise Italy as their home and who seek to send greetings to their friends in Rome.

Nor does anything in the Epistle contradict this idea. That there was a large Jewish element in the Roman Church appears both from Acts and Romans, and is not denied. It has sometimes been thought that Jewish Christians in Rome could not be expected

[1] *Epistle to Hebrews*, p. 69.

to take so much interest in the Temple-worship or be so concerned about its observance as this Epistle requires; but, as Principal Fairbairn long ago pointed out, colonists idealise the institutions of their mother-country more than its resident population, and it is an idealised, not an actual worship that is here described. It is also to be considered that it was in Rome both in the time of Paul and in the second century that in many subtle ways Judaism sought to assert itself and to absorb or expunge Christianity. The fact too that it is in Rome we find the first traces of the use of the Epistle (by Clement) has some weight.

Zahn still further narrows the destination and identifies the recipients of the letter as a small circle of Christians in a large city, a house-church alongside of which there was another or several other such churches in the same city. They have an assembly of their own (x. 25), perhaps also rulers of their own (xiii. 17), although the rulers of the whole Church of the city are also their rulers, and therefore greetings are sent to *all* the rulers and to *all* the Saints (xiii. 24). He is not aware of any place which so well answers to these requirements as one of the house-churches in Rome mentioned in the Epistle of Paul to that Church (chap. xvi). To one of these, possibly to that mentioned in Romans xvi. 14, this Epistle was probably addressed.

The Roman destination may seem to carry with it the authorship of Aquila, for this Jew who was himself so well instructed that he was able to instruct Apollos was intimately associated with Rome and with one of the house-churches there (Romans xvi. 3-5). And indeed all that we know of Aquila seems to fit the conditions as well as any other name that has been suggested.

It is impossible then to dogmatise regarding the authorship of this Epistle, and at present it is best frankly to confess our ignorance. But we may adopt the language of Prof. Rhys Roberts in dealing with the similar case of *Longinus on the Sublime* and say that "while it is good science to refuse to hazard any conjecture which our information does not warrant, it is good science also to decline to follow some critics in abandoning all hope of ever seeing a solution of this knotty problem. Let us rather recognise that we are confronted with one of those stimulating and fruitful uncertainties which classical research so often presents to its votaries—uncertainties which are stimulating because there is some possibility of removing them, and fruitful because in any case they lead to the more thorough investigation of the obscurer bye-ways of history and literature." Or we may adopt the words of Dr. Davidson in dealing

with the similar problem of the authorship of the Book of Job: "There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. Uncertainty is to them more suggestive than exact knowledge. No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel. The religious life of this people was at certain periods very intense, and at these periods the spiritual energy of the nation expressed itself almost impersonally, through men who forgot themselves and were speedily forgotten in name by others." And if we cannot name, we can at least partially describe the author. For his letter reveals a man who was not an Apostle but a scholar of the Apostles; a man of the second Christian generation (genealogisch nicht chronologisch, as Harnack says); a Hellenist yet a member and teacher of a Jewish Christian church; a Paulinist with some tincture of Alexandrian culture, though his treatment of Scripture differs *toto coelo* from Philo's; a friend of Timothy and at the time of writing in the company of Italian Christians.

Aim. But it is not the locality so much as the condition of the readers that chiefly concerns us. And as we read the Epistle it becomes apparent that the danger which roused the writer to interpose was not such definite and grave heresy as evoked the Epistle to the Galatians or that to the Colossians, nor such entangling heathen vices and difficult questions of casuistry as imperilled the Corinthian Church, but rather a gradual, almost unconscious admission of doubt which dulled hope and slackened energy. They had professed Christianity for some time (v. 12); and the sincerity of their profession had been proved by the manner in which they had borne severe persecution (x. 33, 34). They had taken joyfully the spoiling of their possessions; they had endured a great conflict of sufferings. But they found the long-sustained conflict with sin (xli. 4) and the day-by-day contempt and derision they experienced as Christians (xiii. 13), more wearing to the spirit than sharper persecution. Consequently their knees had become feeble to pursue the path of righteous endurance and activity, their hands hung limply by their side as if they were defeated men (xii. 12). They had ceased to make progress and were in danger of falling away (vi. 1-4, iii. 12) and were allowing an evil heart of unbelief to grow in them. No doubt this listless, semi-believing condition laid them open to the incursion of "divers and strange teachings" (xiii. 9) and in itself was full of peril.

To restore in them the freshness of faith the writer at every

part of the Epistle exhorts them to steadfastness and perseverance. "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering" (xi. 23). "Cast not away your confidence" (x. 35). "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him" (x. 38). Or, what may be taken as the hortatory motto of the Epistle, "We are become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end" (iii. 14). That they may have encouragement to do so, he shows them at large the good ground they have for confidence. The fruits of faith in their fathers are recapitulated in the eloquent eleventh chapter. But especially is Jesus exhibited as the great leader in faith. "Consider Him lest ye be weary and faint in your souls" (xii. 3). His supremacy and trustworthiness are expounded in detail, and especially the eternal sufficiency of His sacrifice and intercession is dwelt upon.

Evidently, then, the persons addressed were in the mental and spiritual condition common in every age of the Christian Church, a condition of languor and weariness, of disappointed expectations, deferred hopes, conscious failure and practical unbelief. They were Christians but had slender appreciation of the glory of their calling, misconstrued their experience, and had allowed themselves to drift away from boldness of hope and intensity of faith. Dr. Bruce describes them as persons who never had "insight into the essential nature and distinctive features of the Christian religion"; and if by "insight" he means such perception of the greatness of Christ as causes men to rejoice in serving and suffering for Him, his description is correct. But he seems less exact when he goes on to say "No greater mistake, I believe, can be committed (though it is a common fault of commentators) than to assume that the first readers were in the main in sympathy with the doctrinal views of the writer". Some points, no doubt, which the writer adduces were new to the readers. The manner in which the paragraph regarding Melchisedec is introduced proves this. But we cannot therefore conclude that the whole conception of Christ as Priest was new to them; nor can we suppose that they had never thought of Christ as the Son through whom the final revelation was made and the eternal covenant mediated. Rather they had failed *to consider what these great truths involved.* Hence the writer bids them give "the *more earnest* heed to the things they have heard" (ii. 1), and throughout the Epistle he returns to his favourite admonition "Consider Him," let your minds penetrate more deeply into His significance. They had ceased to have that keen interest in truth which prompts contemplation and inquiry, and they now held what

they had been taught so externally that they were in danger of wholly losing their faith and becoming practical apostates. They had fallen under the power of the present and visible, and were giving to appearance and shadow the value that belonged only to the eternal reality.

The aim of the writer then was to open up the true significance of Christ and His work, and thus to remove the scruples, hesitations and suspicions which haunted the mind of the Jewish Christian embarrassing his faith, lessening his enjoyment, and lowering his vitality. The Jew who accepted Jesus as the Christ had problems to solve and difficulties to overcome of which the Gentile knew nothing. A transition of equal moment and encompassed by so much obscurity men have rarely, if ever, been summoned to make. It is easy for those who look back upon it as an accomplished fact to see that there was no real breach of continuity between the old religion and the new; but that was not readily perceived by those whose whole life and experience were marked by the turmoil and instability which accompanied the abandonment of old forms, the acceptance of new ideas, the building on other foundations. Brought up in a religion which he was persuaded was of Divine authority the Jew was now required to consider a large part of his belief and worship as antiquated. Accustomed to pride himself on a history marked at various stages by angelic visits, Divine voices, and miraculous interventions, he is now invited to shift his faith from institutions and venerable customs to a Person, and this a Person in whom earthly glory is suggested only by its absence and in whom those *apparently* most qualified to judge could discover nothing but imposture which merited a malefactor's death. Cherishing with extraordinary enthusiasm, as his exclusive heritage, the Temple with all its hallowed associations, its indwelling God, its altar, its august priesthood, its complete array of ordinances, he is yet haunted by the Christian new-born instinct that there is an essential lacking in all these arrangements and that for him they are irrelevant and obsolete. A blight has suddenly fallen on what was brightest in his religion, a blight he can neither dissipate nor perfectly justify.

For the Jewish Christian must have found it quite beyond his power to understand the relation of the old to the new. Already indeed it had become apparent that in Jesus prophecy had been fulfilled. He had been accepted as the predicted Messiah partly because it was beyond dispute that in Him a correspondence was found to the figure more or less clearly defined in the Old Testament. This no doubt hinted that there was some strong and vital

connection between the two faiths. But what relation did this Messiah hold to the Mosaic institutions? That was a more difficult problem. The difficulty of it is appreciated when we consider that a large section of the Christian Church judged the old to be irreconcilable with the new, and went so far as to maintain that the God of the Old Testament was antagonistic to the God who revealed Himself in Christ. And even the more moderate section of the Church found difficulty in answering the questions: What was to be thought of the Jewish ordinances and of the Jewish Scriptures which enjoined them? If the ordinances were set aside, could the Scriptures which contained them be retained? In what sense had Christ fulfilled the law, the ceremonial? He had not been a Priest. He had not assumed the Priest's function, but the Rabbi's. He had not been born in a priestly family. A sacrifice, perhaps, in some sense, He had been.

To the Jew, in short, Christ must have created as many problems as He solved. The unquestioning faith that is guided by healthy instincts and can relegate to the future all intellectual explanations and reconcilements is nôt given to every one; and many a Jewish Christian must have passed those first days in painful unrest, drawn to trust Jesus by all that He knew of His holiness and truth and yet sorely perplexed and hindered from perfect trust by the unexpected spirituality of the new religion, by the contempt of his old co-religionists, by the enforced relinquishment of all outward garnishing and glory, and by the apparent impossibility of fitting the gorgeousness of the old and the bareness of the new into one consistent whole. To this miserable and weakening condition of spirit the writer appeals and aims at removing it by giving them a fuller insight into the relation of Christianity to Mosaism, and especially by illustrating the unique supremacy of Christ and the finality of His work. He makes it his aim to show that every name, every institution, every privilege, which had existed under the old economy survived in the new, but invested with a higher meaning and a truer glory—a meaning and a glory, new indeed in themselves, but yet for the first time fulfilling the great purpose of God which from the first had been dimly shadowed forth. "The first was taken away only in order that the second might be introduced."[1]

To this task he necessarily brought his own philosophical presuppositions. Trained in Alexandrian thought he cherished the Platonic[2] conception of the relation of the seen to the unseen. It

"[1] Das Christenthum bringt nichts, was nicht schon im A. T. angelegt, verheissen und vorgebildet gewesen wäre" (Holtzmann, *N. T. Theol.*, ii., 287).

[2] *Timaeus*, 28 C.; *Rep.* 597; Philo, *Mundi Op.*, 4; *De Vita Mosis*, p. 146.

was his inalienable conviction that the visible world is merely phenomenal, the temporary form or manifestation of the invisible, archetypal world which alone is real and eternal. In the Epistle these two worlds are continually related by contrast. The unseen world [πράγματα οὐ βλεπόμενα xi. 1] is the eternal counterpart of this present order of things [αὕτη ἡ κτίσις ix. 11]; the reality, of which earthly things are but the shadow [σκία viii. 5]. The visible heaven and earth are one day to pass away, "as things that have been made" [ὡς πεποιημένων xii. 27], but this only in order that the eternal things which cannot be removed may remain alone existent.

On this broad philosophical basis, itself unshakable as the eternal things, the writer builds his argument. Here he finds the key to the essential distinction between Mosaism and Christianity, as well as the proof of the superiority and finality of the latter. The Mosaic dispensation belongs to the seen and temporal, the Christian to the unseen and eternal. In the one there is a tabernacle "made with hands"; a sanctuary of *this world*, equipped and furnished with material objects; the sacrifices are of bulls and goats; the rest appointed cannot be eternal, because it is in a visible earthly land; their holy city is one which can be profaned by Roman armies; above all, their priesthood is dependent on the flesh. How manifest that all these things belong to the earthly temporal order. The whole dispensation is involved with things visible, tangible, material, evanescent.

But Mosaism was not wholly useless. It was a shadow of the good things to come: and to these real, eternal things Christ introduces men. Christ Himself, being Son of God, belongs to the eternal order. In Him we have throughout to do not with external ceremonies and temporal arrangements, but with what is spiritual; in Him we come into touch not with imperfect revelations of God made through symbol and human medium, but with the very image of God. He mediates between God and man in virtue of His connection with both. He leads men into the true relation to God by Himself perfectly fulfilling the human life of obedience to God's will. His priesthood or power to carry His human brethren with Him into the heavenly life, springs out of His personal worth wrought by discipline to a perfected condition. He is priest in virtue not of what is of the flesh, not by inherited office, but by virtue of His sympathy with men and His personal stainlessness. He enters the presence of God not in an earthly tabernacle nor with the blood of bulls and goats but with His own blood, bringing men and God together by the pure and perfect surrender of Himself to God. This sacrifice though made on earth was yet made in the eternal order,

because made in spirit, in a spirit which necessarily belongs not to this visible and transitory order of things but to the eternal and real, or as the writer says, "through eternal spirit".

That which this writer finds common to the new and the old forms of religion is the purpose of God to bring men into fellowship with Himself, or, in other words, the covenant idea. With this writer religion is the harmony of God and man. He thinks of God, not like Paul, as a Judge before whose bar man must somehow be cleared of guilt, but as entering into covenant with man and providing for the maintenance of this covenant by sacrifice. In history he sees two great epochs in the promotion of this fellowship distinguished by the efficacy with which it is effected. For the covenant being between the holy, heavenly God and His unholy creature, it will not be quite easy to form or to maintain. It involves at any rate two things, that the will of God in the matter be made known, and that man be separated from his sin. It involves, that is to say, that the covenant be effectively mediated and especially in this respect that it be secured that man shall be cleansed from his sin and fitted for true and lasting fellowship with God. So essential is this, that each form of the covenant may be judged by the efficiency with which it accomplishes this. If the arrangements for bringing man into real and abiding union with God are imperfect, then this colours with imperfection the covenant to which these arrangements belong; if, on the other hand, such arrangements are made as actually cleanse the conscience and renew the character then this determines the perfectness of the covenant in which these arrangements are comprised.

Hence the importance which this writer attaches to priesthood and sacrifice. It is by these the nature and efficacy of every covenant between God and man must be determined. If one covenant only provides for a ceremonial purification and a symbolic introduction to God, this of itself stamps that covenant as inferior to one which provides for a spiritual cleansing and a real union If with one of the covenants there is identified a priesthood which is merely hereditary and therefore fleshly and professional, while the other rests on a natural and spiritual priesthood that offers a real spiritual sacrifice, the sacrifice of self, in contrast with the sacrifice of bulls and goats, there can be little hesitation in determining whether of these two is the eternal covenant. It is the writer's aim to exhibit this distinction. He knows that if only his readers can once see the real glory of Christ and His religion all their doubts will vanish, and accordingly he proceeds to send them

such an exposition of that glory as is in point of fact a magnificent apologetic for Christianity from the Jewish point of view.

The relation thus established between the former and the latter dispensation may tend to an undervaluing of the old, and lead to the idea that "the Jew was simply the keeper of a casket which he could not unlock, an actor in a symbolical representation which to him conveyed little or no meaning". It must be borne in mind, therefore, that the arrangements of the Old Testament were primarily for the religious use of the Jews themselves. Their religion was not devised for the intellectual employment or diversion of persons who can now look back upon it, nor altogether for the religious edification of such persons, but primarily for the religious edification of the Jews themselves. They needed a religion as much as we do. They needed assurance of God and His favour, and some means of access to Him and this they found in their religion of type and symbol. To them as to us a gospel was preached (iv. 2). Through the symbolic arrangements of their earthly tabernacle they learned real truth and were brought into fellowship with the eternal. Not that they understood what the physical arrangements of their religion *typified*, but that they did understand what they *symbolised*. The Old Testament ritual was instructive not in so far as it was typical, but in so far as it was symbolical. A symbol is an embodied idea, or what we nowadays call an "object lesson"; an idea rendered visible in a material sign or in an external action. A type not only expresses an idea, but looks forward to a time when this idea shall receive its perfect expression. As Mr. Litton[1] defines it "a type is a prophetic symbol". "Every true type is necessarily a symbol, that is, it embodies and represents the ideas which find their fulfilment in the antitype; but every symbol is not necessarily a type; a symbol may terminate in itself, and point to nothing future; it may even refer to something past." Now it cannot be supposed that the contemporaries of Moses or Moses himself understood what was prefigured by their ritual. But if they did not understand their ritual as a collection of types, they certainly did understand it as a system of symbols. The tabernacle itself was both a symbol and a type. It was a symbol that God dwelt with men, ever in their midst, sharing their fortunes, forgiving their sin, and bestowing blessing. This symbol every child could read. But it was also a type, a symbol with a prophecy wrapped up in it, a symbol giving promise that the truth taught in it would one day find its perfect, eternal manifestation. This could at the best be but imperfectly understood.

[1] Bampton Lectures, p. 82.

But the writer to the Hebrews looking back upon the preparation for Christ can see how this and that prefigured Him who was to come. Every Old Testament institution, ceremony, person or thing in which a principle or idea was embodied which was afterwards embodied in Christ and His Kingdom may legitimately be called "typical". To the Jews themselves these types were helpful not because they threw light upon the person and work of Christ, but because they then and there communicated those very ideas which were subsequently expressed in their reality in Jesus. The institution of sacrifice, *e.g.*, was useful to them not because it taught them to look for a Messiah who should die for their sins—for it had no such effect—but because it then and there communicated the very ideas and the very hopes which the death of Christ expressed—in a dim and unsatisfactory way no doubt, as this writer is careful to show, but still adequately as a first lesson in the holiness and forgiveness of God.

Keeping in view the aim of the writer to convince his readers that the new Christian order of things is an advance on the old Mosaic order, and is indeed the final and universal form of religion, the course of thought is easily followed. The Mediator of the new covenant is first of all compared with the Mediators of the old, with prophets, angels, Moses, Joshua, Aaron, and this comparison occupies the first seven chapters. The writer then proceeds to exhibit the evanescence of the old covenant and the superiority of the new (viii. 6-13), and of the true God-pitched tabernacle and its sacrifice to the first man-made tabernacle with its arrangements and offerings (ix. 1-x. 18). On this demonstrated superiority and finality of the covenant which Christ has mediated the writer founds a forcible appeal and exhorts his readers to hold fast their profession and to use the access to God provided for them (x. 19-25). This exhortation he enforces by warnings (x. 26-31), by awakening remembrances of better times (32-39), by the rapid, sugggestive and eloquent presentation of their predecessors in faith (xi.), and especially of Him whose example in faith and endurance is perfect (xii. 1-4), and by illustrating the reasonableness of hopefully submitting to present trouble as discipline sent by the heavenly Father (xii. 5-13). They are further urged to diligence in sanctification by the consideration that awful as were the sanctions of the old law, those of the new covenant are immensely more awful, that indeed our God is a consuming fire (xii. 14-29). The closing chapter contains miscellaneous but relevant admonitions.

Date. The chief index to the date of the Epistle is its relation

to the destruction of the Temple. The impression one receives from its perusal is that the sacrifices and other services of the Temple were still being performed. If particular passages are examined, this impression is deepened. It is quite true that the use of the present tense (as in Heb. ix. 6, viii. 4, etc.) does not always imply an actual present. The use of this tense by Clement (*Ep.* c. 41) in describing ordinances which in his day were certainly obsolete puts this beyond question. But of course the use of the present generally implies the existence of the object spoken of at the time of the speaker; and it is not easy to suppose that if the Temple and its worship had already been abolished, this writer could use such language as we find in c. x. 1, 2; "they can never with the same sacrifices year by year which they offer continually make perfect them that draw nigh. *Else would they not have ceased to be offered?*" And as Ménégoz [1] says: "C'est précisément l'existence du culte levitique qui offrait des dangers pour la fidelité des chretiens. Après la destruction du Temple ce danger avait disparu, du moins en majeure partie." Besides, it is impossible to suppose that a writer wishing to demonstrate the evanescent nature of the Levitical dispensation, and writing after the Temple services had been discontinued, should not have pointed to that event as strengthening his argument. It would appear, then, that the Epistle must have been written while the Temple was yet standing, that is, prior to the year A.D. 70.

Accordingly Salmon dates the Epistle in 63; Ménégoz places it in 64-67. The year 66 or thereabouts is adopted by Riehm, Lünemann, Hilgenfeld, Weiss, Beyschlag, Schürer, Godet, Westcott. Bleek prefers the year 68 or 69. Harnack, Pfleiderer, von Soden, Holtzmann and McGiffert bring it down to some date between A.D. 81 and 96.

Commentaries. Full lists of commentaries on the Epistle are easily accessible in Bible Dictionaries or in Delitzsch's Commentary. A selection is given by von Soden in the *Hand-commentar*. Here it must suffice to name the most outstanding. Among the patristic commentators Chrysostom is unquestionably the most valuable, always sensible and well expressed. Of mediæval writers Primasius, Atto Vercellensis and Herveius may be consulted with advantage.[2] Calvin, Erasmus, Beza, Grotius, Bengel will inevitably be used in the study of this Epistle, as of any part of the New

[1] *La Theol. de l'ep.* etc., p. 40.

[2] On these and others see Riggenbach's *Die ältesten lateinischen Komm: Zum Hebräerbrief* in Zahn's *Forschungen*.

Testament. At the foundation of all more recent elucidation of the Epistle lies Bleek's great work, *Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert* (1828-1840), the most comprehensive and scholarly, and in all respects one of the best commentaries on any book of the New Testament. Of almost equal value is Weiss' contribution to the revised Meyer. Delitzsch though not so exact is generally suggestive and always rich in material, while his knowledge of the Old Testament enables him to enter into the author's point of view. Westcott, largely indebted to Bleek, is, as always, full and accurate. Vaughan is of great use for ascertaining the precise meaning and biblical usage of words. Davidson (Clark's Bible-class Hand-books) penetrates to the meaning of the writer better than any other commentator. Peake (Jack's *Century Bible*) rivals him in this and has a rare gift of compact lucidity. No better book could be conceived or is needed for English readers. Nothing better has been written on the Epistle than his chapter on its teaching.

Other works such as those by Owen, Peirce, Moses Stuart, Tholuck, Hofmann, McCaul, Lowrie and von Soden will be found helpful, and each has a merit of its own. And naturally the great collectors of illustrative material, Wetstein and Schoettgen, Kypke, Elsner and Raphel will be used. The parallels from Philo have been carefully collected by Carpzov. Where Anz is named, the reference is to his *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita* in the Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses, vol. xii., part ii. (1884).

Riehm's *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes* is a classic, a monument of German industry and comprehensiveness, full of detail but never wearisome, always lighting up old meanings with fresh flashes of insight. Bruce's presentation of the substance of the Epistle (*The Ep. to the Hebrews*, Clark) is characteristically vigorous and full of elevated thought and enriching ideas. An excellent book on *The Theology of the Epistle* has also been issued by Dr. George Milligan. And quite indispensable to the student is *La Theologie de l'Epitre aux Hebreux*, by Eugène Ménégoz.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT.

I. Greek Uncials.

ℵ Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, Saec. iv. Complete.
A Alexandrinus Londinensis, Saec. v. Complete.
B Vaticanus Romanus, Saec. iv. Defective from ix. 14—end. ["Manus multo recentior supplevit, Heb. ix. 14-xiii. 25, quae Mico Italus ipsius codicis conlator Bentleio jubente contulit et Tischendorfius aliquoties notavit siglo b." Gregory's *Prolegomena*, p. 418.]

C Ephraemi Parisiensis, Saec. v. Wants i. 1 πολυμερως—πνευματος αγιου ii. 4. vii. 26 αμιαντος—μεσιτης ix. 15. x. 24 πης και καλων—μιανθωσιν πολλοι xii. 15.

D Claromontanus Parisiensis Nationalis 107, Graeco-Latinus. ["Latina inprimis in epistula ad Hebraeos errores multos praebent" Gregory.] Saec. vi. Heb. xiii. 21-23 is lost. Beza, to whom we owe the earliest notice of this Codex describes it as of equal antiquity with his copy (D) of the Gospels, and tells us it was found at Clermont, near Beauvais. Many hands have revised it.

E Petropolitanus, Graeco-Latinus, Saec. ix. Wants Heb. xii. 8 παντες—υμων, xiii. 25. A faulty copy of D after it had been more than once corrected.

Fa Coislinianus Parisiensis, Saec. vii. Contains x. 26.

H Coislinianus Parisiensis nationalis 202, Saec. vi. The leaves of this MS. are still scattered, some at Paris, some at Moscow, some at St. Petersburg, some at Mt. Athos, others elsewhere. It contains of Hebrews, chapters ii., iii., iv., x.

K Moscuensis, Saec. ix. Complete.

L Angelicus Romanus, Saec. ix. Complete to xiii. 10 εξουσιαν.

M Londin, Hamburg (Scrivener's *Codex Ruber*, so called from beautifully bright red colour of the ink), Saec. ix. Contains i. 1-iv. 3, and xii. 20-xiii. 25. "Textu ad optimos testes hic codex accedit." Gregory, *cf.* Scrivener, p. 184-85.

N Petropolitanus, Saec. ix. Contains v. 8-vi. 10.

O Fragmenta Mosquensia, Saec vi. (?) Contains x. 1-3, 3-7, 32-34, 35-38. Scrivener.

P Porfirianus Chiovensis, Saec. ix. Complete. xii. 9, 10 illegible.

The first verse of the Epistle has been edited by Messrs. Grenfell & Hunt from a fragment in Lord Amherst's collection of papyri. It is in a small uncial hand of the early fourth century. It reads ἡμῶν after πατράσιν.

II. Greek Cursives.

Of the large number of cursives cited by Tischendorf, it may suffice to mention the Codex Colbertinus of the Imperial Library of Paris, collated by Tregelles, and cited as 17 [33 of the Gospels]. It belongs to the eleventh century, and is of great value. Another MS. which was collated by Tregelles and highly valued by him is the Codex Leicestrensis of the fourteenth century, and cited under the sign 37. Gregory also marks 47, Oxon. Bodl. Roe, as "bonae notae". It also was collated by Tregelles.

III. Versions.

The Old Latin and the Vulgate, the Peshitto and Harklean Syriac, the Coptic and fragments of the Sahidic and Bashmuric versions, together with the Armenian and Æthiopic are available for the ascertainment of the text of the Epistle. [For remarks on these versions, see Westcott's *Com.*, Introduction.]

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.[1]

I. 1. [a] ΠΟΛΥΜΕΡΩΣ καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων[2] τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλά-

a Num. xii. 6, 8; Eph. i. 10; Gal. iv. 4.

[1] The title should be simply ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ. See Introd.

[2] T.R. with 47, and some versions; ἐσχατου with ℵABDEKLMP, 17, etc.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-3. The aim of the writer is to prove that the old Covenant through which God had dealt with the Hebrews is superseded by the New; and this aim he accomplishes in the first place by exhibiting the superiority of the mediator of the new Covenant to all previous mediators. The Epistle holds in literature the place which the Transfiguration holds in the life of Christ. Former mediators give place and Christ is left alone under the voice "Hear ye Him". With this writer, Jesus is before all else the Mediator of a better Covenant, viii. 6. But 'Mediator' involves the arranging and accomplishing of everything required for the efficacy of the Covenant; the perfect knowledge of the person and purposes of Him who makes the Covenant with men and the communication of this knowledge to them; together with the removal of all obstacles to man's entrance into the fellowship with God implied by the Covenant. This twofold function is in these first three verses shown to be discharged by Christ. He as Son speaks to men for God and thus supersedes all previous revelations; while, instead of appointing a priest who can only picture a cleansing, and accomplish a ceremonial purity, He becomes Priest and actually cleanses men from sin, and so effects their actual fellowship with God.

Ver. 1. In sonorous and dignified terms the writer abruptly makes his first great affirmation: "God having spoken . . . spoke". ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας . . . ἐλάλησεν, for, however contrasted, previous revelations proceeded from the same source and are one in design and in general character with that which is final. In the N.T. λαλεῖν is not used in a disparaging sense, but, especially in this Epistle, is used of God making known His will. See ii. 2, iii. 5, v. 5, etc. God spoke, desired to be understood, to come into communication with men and therefore uttered Himself in intelligible forms, and succeeded, all through the past, in making Himself and His will known to men. He had not kept silence, allowing men to feel after Him if haply they might find Him. He had met the outstretched hand and guided the seeker. And this "speaking" in the past was preparatory to the final speaking in Christ; "God having spoken . . . spoke". The earlier revelations were the preparation for the later but were distinguished from it in four particulars—in the time, in the recipients, in the agents, in the manner.

πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως "in many parts and in many ways". The alliteration is characteristic of the author, *cf.* v. 8, v. 14, vii. 3, ix. 10, etc. For the use of the words in Greek authors see Wetstein. πολυμερῶς points to the fragmentary character of former revelations. They were given piece-meal, bit by bit, part by part, as the people needed and were able to receive them. The revelation of God was essentially progressive; all was not disclosed at once, because all could not at once be

understood. One aspect of God's nature, one element in His purposes, reflected from the conditions of their time, the prophets could know; but in the nature of things it was impossible they should know the whole. They were like men listening to a clock striking, always getting nearer the truth but obliged to wait till the whole was heard. Man can only know in part, **ἐκ μέρους**, 1 Cor. xiii. [A fine illustration will be found in Browning's *Cleon*, in lines beginning: "those divine men of old time have reached, thou sayest well, each *at one point* the outside verge," etc..] The "speaking" of God to the fathers was conditioned by the capacity of the prophets. His speaking was also **πολυτρόπως** [*cf. Odyss.* i. 1. **Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον**] not in one stereotyped manner but in modes varying with the message, the messenger, and those to whom the word is sent. Sometimes, therefore, God spoke by an institution, sometimes by parable, sometimes in a psalm, sometimes in an act of righteous indignation. For, as Peake says, "the author is speaking not of the forms in which God spoke *to* the prophets, but of the modes in which He spoke *through* them to the fathers. The message took the form of law or prophecy, of history or psalm; now it was given in signs, now in types." So Hofmann. These features of previous revelations, so prominently set and expressed so grandiloquently, cannot have been meant to disparage them, rather to bring into view their affluence and pliability and many-sided application to the growing receptivity and varying needs of men. He wins his readers by suggesting the grandeur of past revelations. But it is at the same time true, as Calvin remarks, "varietatem fuisse imperfectionis notam". So Bengel, "Ipsa prophetarum multitudo indicat, eos ex parte prophetasse". These characteristics, while they encouragingly disclosed God's purpose to find His way to men, did yet discredit, as inadequate for perfect achievement, each method that was tried. The contrast in the new revelation is implied in the word **ἐκάθισεν**, indicating that the work was once for all accomplished.

The next note of previous revelations is found in **πάλαι** "of old," not merely "in time past" as A.V.; marking the time referred to in **λαλήσας** as contrasted with the writer's present, and gently suggesting that other methods of speaking might now be appropriate. Already in 2 Cor. iii. 14 the Mosaic covenant is spoken of as **ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη** *cf.* viii. 13. Here **πάλαι** is contrasted with **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων**, "at the last of these days," ["Aufs Ende dieser Tage," Weizsäcker], *i.e.*, in the Messianic time at the close of the period known to the Jews as "this present time or age". The expression is used in the LXX indifferently with **ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τ. ἡμερῶν** or **ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις** to translate בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (see Isa. ii. 2; Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14), which was used to denote either the future indefinitely or the Messianic period, "the latter days" in which all prophecy was to find its fulfilment. Bleek quotes Kimchi as saying: "Ubicunque leguntur 'Beaharith Hayamim' ibi sermo est de diebus Messiae". And Wetstein quotes R. Nachman: "*Extremum dierum* consensu omnium doctorum sunt Dies Messiae". It was this Jewish usage which the N.T. writers followed in speaking of their own times as "the last days;" **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τ. χρόνου** (Jude 18); **ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τ. ἡμερῶν** (2 Pet. iii. 3); **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τ. χρόνων** (1 Pet. i. 20); and in this Epistle, ix. 26, Christ is said to have appeared **ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων**. The first Advent as terminating the old world and introducing the Messianic reign was considered the consummation. The introduction of the word **τούτων** is suggested by the Jewish division of the world's course into two periods: "This Age" (Ha-Olam Hazzeh) and The Coming Age (Ha-Olam Habbah). The end of "this age" or "these days" was signalised by the coming of the Messiah, the new revelation in Christ. More effectually than the Jews themselves expected has the Advent of the Messiah antiquated the old world and opened a new period.

The temporal contrast is further marked by the words **τοῖς πατράσιν** (ver. 1) and **ἡμῖν** (ver. 2). Former revelations had been made to "the fathers," *i.e.*, of the Jewish people, as in John vii. 22; Rom. ix. 5, xv. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 4. More frequently "our" "your" "their" is added, as in Acts iii. 13, 25; Luke vi. 53. But it is idle to urge, with von Soden, the absence of the pronoun as weighing against the restriction of the term in this place to the Jewish fathers. **ἡμῖν** "to us" of these last days, of the Christian dispensation.

The determining contrast between the

λησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, 2. [b] ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι᾿ οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν,[1] 3. [c] ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ

b Ps. ii. 8; Matt. xxi. 38; Joan. i. 3; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16.
c viii. 1 et ix. 12, etc., et xii. 2; Ps. cx. 1; Sap. vii. 26; Joan. i. 4, et xiv. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15, 7; Phil. ii. 6; Apoc. iv. 11.

[1] T.R. in DbKLP with other MSS. and versions; και εποιησεν τ. αιωνας in ℵABD*, etc., E, etc.

two revelations is found in this, that in the one God spoke ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, while in the other He spoke ἐν υἱῷ. "The prophets" stand here, not for the prophetic writings as in Jo. vi. 45; Acts xiii. 40, etc.; but for all those who had spoken for God, and especially for that great series of men from Abraham and Moses onwards who had been the organs of revelation and were identified with it (*cf.* the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen). The prep. ἐν is not used in its instrumental sense (*cf.* Habak. ii. 1), nor is it = διὰ, it brings God closer to the hearers of the prophetic word, and implies that what the prophets spoke, God spoke. So Hofmann and Weiss. ["Ipse in cordibus eorum dixit quicquid illi foras vel dictis vel factis locuti sunt hominibus," Herveius.] The full significance of ἐν is seen in ἐν υἱῷ. ἐν υἱῷ without the article must be translated "in a son" or "in one who is a son," indicating the nature of the person through whom this final revelation was made. The revelation now consisted not merely in what was said [προφήταις] but in what He was [υἱός]. This revelation was final because made by one who in all He is and does, reveals the Father. By uttering Himself He expresses God. A Son who can be characteristically designated a son, carries in Himself the Father's nature and does not need to be instructed in purposes which are also and already His own, nor to be officially commissioned and empowered to do what He cannot help doing. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (*cf.* John i. 18). The whole section on "The Son of God" in Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu* should be read in this connection. "Son" is here used in its Messianic reference, as the quotations cited in vv. 5, 6 prove. The attributes ascribed to the Son are at the same time Divine attributes. [So Baur and Pfleiderer. Ménégoz denies this]. The writer apparently experiences no difficulty in attaching to one and the same personality the creating of the world and the dying to cleanse sin.

The Son is described in six particulars which illustrate His supremacy and His fitness to reveal the Father: (1) His destination to universal lordship (ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων); (2) His agency in creation (δι᾿ οὗ ἐποίησεν τ. αἰῶνας); (3) His likeness to God (ὢν ἀπαύγασμα κ.τ.λ.); (4) His relation to the world) φέρων τὰ πάντα); (5) His redemptive work (καθαρισμὸν . . . ποιησάμενος); (6) His exaltation (ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ κ.τ.λ.). *Cf.* Vaughan. ὃν ἔθηκεν κληρονόμον πάντων "whom He appointed heir of all". Davidson, Weiss and others understand this of the actual elevation of Christ, on His ascension, to the Lordship of all. ["Dass der Verfasser bei diesen Worten an den erhöhten Christus gedacht habe, halten wir für unzweifelhaft," Riehm, p. 295]. But the position of the clause in the verse and the subsequent mention of the exaltation in ver. 3 rather indicate that ἔθηκεν has here its ordinary meaning (see Elsner and Bleek) of "appointed," and that the reference is to Ps. ii. 8 δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου κ.τ.λ., so Hofmann. Through this Son God is to accomplish His purpose. The Son is to reign over all. The writer lifts the thought of the despondent to Christ's triumph and Lordship. In the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen Christ speaks of Himself as Heir. It is involved in the Sonship; Gal. iv. 7. It is not simply possessor but possessor because of a relation to the Supreme. The Father could not be called κληρονόμος. Dalman shows that the 2nd Psalm "deduces from the filial relation of the King of Zion to God, that universal dominion, originally proper to God, is bequeathed to the Son as an inheritance," *Worte Jesu*, p. 220, E. Tr. 268. *Cf.* also Matt. xi. 27, πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου. [Chrysostom says the use of the term brings out two points τὸ τῆς υἱότητος γνήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον.] The inheritance is not fully entered upon, until it can be said

τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, δι' ἑαυτοῦ [1] καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν,[2]

[1] T.R. in DcEKLM al pler, d, e, Syrutr; omit δι εαυτου with ℵABDbP, 17, 46*, 47.

[2] Omit ημων with ℵ*ABD*E*MP.

that "the kingdom of the world is become the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ," Rev. xi. 15. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 8. But by His incarnation He came into touch with men and poured His life into human history, at once claiming and securing His great inheritance.

δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας "through whom also He made the world," "per quem fecit et secula" (Vulg.), "durch Welchen er auch die Weltzeiten gemacht hat' (Weizsäcker). "Secula et omnia in iis decurrentia" (Bengel). Weiss thinks it quite improbable that so pure a Greek writer should use **αἰῶνας** in the rabbinical sense as = "world," and he believes that the Greek interpreters are right in retaining the meaning "world-periods". But in xi. 3 it becomes obvious that this writer could use the word as virtually = **κόσμος**. "The thought of duration is never wholly lost in the Scripture use of **αἰών**, though in this place, and in xi. 3 it is all but effaced" (Vaughan). *Cf.* Schoettgen and McCaul. The writer perhaps has it in his mind that the significant element in creation is not the mass or magnificence of the material spheres but the evolution of God's purposes through the ages. The mind staggers in endeavouring to grasp the vastness of the physical universe but much more overwhelming is the thought of those times and ages and aeons through which the purpose of God is gradually unfolding, unhasting and unresting, in the boundless life He has called into being. He who is the end and aim, the heir, of all things is also their creator. The **καὶ** brings out the propriety of committing all things to the hand that brought them into being. The revealer is the creator, Jo. i. 1-5. He only can guide the universe to its fit end who at first, presumably with wisdom equal to His power, brought it into being. ["Cette idée d'un être céleste chargé de réaliser la pensée créatrice de Dieu est une idée philonienne; elle a pénétré dans le Judaisme sous l'influence de la philosophie grecque" (Ménégoz). It is true that this is a Philonic idea (see numerous passages in Carpzov, Bleek, McCaul and Drummond) but we may also say with Weiss "Die philonischen Aussagen . . . gehören gar nicht hierher". Certainly Philo never claimed for a definite historical person the attributes here enumerated.] For the Son's agency in Creation see John i. 2; Col. i. 15. Grotius' rendering "propter Messiam conditum esse mundum" is interesting as illustrating his standpoint, but would require **δι' ὅν**.

Ver. 3. **ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα. . . .** "Who being effulgence of His glory and express image of His nature." The relative **ὃς** finds its antecedent in **υἱῷ**, its verb in **ἐκάθισεν**; and the interposed participles prepare for the statement of the main verb by disclosing the fitness of Christ to be the revealer of God, and to make atonement. The two clauses, **ὢν . . . φέρων τε**, are closely bound together and seem intended to convey the impression that during Christ's redemptive activity on earth there was no kenosis, but that these Divine attributes lent efficacy to His whole work. [On the difficulty of this conception see Gore's *Bampton Lec.*, p. 266, and Carpenter's *Essex Hall Lec.*, p. 87.] **ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης . . . ἀπαύγασμα** may mean either what is flashed forth, or what is flashed back: either "ray" or "reflection". Calvin, Beza, Thayer, Ménégoz prefer the latter meaning. Thus Grotius has, "repercussus divinae majestatis, qualis est solis in nube". The Greek fathers, on the other hand, uniformly adopt the meaning "effulgence". Thus Theodoret **τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι, καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρί ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός . . . καὶ τῷ πυρὶ δὲ ὁμοφυὲς τὸ ἀπαύγασμα: οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τῷ πατρί.** So in the Nicene Creed **φῶς ἐκ φωτός**. "The word 'effulgence' seems to mean not rays of light streaming from a body in their connection with that body or as part of it, still less the reflection of these rays caused by their falling upon another body, but rather rays of light coming out from the original body and forming a similar light-body themselves" (Davidson). So Weiss, who says that the "Strahlenglanz ein zweites Wesen erzeugt". Philo's use of the word lends colour to this meaning when

he says of the human soul breathed into man by God that it was ἅτε τῆς μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύγασμα. So in India, Chaitanya taught that the human soul was like a ray from the Divine Being; God like a blazing fire and the souls like sparks that spring out of it. In the Arian contro versy this designation of the Son was appealed to as proving that He is eternally generated and exists not by an act of the Father's will but essentially. See Suicer, s.v. As the sun cannot exist or a lamp burn without radiating light, so God is essentially Father and Son. τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. God's glory is all that belongs to him as God, and the Son is the effulgence of God's glory, not only a single ray but as Origen says: ὅλης τῆς δόξης. Therefore the Son cannot but reveal the Father. Calvin says: "Dum igitur audis filium esse splendorem Paternae gloriae, sic apud te cogita, gloriam Patris esse invisibilem, donec in Christo refulgeat". As completing the thought of these words and bringing out still more emphatically the fitness of the Son to reveal, it is added καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. χαρακτήρ, as its form indicates, originally meant the cutting agent [χαράσσειν], the tool or person who engraved. In common use, however, it usurped the place of χάραγμα and denoted the impress or mark made by the graving tool, especially the mark upon a coin which determined its value; hence, any distinguishing mark, identifying a thing or person, *character*. "Express image" translates it well. The mark left on wax or metal is the "express image" of the seal or stamp. It is a reproduction of each characteristic feature of the original. ὑποστάσεως rendered "person" in A.V.; "substance," the strict etymological equivalent, in R.V, To the English ear, perhaps, "nature" or "essence" better conveys the meaning. It has not the strict meaning it afterwards acquired in Christian theology, but denotes all that from which the glory springs and with which indeed it is identical. [We must not confound the δόξα with the ἀπαύγασμα as Hofmann and others do. The ὑπόστασις is the nature, the δόξα its quality, the ἀπαύγασμα its manifestation.] There is in the Father nothing which is not reproduced in the Son, save the relation of Father to Son. Ménégoz objects that though a mirror perfectly reflects the object before it and the wax bears the very image of the seal, the mirror and the wax have not the same nature as that which they represent. And Philo more than once speaks of man's rational nature as τύπος τις καὶ χαρακτὴρ θείας δυνάμεως, and the ἀπαύγασμα of that blessed nature, see *Quod deter. insid.*, c. xxiii.; *De Opif. Mundi*, c. li. All that he means by this is, that man is made in God's image. But while no doubt the primary significance of the terms used by the writer to the Hebrews is to affirm the fitness of Christ to reveal God, the accompanying expressions, in which Divine attributes are ascribed to Him, prove that this fitness to reveal was based upon community of nature. The two clauses, ὃς to αὐτοῦ, have frequently been accepted as exhibiting the Trinitarian *versus* the Arian and Sabellian positions; the Sabellians accepting the ἀπαύγασμα as representing their view of the modal manifestation of Godhead, the Arians finding it possible to accept the second clause, but neither party willing to accept both clauses—separate or individual existence of the Son being found in the figure of the seal, while identity of nature seemed to be affirmed in ἀπαύγασμα. [ὑπόστασις was derived from the Stoics who used it as the equivalent of οὐσία, that which formed the essential substratum, τὸ ὑποκείμενον, of all qualities. The Greek fathers, however, understood by it what they termed πρόσωπον ὁμοούσιον and affirmed that there were in the Godhead three ὑποστάσεις. The Latin fathers translating ὑπόστασις by *substantia* could not make this affirmation. Hence arose confusion until Gregory Nazianzen pointed out that the difference was one of words not of ideas, and that it was due to the poverty of the Latin language. See Suicer, s.v.; Bleek in *loc.*; Bigg's *Christian Platonists*, p. 164-5; Dean Strong's *Articles* in *J.T.S.* for 1901 on the History of the Theological term Substance; Calvin *Inst.*, i, 13, 2; Loofs' *Leitfaden*, p. 109 note and p. 134.]

φέρων τε τὰ πάντα . . . "and upholding all things by the word of His power". The meaning of φέρων is seen in such expressions as that of Moses in Num. xi. 14 οὐ δυνήσομαι ἐγὼ μόνος φέρειν πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον, where the idea of being responsible for their government and guidance is involved. So in Plutarch's *Lucullus*, 6, φέρειν τὴν πόλιν of governing the city. In Latin Cicero (*pro Flac.*, 37) reminds his judges "sustinetis rempublicam humeris vestris". See Bleek. In Rabbinic literature, as

ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, 4. [d] τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρο-

d Eph. i. 21; Phil. ii. 9, 10.

Schoettgen shows, God is commonly spoken of as "portans mundum," the Hebrew word being סַבָּל In Philo, the Logos is the helmsman and pilot of all things (*De Cherub.*) τῷ ῥήματι, by the expression of His power, by making His will felt in all created nature. The present, φέρων, seems necessarily to involve that during the whole of His earthly career, this function of upholding nature was being discharged. Probably the clause is inserted not merely to illustrate the dignity of the Son, but to suggest that the whole course of nature and history, when rightly interpreted, reveals the Son and therefore the Father. The responsibility of bringing the world to a praiseworthy issue depends upon Christ, and as contributing to this work His earthly ministry was undertaken. For the notable thing He accomplished as God's Son, the use He made of His dignity and power, is expressed in the words, καθαρισμὸν τ. ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος "having accomplished purification of the sins". This was as essential to the formation of the covenant as the ability rightly to represent God's mind and will. This itself was the supreme revelation of God, and it was only after accomplishing this He could sit down at God's right hand as one who had finished the work of mediating the eternal covenant. ποιησάμενος, the mid. voice, supersedes the necessity of δι' ἑαυτοῦ. The aorist part. implies that the cleansing referred to was a single definite act performed before He sat down, and in some way preparatory to that Exalta tion. The word receives explanation in subsequent passages of the Ep. vii. 27, ix. 12-14. καθαρισμός as used in LXX suggests that the cleansing referred to means the removal of guilt and its consciousness. The worshippers were fitted by cleansing to appear before God.

ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ... "sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high". ἐκάθισεν seems to denote that the work undertaken by the Son was satisfactorily accomplished; while the sitting down ἐν δεξιᾷ κ.τ.λ. denotes entrance upon a reign. The source of the expression is in Ps. cx. 1 (cited v. 13) where the Lord says to Messiah κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, and this not only as introducing Him to the place of security and favour, but also of dignity and power. "The King's right hand was the place of power and dignity, belonging to the minister of his authority and his justice, and the channel of his mercy, the Mediator in short between him and his people" (Rendall). *Cf.* Ps. lxxx. 17. In contrast to the ever-growing and never complete revelation to the fathers, which kept the race always waiting for something more sufficing, there came at last that revelation which contained all and achieved all. But the expression not only looks backward in approval of the work done by the Son, but forward to the result of this work in His supremacy over all human affairs. μεγαλωσύνη is ascribed to God in Jude 25 and in Deut. xxxii. 3 δότε μεγαλωσύνην τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν. *Cf.* also Clem., *Ep.*, xvi. Here it is used to denote the sovereign majesty inherent in God (*cf.* xii. 2; Mk. xiv. 62). The words ἐν ὑψήλοις are connected by Westcott and Vaughan with ἐκάθισεν. It is better, with Beza and Bleek, to connect them with μεγαλωσύνης, for while in x. 12 and xii. 2, where it is said He sat down on the throne *of God*, no further designation is needed; in viii. 1, as here, where it is said that He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty, it is felt that some further designation is needed and ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς is added. No local region is intended, but supreme spiritual influence, mediation between God, the ultimate love, wisdom and sovereignty, and this world. This writer and his contemporary fellow-Christians, had reached the conviction here expressed, partly from Christ's words and partly from their own experience of His power.

Vv. 4—ii. 18. *The Son and the Angels.* Ver. 4, although forming part of the sentence 1-3, introduces a subject which continues to be more or less in view throughout chaps. i. and ii. The exaltation of the Mediator to the right hand of Sovereignty is in keeping with His designation as Son, a designation which marked Him out as superior to the angels. Proof is adduced from the O.T. To this proof, in accordance with the writer's manner, a resulting admonition is attached, ii. 1-4. And the remainder of chap. ii. is occupied with an explanation of the reasonableness of the

νόμηκεν ὄνομα. 5. ᵉ Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέ ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων, "Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε;" καὶ πάλιν, "Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ

e v. 5; 2 Sam. vii. 14; 1 Par. xxii. 10 et xxviii. 6; Ps. ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33.

incarnation and the suffering it involved; or, in other words, it is explained why if Christ is really greater than the angels, He had to be made a little lower than they.

τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος . . . "having become as much superior to the angels as He has obtained a more excellent name than they". The form of comparison here used, **τοσ. . . . ὅσῳ** is found also, vii. 20-22, viii. 6,x. 25; also in Philo. **κρείττων** is one of the words most necessary in an Epistle in which comparison is never out of sight. The Son *became* (**γενόμενος**) greater than the angels in virtue of taking His seat at God's right hand. This exaltation was the result of His earthly work. It is as Mediator of the new revelation, who has cleansed the sinful by His death, that He assumes supremacy. And this is in keeping with and in fulfilment of His obtaining the name of Son. This name **κεκληρονόμηκεν**, He has obtained, not "von Anfang an" as Bleek and others say, but as Riehm points out, in the O.T. The Messiah, then future, was spoken of as Son; and therefore to the O.T. reference is at once made in proof. The Messianic Sonship no doubt rests upon the Eternal Sonship, but it is not the latter but the former that is here in view.

In support of this statement the writer adduces an abundance of evidence, no fewer than seven passages being cited from the O.T. Before considering these, two preliminary objections may first be removed. (1) To us nothing may seem less in need of proof than that Christ who has indelibly impressed Himself on mankind is superior to the angels who are little more than a picturesque adornment of earthly life. But when this writer lived the angels may be said to have been in possession, whereas Christ had yet to win His inheritance. Moreover, as Schoettgen shows (p. 905) it was usual and needful to make good the proposition, "Messias major est Patriarchis, Mose, et Angelis ministerialibus". Prof. Odgers, too, has shown (*Proceedings of Soc. of Hist. Theol.*, 1895-6) that quite possibly the writer had in view some Jewish Gnostics who believed that Christ Himself belonged to the angelic creation and had, with the angels, a fluid personality and no proper human nature. In any case it was worth the writer's while to carry home to the conviction of his contemporaries that a mediation accomplished by one who was tempted and suffered and wrought righteousness, a mediation of an ethical and spiritual kind, must supersede a mediation accomplished by physical marvels and angelic ministries. (2) The passages cited from the Old Testament in proof of Christ's superiority although their immediate historical application is disregarded, are confidently adduced in accordance with the universal use of Scripture in the writer's time. But it must not be supposed that these passages are culled at random. With all his contemporaries this writer believed that where statements were made of an Israelitish king or other official in an ideal form not presently realised in those directly addressed or spoken of, these were considered to be Messianic, that is to say, destined to find their fulfilment and realisation in the Messiah. These interpretations of Scripture were the inevitable result of faith in God. The people were sure that God would somehow and at some time fulfil the utmost of His promise.

The first two quotations (ver. 5) illustrate the giving of the more excellent name; the remaining quotations exhibit the superiority of the Son to angels, or more definitely the supreme rule and imperishable nature of the Son, in contrast to the perishable nature and servile function of the angels.

Ver. 5. **τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων** . . . "For to which of the angels did he ever say My Son art Thou, I this day have begotten Thee?" **τίνι** to what individual; **ποτε** in the whole course of history. The angels as a class are called "Sons of Elohim" in the O.T. (Gen. vi. 2; Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7; Job i. 6). But this was not used in its strict sense but merely as expressive of indefinite greatness, nor was it addressed to any individual. **εἶπεν**, the subject unexpressed, as is common in citing Scripture (2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8, etc.). Winer and Blass supply **ὁ θεός**, others **ἡ γραφή**. Warfield, who gives the fullest treatment of the subjectless use of **λέγει, φησί**, and such words

f Ps. xcvii. 7; Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18.

εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν;" 6. f ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει, "Καὶ προσκυνη-

(*Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 1899) holds that either subject may be supplied, because "under the force of their conception of Scripture as an oracular book it was all one to the N.T. writers whether they said 'God says' or 'Scripture says'." Here, however, the connection involves that the subject is **ὁ θεός**. The words cited are from Ps. ii. 7 and are in verbal agreement with the LXX, which again accurately represents the Hebrew. The psalm was written to celebrate the accession of a King, Solomon or some other; but the writer, seeing in his mind's eye the ideal King, clothes the new monarch in his robes. The King was called God's Son on the basis of the promise made to David (2 Sam. vii. 14) and quoted in the following clauses: The words **ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε** do not seem to add much to the foregoing words, except by emphasising them, according to the ordinary method of Hebrew poetry. **σήμερον** is evidently intended to mark a special occasion or crisis and cannot allude to the eternal generation of the Son. In its original reference it meant "I have begotten Thee to the kingly dignity". It is not the beginning of life, but the entrance on office that is indicated by **γεγέννηκα**, and it is as King the person addressed is God's Son. Thus Paul, in his address to the Pisidians (Acts xiii. 33), applies it to the Resurrection of Christ; *cf.* Rom. i. 4. The words, then, find their fulfilment in Christ's Resurrection and Ascension and sitting down at God's right hand as Messiah. He was thus proclaimed King, begotten to the royal dignity, and in this sense certainly no angel was ever called God's Son.

This is more fully illustrated by another passage introduced by the usual **καὶ πάλιν** (see x. 30, and Longinus, *De Subl.*, chap. iv, etc.). **Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα . . .**, words spoken in God's name by Nathan in reference to David's seed, and conveying to him the assurance that the kings of his dynasty should ever enjoy the favour and protection and inspiration enabling them to rule as God's representatives. This promise is prior in history to the previous quotation, and is its source; see 2 Sam. vii. 14. **ἔσομαι εἰς** is Hellenistic after a Hebrew model. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 85.

Ver. 6. **ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ . . .** "And when He shall again have brought the first-begotten into the world [of men], He says, "And let all God's angels worship Him". Having shown that "Son" is a designation reserved for the Messiah and not given to any of the angels, the writer now advances a step and adduces a Scripture which shows that the relation of angels to the Messiah is one of worship. It is not easy to determine whether **πάλιν** merely indicates a fresh quotation (so Bleek, Bruce, etc.) as in ver. 5; or should be construed with **εἰσαγάγῃ**. On the whole, the latter is preferable. Both the position of **πάλιν** and the tense of **εἰσαγ.** seem to make for this construction. The "bringing in" is still future. Apparently it is to the second Advent reference is made; *cf.* ix. 28. To refer **εἰσαγ.** to the incarnation, with Chrysostom, Calvin, Bengel, Bruce (see esp. Schoettgen); or to the resurrection with Grotius; or to an imagined introduction of the Son to created beings at some past period, with Bleek, is, as Weiss says, "sprachwidrig". Rendall remarks: "The words *bring in* have here a legal significance; they denote the introduction of an heir into his inheritance, and are used by the LXX with reference to putting Israel in possession of his own land both in the time of Joshua and at the Restoration (Exod. vi. 8, xv. 17; Deut. xxx. 5)." This throws light not only on **εἰσαγ.** but also on **πρωτότοκον** and **οἰκουμένην**, and confirms the interpretation of the clause as referring to the induction of the first-born into His inheritance, the world of men. **πρωτότ.** is used of Christ (1) in relation to the other children of Mary (Luke ii. 7; Matt. i. 25); (2) in relation to other men (Rom. viii. 29; Col. i. 18); (3) in relation to creation (Col. i. 15). Nowhere else in N.T. is it used absolutely; but *cf.* Ps. lxxxix. 27. "I will make him first-born," *i.e.*, superior in dignity and closer in intimacy. **λέγει**, the present is used because the words recorded in Scripture and still unfulfilled are meant. These words, **καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν . . .** occur verbatim in Moses' song (Deut. xxxii. 43). In the Alexandrian text, from which this writer usually quotes, we find **υἱοὶ Θεοῦ** (*v.* Swete's LXX), but in a copy of the song subjoined to the Psalter this MS. itself has **ἄγγελοι**. The words are not represented in the Hebrew, and

σάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ". 7. [g] Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει, "Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα". 8. [h] πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, "Ὁ

g Ps. civ. 4.
h Ps. xlv. 6.

are supposed by Delitzsch to have been added in the liturgical use of Moses' song. The part of the song to which they are attached represents the coming of God to judgment, a fact which further favours the view that it is the second Advent our author has in view.

Ver. 7. **καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει. . . .** The **πρὸς μὲν** of this verse is balanced by **πρὸς δὲ** in ver. 8; and in both **πρός** is to be rendered "with reference to," or "of" as in Luke xx. 19; Rom. x. 21; Xen., *Mem.*, iv. 2-15. *Cf.* Winer, p. 505: and our own expression "speak to such and such a point". **ὁ ποιῶν κ.τ.λ.** cited from Ps. civ. 4, Lünemann and others hold that the Hebrew is wrongly rendered and means "who maketh winds his messengers" not "who maketh His angels winds". Calvin, too, finds no reference to angels in the words. He believes that in this Hymn of Creation the Psalmist, to illustrate how God is in all nature, says "who maketh the winds his messengers," *i.e.*, uses for his purposes the apparently wildest of natural forces, and "flaming fire his ministers," the most rapid, resistless and devouring of agents controlled by the Divine hand. *Cf.* Shakespeare, "thought-executing fires". The writer accepts the LXX translation and it serves his purpose of exhibiting that the characteristic function of angels is service, and that their form and appearance depend upon the will of God. This was the current Jewish view. Many of the sayings quoted by Schoettgen and Weber suggest that with some of the Rabbis the belief in angels was little more than a way of expressing their faith in a spiritual, personal power behind the forces of nature. "When they are sent on a mission to earth, they are wind: when they stand before God they are fire." The angel said to Manoah, "I know not after what image I am made, for God changes us every hour; why, then, dost thou ask after my name? Sometimes He makes us fire, at others wind; sometimes men, at other times angels." Sometimes they appear to have no individual existence at all, but are merely the light-radiance or halo of God's glory. "No choir of angels sings God's praises twice, for each day God creates new hosts which sing His praises and then vanish into the stream of fire from under the throne of His glory whence they came." *Cf.* also the Book of Jubilees, ii. 2. "On the first day He created the heavens which are above and the earth and the waters and all the spirits which serve before Him—the angels of the presence, and the angels of sanctification, and the angels of the spirit of the winds, and the angels of the spirit of the clouds, and of darkness, and of snow and of hail, and of hoar frost, and the angels of the voices of the thunder and of the lightning, and the angels of the spirits of cold and of heat, and of winter and of spring, and of autumn and of summer, and of all the spirits of His creatures which are in the heavens and on the earth, the abysses and the darkness, eventide and the light, dawn and day which He hath prepared in the knowledge of His heart." One thing all these citations serve to bring out is that the angels were merely servants; like the physical forces of nature they were dependent and perishable. In contrast to these qualities are those ascribed to the Son.

Ver. 8. **πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν . . .,** the quotation being from Ps. xlv. in which the King in God's kingdom is described ideally. The points in the quotation which make it relevant to the writer's purpose are the ascription of *dominion and perpetuity* to the Son. The emphatic words, therefore, are **θρόνος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ῥάβδος,** and **παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.** It does not matter, therefore, whether we translate "Thy throne is God" or "Thy throne, O God," for the point here to be affirmed is not that the Messiah is Divine, but that He has a throne and everlasting dominion. Westcott adopts the rendering "God is thy throne," and compares Ps. lxxi. 3; Isa. xxvi. 4; Ps. xc. 1, xci. 1, 2; Deut. xxx. 27. He thinks it scarcely possible that "God" can be addressed to the King. Vaughan, on the other hand, says: "Evidently a vocative. *God is thy throne* might possibly have been said (Ps. xlvi. 1): *thy throne is God* seems an unnatural phrase. And even in its first (human) application the vocative would cause no difficulty (Ps. lxxxii. 6; John x. 34, 35)." Weiss strongly advocates this construction, and speaks of the other as quite given up. **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τ. αἰῶνος,** "to the age of the age," "for

θρόνος σου, ὁ Θεὸς, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος[1]· ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος[2] τῆς βασιλείας σου.[3] 9. [i]ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην, καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν· διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ Θεός σου, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου." 10. [k]Καὶ, "Σὺ κατ' ἀρχὰς,

i Acts x. 38.
k Ps. cii. 25.

[1] Insert και with ℵABD*E*M, 17.
[2] T.R. in DEKLP al fere omn; η ραβδος ευθ. ραβδος with ℵABM.
[3] αυτου in ℵB; σου in ADEKLMP.

ever and ever," "to all eternity." *Cf.* Eph. iii. 21, **εἰς πάσας τ. γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τ. αἰώνων**, and the frequent **εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων**. See others in Vaughan or Concordance. "The aim of all these varieties of expression is the same; to heap up masses of time as an approximation to the conception of eternity" (Vaughan). **καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς εὐθύτητος ῥάβδος τ. βασιλείας σου.** The less strongly attested reading [see notes] gives the better sense: The sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. The well-attested reading gives the sense: "The sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of thy kingdom". The everlasting dominion affirmed in the former clause is now declared to be a righteous rule. An assurance of this is given in the the further statement.

Ver. 9. **ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην . . .** "Thou lovedst righteousness and didst hate lawlessness, therefore God, thy God, anointed thee with oil of gladness above thy fellows." The quotation is verbatim from LXX of Ps. xlv. 8 [the Alexand. text reads **ἀδικίαν** in place of **ἀνομίαν**, so that the author used a text not precisely in agreement with that of Cod: Alex. *v.* Weiss]. The anointing as King is here said to have been the result [**διὰ τοῦτο**] of his manifestation of qualities fitting him to rule as God's representative, namely, love of right and hatred of iniquity. [**ἀνομία** is used in 1 John iii. 4, as the synonym and definition of **ἁμαρτία. ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία.** It is contrasted with **δικαιοσύνῃ** in 2 Cor. vi, 14, **τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀνομίᾳ**;] It is the Messiah's love of righteousness as manifested in His earthly life which entitles Him to sovereignty. **ὁ Θεός** is taken as a vocative here, as in ver. 8, by Lünemann, Weiss and others; and **ὁ Θεός σου** as the direct nom. to **ἔχρισε**. Westcott thinks that the **ἔλαιον ἀγαλλ.** refers "not to the solemn anointing to royal dignity but to the festive anointing on occasions of rejoicing". So Alford. Davidson, on the other hand, says: "As Kings were anointed when called to the throne, the phrase means made King". So, too, Weiss and von Soden. But the psalm is not a coronation ode, but an epithalamium; the epithalamium, indeed, of the ideal King, but still a festive marriage song (vv. 10-17), to which the festal **ἔλαιον ἀγαλ.** is appropriate. The oil of exultation is the oil expressive of intense joy (*cf.* ver. 15 of the psalm). The only objection to this view is that God is said to be the anointer, but this has its parallel in Ps. xxiii. 5.; and throughout Ps. xlv. God is considered the originator of the happiness depicted (*cf.* ver. 2). Whether the marriage rejoicings are here to be applied to the Messiah in terms of vv. 16 and 17 of the psalm is doubtful. The verse is cited probably for the sake of the note of superiority contained in **παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου.** In the psalm the **μέτοχοι** are hardly other Kings; rather the companions and counsellors of the young King. In the Messianic application they are supposed by Bleek, Pierce, Alford, Davidson, Peake, etc., to be the angels. It seems preferable to keep the term indefinite as indicating generally the supremacy of Christ (*cf.* Ps. xlv. 2).—[**παρά** "From the sense of (1) *beside, parallel to*, comes that of (2) *in comparison with*; and so (3) in *advantageous* comparison with, *more than, beyond*". Vaughan].

Ver. 10. In vv. 10-12 the writer introduces another quotation from Ps. 102 (in LXX 101, 25-7). The quotation is verbatim from the LXX except that **σὺ** is lifted from the fifth to the first place in the sentence, for emphasis, and that a second **ὡς ἱμάτιον** is inserted after **αὐτούς** in ver. 12. With the introductory **καὶ** Weiss understands **πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγει**, as in ver. 8. He is also of opinion that the writer considers that the words were spoken by Jehovah and that **κύριε**, therefore, must be the Messiah.

Κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἐθεμελίωσας, καὶ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· 11. [l]αὐτοὶ ἀπολοῦνται, σὺ δὲ διαμένεις· καὶ πάντες ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσονται, 12. καὶ ὡσεὶ περιβόλαιον ἑλίξεις[1] αὐτοὺς[2] καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται· σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ, καὶ τὰ ἔτη σου οὐκ ἐκλείψουσι". 13. [m]Πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἴρηκέ ποτε, "Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου;" 14. [n]οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ

l Esa. li. 6; 2 Peter iii. 7, 10.
m x. 12, 13, et xii. 2; Ps. cx. 1; Matt. xxii. 44; Marc. xii. 36: Luc. xx. 42; Acta ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 20.
n Ps. xxxiv. 7, et xci. 11.

[1] ελιξεις ABD[c]KLMP, Vulg., WH; αλλαξεις ℵ*D* 43, Tisch.

[2] Insert ως ιματιον with ℵABD*, d, e. Tisch. with KLMP omits as a gloss. It has the appearance of a homoioteleuton.

This is possible, but it is not necessary for the justification of the Messianic reference. This follows from the character of the psalm, which predicts the manifestation of Jehovah as the Saviour of His people, even though this may only be in the far future (see ver. 13: "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion. . . . So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, etc.") Prof. B. W. Bacon of Yale has investigated this matter afresh and finds that, so far from the application of these verses to the Messiah being an audacious innovation, or even achieved, as Calvin says, "pia deflectione," "the psalm itself was a favourite resort of those who sought in even pre-Christian times for proof-texts of Messianic eschatology"; also that "we have specific evidence of the application of vv. 23, 24 to the Messiah by those who employed the Hebrew or some equivalent text" and finally that by the rendering of ענה in ver. 24 (English ver. 23) by *respondit* or ἀπεκρίθη "we have the explanation of how, in Christian circles at least, the accepted Messianic passage could be made to prove the doctrine that the Messiah is none other than the pre-existent wisdom of Prov. viii. 22-31, "through whom," according to our author, ver. 2, "God made the worlds." Indeed, we shall not be going too far if with Bruce we say: "It is possible that the writer (of Heb.) regarded this text (Ps. cii. 25-27) as Messianic because in his mind creation was the work of the pre-existent Christ. But it is equally possible that he ascribed creative agency to Christ out of regard to this and other similar texts believed to be Messianic on other grounds." See Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 280.

In vv. 13 and 14, we have the final contrast between the place of the Son and that of the angels in human redemptive history. This contrast is connected by the form of its statement with ver. 5 ("to which of the angels, etc."). There it was the greater name that was in question, here it is the higher station and function. **πρὸς τίνα δὲ κ.τ.λ.** "But to which of the angels has He at any time said . . .?" implying that to the Son He has said it, as is proved by the citation from Ps. cx. On this psalm (see note on ver. 9). **δὲ** connects this ver. with ver. 8, and stands in the third place as frequently in classics when a preposition begins the sentence (Herod., viii., 68, 2; Thuc., i., 6; Soph., *Philoct.*, 764. See examples in Klotz' *Devarius*, p. 379). **κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου**, see ver. 3; **ἐκ δεξ.** is not classical, but frequent in Hellenistic Greek, see references. **ἕως ἂν θῶ. . . .** "Until I set thine enemies as a footstool for thy feet." **ὑποπόδιον** is a later Greek word used in LXX and N.T. The figure arose from the custom of conquerors referred to in Josh. x. 24. Here it points to the complete supremacy of Christ. This attained sovereignty is the gauge of the World's consummation. The horizon of human history is the perfected rule of Jesus Christ. It is the end for which all things are now making. Whereas the angels are but the agents whose instrumentality is used by God for the furtherance of this end. **οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα. . . .** "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to serve for the sake of those who are to obtain salvation?" They have no function of rule, but are directed by a higher will to promote the interests of those who are to form Christ's kingdom. This is true of *all* of them [**πάντες**] whatever hierarchies there be among them. **λειτουργικὰ**, *cf.* v. 5. **λειτουργός**

τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; II. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο δεῖ περισσοτέρως ἡμᾶς προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, μή ποτε παρα-

with its cognates has come to play a large part in ecclesiastical language. It is originally "a public servant"; from λεῖτος, an unused adjective connected with λαός, meaning "what belongs to the people" and ἔργον. It occurs frequently in LXX, sometimes denoting the official who attends on a king (Josh. i. 1), sometimes angels (Ps. ciii. 21), commonly the priests and Levites (Neh. x. 39), οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ λειτουργοί, and Is. lxi. 6. In N.T. it is used of those who render service to God or to Christ or to men (*cf.* Lepine's *Ministers of Jesus Christ*, p. 126). εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα, present part., denoting continuous action. "Sent forth"; therefore as servants by a higher power (*cf.* Acts i. 25, διακονίας ταύτης κ. ἀποστολῆς). Διακονία originally means the ministry of a body servant or table servant (*cf.* Luke iv. 39; Mark i. 13, οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ) and is used throughout N.T. for ministry in spiritual things. μέλλοντας might almost be rendered "destined" as in Matt. iii. 7, xi, 14, xvi. 27, xvii. 12, etc. κληρονομεῖν, see on ver. 4. σωτηρίαν in the classics means either preservation or deliverance. In N.T. the word naturally came to be used as the semi-technical term for the deliverance from sin and entrance into permanent wellbeing effected by Christ. See Luke i. 71, 77; John iv. 22; Acts iv. 12, xvi. 17; Rom. i. 16, etc. In ii. 3 the salvation referred to is termed τηλικαύτη. *Cf.* Hooker's outburst, *Eccles. Pol.*, i., iv., 1, and Sir Oliver Lodge (*Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1903, p. 223): "If we are open to influence from each other by non-corporeal methods, may we not be open to influence from beings in another region or of another order? And if so, may we not be aided, inspired, guided by a cloud of witnesses—not witnesses only, but helpers, agents like ourselves of the immanent God?" On guardian angels, see Charles' *Book of Jubilees*, Moulton in *J. T. S.*, August 1902, and Rogers' edition of Aristoph., *Eccles.*, 999, and the Orphic Fragment quoted by Clement (*Strom.*, v.) Σῷ δὲ θρόνῳ πυρόεντι παρεστᾶσιν πολυμόχθοι Ἄγγελοι οἶσι μέμηλε βροτοῖς ὡς πάντα τελεῖται. *Cf.* Shakespeare's "Angels and *ministers of grace* defend us".

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-4. From this proved superiority of the Son to the angels the writer deduces the warning that neglect of the salvation proclaimed by the Lord Himself and attested by God in miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost will incur heavier punishment than that which was inflicted upon those who neglected the word spoken by angels.

Ver. 1. Διὰ τοῦτο: "on this account," because God has now spoken not through prophets or angels, but through a Son. δεῖ . . . ἡμᾶς: "we must give more excessive heed". "Alibi utitur verbo ὀφείλειν *debere:* hic δεῖ *oportet.* Illud dicit *obligationem:* hoc, urgens periculum"; Bengel, who also remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 10, ὀφείλει notat obligationem: δεῖ necessitatem; illud morale est, hoc quasi physicum; ut in vernaculâ, wir sollen und müssen". Here then it is the logical necessity that is prominent. περισσοτέρως is to be joined not with δεῖ as in Vulg. (and Bengel), "abundantius oportet observare," but with προσέχειν. The adverb occurs in xiii. 19 and six times in 2 Cor.; the adj. frequently in N.T. περισσοτέρως [περιττοτέρως] occurs in Diod. Sic., xiii. 108, τὰ περ. εἰργασμένα; also in Athenaeus, v., p. 192 F. κλισμὸς περιτ. κεκόσμηται. The comparative is here used with reference to the greater attention due to the revelation than if it had been delivered by one of less position. Atto Vercell. suggestively, "Quare abundantius . . . Nonne et illa Dei sunt et ista?" His answer being that those who had been brought up to reverence the O.T. might be apt to despise the new revelation. προσέχειν never in N.T. and only once in LXX (Job vii. 17) has the added τὸν νοῦν usual in classics. As προσέχειν is commonly used of bringing a ship to land, this sense may have suggested the παραῤῥυῶμεν. ἡμᾶς, including himself, but meaning to indicate all who in these last days had heard the revelation of Christ. τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν: "the things heard," the great salvation first preached by the Lord, ver. 3; *cf.* Acts viii. 6, xvi. 14. He means to disclose the significance of what they have already heard, rather than to bring forward new truth. μή ποτε παραῤῥυῶμεν: "lest haply we drift away". μή ποτε, as Hoogeveen shows, occurs in N.T. as = *ne quando* and also as = *ne forte;* but

ρρυῶμεν.[1] 2. [a] εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος ἐγένετο βέβαιος, καὶ πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοὴ ἔλαβεν ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν, 3. [b] πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας; ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπὸ τῶν

a Deut. xxvii. 26; Acts vii. 38, 53; Gal. iii. 19.

b xii. 25; Matt. iv. 17; Marc. i. 14.

[1] **παραρυωμεν** with ℵAB*D*LP, 17, 47, 115. Bleek favours the T.R. See also the forms given by Veitch.

in clauses expressing apprehension, as here, it can always be rendered "lest perchance". [" In Hellenistic Greek **μήποτε** in a principal clause means 'perhaps,' in a dependent clause 'if perchance,' 'if possibly,'" Blass, p. 212.] **παραῤῥυῶμεν** is 2nd aor. subj. pass. (with neuter meaning) of **παραῤῥέω**, I flow beside or past; as in Xen., *Cyrop.*, iv. 52, **πιεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραῤῥέοντος ποταμοῦ.** Hence, to slip aside; as in Soph., *Philoct.*, 653, of an arrow slipping from the quiver; in Xen., *Anab.*, iv. 4, of snow slipping off; Ælian, *V. H.*, iii. 30, of a coarse story unseasonably slipping into a discreet conversation; and in medical writers, frequently of food slipping aside into the windpipe. Origen (*Contra Celsum*, 393) says the multitude need fixed holy days, **ἵνα μὴ τέλεον παραῤῥυῇ,** "that they may not quite drift away". See also Prov. iii. 21, **υἱέ, μὴ παραῤῥυῇς, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βουλήν.**

Ver. 2. **εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι᾽ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος. . . .** An *a fortiori* argument derived from the notoriously inevitable character of the punishment which overtook those who disregarded the Law. "The word spoken through angels" is the Law, the characteristic and fundamental form under which the old revelation had been made. The belief that angels mediated the Law is found in Deut. xxxiii. 2; Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Josephus, *Ant.*, xv. 53. **ἐγένετο βέβαιος**: "proved steadfast," inviolable, held good; as in Rom. iv. 16, of the promise **εἰς τὸ εἶναι βέβαιαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν.** The sanctions of the law were not a mere *brutum fulmen*. This appeared in the fact that **πᾶσα παράβασις . . .** "every transgression and disobedience". **παράβασις** is transgression of a positive command: **παρακοή** is neglect to obey. Grotius renders **παρακ.** by "contumacia" which may be involved; but Böhme is right in his note "non commissa solum, sed omissa etiam". The inflictions, whether on individuals, as Achan, or on the whole people, as in the wilderness-generation, were "a just recompense," not an arbitrary, or excessive punishment. For **μισθαποδοσία** classical writers use **μισθοδοσία.**

Ver. 3. **πῶς ἡμεῖς. . . .** "How shall we"—to whom God has spoken through the Son, i. 2—"escape (**ἔνδικον μισθ.** prob. in final judgment, as in x. 27) if we have neglected (the aorist **ἀμελήσαντες** suggesting that life is looked at as a whole) so great a salvation?"—the salvation which formed the main theme of the new revelation. The meaning of **ἀμελήσαντες** is best illustrated by Matt. xxii. 5, where it is used of those who disregarded, or treated with contempt, the invitation to the marriage-supper. The guilt and danger of so doing are in proportion to the greatness of the announcement, and this is no longer of law but of life, *cf.* 2 Cor. iii. The word now spoken is vastly more glorious and more fully expressive of its Author than the Law, "Non erat *tanta* salus in V.T., quanta est in gratia quam Dei filius nobis attulit" (Atto Vercell:). The "greatness" of the salvation is involved in the greatness of Him who mediates it (i. 4), of the method employed (ii. 10), of the results, *many* sons being brought to *glory* (ii. 10). But one relevant aspect of its greatness, the source and guaranteed truth of its proclamation is introduced by **ἥτις**, which here retains its proper qualitative sense and may be rendered "inasmuch as it . . .". "Its object is to introduce the mention of a characteristic quality, which explains or emphasises the thing in question" (Vaughan). It was the trustworthiness of the new revelation of salvation which the Hebrews were beginning to question. The law had proved its validity by punishing transgressors but the majesty and certainty of the recent proclamation were doubtful. Therefore the writer insists that it is "very great," and illustrates its trustworthiness by adducing these three features: (1) its original proclamation by the Lord, (2) its confirmation by those who heard Him, (3) its miraculous certi-

ᶜ Marc. xvi. 20; Acts ii. 22, et xiv. 3, et xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 4, 7, 11.

ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη, 4. ᶜ συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ Θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου μερισμοῖς, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν.

fication by God. [This is not contradicted by Bleek's "Das τηλικ., tantae talisque salutis, verweist an sich wohl nicht auf den nachfolgenden relativen Satz," nor by Weiss' "Das ἥτις hängt weder sprachlich noch sachlich mit τηλικ. zusammen."] **ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι**, lit.: "having received a beginning to be spoken" = "having begun to be spoken," or "which was first proclaimed". **ἀρχὴν λαβ.**, a common phrase in later Greek, see Stephanus and Wetstein. In Polybius of a war "taking its rise". In Ælian, *V. H.*, ii. 28. **πόθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὅδε ὁ νόμος, ἐρῶ.** It is used here to indicate with precision the origin of the proclamation of the revelation about which they are feeling uncertain. **λαλεῖσθαι** refers back to ver. 2 and also to i. 1. **διὰ** to be connected with **ἀρχὴν λαβ.**; it is used instead of **ὑπὸ** because God is throughout viewed as the ultimate source of revelation. **τοῦ Κυρίου**, "the Lord" supreme over angels, and whose present exaltation reflects dignity and trustworthiness on the revelation He made while on earth. The salvation which they are tempted to neglect was at first proclaimed not by angels sent out to minister, not by servants or delegates who might possibly misapprehend the message, but by the Lord Himself, the Supreme. The source then is unquestionably pure. Has the stream been contaminated? God testifies to its purity. There is only one link between the Lord and you, they that heard Him delivered the message to you, and God by witnessing with them certifies its truth. The main verb is **ἐβεβαιώθη** which looks back to **βέβαιος** of ver. 2, and compares the inviolability of the one word or revelation with that of the other. We must not, he argues, neglect a gospel of whose veracity and importance we have assurance in this, that it was first proclaimed by the Lord Himself and that we have it on the authority of those who themselves heard Him, and who therefore were first-hand witnesses who had also made experimental verification of its validity. For **ἀκουσάντων** though without an object expressed, plainly means those who heard the Lord, *cf.* Luke i. 1. **εἰς ἡμᾶς** is rendered by Theophylact **διαπορθμευθὴ εἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως**, it has been conveyed to us in a trustworthy manner. To their testimony was added the all-convincing witness borne by God, **συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ.** The word is found in Aristotle, Philo and Polybius, xxvi. 9, 4, **παρόντων δὲ τῶν Θετταλῶν καὶ συνεπιμαρτυρούντων τοῖς Δαρδανίοις.** Also in Clement, *Ep.*, c. xxiii., **συνεπιμαρτυρούσης τῆς γραφῆς**; but only here in N.T., *cf.* 1 Pet. v. 12; Rom. ii. 15, viii. 16, ix. 1. The sense is found in Mark xvi. 20, **ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.** This witness was borne **σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν** "by signs and wonders," the two words referring to the same manifestations (**τε καὶ** closely uniting the words), which in one aspect were "signs" suggesting a Divine presence or a spirtual truth, and in another aspect "wonders" calculated to arrest attention. [The words are similarly conjoined in Polybius, Plutarch, Ælian, Philo and Josephus.] **καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσιν** "and various miracles," lit. powers, as in Matt. xi. 21, **καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλάς.** Bleek thinks it is not the outward manifestations but the powers themselves that are here meant. This, he thinks, is suggested by the connexion of the word with **πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς**, "distributions of the Holy Spirit". The genitive is genitive objective, "distributions consisting of the Holy Spirit". The remarkable character of the Charismata and the testimony they bore to a Divine presence and power are frequently alluded to in the N.T. and are enlarged upon in 1 Cor. xii. 14. Paul uses the same argument as this writer in Gal. iii. 1-4. The article is wanting before **πνεύματος** in accordance with the usage noted by Vaughan, that it is generally omitted when the communication of the Spirit is spoken of, *cf.* Luke ii. 25, John vii. 39, with John xiv. 26, Acts xix. 2 with 6. **μερισμός** only here and in a different sense in iv. 12; the verb is common. St. Paul uses it in connection with the distribution of spiritual gifts in Rom. xii. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 17. No one thought himself possessed of the fulness of the Spirit, only a **μέρος.** These distributions or apportionings, being of the Spirit of God, are necessarily

5. [d] Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξε τὴν οἰκουμένην τὴν μέλλουσαν, περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν. 6. [e] διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων, "Τί ἐστιν

d i. 2, 4, 8; 2 Peter iii. 13.
e Ps. viii. 4, et cxliv. 3.

made κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν "according to His [God s] will". In 1 Cor. xii. 11 the will is that of the Spirit. "Non omnibus omnia dabat Deus, sed quae et quantum et quibus vellet, Eph. iv. 7" (Grotius). [θέλησις only here in N.T., but ten times in LXX. Pollux calls it a "vulgarism" ἰδιωτικόν. On the substitution of nouns in -μα for nouns in -σις, see Jannaris' *Hist. Gram.*, p. 1024, and *cf.* x. 7, ix. 36, xiii. 21, so that in the present passage the choice of the active form is deliberate.] The clause is added to enforce the writer's contention that all the Charismata with which his readers were familiar were not mere fruits of excitement or in any way casual, but were the result of a Divine intention to bear witness to the truth of the gospel.

Vv. 5-18. Having sufficiently brought out the permanence and sovereignty of the Son by contrasting them with the fleeting personality and ministerial function of angels, the author now proceeds to bring the supremacy of the Son into direct relation to the Messianic administration of 'the world to come," the ideal condition of human affairs; and to explain why for the purposes of this administration it was needful and seemly that "the Lord" should for a season appear in a form "a little lower than the angels". The world of men as it was destined to be [ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα] was a condition of things in which man was to be supreme, not subject to any kind of slavery or oppression. And if the Jew asked why, in order to bring this about, the appearance of the Son in so apparently inglorious a form was necessary; if he asked why suffering and death on His part were necessary, the answer is, that it was God's purpose to bring, not angels, but many human sons to glory and that as there is but one path, and that a path of suffering, by which men can reach their destiny, it was becoming that their leader should act as pioneer in this path. His path to glory must be a path in which men can follow Him; because it is from the human level and as man that He wins to glory. More particularly His sufferings accomplish two objects: they produce in Him the sympathy which qualifies Him as High Priest, while His death breaks the power which kept them enslaved and in fear. [On this section Robertson Smith's papers in the *Expositor*, 1881-2, should be consulted.]

Ver. 5. Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις. . . . "For not to angels". With γὰρ the writer proceeds to clinch the exhortation contained in vv. 1-4, by exhibiting the ground of it. Under the old Covenant angels had been God's messengers, but this mode of mediation has passed away. The οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα is not subject to them. It is the Son as man who now rules and to whom attention must be given. ὑπέταξεν . . . "did He"—that is God—subject the world to come of which we are speaking, ἡ οἰκουμένη, not κόσμος, but the inhabited world. So used in Diod. Sic., i. 8 καθ' ἅπασαν τ. οἰκουμένην, wherever there were men. From the O.T. point of view "the world to come" meant the world under Messianic rule, but in this Epistle the Messianic Kingdom is viewed as not yet fully realised. The world to come is therefore the eternal order of human affairs already introduced and rendering obsolete the temporary and symbolic dispensation. Calvin accurately defines it thus: "Non vocari orbem futurum duntaxat, qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui coepit ab exordio regni Christi. Complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione." It is the present world of men regenerated, death and all that is inimical to human progress abolished; a condition in which all things are subjected to man. The repudiation of angels as lords of the world to come implies the admission that the obsolescent dispensation had been subject to them. So in Deut. xxxii. 8: ἔστησεν ὅρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, *cf.* Dan. x. 13-21 and *Book of Jubilees*, xv. 31. *Cf.* the pages in which Robertson Smith expands the remark that "to be subordinated" to the angelic dispensation is the same thing as to be "made under the law" (*Expositor*, 1881, p. 144 ff.). Hermas (*Vis.*, iii. 4, 1) represents the Church as being built by six angels whom he describes as being the first created οἷς παρέδωκεν ὁ Κύριος πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ, αὔξειν καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ δεσπόζειν τῆς κτίσεως πάσης.

Ver 6. διεμαρτύρατο δέ πού τις λέγων: "but some one in a certain place solemnly testifies, saying". The indefinite formula of quotation is used not because doubt existed regarding the authorship of the psalm, nor because the writer was citing

ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ· ἢ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἐπισκέπτῃ αὐτόν; 7. ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους· δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτὸν, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου[1]· 8. [f] πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ."

f Ps. viii. 6; Matt. xxviii. 18; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 27; Eph. i. 22.

[1] This clause καὶ κατέστησας is omitted from B, and the sense favours the omission.

from memory, but rather as a rhetorical mode of suggesting that his readers knew the passage well enough. So Chrysostom: δεικνύντος ἐστίν, αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμπείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν. Philo frequently uses an indefinite form of quotation: this identical form in *De Ebriet.*, 14 (Wendland, ii. 181) εἶπε γάρ πού τις. *Cf.* Longinus, *De Sub.*, ix. 2 γέγραφά που. Here only in the Epistle is a quotation from Scripture referred to its human author. **τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος. . . .** The quotation is from Ps. viii. and extends to ποδῶν αὐτοῦ in ver. 8. It illustrates the greatness of man in three particulars.

1. ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους.
2. δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας αὐτόν.
3. πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ.

And the author goes on to say that in Jesus the two former elements of man's greatness are seen to be fulfilled (He is made a little lower than the angels, and He is crowned with glory and honour), while the third is guaranteed because Jesus has tasted death for every man and so subdued even it, the last enemy, and therefore all things, under his feet.

In Ps. viii. as in so many other poets and prose writers (see Pascal's chapter on *The Greatness and Littleness of Man*, A. R. Wallace's *Man's Place in the Universe* and Fisk's *Destiny of Man*), it is the dignity put upon man which fills the writer with astonishment. When Sophocles in the *Antigone* celebrates man's greatness, πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ κοὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον πέλει, he excepts death from subjection to man, Ἅιδα μόνον φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται. Here the Hebrew poet excepts nothing. But only by Christ was he justified. Man's real place is first won by Christ. **μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ** "Thou art mindful of him" for good as in xiii. 3. Man, the subject of satire and self-contempt, is the object of God's thought. **υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου** = ἄνθρωπος of the first clause. In the Heb. אֱנוֹשׁ and בֶּן־אָדָם. **ἐπισκέπτῃ** "visit," generally as a friend (Mat. xxv. 36, James i. 27) frequently of physician visiting sick; in judgment, Jer. v. 9, 29. "The day of visitation," ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς, in good sense, Luke xix. 44; for chastisement, Isa. x. 3; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12. In Jer. xv. 15 we have the two words μνήσθητί μου καὶ ἐπίσκεψαί με.

Ver. 7. That God has been mindful of man and visited him is apparent in the three particulars now mentioned. **βραχύ τι** is "a little," either in material, or in space, or in time. In 1 Sam. xiv. 29, ἐγευσάμην βραχύ τι τ. μέλιτος. In Isa. lvii. 17, of time, δι' ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα αὐτον. So in N.T., of aterial, Jo. vi. 7; of space, Acts xxvii. 28; of time Acts, v. 34. So in classics, *v.* Bleek. The original of the psalm points to the translation: "Thou didst make him little lower than the angels" [in the Heb. מֵאֱלֹהִים "than God"]. There seems no reason to depart from this meaning either in this verse or in ver. 9. So Alford and Westcott, but Davidson and Weiss and several others are of opinion that as the words are in ver. 9 applied to the Messiah, whose superiority has been so insisted upon, an allusion to His inferiority would be out of place; "and that the phrase should be used of degree in one place and time in another, when the point of the passage lies in the identity of the Son's history with that of man, is an idea only puerile" (Davidson). But on any rendering the inferiority of Jesus to angels so far as dying goes is granted, and there is no reason why the sense of degree should not be kept in both clauses. **δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ** frequently conjoined, Rev. xxi. 26; 1 Tim. i. 17; Thucyd., iv. 86; Plut., *Num.*, 51; Lucian *Somn.*, 13.

Ver. 8. **πάντα ὑπέταξας. . . .** "Thou didst put all things under his feet." In the psalm "all things" are defined as "all sheep and oxen, yea and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passes through the paths of the sea". But to our author the scope of the "all" has

Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, οὐδὲν ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον· νῦν δὲ οὔπω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα. 9. [g] τὸν δὲ βραχύ τι παρ' ἀγγέλους ἠλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου, δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον,

g Acts ii. 33; Phil. ii. 7, 8, 9.

been enlarged by the event. His argument requires an absolutely universal subjection, so that everything obstructive of man's "glory" may be subdued. And having seen this achieved by Christ, he is emboldened to give to "all" this fullest content. The one point he seeks to make good is that "in subjecting all things to him, he has left nothing, *and therefore not the* **οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα**, unsubjected to him". The "world to come" is under human dominion and administration. The angels are left behind; there is no room for angelic government. But this very sovereignty of man is precisely that which we do not see visibly fulfilled: "for the present (**νῦν**) we do not yet see all things subjected to him". True, says the author, but we do see Jesus who for the suffering of death (or that He might suffer death) has been made a little lower than angels, crowned with glory and honour that by God's grace He might taste death for every man. In other words, we see the first two items of man's supremacy, as given in the psalm, fulfilled, and the third guaranteed. Jesus was (1) made a little lower than angels; (2) was crowned with glory and honour; and (3) by dying for every man has removed that last obstacle, the fear of death which kept men in **δουλεία** and hindered them from supreme dominion over all things. The construction of the sentence is much debated. But it must be admitted that any construction which makes the coronation subsequent to the tasting death for every man, is unnatural; the **ὅπως** depends upon **ἐστεφανωμένον**. And the difficulty which has been felt in giving its natural sense to this clause has been introduced by supposing that **δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφ.** refers to the heavenly state of Jesus. On this understanding it is of course difficult to see how it could be said that Jesus was crowned in order to taste death. But as undoubtedly the first clause, **ἠλαττουμένον βλέπομεν**, refers to the earthly life of Jesus, it is natural to suppose that the second clause, which speaks of his being crowned, also refers to that life. The tenses are the same. But if so, what was the crowning here referred to? It was His recognition as Messiah, as the true Head and King of men. He was thus recognised by God at His baptism and at the Transfiguration [in connection with which the same words **δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ** are used, 2 Pet. i. 16-18] as well as by His disciples at Caesarea Philippi. It was this crowning alone which enabled Him to die a representative death, the King or Head for His people; it was this which fitted Him to taste death for *every* man. He was made a little lower than the angels that He might suffer death; but He was crowned with glory and honour that this very death might bring all men to the glory of supremacy which was theirs when the fear of death was removed; see v. 14, 15. For a fuller exposition of this view of the verse, see *Expository Times*, April, 1896. **χάριτι θεοῦ**, "by God's grace," to men, not directly to Jesus. It is remarkable that Weiss, an expert in textual criticism, should adopt the reading **χωρὶς θεοῦ** "apart from God" finding in these words a reference to the cry on the cross "My God, My God, etc.". The other meaning put upon the words, "except God," needs no comment. The Nestorians used the reading to prove that Christ suffered apart from His Divinity ("divinitate tantisper deposita **οὐ συνῆν ἡ θεότης**") but such a meaning can hardly be found in the words. **ὑπὲρ παντός**, these are the emphatic words, bringing out the writer's point that Christ's victory and supremacy were not for Himself alone, but for men. [Chrysostom strikingly says: **οὐχὶ τῶν πιστῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης· αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· τί δὲ, εἰ μὴ πάντες ἐπίστευσαν; αὐτὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πεπλήρωκε.**] **γεύσηται θανάτου** "he might taste death," *i.e.*, actually experience death's bitterness. The Greek commentators suppose the word is chosen to bring out the shortness of our Lord's experience of death, **μικρὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσας διάστημα**. This seems incorrect. [The rule, sometimes laid down,, that **γεύεσθαι** followed by an accusative means to partake freely, and by a genitive sparingly, cannot be universally applied. The ordinary distinction observed in the use of verbs of sense that they take the

h v. 9, et xii. 2; Luc. xxiv. 26, 46; Acts iii. 15, et v. 31; Rom. ii. 36; Phil. ii. 8, 9.

ὅπως χάριτι Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ[1] παντὸς γεύσηται θανάτου.[2] 10. h Ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτῷ, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς

[1] T.R. is read in almost all the MSS. and versions and adopted by all editors. But χωρις Θεου is found in M, 67**, Origen.

[2] "Hic versus multas difficultates interpretationi affert. Fortasse v. 9b (οπως . . . θανατου) corruptus vel interpolatus est" (Baljon).

accusative of the nearer, the genitive of the remoter source of the sensation is much safer.] The expression γεύεσθαι θανάτου does not occur in the classics, although we find γευ. μόχθου in Soph., *Trachin.*, 1103, where the Scholiast renders by ἐπειράθην, in *Antig.*, 1005, where Jebb renders "proceeded to make trial of," in Eurip., *Hecuba*, 375, with κακῶν and in Plato, *Rep.*, 475 with πάντος μαθήματος.

Vv. 10-18. The humiliation of the Son justified; "a condensed and pregnant view of the theory of the whole work of Christ, which subsequent chapters develop, eludicate, and justify dialectically, in contrast or comparison with the O.T. . . . The ultimate source of all doubt whether the new dispensation is superior to the old is nothing else than want of clear insight into the work of Christ, and especially into the significance of His passion, which, to the Jews, from whom the Hebrew Christians of our Epistle were drawn, was the chief stumbling-block in Christianity. Here, therefore, the writer has at length got into the heart of his subject, and, leaving the contrast between Christ and the angels, urges the positive doctrine of the identification of Jesus with those that are his—his brethren, the Sons of God whom He sanctifies—as the best key to that connection between the passion and glorification of Christ which forms the cardinal point of N.T. revelation" (Robertson Smith). To this it may only be added that in order to prove man's supremacy and justify Psalm viii., it was essential that the writer should show that Christ was man, identified with humanity.

In justification then (justification introduced by γὰρ) of the subjection of Jesus to the πάθημα θανάτου, the writer proceeds to say ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ "it befitted Him". The expression, says Carpzov, is "frequentissima Philoni phrasis"; but in Scripture, at least in this sense, it stands alone: *cf.* Jer. x. 7; Ps. lxv. 1. Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.*, iv. 2-2: Burnet, p. 173) says that what is befitting is relative to the person, the circumstances and the object [τὸ πρέπον δὴ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ ὅ]. The object here in view, the "bringing many sons to glory," needs no justification. As Tertullian (*adv. Marcion*, ii. 27) says: "nihil tam dignum Deo, quam salus hominis". But that the means used by God to accomplish this end was not only fit to bring it about but was also πρέπον θεῷ, in other words, that Christ's humiliation and death were in accordance with the Divine nature, is the point the writer wishes to make good. "The whole course of nature and grace must find its explanation in God, and not merely in an abstract Divine *arbitrium*, but in that which befits the Divine nature". This matter of Christ's suffering has not been isolated in God's government but is of a piece with all He is and has done; it has not been handed over to chance, accident, or malevolent powers, but is part of the Divine rule and providence; it is not exceptional, unaccountable, arbitrary, but has its root and origin in the very nature of God. God acted freely in the matter, governed only by His own nature. "Man has not wholly lost the intuitive power by which the fitness of the Divine action, its correspondence to the idea standard of right which his conscience certifies and his reason approves, may be recognised" (Henson, *Disc. and Law*, p. 56). "It is worth noting that the chief value of Anselm's view of the Atonement lies in the introduction into theology of the idea of what befits God—the idea, as he puts it, of God's honour. Anselm fails, however, by thinking rather of what God's honour must receive as its due than of what it is seemly for God in His grace to do, and thus his theory becomes shallow and inadequate" (Robertson Smith). The writer does not say ἔπρεπεν θεῷ but ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα "Him on account of whom are all things and through whom are all things," who is the reason and the cause of all existence; in whom, there-

δόξαν ἀγαγόντα, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων i x. 10, 14; τελειῶσαι. 11. [1]ὅ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι, ἐξ ἑνὸς πάν- Acts xvii. 26.

fore, everything must find its reason and justification. "Denn wenn um seinetwillen das All ist, also Alles seinen Zwecken dienen muss, und durch ihn das All ist, also nichts ohne sein Zuthun zu Stande kommt, so muss man bei Allem, was geschieht, und somit auch bei dem Todesleiden fragen, wiefern es ihm angemessen ist" (Weiss). The purpose of God is expressed in the words: **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα** "in bringing many sons to glory". The accusative **ἀγαγ.** (although referring to **αὐτῷ**) does not require us to construe it with **ἀρχηγὸν**. That is a possible but clumsy construction. The use of **υἱοὺς** implies that the Father is the subject and leads us to expect that the action of God will be mentioned. And this construction, in which the dative of the subject becomes an accusative when an infinitive follows, is not unknown, but is merely a species of attraction—the infinitive drawing the noun into the case appropriate. *Cf.* Acts xi. 12, xv. 22; Luke i. 74. Examples from the classics in *Matthiae*, 535. The aorist participle has led the Vulgate to translate "qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat," needlessly, for "the aorist participle is sometimes used adverbially in reference to an action evidently in a general way coincident in time with the action of the verb, yet not identical with it. The choice of the aorist participle rather than the present in such cases is due to the fact that the action is thought of, not as in progress, but as a simple event or fact (Burton, *M. and T.*, 149). **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς** "many" is not used with any reference to the population of the world, or to the proportion of the saved, but to the one Son already celebrated. It was God's purpose not only to have one Son in glory, but to bring many to be partakers with Him. Hence the difficulty; hence the need of the suffering of Christ. But it is not merely **πολλοὺς** but **πολλοὺς υἱοὺς** suggesting the relationship dwelt upon in the succeeding verses. **τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτηρίας** . . . the author [pioneer] of their salvation indicating that feature of Christ's relation to the saved which determined His experience, "the Captain of their salvation". R.V. has "author" following Vulg. Chrysostom has **ἀρχηγὸν τουτέστι τὸν αἴτιον**, and so Robertson Smith, "it is hardly necessary to put more meaning into the phrase than is contained in the parallel expression of v. 9". So Bleek, Kübel and von Soden. But the word is select, and why select, if not to bring out precisely this, that in the present case the cause is also the leader, "that the Son goes before the saved in the same path". He is the strong swimmer who carries the rope ashore and so not only secures His own position but makes rescue for all who will follow. "The **ἀρχηγός** himself first takes part in that which he establishes" (Westcott). One of the chief points in the Epistle is that the Saviour is also **ἀρχηγός**. The word is commonly used of founders of tribes, rulers and commanders, persons who begin anything in become the source of anything, but or this Epistle (xii. 2) it has over and above the sense of "pioneer". **διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι**, "to perfect through sufferings". **τελειῶσαι** is to make **τέλειον**, to bring a person or thing to the appropriate **τέλος**, to complete, perfect. consummate. In the Pentateuch it is regularly used to denote the consecration of the priests. In the N.T. this consecration is no formal setting apart to office, but a preparation involving ethical fitness. So that here the word *directly* denotes making perfect as leader of salvation, but *indirectly* and by implication making morally perfect. And this moral perfection, requisite in one who was to cleanse sinners (note **σωτηρίας**) and lead the way to glory, could only be proved and acquired through the sufferings involved in living as man, tempted and with death to face. Therefore **διὰ παθημάτων**, "a plurality of sufferings" not merely as in ver. 9 **τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου**. *Cf.* ver. 18. The glory indeed to which this captain of salvation leads is the glory of triumph over temptation and all that tends to terrify and enslave men.

Ver. 11. In the eleventh verse the writer proceeds to explain *wherein* consisted the fittingness (**τὸ πρέπον**) of perfecting the **ἀρχηγόν** through sufferings. It lies in the fact that He and those He leads are brothers. In vv. 11-13 it is shown that this is so, and in the succeeding verses the writer points out what is involved in this brotherhood. **ὁ ἁγιάζων** and **οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι** are to be

k Ps. xxii. 22, 25; 2 Sam. xxii. 3; Ps. xviii. 2.

τες· δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, 12. k λέγων, "Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε". Καὶ πάλιν, "Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ'

taken as present participles, so usually are, in the timeless substantive sense. ἁγιάζειν means (1) to set apart as belonging to God, in contradistinction to κοινός, belonging to every one. So in Gen. ii. 3, of the seventh day, and in Exodus of the mountain, the tent, the altar. It is especially used of persons set apart to the priesthood or to any special work (Exod. xxx. 30; Jer. i. 5; John x. 36). Through the O.T. ceremonial the whole people were thus ἡγιασμένοι, set apart to God, admitted to His worship. In this Epistle the word is used with much of the O.T. idea cleaving to it, and is often rather equivalent to what we understand by "justify" than to "sanctify". *Cf.* x. 10. It signifies that which enables men to approach God. But (2) it is in N.T. more and more felt that it is only by purification of character men can be set apart for God, so that this higher meaning also attaches to the word. In the present verse ἁγιάζων introduces the priestly idea, enlarged upon in ver. 17. ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες "all of one". There is much to be said for Calvin's interpretation "of one nature," or Cappellus' "of one common mass". Certainly Bleek's reason for rejecting such renderings—that ἐξ can only signify *origin*, is incorrect. "Greek often uses the prepositions of origin (ἐκ, ἀπό) when we prefer those of position or direction, as in ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου, on a sudden, ἐξ ἀφανοῦς, in a doubt, ἐκ μιᾶς χειρός, with one hand" (Verrall on *Choeph.*, line 70). In N.T. ἐκ frequently expresses the party or class to which one belongs (Jo. iii. 31). And *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 17. It might be urged from xi. 12 that this writer had he meant parentage would have said ἀφ' ἑνός. Nevertheless the meaning seems to be "of one father". The πολλοὺς υἱοὺς of ver. 10, and the δι' ἣν αἰτίαν which follows make for this sense. And the argument of ver. 14, that because Christ was brother to men He therefore took flesh, proves that ἐξ ἑνὸς cannot mean "of one nature". The fact that He and they are ἐξ ἑνὸς is the ground of His incarnation. He was Son and Brother before appearing on earth. The words then can only mean that the "many sons" who are to be brought to glory and the "Son" who leads them are of one parentage. The sonship in both cases looks to the same Father, and depends on Him and is subject to the same laws of obedience and development. But what Father is meant? Not Adam (Beza, Hofmann, etc.); Weiss argues strongly for Abraham, appealing to ver. 16 and other considerations; but the fact that in ver. 14 the incarnation is treated as a *result* of the brotherhood, seems to involve that we must understand that God is meant; that before the incarnation Christ recognised His brotherhood. "On this account," because His parentage is the same, "He is not ashamed to call them brothers". He might have been expected to shrink from those who had so belied their high origin, or at the best to move among them with the kindly superior professionalism of a surgeon who enters the ward of an hospital solely to heal, not to live there; but He claims men as his kin and on this bases His action (*cf.* xi. 16).

Ver. 12. In proof that He is not ashamed to take his place among men as a brother three passages are adduced from the O.T. in which this relationship is implied. These passages are so confidently assumed to be Messianic that they are quoted as spoken by Christ Himself, λέγων. The fact that words of Jesus spoken while He lived on earth are not quoted can scarcely be accepted as proof that the Gospels were not in existence when this Epistle was written, for even after the middle of the second century, the O.T. was still the "Scripture" of the Christian Church. The first quotation is from the twenty-second Psalm applied to Himself by our Lord on the cross. The LXX διηγήσομαι is altered to ἀπαγγελῶ. The significant words in the first clause are τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου; and the significance of the second clause consists in the representation of the Messiah as taking part in the *worship of God* in the congregation. This is one particular form in which His brotherhood manifests itself. For the passages cited not merely affirm the brotherhood, but also exhibit its reality in the participation by the Messiah of human conditions.

Ver. 13. The two quotations cited in the thirteenth verse are from Isa. viii. 17, 18. There they are continuous, here they are separately introduced, each by the

αὐτῷ". 13. [l] Καὶ πάλιν, "Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἅ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός". 14. [m] Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος,[1] καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, τουτ-

l Esa. viii. 18; Joan. x. 29, et xvii. 6, 9, 11, 12.
m Esa. xxv. 8; Ose. xiii. 14; Joan. i. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 10.

[1] T.R. in KL, f, vgcle; αιματ. κ. σαρκος in ℵBCDEMP, 17, 37, 47, 137.

usual καὶ πάλιν, because they serve to bring out two distinct points. In the first, the Messiah utters his trust in God, and thereby illustrates His sonship and brotherhood with man. Like all men He is dependent on God. As Calvin says: "since He depends on the aid of God His condition has community with ours". In the second part, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ not only calls attention to Himself as closely associated with the παιδία; but also, as Weiss thinks, intimates His readiness to obey, as if "Here am I". This obedience He shares with those whom God has committed to His care, God's παιδία and His brothers. *Cf.* Jo. vi. 37, 39, xvii. 11.

Vv. 14-16. This saving brotherhood involved incarnation and death. For, as it has ever been the common lot of the παιδία to live under the conditions imposed by flesh and blood, subject to inevitable dissolution and the shrinkings and weaknesses consequent, He also, this Son of God, Himself (καὶ αὐτὸς) shared with them in their identical nature, thus making Himself liable to death; His intention being that by dying He might render harmless him that used death as a terror, and thus deliver from slavery those who had suffered death to rule their life and lived in perpetual dread. κεκοινώνηκεν . . . μετέσχεν perf. and aor.; the one pointing to the common lot which the παιδία have always shared, αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, usually (but not always, Eph. vi. 12) inverted and denoting human nature in its weakness and liability to decay (Gal. i. 16, etc., and especially 1 Cor. xv. 50); the other, expressing the one act of Christ by which He became a sharer with men in this weak condition. He partook, but does not now partake. [Wetstein quotes from Polyaenus that Chabrias enjoined upon his soldiers when about to engage in battle to think of the enemy as ἀνθρώποις αἷμα καὶ σάρκα ἔχουσιν καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν κεκοινωνηκόσι.] This human nature Christ assumed παραπλησίως, which Chrysostom interprets, οὐ φαντασίᾳ οὐδὲ εἰκόνι ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ. It means not merely "in like manner," but "in absolutely the same manner"; as in Arrian vii. 1, 9, σὺ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὢν, παραπλήσιος τοῖς ἄλλοις, Herod. iii. 104, σχεδὸν παραπλησίως "almost identical"; see also Diod. Sic., v. 45. τῶν αὐτῶν, *i.e.*, blood and flesh. The purpose of the incarnation is expressed in the words ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου . . . ἦσαν δουλείας. He took flesh that He might die, and so destroy not death but him that had the power of death, and deliver, etc. The double object may be considered as one, the defeat of the devil involving the deliverance of those in bondage. The means He used to accomplish this object was His dying (διὰ τ. θανάτου). How the death of Christ had the result here ascribed to it, we are left to conjecture; for nowhere else in the Epistle is the deliverance of man by Christ's death stated in analogous terms. We must first endeavour to understand the terms here employed. καταργήσῃ: "might render inoperative" (ἄεργον), "bring to nought". Sometimes "destroy" or "put an end to" as in 1 Cor. xv. 26 ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος. τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, "him who has the power of death, that is, the devil," τὸν διάβολον (διαβάλλω, I set asunder, put at variance) used by LXX to render שָׂטָן in Job i. ii. and Zach. iii., etc.; Σατάν is used in 1 Kings xi. In N.T. both designations occur frequently. But the significance for our present passage lies in the description "him who has the power of death". ἔχειν τὸ κράτος is classical, and κράτος with the genitive denotes the realm within which or over which the rule is exercised, as Herod., iii. 142, τῆς Σάμου τ. κράτος. In connection with this universal human experience of death he uses his malign influence, and the striking vision of Zech. iii. shows us how he does

n Luc. i. 74; Rom. viii. 15. ἐστι, τὸν διάβολον, 15. ⁿ καὶ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους, ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας.[1] 16. οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐπι-

[1] δουλιας in ℵD*E*HP; δουλειας in ABCDb, etc., E**KLM.

so. He brings sins to remembrance, he appears as the accuser of the brethren, as the counsel for the prosecution. Thus he creates a fear of death, a fear which is one of the most marked features of O.T. experience. Both Schoettgen and Weber produce rabbinical sayings which illustrate the power of a legal religion to produce servility and fear, so that the natural expression of the Jew was, "In this life death will not suffer a man to be glad". Life, in short, with sin unaccounted for, and with death viewed as the punishment of sin to look forward to, is a **δουλεία** unworthy of God's sons. This indeed is expressly stated in ver. 15. The **δουλεία** which contradicts the idea of sonship and prevents men from entering upon their destiny of dominion over all things is occasioned by their fear of death (**φόβῳ**, the dative of cause) as that which implies rejection by God. [Among the races whose conscience was not educated by the law, views of death varied greatly. These will be found in Geddes' *Phaedo*, pp. 217, 223; and *cf.* the opening paragraphs of the third Book of the *Republic*, as well as pp. 330 and 486 B. Aristotle with his usual straightforward frankness pronounces death **φοβερώτατον**. On the other hand, many believed **τεθνάμεναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος**; Hegesias was styled **ὁ πεισιθάνατος**, and by his persuasions and otherwise suicide became popular; and death was no longer reckoned an everlasting ill, but "portum potius paratum nobis et perfugium". Wholly applicable to the present passage is Spinoza's "homo *liber* de nihilo minus quam de morte cogitat". *Cf.* Philo, *Omn. sap. liber*, who quotes Eurip., **τίς ἐστι δοῦλος τοῦ θανεῖν ἄφροντις ὤν**;] This then was the bondage which characterised the life (**διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν**) of those under the old dispensation; the bondage in which they were held (**ἔνοχοι = ἐνεχόμενοι**, "held" or "bound," "subject to," see Thayer, s.v.), and from which Christ delivered **τούτους ὅσοι**, not as if it were a restricted number who were delivered, but on the contrary to mark that the deliverance was coextensive with the bondage. **ἀπαλλάξῃ**, used especially of freeing from slavery [exx. from Philo in Carpzov, and *cf.* Isocrates **οὗτος ἀπήλλαξεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ δέους τούτου**. In the *Phaedo* frequently of soul emancipated from the body.] How the Son wrought this deliverance **διὰ τοῦ θανάτου** can now be answered; and it cannot be better answered than in the words of Robertson Smith: "To break this sway, Jesus takes upon Himself that mortal flesh and blood to whose infirmities the fear of death under the O.T. attaches. But while He passes through all the weakness of fleshly life, and, finally, through death itself, He, unlike all others, proves Himself not only exempt from the fear of death, but victorious over the accuser. To Him, who in His sinlessness experienced every weakness of mortality, without diminution of his unbroken strength of fellowship with God, death is not the dreaded sign of separation from God's grace (*cf.* ver. 7), but a step in his divinely appointed career; not something inflicted on Him against His will, but a means whereby (**διὰ** with genitive) He consciously and designedly accomplishes His vocation as Saviour. For this victory of Jesus over the devil, or, which is the same thing, the fear of death, must be taken, like every other part of His work, in connection with the idea of His vocation as Head and Leader of His people." In short, we see now what is meant by His tasting death "*for every man*," and how this death guarantees the perfect dominion and glory depicted in Psalm viii. All the humiliation and death are justified by the necessities of the case, he concludes, "For, as I need scarcely say, it is not angels (presumably sinless and spiritual beings, **πνεύματα**, i. 14) He is taking in hand, but He is taking in hand Abraham's seed (the dying children of a dead father; 'also dergleichen sterbliche und durch Todesfurcht in Knechtschaft befangene Wesen,' Bleek). **δήπου**: frequently in classics, as Plato, *Protagoras*, 309 C. **οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐνέτυχες**, "for I may take it for granted you have not met" (*Apol.*, 21 B). **τί ποτε λέγει ὁ θεὸς . . . φάσκων ἐμὲ σοφώτατον εἶναι; οὐ γὰρ δήπου ψεύδεταί γε**, "for, at any rate, as need hardly be said, he is not saying what is untrue". **ἐπιλαμβάνεται**: "lays hold to help" or simply "succours," with the idea of taking a person up to see him through. *Cf.*

γέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. 17. ° ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι

o iv. 15, et v. 2; Phil. ii. 7.

Sir., iv. 11. ἡ σοφία . . . ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν, and the Scholiast on Aesch., *Pers.*, 742, ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις εἰς καλὰ ἢ εἰς κακά, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. Castellio was the first to propose the meaning "help" in place of "assume the nature of," and Beza having urged the latter rendering as being that of the Greek fathers, goes on to say, "quo magis est execranda Castellionis audacia qui ἐπιλαμ. convertit '*opitulatur*,' non modo falsa, sed etiam inepta interpretatione, etc.". It has been suggested that θάνατος might be the nominative which would give quite a good sense, but as Christ is the subject both of the foregoing and of the succeeding clause it is more likely that this affirmation also is made of Him. It is certainly remarkable that instead of saying "He lays hold of man to help him," the writer should give the restricted σπέρματος Ἀβ. Von Soden, who supposes the Epistle is addressed to Gentiles, thinks the writer intends to prepare the way for his introducing the priesthood of Christ, and to exhibit the claim of Christians to the fulfilment of the prophecies made to Abraham (*cf.* Robertson Smith), but this Weiss brands as "eine leere Ausflucht". Perhaps we cannot get further than Estius (cited by Bleek): "gentium vocationem tota hac epistola prudenter dissimulat, sive quod illius mentio Hebraeis parum grata esset, sive quod instituto suo non necessaria". Or, as Bleek says, "es erklärt sich aus dem Zwecke des Briefes".

Ver. 17. ὅθεν [six times in this Epistle; not used by Paul, but *cf.* Acts xxvi. 19] 'wherefore," because He makes the seed of Abraham the object of His saving work, ὤφειλεν, "He was under obligation". ὀφείλω is "used of a necessity imposed either by law and duty, or by reason, or by the times, or by the nature of the matter under consideration" (Thayer). Here it was the nature of the case which imposed the obligation κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι "to be made like His brothers in all respects," and therefore, as Chrysostom says, ἐτέχθη, ἐτράφη, ηὐξήθη, ἔπαθε πάντα ἅπερ ἐχρῆν, τέλος ἀπέθανη. He must be a real man, and not merely have the appearance of one. He must enter into the necessary human experiences, look at things from the human point of view, take His place in the crowd amidst the ordinary elements of life. ἵνα introduces one purpose which this thorough incarnation was to serve. It would put Christ in a position to sympathise with the tempted and thus incline Him to make propitiation for the sins of the people. [τοῦ λαοῦ, also a restricted Jewish designation.] The High-Priesthood is here first mentioned, and it is mentioned as an office with which the readers were familiar. The writer does not now enlarge upon the office or work of the Priest, but merely points to one radical necessity imposed by priesthood, "making propitiation for the sins of the people"; and he affirms that in order to do this (εἰς τὸ) he must be merciful and faithful. ἐλεήμων as well as πιστὸς is naturally construed with ἀρχιερεύς, and has its root in Exod. xxii. 27, ἐλεήμων γάρ εἰμι, the priest must represent the Divine mercy; he must also be πιστός, primarily to God, as in iii. 2, but thereby faithful to men and to be trusted by them in the region in which he exercises his function, τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, the whole Godward relations of men. The expression is directly connected with ἀρχιερεὺς, by implication with πιστὸς, and it is found in Exod. xviii. 19, γίνου σὺ τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. For neat analogies *cf.* Wetstein. εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι, "for the purpose of making propitiation," εἰς indicating the special purpose to be served by Christ's becoming Priest. ἱλάσκομαι (ἱλάσκω is not met with), from ἵλαος, Attic ἵλεως "propitious," "merciful," means "I render propitious to myself". In the classics it is followed by the accusative of the person propitiated, sometimes of the anger felt. In the LXX it occurs twelve times, thrice as the translation of כִּפֵּר. The only instance in which it is followed by an accusative of the sin, as here, is Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 3, τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ ἱλάσῃ. In the N.T., besides the present passage, it only occurs in Luke xviii. 13, in the passive form ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ, *cf.* 2 Kings v. 18. The compound form ἐξιλάσκομαι, although it does not occur in N.T., is more frequently used in the LXX than the simple

p iv. 15, 16. τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ. 18. [p] ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι.

a iv. 14, et vi. 20, et viii. 1, et ix. 11; Rom. xv. 8; Phil. iii. 14.

III. 1. [a] ΟΘΕΝ, ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Χρισ-

verb, and from its construction something may be learnt. As in profane Greek, it is followed by an accusative of the person propitiated, as in Gen. xxxii. 20, where Jacob says of Esau **ἐξιλάσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς δώροις κ.τ.λ.**; *Z*ech. vii. 2, **ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸν Κύριον,** and viii. 22, **τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου,** also Matt. i. 9. It is however also followed by an accusative of the thing on account of which propitiation is needed or which requires by some rite or process to be rendered acceptable to God, as in Ecclus. iii. 3, iii. 30, v. 6, xx. 28, etc., where it is followed by **ἀδικίαν,** and **ἁμαρτίας**; and in Lev. xvi. 16, 20, 33, where it is followed by **τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ θυσιαστήριον,** and in Ezek. xlv. 20 by **τὸν οἶκον.** At least thirty-two times in Leviticus alone it is followed by **περί,** defining the persons for whom propitiation is made, **περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐξιλάσεται ὁ ἱερεύς** or **περὶ πάσης συναγωγῆς,** or **περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν.** In this usage there is apparent a transition from the idea of propitiating God (which still survives in the passive **ἱλάσθητι**) to the idea of exerting some influence on that which was offensive to God and which must be removed or cleansed in order to complete entrance into His favour. In the present passage it is **τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ** which stand in the way of the full expression of God's favour, and upon those therefore the propitiatory influence of Christ is to be exerted. In what manner precisely this is to be accomplished is not yet said. "The present infinitive **ἱλάσκεσθαι** must be noticed. The one (eternal) act of Christ (c. x. 12—14) is here regarded in its continuous present application to men (*cf.* c. v. 1, 2)," Westcott. (See further on **ἱλάσκεσθαι** in Blass, *Gram.*, p. 88; Deissmann's *Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 52; and Westcott's *Epistle of St. John*, pp. 83-85.) **τοῦ λαοῦ** the historical people of God, Abraham's seed; *cf.* Matt. i. 21; Heb. iv. 9, xiii. 12.

Ver. 18. **ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν. . . .** He concludes this part of his argument by explaining the process by which Christ's becoming man has answered the purpose of making Him a merciful and faithful High Priest. The explanation is "non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco". **ἐν ᾧ** is by some interpreters resolved into **ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι** = whereas; by others into **ἐν τούτῳ ὅ** = wherein; the second construction has certainly the ampler warrant, see 1 Pet. ii. 12; Gal. i. 8; Rom. xiv. 22; but the former gives the better sense. It is also contested whether the words mean, that Christ suffered by being tempted, or that He was tempted by His sufferings. Both statements of course are true; but it is not easy to determine which is here intended. Are the temptations the cause of the sufferings, or the sufferings the cause of the temptations? The A.V. and the R.V., also Westcott and others, prefer the former; and from the relation of the participial **πειρασθείς** to the main verb **πέπονθεν,** which naturally indicates the suffering as the result of the temptation, this would seem to be the correct interpretation. Bleek, Delitzsch, Alford and Davidson, however, prefer the other sense, Alford translating: "For He Himself, having been tempted, in that which He hath suffered, He is able to succour them that are (now) tempted". Davidson says: "These sufferings at every point crossed the innocent human instinct to evade them; but being laid on Him by the will of God and in pursuance of His high vocation, they thus became temptations". Dr. Bruce says: "Christ, having experienced temptation to be unfaithful to His vocation in connection with the sufferings arising out of it, is able to succour those who, like the Hebrew Christians, were tempted in similar ways to be unfaithful to their Christian calling". The interpretation has much to recommend it, but as it limits the temptations of Christ to those which arose out of His sufferings, it seems scarcely to fall in so thoroughly with the course of thought, especially with v. 17. **δύναται,** *cf.* iv. 15, v. 2.

CHAPTER III. 1.-CHAPTER IV. 13.—Chapters iii. and iv. as far as ver. 13, form one paragraph. The purpose of the writer in this passage, as in the whole Epistle, is to encourage his readers in their allegiance to Christ and to save them from apostacy by exhibiting Christ as the final mediator. This purpose he has in the first two chapters sought to achieve by compar-

ing Christ with those who previously mediated between God and man,—the prophets who spoke to the fathers, and the angels who mediated the law and were supposed even to regulate nature. He now proceeds to compare Jesus with him round whose name gathered all that revelation and legislation in which the Jew trusted. Moses was the ideal mediator, faithful in *all* God's house. Underlying even the priesthood of Aaron was the word of God to Moses. And yet, free channel of God's will as Moses had been, he was but a servant and in the nature of things could not so perfectly sympathise with and interpret the will of Him whose house and affairs he administered as the Son who Himself was lord of the house.

He therefore bids his readers encourage themselves by the consideration of His trustworthiness, His competence to accomplish all God's will with them and bring them to their appointed rest. But this suggests to him the memorable breakdown of faith in the wilderness generation of Israelites. And he forthwith strengthens his admonition to trust Christ by adding the warning which was so legibly written in the fate of those who left Egypt under the leadership of Moses, but whose faith failed through the greatness of the way. It was not owing to any incompetence or faithlessness in Moses that they died in the wilderness and failed to reach the promised land. It was "because of their unbelief" (iii. 19). Moses was faithful in all God's house, in everything required for the guidance and government of God's people and for the fulfilment of all God's purpose with them: but even with the most trustworthy leader much depends on the follower, and entrance to the fulness of God's blessing may be barred by the unbelief of those who have heard the promise. The promise was not mixed with faith in them to whom it came. But what of those who were led in by Joshua? Even they did not enter into God's rest. That is certain, for long after Joshua's time God renewed His promise, saying "To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts". Entrance into the land, then, did not exhaust the promise of God; there remains over and above that entrance, a rest for the people of God, for "without us," *i.e.*, without the revelation of Christ the fathers were not perfect, their best blessings, such as their land, being but types of better things to come. Therefore let us give diligence to enter into that rest, for the word of God's promise is searching; and, by offering us the best things in fellowship with God, it discloses our real disposition and affinities.

The passage falls into two parts, the former (iii. 1-6) exhibiting the trustworthiness of Christ, the latter (iii. 7-iv. 13) emphasising the unbelief and doom of the wilderness generation.

Ver. 1. **Ὅθεν**, "wherefore," if through Jesus God has spoken His final and saving word (i. 1), thus becoming the Apostle of God, and if the high priest I speak of is so sympathetic and faithful that for the sake of cleansing the people He became man and suffered, then "consider, etc.". The **πιστός** of ver. 17 strikes the keynote of this paragraph. Here for the first time the writer designates his readers, and he does so in a form peculiar to himself (the reading in 1 Thess. v. 27 being doubtful) **ἀδελφοὶ ἅγιοι**, "Christian brethren," literally "brethren consecrated," separated from the world and dedicated to God. Bleek quotes from Primasius: "Fratres eos vocat tam carne quam spiritu qui ex eodem genere erant". But there is no reason to assign to **ἀδελφοὶ** any other meaning than its usual N T. sense of "fellow-Christians," *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 8. But there is further significance in the additional **κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι**, "partakers of a heavenly calling" (*cf.* **οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας**, ix. 15) suggested by the latent comparison in the writer's mind between the Israelites called to earthly advantages, a land, etc., and his readers whose hopes were fixed on things above. "In the word 'heavenly' there is struck for the first time, in words at least, an antithesis of great importance in the Epistle, that of this world and heaven, in other words, that of the merely material and transient, and the ideal and abiding. The things of the world are material, unreal, transient: those of heaven are ideal, true, eternal. Heaven is the world of realities, of things themselves (ix. 23) of which the things here are but 'copies'" (Davidson). **κατανοήσατε**, "consider," "bring your mind to bear upon," "observe so as to see the significance," as in Luke xii. 24, **κατανοήσατε τοὺς κόρακας**, though it is sometimes, as in Acts xi. 6, xxvii. 39, used in its classical sense "perceive". A "confession" does not always involve that its significance is seen. *Consider* then **τὸν . . . Ἰησοῦν** "the Apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus," the

b ver. 5; Num. xii. 7. c Zach. vi. 12; Matt. xvi. 18.

τὸν[1] Ἰησοῦν· 2. [b] πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτὸν, ὡς καὶ Μωσῆς[2] ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ. 3. [c] Πλείονος γὰρ δόξης οὗτος[3] παρὰ Μωσῆν ἠξίωται, καθ' ὅσον πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάσας

[1] Delete Χριστον with ℵABC*D*MP, 17, 34, 47.
[2] Μωσης in ℵABDEM; Μωυσης in CKLP, 17.
[3] ουτος δοξης in ℵABCDEP; δοξης ουτος KLM.

single article brackets the two designations and Bengel gives their sense: "τὸν ἀποστ. eum qui Dei causam apud nos agit. τὸν ἀρχ. qui causam nostram apud Deum agit". These two functions embrace not the whole of Christ's work, but all that He did on earth (*cf.* i. 1-4). The frequent use of ἀποστέλλειν by our Lord to denote the Father's mission of the Son authorises the present application of ἀπόστολος. It is through Him God has spoken (i. 1). Moses is never called ἀπόστολος (a word indeed which occurs only once in LXX) though in Exod. iii. 10 God says ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς Φαραώ. Schoettgen quotes passages from the Talmud in which the high priest is termed the Apostle or messenger of God and of the Sanhedrim, but this is here irrelevant. **καὶ ἀρχιερέα**, a title which, as applicable to Jesus, the writer explains in chaps. v.-viii. **τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν**, "of our confession," or, whom we, in distinction from men of other faiths, confess; chiefly no doubt in distinction from the non-Christian Jews. ὁμολογία, as the etymology shows, means "of one speech with," hence that in which men agree as their common creed, their *confession*, see ref. As Peake remarks: "If this means profession of faith, then 'the readers already confess Jesus as high priest, and this is not a truth taught them in this Epistle for the first time'." [Carpzov quotes from Philo (*De Somn.*): ὁ μὲν δὴ μέγας Ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας, but here another sense is intended.] **Ἰησοῦν** is added to preclude the possibility of error. Ἰησοῦς occurs in this Epistle nine times by itself, thrice with Χριστός.

Ver. 2. The characteristic, or particular, qualification of Jesus which is to hold their attention is His trustworthiness or fidelity. **πιστὸν ὄντα** might be rendered "as being faithful". The fidelity here in view, though indirectly to men and encouraging them to trust, is directly to Him who made Him, *sc.*, Apostle and High Priest. **τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν.** The objection urged by Bleek, Lünemann and Alford that ποιεῖν can mean "appoint" only when followed by two accusatives is not valid The second accusative may be understood; and in 1 Sam. xii. 6 we find Κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρών, words which may have been in the writer's mind. The Arian translation, "to Him that created Him," is out of place. Appointment to office finds its correlative in faithfulness, creation scarcely suggests that idea. The fidelity of Jesus is illustrated not by incidents from His life nor by the crowning proof given in His death, nor is it argued from the admitted perfections of His character, but in accordance with the plan of the Epistle it is merely compared to that of Moses, and its superiority is implied in the superiority of the Son to the servant. He was faithful "as also Moses in all His house," this being the crowning instance of fidelity testified to by God Himself, ὁ θεράπων μου Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστι (Num. xii. 7), where the context throws the emphasis on ὅλῳ. "The 'house of God' is the organised society in which He dwells" (Westcott), *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 15. Weiss says that the words ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ "necessarily belong" to πιστὸν ὄντα. This is questionable, because the writer's point is that Jesus is faithful not "in" but "over" the house of God (ver. 6).

Ver 3. The reason is now assigned why Jesus and His fidelity should eclipse in their consideration that of Moses. The reason is that "this man" (οὗτος, "the person who is the subject of our consideration") "has been and is deemed worthy of greater glory ('amplioris gloriae,' Vulg. πλείονος, qualitative as in xi. 4) than Moses, in proportion as he that built the house has more honour than the house." The genitive follows the comparative πλείονα. The "greater glory" is seen in the more important place occupied by Him in the fulfilment of God's purpose of salvation. This glory of Jesus is as much greater than that of Moses, as the cause is greater than the effect, the builder than the house. [The principle is stated by Philo (*De Plant.*,

αὐτόν· 4. [d] πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος κατασκευάζεται ὑπό τινος· ὁ δὲ τὰ πάντα κατασκευάσας, Θεός. 5. [e] καὶ Μωσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ

d 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10.
e ver. 2; Deut. xviii. 15, 18.

c. 16. In Wendland's ed., ii. 147) ὁ κτησάμενος τὸ κτῆμα τοῦ κτήματος ἀμείνων καὶ τὸ πεποιηκὸς τοῦ γεγονότος, and by Menander and other comic poets as quoted by Justin (*Apol.*, i. 20) μείζονα τὸν δημιουργὸν τοῦ σκευαζομένου. Weiss, however, is of opinion that it is not a general principle that is being stated, but that τοῦ οἴκου refers directly to the house of God.] ὁ κατασκευάσας includes all that belongs to the completion of a house, from its inception and plan in the mind of the architect to its building and furnishing and filling with a household. Originally the word means to equip or furnish, κατασκευάζειν τὴν οἰκίαν τοῖς σκεύεσιν, Diog. L. v. 14. So συμπόσιον κατασ. Plato, *Rep.*, 363 C. σκεύεσιν ἰδίοις τὴν ναῦν κατεσκεύασα, Demosth.. *Polyc.*, 1208. Thence, like our word "furnish" or "prepare," it took the wider meaning of "making" or "building" or "providing". Thus the shipbuilder κατασκ. the ship; the mason κατασ. the tower. So in Heb. xi. 7 κατεσκεύασε κιβωτόν, *cf.* 1 Peter iii. 20. (Further, see Stephanus and Bleek). In the present verse it has its most comprehensive meaning, and includes the planning, building, and filling of the house with furniture and with a household. The household is more directly in view than the house. The argument involves that Jesus is identified with the builder of the house, while Moses is considered a part of the house. It is the Son (who in those last Days has spoken God's word to men through the lips of Jesus), who in former times also fulfilled God's purpose by building His house and creating for Him a people. And lest the readers of the epistle should object that Moses was as much the builder of the old as Jesus of the new, the writer lifts their mind from the management of the system or Church to the creation of it.

Ver. 4. πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος . . . Θεός. "For every house *is built* by someone, but he that built all is God." Over and above the right conduct of the house there is a builder. No house, no religious system, grows of itself; it has a cause in the will of one who is greater than it. There is a "someone" at the root of all that appears in history. And He who planned and brought into being πάντα, "all," whether old or new, is God. The present development of this divine house as well as its past condition and equipment is of God. And Christ, the Son, naturally and perfectly representing God or the builder, and by whose agency God created all things (i. 2) is therefore worthy of more honour than Moses. The argument is not so much elliptical as incomplete, waiting to be supplemented by the following verses in which the relation of Jesus to God and the relation of Moses to the house are exhibited. "It is argued that a household must be established by a householder; now God established the universe, and therefore he is the supreme householder of the universal household or Church of God, and in that household Jesus, as His perfect representative, is entitled to receive glory corresponding" (Rendall).

Ver. 5. καὶ Μωϋσῆς. . . . Another reason for expecting to find fidelity in Jesus and for ascribing to Him greater glory. Moses was faithful as a servant *in* the house (ἐν), Christ as a Son *over* (ἐπὶ) his house. θεράπων denotes a free servant in an honourable position and is the word applied to Moses in Num. xii. 7. ["Apud Homerum nomen est non servile sed ministros significat voluntarios, nec raro de viris dicitur nobili genere natis" (Stephanus). It is especially used of those who serve the gods. See Pindar *Olymp.* iii. 29.] Both the fidelity and the inferior position of Moses are indicated in the words which occur like a refrain in Exodus: "According to all that the Lord commanded, so did he". Nothing was left to his own initiative; he had to be instructed and commanded; but all that was entrusted to him, he executed with absolute exactness. The crowning proof of his fidelity was given in the extraordinary scene (Exod. xxxvii.), where Moses refused to be "made a great nation" in room of Israel. He is said to have been faithful εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων. The meaning is, the testimony to his faithfulness which God had pronounced was the guarantee of the trustworthiness of the report he gave of what the Lord afterwards spoke to him. This meaning seems to be determined by the context in Numbers xii. "My servant Moses

αὐτοῦ, ὡς θεράπων, εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων· 6. [f] Χριστὸς δὲ, ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, οὗ[1] οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐάνπερ[2] τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν[3] κατάσχωμεν. 7. [g] Διὸ, καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, "Σήμερον

f Matt. xxiv. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 16, et vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21, 22. 1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Peter ii. 5.

g ver. 15, et iv. 7; Ps. xlv. 7.

[1] T.R. in ℵABC; ος in D*M, 6, 67** d, e, f, Vulg. (quae domus sumus nos).

[2] T.R. in ℵcACDcE**KL; εαν in ℵ*BDE*MP, 17, d, e, f, Vulg.

[3] WH bracket μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν and Weiss rejects the words with B. All the other great uncials insert the words. Bleek thinks them genuine.

. . . is faithful in all my house. I *will speak to him* mouth to mouth, apparently and not in dark speeches." Grotius says "ut pronuntiaret populo ea quae Deus ei dicenda quoquo tempore mandabat". Bleek and Davidson refer the μαρτύριον to Moses not to God. "He was a servant *for a testimony*, *i.e.*, to bear testimony of those things which were to be spoken, *i.e.*, from time to time revealed. Reference might be made to Barnabas viii. 3, εἰς μαρτ. τῶν φυλῶν. The meaning advocated by Calvin, Delitzsch, Westcott and others is attractive. They understand the words as referring to the things which were to be spoken by Christ, and that the whole of Moses' work was for a testimony of those things. Thus Westcott translates "for a testimony of the things which should be spoken by God through the prophets and finally through Christ". This gives a fine range to the words, but the context in Numbers is decisively against it. The idea seems to be that Moses being but a θεράπων needed a testimonial to his fidelity that the people might trust him; and also that he had no initiative but could only report to the people the words that God might speak to him. In contrast to this position of Moses, Χριστὸς ὡς υἱὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, Christ's fidelity was that of "a Son over his house". It was not the fidelity which exactly performs what another commands and faithfully enters into and fulfils His will. It is the fidelity of one who himself is possessed by the same love and conceives the same purposes as the Father. The interests of the house and the family are the Son's interests. "We are His house" and in Christ we see that the interests of God and man, of the Father and the family are one. [Grotius quotes the jurisconsults: "etiam vivente patre filium quodam modo dominum esse rerum paternarum".] But this house so faithfully administered by the Son Himself is the body of Christian people, οὗ οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, we are those on whom this fidelity is spent. The relative finds its antecedent in αὐτοῦ. The "house of God" is, in the Gospels, the Temple; but in 1 Pet. iv. 17 and 1 Tim. iii. 15 it has the same meaning as here, the people or Church of God. "Whose house are we," but with a condition ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . κατάσχωμεν, "if we shall have held fast our confidence and the glorying of our hope firm to the end". For, as throughout the Epistle, so here, all turns on perseverance. παρρησία originally "frank speech," hence the boldness which prompts it. *Cf.* iv. 16, x. 19, 35; so in Paul and John. καύχημα, not as the form of the word might indicate, "the object of boasting," but the disposition as in 1 Cor. v. 6: οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν and 2 Cor. v. 12: ἀφορμὴν διδόντες ὑμῖν καυχήματος. [*Cf.* the interchange of βρῶσις and βρῶμα in Jo. iv. 32, 34, and Jannaris, *Hist. Gk. Gram.*, 1021 and 1155.] Whether ἐλπίδος belongs to both substantives is doubtful. The Christian's hope of a heavenly inheritance (ver. 1), of perfected fellowship with God, should be so sure that it confidently proclaims itself, and instead of being shamefaced glories in the future it anticipates. And this attitude must be maintained μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν, until difficulty and trial are past and hope has become possession. βεβαίαν in agreement with the remoter substantive, which might give some colour to the idea that the expression was lifted from ver. 14 and inserted here; but Bleek shows by several instances that the construction is legitimate.

CHAPTER III. 7—IV. 13. The great instance in history of the disaster which attends failure of faith is adduced as a warning to the faltering Hebrews.

Διὸ, "wherefore," since it is only by holding fast our confidence to the end,

ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, 8. [h] μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ, κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, 9. οὗ ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με,[1] καὶ

h Exod. xvii. 2; Num. xx. 13.

[1] T.R.ℵcDcKL al pler, f, vg.; **εν δοκιμασια** with ℵ*ABCD*EMP, 17, 73, 137.

that we continue to be the house of Christ and enjoy His faithful oversight, *cf.* ver. 14. **Διὸ** was probably intended to be immediately followed by **βλέπετε** (ver. 12) "wherefore take heed," but a quotation is introduced from Ps. xcv. which powerfully enforces the **βλέπετε**. Or it may be that **διὸ** connects with **μὴ σκληρύνητε**, but the judicious bracketing of the quotation by the A.V. is to be preferred. The quotation is introduced by words which lend weight to it, **καθὼς λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον**, a form of citation not found elsewhere in exactly the same terms, but in x. 15 we find the similar form **μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγ.** *Cf.* also ix. 8. Agabus uses it of his own words (Acts xxi. 11). In 1 Tim. iv. 1 we have **τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει** *cf.* Rev. ii.-iii. "It is characteristic of the Epistle that the words of Holy Scripture are referred to the Divine Author, not to the human instrument" (Westcott). The Psalm (95) is ascribed to David in iv. 7 as in the LXX it is called **αἶνος ᾠδῆς τῷ Δαυίδ**, although in the Hebrew it is not so ascribed. The quotation contains vv. 7-11.

Σήμερον, "to-day" is in the first instance, the "to-day" present to the writer of the psalm, and expresses the thought that God's offers had not been wlthdrawn although rejected by those to whom they had long ago been made. But Delitzsch adduces passages which show that **σήμερον** in this psalm was understood by the synagogue to refer to the second great day of redemption. "The history of redemption knows but of two great turning points, that of the first covenant and that of the new" (Davidson). And what the writer to the Hebrews fears is that the second announcement of promise may be disregarded as the first. Force is lent to his fears by the fact that the forty years of the Messiah's waiting from 30-70 A.D., when Jerusalem was to be destroyed, were fast running out. The fate of the exasperating Israelites in the wilderness received an ominous significance in presence of the obduracy of the generation which had heard the voice of Christ Himself.

ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, "if ye shall hear His voice" (R.V., Vaughan); not "if ye will hearken to His voice." The sense is, "If God should be pleased, after so much inattention on our part, to speak again, see that ye give heed to Him".

Ver. 8. **μὴ σκληρύνητε**, the prohibitory subjunctive, *v.* Burton, p. 162. "The figure is from the stiffening by cold or disease, of what ought to be supple and pliable" (Vaughan). [The verb occurs first in Hippocrates, *cf. Anz.* 342.] It is ascribed to **τὸν τράχηλον** (Deut. x. 16), **τὸν νῶτον** (2 Kings xvii. 14), **τὴν καρδίαν** (Exod. iv. 21), **τὸ πνεῦμα** (Deut. ii. 30). Sometimes the hardening is referred to the man, sometimes it is God who inflicts the hardening as a punishment. Here the possible hardening is spoken of as if the human subject could prevent it. **τὰς καρδίας**, the whole inner man. **ὡς ἐν τῷ . . ἐρήμῳ.** This stands in the psalm as the translation of the Hebrew which might be rendered: ["Harden not your hearts] as at *Meribah*, as on the day of *Massah* in the wilderness," Meribah being representedby **παραπικρασμός** and Massah by **πειρασμός**. The tempting of God by Israel in the wilderness is recorded in Exod. xvii. 1-7, where the place is called "Massah and Meribah". This occurred in the first year of the wanderings. **παραπικρασμός** is found only in this psalm (although **παραπικραίνειν** is frequent) its place being taken by **λοιδόρησις** in Exod. xvii. 7 and by **ἀντιλογία** in Num. xx. 12. It means "embitterment," "exacerbation," "exasperation". **κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν** is rendered by the Vulgate "secundum diem," rightly. It means "after the manner of the day". Westcott, however, prefers the temporal sense.

Ver. 9. **οὗ ἐπείρασάν με . . .**, "where your fathers tempted me," *i.e.*, in the wilderness. Others take **οὗ** as = "with which," attracted into genitive by **πειρασμοῦ**. **ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ**, "in pntting me to the proof". **καὶ εἶδον . . . ἔτη**, "and saw my works forty years," the wonders of mercy and of judgment. In the psalm **τεσσ. ἔτη** are joined to **προσώχθισα, διὸ** being omitted. The same connection is adopted in ver. 17.

εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη· 10. διὸ προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εἶπον, Ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου· 11. [1] ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου." 12. βλέπετε, ἀδελφοί, μή ποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζῶντος· 13. ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν,

1 Num. xiv. 21; Deut. i. 34.

Ver. 10. **διὸ προσώχθισα**, "wherefore I was greatly displeased". In the psalm the Hebrew verb means "I loathed," elsewhere in the LXX it translates verbs meaning "I am disgusted with," "I spue out," "I abhor," *cf.* Lev. xxvi. 30, [from ὄχθη a bank, as if from a river chafing with its banks; or related to ἄχθος and ἄχθομαι as if "burdened".] **αὐτοὶ δὲ. . .** The insertion of αὐτοὶ δὲ shows that this clause is not under εἶπον, but is joined with the preceding προσώχθ. "I was highly displeased,—but yet they did not recognise my ways."

Ver. 11. **ὡς ὤμοσα.** "As I sware," *i.e.*, justifying my oath to exclude them from the land. **εἰ εἰσελεύσονται**, the common form of oath with εἰ which supposes that some such words as "God do so to me and more also" have preceded the "if". The oath quoted in Ps. xcv. is recorded in Num. xiv. 21-23. **εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου**, "into my rest," primarily, the rest in Canaan, but see on chap. iv.

Ver. 12. **Βλέπετε ἀδελφοὶ μήποτε. . . .** "Take heed lest haply" as in xii. 25, Col. ii. 8, for the more classical ὁρᾶτε μή. It is here followed by a future indicative as sometimes in classics. **ἔν τινι ὑμῶν**, the individualising, as in ver. 13 indicates the writer's earnestness, whether, as Bleek supposes, it means that the whole Christian community of the place is to be watchful for the individual, may be doubted; although this idea is confirmed by the παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς of ver. 13. What they are to be on their guard against is the emergence of **καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν . . . ζῶντος**, a wicked heart of unbelief manifesting itself in departing from Him who is a living God. **ἀπιστίας** is the genitive of quality = a bad, unbelieving heart; whether the wickedness proceeds from the unbelief, or the unbelief from the wickedness, is not determined. Although, from the next verse it might be gathered that unbelief is considered the result of allowed sin: *i.e.*, it is when the heart is hardened through sin, it becomes unbelieving, so that the psychological order might be stated thus: sin, a deceived mind, a hardened heart, unbelief, apostasy. The main idea in the writer's mind is that unbelief in God's renewed offer of salvation is accompanied by and means apostasy from the living God. In the O.T. Jehovah is called "the living God" in contrast to lifeless impotent idols, and the designation is suggestive of His power to observe, visit, judge and succour His people. In this Epistle it occurs, ix. 14, x. 31, xii. 22. To object that the apostasy of Jews from Christianity could not be called "apostacy from God" is to mistake. The very point the writer wishes to make is just this: Remember that to apostatize from Christ in whom you have found God, is to apostatize from God. It is one of the ominous facts of Christian experience that any falling away from high attainment sinks us much deeper than our original starting point.

Ver. 13. To avoid this, **παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν**, "Exhort one another daily". **ἑαυτούς** is equivalent to ἀλλήλους, see Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13. **ἄχρις οὗ τὸ Σήμερον καλεῖται**, "as long as that period endures which can be called 'to-day'". **ἄχρις** denotes a point up to which something is done; hence, the term during which something is done as here. **τὸ σήμερον** = the word "to-day". Bengel says, "Dum Psalmus iste auditur et legitur"; but this is less likely. The meaning is, So long as opportunity is given to hear God's call. **ἵνα μὴ . . . ἁμαρτίας**, "lest any of you be rendered rebellious through sin's deceit"; perhaps the meaning would be better brought out by translating "lest any of you be rendered rebellious by sin's deceit". [On sin's deceit *cf.* "Nemo repente pessimus evasit"; and the striking motto to the 35th chap. of *The Fortunes of Nigel.*] Sin in heart or life blinds a man to the significance and attractiveness of God's offer.

Ver. 14. **μέτοχοι γὰρ. . . .** In ver. 6 the writer had adduced as the reason of his warning (βλέπετε) that participation

ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπάτῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας· 14. [k] μέτοχοι γὰρ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, 15. [l] ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι, "Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ". 16. Τινὲς [1] γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου

k Rom. viii. 17.
l ver. 7.

[1] T.R. with LMP, 37; τίνες in agreement with τίσι of vv. 17, 18; and with the sense. See Bengel in loc.

in the salvation of Christ depended on continuance in the confident expectation that their heavenly calling would be fulfilled; and so impressed is he with the difficulty of thus continuing that he now returns to the same thought, and once again assigns the same reason for his warning: "For we are become partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". Delitzsch, Rendall, Bruce and others understand by **μέτοχοι**, "partners" or "fellows" of Christ, as if the faithful were not only the house of Christ (ver. 6) but shared His joy in the house. It may be objected that **μέτοχοι** in this Epistle (ii. 14, iii. 1, v. 13, vi. 4, vii. 13, xii. 8) is regularly used of participators in something, not of participators with someone. In i. 9, however, it is not so used. The idea of participating with Christ finds frequent expression in Scripture. See Matt. xxv. 21; Rev. iii. 21. **τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, the article may link this mention of Christ's name with that in ver. 6; and, if so, **μέτοχοι** will naturally refer to companionship with Christ in His house. This companionship we have entered into and continue to enjoy [**γεγόναμεν**] on the same condition as above (ver. 6) **ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν...** "if at least we maintain the beginning of our confidence firm to the end". **ὑποστάσεως** is used by LXX twenty times and represents twelve different Hebrew words [Hatch in *Essays in Bibl. Greek* says eighteen times representing fifteen different words, but *cf. Concordance*]. In Ruth i. 12, Ps. xxxix. 8, Ezek. xix. 5 it means "ground of hope" [its primary meaning being that on which anything is based], hence it takes the sense, "hope" or "confidence". Bleek gives examples of its use in later Greek, Polyb., iv. 50, **οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν**, so vi. 55 of Horatius guarding the bridge. It also occurs in the sense of "fortitude," bearing up against pain, *v.* Diod. Sic., *De Virt.*, p. 557, and Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 1. Confidence the Hebrews already possessed [**ἀρχὴν**]; their test was its maintenance to the end [**τέλους**], *i.e.*, till it was beyond trial, finally triumphant, in Christ's presence.

Ver. 15. **ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι. . . .** "While it is said to-day, etc." The construction of these words is debated. Bleek, Delitzsch, von Soden and others construe them with what follows, beginning at this point a fresh paragraph. The meaning would thus be: "Since it is said, 'To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not, etc.,' who are meant, who were they who heard and provoked?" This is inviting but the **γὰρ** of ver. 16 is decidedly against it. Davidson connects **ἐν τῷ λεγ.** with what immediately precedes: "'if we hold fast . . . unto the end, while it is said,' *i.e.*, not *during* the time that it is said, but in the presence and consciousness of the saying, Harden not, etc. . . . with this divine warning always in the ears". Similarly Weiss. Westcott connects the words with ver. 13, making 14 parenthetical. Either of these constructions is feasible. It is also possible to let the sentence stand by itself as introductory to what follows, taking **μὴ σκληρ.** as directly addressed to the Hebrews, not as merely completing the quotation: "While it is being said To-day if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts as in the provocation". The **λέγεσθαι** thus contains only the clause ending with **ἀκούσητε**.

Ver. 16. **τίνες γὰρ ἀκούσαντες παρεπίκραναν**: "For who were they who after hearing provoked?" He proceeds further to enforce his warning that confidence begun is not enough, by showing that they who provoked God and fell in the wilderness had begun a life of faith and begun it well. For the answer to his question is "Nay did not all who came out of Egypt with Moses?" They were not exceptional sinners who fell away, but all who came out of Egypt,

δὶα Μωσέως. 17. [m] τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; 18. [n] τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι; 19. καὶ βλέπομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν. IV. 1. Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν μή ποτε καταλειπομένης [1] ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, δοκῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν

m Num. xiv. 22, 37, et xxvi. 65. Ps. cvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 5, etc., Judæ v.

n Num. xiv. 30, Deut. i. 34, 35.

[1] T.R. ABCDcKLMP; **καταλιπομενης** ℵD*.

the whole mass of the gloriously rescued people whose faith had carried them through between the threatening walls of water and over whom Miriam sang her triumphal ode. **ἀλλά** adds force to the answer, as if it were said, It is asked *who* provoked, as though it were some only, *but* was it not *all?* **πάντες**, for it is needless excepting Joshua and Caleb.

Ver. 17. **τίσι δὲ προσώχθισε.** . . . "And with whom was He angry forty years?" taking up the next clause of the Psalm, v. 10. Again the question is answered by another "Was it not with them that sinned?" [**ἁμαρτήσασιν**: "This is the only form of the aorist participle in N.T. In the moods the form of **ἥμαρτον** is always used except Matt. xviii. 15, Luke xvii. 4, **ἁμαρτήσῃ**: Rom. vi. 15." Westcott, *cf.* Blass, p. 43.] It was not caprice on God's part, nor inability to carry them to the promised land. It was because they sinned [see esp. Num. xxxii. 23] that their "carcases fell in the wilderness". **ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.** These words are taken from Num. xiv. 29, 32, where God utters the doom of the wilderness generation. **κῶλον**, a limb or member of the body [Æsch., *Prom.*, 81; Soph., *O.C.*, 19, etc.]; hence a clause of a sentence (and in English, the point which marks it). Used by the LXX to translate פֶּגֶר, cadaver. Setting out from Egypt with the utmost confidence, they left their bones in the desert in unnamed and forgotten graves; not because of their weakness nor because God had failed them but because of their sin.

Ver. 18. **τίσι δὲ ὤμοσε.** . . . "And to whom swore He that they should not enter into His rest, but to them that obeyed not?" The real cause of their exclusion from the rest prepared for them was their disobedience. *Cf.* especially the scene recorded in Num. xiv. where Moses declares that as **ἀπειθοῦντες Κυρίῳ** they were excluded from the land. At the root of their disobedience was unbelief.

Ver. 19. They did not believe God could bring them into the promised land in the face of powerful opposition and so they would not attempt its conquest when commanded to go forward. They were rendered weak by their unbelief. This is pointed out in the concluding words **καὶ βλέπομεν** . . . where the emphasis is on **οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν**, they were not able to enter in, the reason being given in the words **δι' ἀπιστίαν.** The application to the Hebrew Christians was sufficiently obvious. They were in danger of shrinking from further conflict and so losing all they had won. They had begun well but were now being weakened and prevented from completing their victory; and this weakness was the result of their not trusting God and their leader.

Between chapters iii. and iv. there is no break. The unbelief of the wilderness generation is held up as a warning, and its use in this respect is justified by the fact that the promise made to them is still made, and is a "living" word which reveals the inmost purposes of the heart and is inevitable in its judgment.

Ver. 1. **φοβηθῶμεν οὖν**, "let us then fear," the writer speaks in the name of the living generation, "lest haply, there being left behind and still remaining a promise to enter [**ἐπαγγελίας εἰσελθεῖν**; *cf.* **ὥρα ἀπιέναι**, Plato, *Apol.*, p. 42] into His (*i.e.*, God's) rest, any of you (not **ἡμῶν**) should fancy that he has come too late for it; **δοκῇ ὑστερηκέναι.** Of these words there are three linguistically possible translations.

1. Should seem to have fallen short.

2. Should be judged to have fallen short.

3. Should think that he has fallen short or come too late.

The argument of the passage favours the third reading, for it aims at strengthening the belief that the promise does remain and that the readers are not born too late to enjoy it. "Gloomy imaginations of failure were rife among the Hebrews" (Rendall). These perse-

ὑστερηκέναι. 2. καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι, καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι· ἀλλ᾿ οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκείνους, μὴ συγκεκραμένος[1] τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. 3. [a] εἰσερχόμεθα[2] γὰρ εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν οἱ πιστεύσαντες, καθὼς εἴρηκεν, "Ὡς ὤμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου, Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου," καίτοι τῶν ἔργων ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γενηθέντων. 4. [b] Εἴρηκε γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἑβδόμης οὕτω, "Καὶ κατέπαυσεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ"· 5. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, "Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου". 6. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολείπεταί τινας εἰσελθεῖν εἰς αὐτήν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον δι᾿ ἀπείθειαν,

a Ps. xcv. 11.

b Gen. ii. 2; Exod. xx. 11, et xxxi. 17.

[1] T.R. 31, 41, 114, d, e, vg.cle [συγκεκερασμενος in ℵ exegetisch allein haltbar (Weiss)]; συγκεκερασμενους in ABCD*M, Theod.-Mops.; συγκεκραμενους DcEKLP.

[2] T.R. in ℵBDEKLMP, d, e; εισερχωμεθα in AC, 17, 37* f, vg., Primas.

cuted Christians who had expected to find the fulfilment of all promise in Christ, found it hard to believe that "rest" was attainable in Him. The writer proceeds therefore to prove that this promise is left and is still open. καὶ γάρ ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι. . . . "For indeed we, even as also they, have had a gospel preached to us." We should have expected an expressed ἡμεῖς, but its suppression shows us that the writer wishes to emphasise εὐηγγελ. To us as to them *it is a gospel* that is preached; and the καθάπερ κἀκεῖνοι, "even as they also had," brings out the fact that under the promise of a land in which to rest, the Israelites who came out of Egypt were brought in contact with the redeeming grace and favour of God. The expression reflects significant light on the inner meaning of all God's guidance of Israel's history. They received this rich promise laden with God's intention to bless them, "but the word which they heard did them no good, because in those who heard, it was not mixed with faith". [For συγκεκ. see the *Phaedo*, p. 95A. The accusative is best attested (see critical note), but the sense "not mixed by faith with those who heard," *i.e.*, Caleb and Joshua, is most improbable.] Belief, then, is everything. In proof of which our own experience may be cited: "For we are entering into the rest, we who have believed". This clause confirms both the statements of the previous verse: "we have the promise as well as they," *for* we *are entering* into the rest [note the emphatic position of εἰσερχόμεθα]; and "the word failed them because of their lack of faith," *for* it is our faith [οἱ πιστεύσαντες] which is carrying us into the rest. This fact that we are entering in by faith is in accordance with the utterance quoted already in iii. 11, καθὼς εἴρηκεν, Ὡς ὤμοσα . . . "I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest, although the works were finished from the foundation of the world". This quotation confirms the first clause of the verse, because it proves two things: first, that God had a rest, and second, that He intended that man should rest with Him, because it was "in His wrath," justly excited against the unbelieving (*cf.* iii. 9, 10), that He sware they should not enter in. Had it not been God's original purpose and desire that men should enter into His rest, it could not be said that "in wrath" He excluded some. Their failure to secure rest was not due to the non-existence of any rest, for God's works were finished when the world was founded. This again is confirmed by Scripture, εἴρηκεν γάρ που, *viz.*, in Gen. ii. 2 (*cf.* Exod. xx. 11, xxxi. 17), where it is said that after the six days of creation God rested on the seventh day from all His works. That God has a rest is also stated in the ninety-fifth Psalm, for these words "they shall not enter into my rest" prove that God had a rest. The emphasis in this second quotation (ver. 5) is on the word μου.

Ver. 6. The writer now, in vv. 6-9, gathers up the argument, and reaches his conclusion that a Sabbatism remains for God's people. The argument briefly is, God has provided a rest for men and has promised it to them. This promise was

c iii. 7, 15; Ps. xcv. 7. 7. [c] πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, "Σήμερον," ἐν Δαβὶδ λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον· καθὼς εἴρηται,[1] "Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν". 8. Εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας· 9. ἄρα ἀπολείπεται σαββατισμὸς τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ τῶν

[1] προειρηται in ℵACD*E*P, d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm.; ειρηται in DcE**KL.

not believed by those who formerly heard it, neither was it exhausted in the bringing in of the people to Canaan. For had it been so, it could not have been renewed long after, as it was. It remains, therefore, to be now enjoyed. "Since, therefore, it remains that some enter into it and those who formerly heard the good news of the promise did not enter, owing to disobedience." **ἀπολείπεται**, there remains over as not yet fulfilled. In v. 9. **σαββατ.** is the nominative, here **τινας εἰσελθεῖν** might be considered a nominative but it is better, with Viteau (256), to construe it as an impersonal verb followed by an infinitive. From the fact that the offer of the rest had been made, or the promise given, "it remains" that some (must) enter in. But a second fact also forms a premiss in the argument. *viz.:* that those to whom the promise had formerly been made did not enter in; therefore, over and above and long after (**μετὰ τοσ. χρόνον**) the original proclamation of this gospel of rest, even in David's time, again (**πάλιν**), God appoints or specifies a certain day (**τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν**) saying "To-day". This proves that the offer is yet open, that the promise holds good in David's time. The words already quoted (**καθὼς προείρηται**) from the 95th Psalm prove this, for they run, "To-day, if ye hear His voice," etc. They prove at any rate that the gospel of rest was not exhausted by the entrance into Canaan under Joshua, "for if Joshua had given them rest, God would not after this speak of another day". The writer takes for granted that the "To-day" of the Psalm extends to Christian times, whether because of the life (ver. 12) that is in the word of promise, or because the reference in the Psalm is Messianic. "This 'voice' of God which is 'heard' is His voice speaking to us in His Son (i. 1) and this 'To-day' is 'the end of these days' in which He has spoken to us in Him, on to the time when He shall come again (iii. 13). In effect God has been 'heard' speaking only twice, to Israel and to us, and what He has spoken to both has been the same,—the promise of entering into His rest. Israel came short of it through unbelief; we do enter into the rest who believe (iv. 3)" (Davidson). At all events, the conclusion unhesitatingly follows: "Therefore there remains a Sabbath-Rest for the people of God". **ἄρα** though often standing first in a sentence in N.T. cannot in classical Greek occupy that place. **Σαββατισμός**, though found here only in Biblical Greek, occurs in Plutarch (*De Superstit*, c. 3). The verb **σαββατίζειν** occurs in Exod. xvi. 30 and other places. The word is here employed in preference to **κατάπαυσις** in order to identify the rest promised to God's people with the rest enjoyed by God Himself on the Sabbath or Seventh Day. [So Theophylact, **ἑρμηνεύει πῶς σαββατ. ὀνόμασε τὴν τοιαύτην κατάπαυσιν· διότι, φησί, καταπαυόμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ θεός, καταπαύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν εἰς σύστασιν τοῦ κόσμου, σάββατον τὴν ἡμέραν ὠνόμασεν.**] To explain and justify the introduction of this word, the writer adds **ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν** . . . as if he said, I call it a Sabbatism, because it is not an ordinary rest, but one which finds its ideal and actual fulfilment in God's own rest on the Seventh Day. It is a Sabbatism because in it God's people reach a definite stage of attainment, of satisfactorily accomplished purpose, as God Himself did when creation was finished. **ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν**, whoever has entered, not to be restricted to Jesus, as by Alford, **εἰς τ. κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ**, into God's rest, **καὶ αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ.** himself also rested from his (the man's) works as God from His."

The salvation which the writer has previously referred to as a glorious dominion is here spoken of as a Rest. The significance lies in its being God's rest which man is to share. It is the rest which God has enjoyed since the creation. From all His creative work God could

ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ὁ Θεός. 11. Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας. 12. [d] Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐνεργής,[1] καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον, καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε[2] καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ

d Eccl. xii. 11; Esa. xix. 2; Jer. xxiii. 29; 1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5; Eph. vi. 17.

[1] T.R. in ℵACDEHKLP; εναργης in B.
[2] ℵABCHLP omit τε.

not be said to rest till, after what cannot but appear to us a million of hazards, man appeared, a creature in whose history God Himself could find a worthy history, whose moral and spiritual needs would elicit the Divine resources and exercise what is deepest in God. When man appears God is satisfied, for here is one in His own image. But from this bare statement of the meaning of God's rest it is obvious that God's people must share it with Him. God's rest is satisfaction in man; but this satisfaction can be perfected only when man is in perfect harmony with Him. His rest is not perfect till they rest in Him. This highly spiritual conception of salvation is involved in our Author's argument. *Cf.* the grand passage on God's Rest in Philo, *De Cherubim*, c. xxvi., and also Barnabas xv., see also Hughes' *The Sabbatical Rest of God and Man*.

Ver. 11. The exhortation follows naturally, "Let us then earnestly strive to enter into that rest, lest anyone fall in the same example of disobedience". The example of disobedience was that given by the wilderness generation and they are warned not to fall in the same way. **πέσῃ ἐν** is commonly construed "fall into," but it seems preferable to render "fall by" or "in"; **πέσῃ** being used absolutely as in Rom. xiv. 4, **στήκει ἢ πίπτει.** Vaughan has "lest anyone fall [by placing his foot] in the mark left by the Exodus generation". **ὑπόδειγμα** is condemned by Phrynichus who says: **οὐδὲ τοῦτο ὀρθῶς λέγεται· παράδειγμα λέγε.** "In Attic **ὑποδείκνυμι** was never used except in its natural sense of *show by implication;* but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies *to mark out, set a pattern.*" Rutherford's *Phryn.*, p. 62. *Cf.* viii. 5 of this Epistle with John xiii. 15 for both meanings. It is used in James v. 10 with genitive of the thing to be imitated.

In vv. 12 and 13 another reason is added for dealing sincerely and strenuously with God's promises and especially with this offer of rest. **ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ,** "for the word of God is living," that word of revelation which from the first verse of the Epistle has been in the writer's mind and which he has in chaps. iii., iv. exhibited as a word of promise of entrance into God's rest. Evidently, therefore, **ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ** is not, as Origen and other interpreters have supposed, the Personal Word incarnate in Christ, but God's offers and promises. Not only is the **γάρ,** linking this clause to the promise of rest, decisive for this interpretation; but the mention of **ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς** in ver. 2 and the prominence given in the context to God's promise make it impossible to think of anything else. To enforce the admonition to believe and obey the word of God, five epithets are added, which, says Westcott, "mark with increasing clearness its power to deal with the individual soul. There is a passage step by step from that which is most general to that which is most personal." It is, first, **ζῶν,** "living" or, as A.V. has it, "quick". *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 23, **ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος,** and ver. 24 **τὸ ῥῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.** The meaning is that the word remains efficacious, valid and operative, as it was when it came from the will of God. "It is living as being instinct with the life of its source" (Delitzsch). It is also **ἐνεργής,** active, effective, still doing the work it was intended to do, *cf.* Isa. 55·11. **τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον,** "sharper than any two-edged sword". **τομ. ὑπὲρ** is a more forcible comparative than the genitive; *cf.* Luke xvi. 8; 2 Cor. xii. 13. The positive **τομός** is found in Plato *Tim.* 61 E. and elsewhere. **δίστομος** double-mouthed, *i.e.*, double-edged, the sword being considered as a devouring beast, see 2 Sam, xi. 25, **καταφάγεται ἡ μάχαιρα.** A double-edged sword is not only a more formidable weapon than a single-edged, offering less resistance and therefore cutting deeper (see Judges iii. 16 where Ehud made for

e Ps. xxxiii. 13, 14. 15, et xxxiv. 15, et xc. 8, et cxxxix. 11, 12; Ecclus. xv. 19.

μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας· 13. ᵉ καὶ οὐκ ἔστι κτίσις ἀφανὴς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, πάντα δὲ γυμνὰ καὶ τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος.

himself μάχαιραν δίστομον a span long, and *cf.* Eurip., *Helena*, 983), but it was a common simile for sharpness as in Prov. v. 4, ἠκονημένον μᾶλλον μαχαίρας διστόμου, whetted more than a two-edged sword; and Rev. i. 16, ῥομφαία δίστομος ὀξεῖα. The same comparison is used by Isaiah (xlix. 2) and by St. Paul (Eph. vi. 17); but especially in Wisdom xviii. 15, "Thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven . . . and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword. This sharpness is illustrated by its action, διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶντε καὶ μυελῶν, an expression which does not mean that the word divides the soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow, but that it pierces through all that is in man to that which lies deepest in his nature. "It is obvious that the writer does not mean anything very specific by each term of the enumeration, which produces its effect by the rhetorical fullness of the expressions" (Farrar). For the expression *cf.* Eurip., *Hippol.*, 255 πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς. But it is in the succeeding clause that the significance of his description appears; the word is Κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας "judging the conceptions and ideas of the heart". The word of God coming to men in the offer of good of the highest kind tests their real desires and inmost intentions. When fellowship with God is made possible through His gracious offer, the inmost heart of man is sifted; and it is infallibly discovered and determined whether he truly loves the good and seeks it, or shrinks from accepting it as his eternal heritage. The terms in which this is conveyed find a striking analogy in Philo (*Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, p. 491) where he speaks of God by His Word "cutting asunder the constituent parts of all bodies and objects that seem to be coherent and united. Which [the word] being whetted to the keenest possible edge, never ceases to pierce all sensible objects, and when it has passed through them to the things that are called atoms and indivisible, then again this cutting instrument begins to divide those things which are contemplated by reason into untold and indescribable portions." *Cf.* p. 506. In addition to this (καὶ), the inward operation of the word finds its counterpart in the searching, inevitable inquisition of God Himself with whom we have to do. "No created thing is hidden before Him (God) but all things are naked and exposed to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." τετραχηλισμένα has created difficulty. τραχηλίζω is a word of the games, meaning "to bend back the neck" and so "to overcome". In this sense of overmastering it was in very common use. In Philo, *e.g.*, men are spoken of as τετραχηλισμένοι ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. This meaning, however, gives a poor sense in our passage where it is followed by τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. Chrysostom says the word is derived from the skinning of animals, and Theophylact, enlarging upon this interpretation, explains that when the victims had their throats cut, the skin was dragged off from the neck downwards exposing the carcase. No confirmation of this use of the word is given. Perizonius in a note on Ælian, *Var., Hist.*, xii. 58, refers to Suetonius, *Vitell.*, 17, where Vitellius is described as being dragged into the forum, half-naked, with his hands tied behind his back, a rope round his neck and his dress torn; and we are further told that they dragged back his head by his hair, and even pricked him under the chin with the point of a sword as they are wont to do to criminals, that he might let his face be seen and not hang his head. [So, too, Elsner, who refers to Perizonius and agrees that the word means *resupīnata*, *manifesta*, eorum quasi cervice ac facie reflexa, atque adeo *intuentium oculis exposita*, genere loquendi ab iis petito, quorum capita reclinantur, ne intuentium oculos fugiant et lateant; quod hominibus qui ad supplicium ducebantur, usu olim accidebat." *Cf.* "Sic fatus galeam laeva tenet, atque reflexa Cervice orantis capulo tenus applicat ensem. Virgil, *Æn.* x. 535.] Certainly this bending back of the head to expose the face gives an excellent and relevant sense here. The reason for thus emphasising the penetrating and inscrutable gaze of God is given in the description appended in the relative

14. [f]Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας. 15. [g]Οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον συμπαθῆσαι[1] ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν,

f iii. 1, et vi. 20, et vii. 26, et viii. 1, et ix. 11, 24, et x. 23.

g ii. 17; Esa. liii. 9; Luc. xxii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. ii. 7; 1 Peter ii. 22; 1 Joan. iii. 5.

[1] συμπαθ, in BcDcEKLP; συνπαθ, in ℵAB*CD*H.

clause; it is He πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, which, so far as the mere words go, might mean "of whom we speak" (*cf.* i. 7 and v. 11), but which obviously must here be rendered, as in A.V., "with whom we have to do," or "with whom is our reckoning," *cf.* xiii. 17.

From iv. 14 to x. 15 the writer treats of the Priesthood of the Son. The first paragraph extends from iv. 14-v. 10, and in this it is shown that Jesus has the qualifications of a priest, a call from God, and the sympathy which makes intercession hearty and real. The writer's purpose is to encourage his readers to use the intercession of Christ with confidence, notwithstanding their sense of sinfulness. And he does so by reminding them that all High priests are appointed for the very purpose of offering sacrifice for sin, and that this office has not been assumed by them at their own instance but at the call of God. It is because God desires that sinful men be brought near to Him that priests hold office. And those are called to office, who by virtue of their own experience are prepared to enter into cordial sympathy with the sinner and heartily seek to intercede for him. All this holds true of Christ. He is Priest in obedience to God's call. The office, as He had to fill it, involved much that was repugnant. With strong crying and tears He shrank from the death that was necessary to the fulfilment of His function. But His godly caution prompted as His ultimate prayer, that the will of the Father and not His own might be done. Thus by the things He suffered He learned obedience, and being thus perfected became the author of eternal salvation to all that obey Him, greeted and proclaimed High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Ver. 14. Ἔχοντες οὖν . . . "Having then a great high priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession." οὖν resumes the train of thought started at iii. 1, where the readers were enjoined to consider the High Priest of their confession. But *cf.* Weiss and Kübel. μέγαν is now added, as in x. 21, xiii. 20, that they may the rather hold fast the confession they were in danger of letting go. The μέγαν is explained and justified by two features of this Priest: (1) He has passed through the heavens and entered thus the very presence of God. For διεληλ. τ. οὐρανούς cannot mean, as Calvin renders "qui coelos ingressus est". As the Aaronic High Priest passed through the veil, or, as Grotius and Carpzov suggest, through the various fore courts, into the Holiest place, so this great High Priest had passed through the heavens and appeared among eternal realities. So that the very absence of the High Priest which depressed them, was itself fitted to strengthen faith. He was absent, because dealing with the living God in their behalf. (2) The second mark of His greatness is indicated in His designation Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τ. Θεοῦ, the human name suggesting perfect understanding and sympathy, the Divine Sonship acceptance with the Father and pre-eminent dignity. κρατῶμεν τ. ὁμολογίας. "Our confession" primarily of this great High Priest, but by implication, our Christian confession, *cf.* iii. 1.

Ver. 15. Confirmation both of the encouragement of ver. 14 and of the fact on which that encouragement is founded is given in the further idea: οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν . . . "for we have not a high priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but has been tempted in all points like us, without sin". He repels an idea which might have found entrance into their minds, that an absent, heavenly priest might not be able to sympathise. Συνπαθέω [to be distinguished from συνπάσχω which occurs in Rom. viii. 17 and 1 Cor. xii. 26, and means to suffer along with one, to suffer the same ills as another] means to feel for, or sympathise with, and occurs also in x. 34, and is peculiar in N.T. to this writer but found in Aristotle, Isocrates and Plutarch, and in the touching expression of *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, 17, ὃς μόνος συνεπάθησεν πλανωμένῳ κόσμῳ. Jesus is able to sympathise with ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν "our

h x. 19, etc.; Rom. v. 2, 25; Eph. ii. 18, et iii. 12.

πεπειρασμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. 16. [h] προσερχώμεθα οὖν μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, ἵνα λά-

infirmities," the weaknesses which undermine our resistance to temptation and make it difficult to hold fast our confession: moral weaknesses, therefore, though often implicated with physical weaknesses. Jesus can feel for these because **πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα,** He has been tempted in all respects as we are. **κατὰ πάντα,** classical, "in all respects," *cf.* Wetstein on *Acts* xvii. 22; and Evagrius, v. 4, of Christ incarnate, **ὁμοιοπαθῆ κατὰ πάντα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας,** *cf.* ii. 17. **καθ' ὁμοιότητα** may either mean "according to the likeness of our temptations," or, "in accordance with His likeness to us". The latter is preferable, being most in agreement with ii. 17. So Theophylact, **καθ' ὁμοιότητα τὴν ἡμετέραν, τουτέστι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν,** *cf.* Gen. i. 11, 12; and Philo, *De Profug.*, c. 9, **κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τἄλλα ὁμοιότητα.** The writer wishes to preclude the common fancy that there was some peculiarity in Jesus which made His temptation wholly different from ours, that He was a mailed champion exposed to toy arrows. On the contrary, He has felt in His own consciousness the difficulty of being righteous in this world; has felt pressing upon Himself the reasons and inducements that incline men to choose sin that they may escape suffering and death; in every part of His human constitution has known the pain and conflict with which alone temptation can be overcome; has been so tempted that had He sinned, He would have had a thousandfold better excuse than ever man had. Even though His divinity may have ensured His triumph, His temptation was true and could only be overcome by means that are open to all. The one difference between our temptations and those of Jesus is that His were **χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας.** Riehm thinks this expression is not exhausted by declaring the fact that in Christ's case temptation never resulted in sin. It means, he thinks, further, and rather, that temptation never in Christ's case sprang from any sinful desire in Himself. So also Delitzsch, Weiss, Westcott, etc. But if Theophylact is right in his indication of the motive of the writer in introducing the words, then it is Christ's successful resistance of temptation which is in the foreground; **ὥστε δύνασθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας διαγενέσθαι.**

Ver. 16. **προσερχώμεθα οὖν....** "Let us, therefore [*i.e.*, seeing that we have this sympathetic and victorious High Priest] with confidence approach the throne of grace". **προσέρχεσθαι** is used in a semi-technical sense for the approach of a worshipper to God, as in LXX frequently. Thus in Lev. xxi. 17 it is said of any blemished son of Aaron **οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ αὐτοῦ,** and in the 23rd ver. **ἐγγιεῖ** is used as an equivalent, *cf.* Heb. vii. 19. The word is found only once in St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and there in a peculiar sense; but in Heb. it occurs seven times, and generally in its more technical sense, vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6. It had become so much a technical term of divine worship that it can be used, as in x. 1, 22, without an object. Here, as in vii. 25, it is followed by a dative **τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος,** the seat of supreme authority which by Christ's intercession is now characterised as the source from which grace is dispensed. Premonitions of this are found in O.T.; for although in Ps. xcvi. (xcvii.) 2 and elsewhere we find **δικαιοσύνη καὶ κρίμα κατόρθωσις τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ,** yet in Isa. xvi. 5 we read **διορθωθήσεται μετ' ἐλέους θρόνος.** Philo encourages men to draw near to God by representing "the merciful, and gentle, and compassionate nature of Him who is invoked, who would always rather have mercy than punishment" (*De Exsecr.*, c. ix). There is also something in Theophylact's remark: **Δύο γὰρ θρόνοι εἰσίν, ὁ μὲν νῦν χάριτος, . . . ὁ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας θρόνος οὐ χάριτος . . . ἀλλὰ κρίσεως.** Similarly Atto: "Modo tempus est donorum: nemo de se ipso desperet". They are to approach **μετὰ παρρησίας,** for as Philo says (*Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, 4): **φιλοδεσπότοις ἀναγκαιότατον ἡ παρρησία κτῆμα;** and in c. 5. **παρρησία φιλίας συγγενές.** The purpose of the approach is expressed in two clauses which Bleek declares to be "ganz synonym". This, however, is scarcely correct. As is apparent from the next verse, the "obtaining mercy" refers to the pardon of sins, while the "finding grace" implies assistance given. So Primasius,

βωμεν ἔλεον,[1] καὶ χάριν εὕρωμεν εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν. V. 1. [a]πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε[2] καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν,

a ii. 17, et viii. 3.

[1] T.R. in C^bD^cEL; ελεος ℵABC*D*KP. "The exx. of interchange of -ος masc. Decl. ii., and -ος neut. Decl. iii., have somewhat increased in number [in N.T. Greek] in comparison with those in the classical language" (Blass, *Gram.*, p. 28, E. Tr.).

[2] δωρα τε with ℵACD^{c}EKLP; τε omitted by BD^b, vg., "ut offerat dona, et sacrificia pro peccatis".

quoted by Westcott "ut misericordiam consequamur, id est remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam donorum Spiritus Sancti". ἔλεος and χάρις are, however, constantly conjoined (*v.* Hort on 1 Pet. i. 2). The close connection of χάριν with βοήθειαν suggests that ἔλεος is the more general and comprehensive term, and that χάρις is becoming already more associated with particular manifestations of ἔλεος. There may be ἔλεος, where there is no χάρις. We first obtain mercy and then find grace. εὑρίσκειν is everywhere in LXX used with χάριν in this sense, translating מָצָא. εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν "for timely help"; assistance in hours of temptation must be timely or it is useless. For βοήθεια *cf.* ii. 18; and for the whole verse, see Bishop Wilson's *Maxim*: "The most dangerous of all temptations is to believe, that one can avoid or overcome them by our own strength, and without asking the help of God".

Chapter V.—Ver. 1. Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς . . . γὰρ introduces the ground of the encouraging counsel of iv. 16, and further confirms iv. 15. [But *cf.* Beza: "Itaque γὰρ non tam est causalis quam inchoativa, ut loquuntur grammatici"; and Westcott: "the γάρ is explanatory and not directly argumentative".] The connection is: Come boldly to the throne of grace; let not sin daunt you, for *every* high priest is appointed for the very purpose of offering sacrifices *for sin* (*cf.* viii. 3). This he must do because he is appointed by God for this purpose, and he does it readily and heartily because his own subjection to weakness gives him sympathy. πᾶς ἀρχιερ. "Every high priest," primarily, every high priest known to you, or every ordinary Levitical high priest. There is no need to extend the reference, as Peirce does, to "others who were not of that order". ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, "being taken from among men," not, "who is taken from etc.," as if defining a certain peculiar and exceptional kind of high priest. It might almost be rendered "since he is taken from among men"; for the writer means that all priesthood proceeds on this foundation, and it is this circumstance that involves what is afterwards more fully insisted upon, that the high priest has sympathy. For λαμβ. *cf.* Num. xxv. 4, viii. 6. On the present tense, see below. Grotius renders "segregare, ut quae ex acervo desumimus". Being taken from among men every high priest is also appointed not for his own sake or to fulfil his own purposes, but ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται, "is appointed in man's behalf"; not with Calvin, "ordinat ea quae ad Deum pertinent," taking καθ. as middle. The word is in common use in classical writers. "The customariness [implied in λαμβ. and καθ.] applies not to the action of the individual member of the class, but to that of the class as a whole". Burton, *M. and T.*, cxxiv. τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, "in things relating to God"; an adverbial accusative as in Rom. xv. 17. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 94; and *cf.* Exod. xviii. 19, γίνου σὺ τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. In all that relates to God the high priest must mediate for men; but he is appointed especially and primarily, ἵνα προσφέρῃ . . . ἁμαρτιῶν, "that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins". Were there no sins there would be no priest. The fact that we are sinners, therefore, should not daunt us, or prevent our using the intercession of the priest. προσφέρειν, technical term, like our "offer"; not so used in the classics. δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας, the same combination is found in viii. 3 and ix. 9 with the same conjunctions. Δῶρα as well as θυσίαι include all kinds of sacrifices and offerings. Thus in Lev. i. *passim*, *cf.* ver. 3: ἐὰν ὁλοκαύτωμα τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ. It is best, therefore, to construe ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτ. with προσφέρειν and not with θυσίας; *cf.* ver. 3 and x. 12. So Bleek and Weiss against Grotius and others; *e.g.*, Westcott, who says: "The clause

b ii. 18, et iv. 15, et vii. 28.
c vii. 27; Lev. ix. 7, et xvi. 3, etc.
d Exod. xxviii.; 1 Par. xxiii. 13; 2 Par. xxvi. 16, etc.

2. [b] μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν· 3. [c] καὶ διὰ ταύτην[1] ὀφείλει, καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ, οὕτω καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ[2] προσφέρειν ὑπὲρ[3] ἁμαρτιῶν. 4. [d] Καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλὰ ὁ καλούμενος[4]

[1] T.R. read by CcDcEKL; δι αυτην by ℵABC*D*P, 7, 17, 80.
[2] T.R. with ℵACDcEKLP; αυτου with BD*, 219.
[3] υπερ in CcDcEKL; περι in ℵABC*D*P and in Levit. xvi. 6 and 15.
[4] Omit art. with ℵABC*DEK; insert art. CbLP.

ὑπὲρ ἁμ. is to be joined with θυσίας and not with προσφέρῃ as referring to both nouns. The two ideas of eucharistic and expiatory offerings are distinctly marked."

Ver. 2. μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος: "as one who is able to moderate his feeling". The Vulgate is too strong: "qui condolere possit"; Grotius has: "non inclementer affici"; Weizsäcker: "als der billig fühlen kann"; and Peirce: "who can reasonably bear with". As the etymology shows, it means "to be moderate in one's passions". It was opposed by Aristotle to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. [Diog. Laert., *Arist.*: ἔφη δὲ τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ μετριοπαθῆ δέ: not without feeling, but feeling in moderation; and Peirce, Tholuck, and Weiss conclude that the word was first formed by the Peripatetics; Tholuck expressly; and Weiss, "stammt aus dem philosophischen Sprachgebrauch". *Cf.* the chapter of Philo (*Leg. Allegor.*, iii., 45; Wendland's ed., vol. i. 142) in which he puts ἀπάθεια first and μετριοπάθ. second; and to the numerous exx. cited by Wetstein and Kypke, add Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, cxix., where the word is defined in relation to grief. Josephus (*Ant.*, xii. 3, 2) remarks upon the striking self-restraint and moderation (μετριοπαθησάντων) of Vespasian and Titus towards the Jews notwithstanding their many conflicts.] If the priest is cordially to plead with God for the sinner, he must bridle his natural disgust at the loathsomeness of sensuality, his impatience at the frequently recurring fall, his hopeless alienation from the hypocrite and the superficial, his indignation at any confession he hears from the penitent. This self-repression he must exercise τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις: "the ignorant and erring". The single article leads Peirce and others to render as a Hendiadys = τοῖς ἐξ ἀγνοίας πλαν., those who err through ignorance. ἄγνοια is not frequent in LXX, but in Ezek. xlii. 13, and also in chaps. xliv. and xlvi., it translates אָשָׁם, but in Lev. v. 18 and in Eccles. v. 5 it translates שְׁגָגָה which in Lev. iv. 2 and elsewhere is rendered by ἀκουσίως. A comparison too of the passages in which the word occurs seems to show that by "sins of ignorance" are meant both sins committed unawares or accidentally, and sins into which a man is betrayed by passion. They are opposed to presumptuous sins, sins with a high hand ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας, בְּיָד רָמָה (Num. xv. 30), sins which constitute a renunciation of God and for which there is no sacrifice, *cf.* x. 26. ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθένειαν: "since he himself also is compassed with infirmity," giving the reason or ground of μετριοπ. δυνάμενος. περίκειμαι, "I lie round," as in Mk. ix. 42, Luke xvii. 2 with περί and in Heb. xii. 1 with dative. In Acts xxviii. 20, τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι, it is used passively as here, followed by an accusative according to the rule that verbs which in the active govern a dative of the person with an accusative of the thing, retain the latter in the passive. See Winer, p. 287, and Rutherford's *Babrius*. The priests, living for the greater part of the year in their own homes, were known to have their weaknesses like other men, and even the high priests were not exempt from the common passions. Their gorgeous robes alone separated them from sinners, but like a garment infirmity clung around them. "How the very sanctity of his office would force on the attention of one who was not a mere puppet priest the contrast between his official and his personal character, as a subject of solemn reflection" (Bruce).

Ver. 3. καὶ δι' αὐτὴν . . . ἁμαρτιῶν "and because of it is bound as for the people, so also for himself to offer for sins". Vaughan recommends the dele-

ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθάπερ[1] καὶ ὁ[2] Ἀαρών. 5. [e] οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν, "Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε". 6. [f] καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, "Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ".

e i. 5; Ps. ii. 7; Joan. viii. 54; Acts xiii. 33.
f vii. 17; Ps. cx. 4.

[1] **καθαπερ** in ℵcCbDcEKLP; **καθωσπερ** in ℵ*ABD*, 17.

[2] Delete **ο** with ℵABCD, etc., and in conformity with this writer's usage.

tion of the stop at the end of ver. 2. The law which enjoined that the high priest should on the Day of Atonement sacrifice for himself and his house (**ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὑτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὑτοῦ**) before he sacrificed **περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ**, is given in Lev. xvi. 6, 15.

Ver 4. **καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν** "And no one taketh to himself this honourable office." **καί** introduces a second qualification of the priest, implied in **καθίσταται** of ver. 1, but now emphasised. An additional reason for trusting in the priest is that he has not assumed the office to gratify his own ambition but to serve God's purpose of restoring men to His fellowship. All genuine priesthood is the carrying out of God's will. The priest must above all else be *obedient*, in sympathy with God as well as in sympathy with man. God's appointment also secures that the suitable qualifications will be found in the priest. The office is here called **τιμή**, best translated by the German "Ehrenamt" or "Ehrenstelle." For **τιμή** meaning an office see Eurip., *Helena*, 15; Herodot., ii. 65, **παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδέκεται τὴν τιμήν**; and especially Aristotle, *Pol*., iii. 10, **τιμὰς γὰρ λέγομεν εἶναι τὰς ἀρχάς**. *Cf*. Hor. i. 1, 8 "tergeminis honoribus". Frequently in Josephus **τιμή** is used of the high priesthood, see *Antiq*., xii. 2-5, iv. 1, etc.; and the same writer should be consulted for the historical illustration of this verse (*Antiq*., iii. 8-1). In this remarkable passage he represents Moses as saying **ἔγωγε . . . ἐμαυτὸν ἂν τῆς τιμῆς ἄξιον ἔκρινα . . . νῦν δ' αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς Ἀαρῶνα τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης ἄξιον ἔκρινε**. The *nolo episcopari* implied in the words is amply illustrated in the case of Augustine, of John Knox, and especially of Anselm who declared he would rather have been cast on a stack of blazing faggots than set on the archiepiscopal throne, and continued to head his letters "Brother Anselm monk of Bec by choice, Archbishop of Canterbury by violence". On the other hand, see the account of the appointment by his own act (**αὐτόχειρ**) of the priest king in Aricia, in Strabo v. 3-12 and elsewhere. **ἀλλὰ καλούμενος . . . καθώσπερ καὶ Ἀαρών**. "but when called by God as in point of fact even Aaron was". If the article is retained before **καλ**. we must translate "but he that is called," **καλούμενος** "in diesem amtlichen Sinne nur hier," says Weiss, but see Matt. iv. 21, Gal. i. 15. For Aaron's call, see Exod. xxviii. 1 ff. Schöttgen and Wetstein appositely quote from the *Bammidbar Rabbi* "Moses said to Korah and his associates:—If my brother Aaron took to himself the priesthood, then ye did well to rebel against him; but in truth God gave it to him, whose is the greatness and the power and the glory. Whosoever, then, rises against Aaron, does he not rise against God?" It is notorious that the contemporary priesthood did not fulfil the description here given.

Ver. 5. **οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς. . . .** "So even the Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest." ["So hat auch der Christus nicht sich selbst die Herrlichkeit des Hohenpriestertums zugeeignet," Weizsäcker.] The designation, "the Christ," is introduced, because it might not have seemed so significant a statement if made of "Jesus". It was not personal ambition that moved Christ. He did not come in His own name, nor did He seek to glorify Himself. See John viii. 54; v. 31, 43; xvii. 5, and *passim*. **ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας . . . Μελχισεδέκ**. "but He [glorified Him to be made a priest] who said, Thou art My Son, I this day have begotten Thee; as also in another place He says, Thou art a priest for ever after the order Melchizedek". The question here is: Why does the writer introduce the quotation from the 2nd Psalm at all? Why does he not directly prove his point by the quotation from the Messianic 110th Psalm? Does he mean that He who said, Thou art my Son, glorified Christ as priest *in saying this?* Apparently he does, otherwise the **καὶ** in **καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ** would be unwarranted. By introducing the former of the two quotations and designating

g Matt. xxvi. 38, etc., et xxvii. 46, 50; Marc. xiv. 33, 36, et xv. 34, 37; Luc. xxii. 42, et xxiii. 46; Joan. xii. 27, et xvii. 1.

7. [g]Ὃς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου, μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς

God as He that called Christ Son, or nominated him to the Messianic dignity, which involved the priesthood, he shows that the greater and more comprehensive office of Messiahship was not assumed by Christ at His own instance and therefore that the priesthood included in this was not of His own seeking, but of God's ordaining; *cf.* Weiss. Bleek says the reference to Psalm ii. is made to lessen the marvel that God should glorify Christ as priest. Similarly Riehm "dass Christus in einem so unvergleichlich innigen Verhältnisse zu Gott steht, dass seine Berufung zum Hohepriesteramt nicht befreundlich sein kann;" and Davidson, "It is by no means meant that the priesthood of Christ was *involved* in His Sonship (Alford), an *a priori* method of conception wholly foreign to the Epistle, but merely that it was suitable in one who was Son, being indeed possible to none other (see on i. 3)." Bruce thinks the writer wishes to teach that Christ's priesthood is coeval with His Sonship and inherent in it. **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν** "after the order;" among its other meanings **τάξις** denotes a class or rank, "ordo quâ dicitur quispiam senatorii ordinis, vel equestris ordinis". Thus in Demosthenes, **οἰκέτου τάξιν οὐκ ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς ἔχων**, in Diod. Sic., iii. 6, **οἱ περὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν θεραπείας διατρίβοντες ἱερεῖς, μεγίστην καὶ κυριωτάτην τάξιν ἔχοντες.** In the subsequent exposition of the Melch. priesthood it is chiefly on **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** that emphasis is laid.

Ver 7. **ὃς . . . ἔμαθεν . . . καὶ ἐγένετο.** In these verses the writer shows how much there was in the call to the priesthood repugnant to flesh and blood; how it was through painful obedience, not by arrogant ambition he became Priest. The main statement is, He learned obedience and became perfect as Saviour. **ὃς ἐν τ. ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ** "who in the days of His flesh," and when therefore He was like His brethren in capacity for temptation and suffering; *cf.* ii. 14. **δεήσεις . . . προσενέγκας** "having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death". **προσενέγκας** has sometimes been supposed to refer to the **προσφέρειν** of ver. 3, and to have a sacrificial sense. It was such an offering as became His innocent **ἀσθένεια**. As the ordinary high priest prepared himself for offering for the people by offering for himself, so, it is thought, Christ was prepared for the strictly sacrificial or priestly work by the feeling of His own weakness. There is truth in this. Weiss' reason for excluding this reference is "dass ein Opfern mit starkem Geschrei und Thränen eine unvollziehbare Vorstellung ist". *Cf.* Davidson, p. 113, note. **προσφ.** is used with **δέησιν** in later Greek writers: instances in Bleek. **δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας,** these words are elsewhere combined as in Isocrates, *De Pace*, 46; Polybius, iii. 112, 8; *cf.* Job. xl. 22. The relation of the two words is well brought out in a passage from Philo quoted by Carpzov: **γραφὴ δὲ μηνύσει μου τὴν δέησιν ἣν ἀνθ' ἱκετηρίας προτείνω.** *Cf.* Eurip., *Iph. Aul.*, 1216. **ἱκετηρία** [from **ἵκω** I come, **ἱκέτης** one who comes as a suppliant] is originally an adjective = fit for suppliants, then an olive branch [sc. **ἐλαία**, or **ῥάβδος**] bound with wool which the suppliant carried as a symbol of his prayer. The conjunction of words in this verse is for emphasis. These supplications were accompanied **μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς καὶ δακρύων** "with strong crying and tears," expressing the intensity of the prayers and so the keenness of the suffering. The "strong crying" is striking. Schöttgen quotes: "There are three kinds of prayers, each loftier than the preceding: prayer, crying, and tears. Prayer is silent, crying with raised voice, tears overcome all things." It is to the scene in Gethsemane reference is made, and although "tears" are not mentioned by the evangelists in relating that scene, they are implied, and this writer might naturally thus represent the emotion of our Lord. The prayer was addressed **πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου** "to Him that was able to save Him from death," which implies that the prayer was that Christ might be saved from death ["Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me"] but also suggests that the prayer was not formally answered —else why emphasise that God had power to answer it? **σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου.** The

καὶ δακρύων προσενέγκας, καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, 8. [h] καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς, ἔμαθεν ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοὴν, 9. [i] καὶ τελειω-

h Phil. ii. 6, etc.
i ii. 10.

prayer recorded in Mark xiv. 36, and the anticipation of Gethsemane alluded to in John xii. 57 [Πάτερ σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης] are sufficient to show that it is deliverance from dying that is meant. Milligan, however, says: "Christ is thus represented as praying not that death may be averted, but that He may be saved 'out of it,' when it comes." Westcott thinks the word covers both ideas and that in the first sense the prayer was not granted, that it might be granted in the second. It is preferable to abide by the simple statement that the passion of Christ's prayer to escape death was intensified by the fact that He knew God could deliver Him by twelve legions of angels or otherwise. His absolute faith in the Father's almighty power and infinite resource was the very soul of his trial. **καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας** "and having been heard on account of His godly reverence". **εὐλάβεια** [from **εὖ λαβεῖν** to take good hold, or careful hold] denotes the cautious regard which a wise man pays to all the circumstances of an action. Thus Fabius Cunctator was termed **εὐλαβής**. And in regard to God **εὐλάβεια** means that reverent submission to His will which caution or prudence dictates. [See Prov. xxviii. 14 and the definitions by Philo. *Quis. Rer. Div. Haer.*, 6.] That **ἀπό** following **εἰσακουσθεὶς** means in Biblical Greek "on account of" we have proof in Job xxxv. 12 and Luke xix. 3, as well as from the frequent use of **ἀπό** in N.T. to denote cause, John xxi. 6; Acts xii. 14, etc. In classical Greek also **ἀπό** is used for *propter*, see Aristoph., *Knights*, l. 767 **ὡς ἀπὸ μικρῶν εὔνους αὐτῷ θωπευματίων γεγένησαι.** See also the *Birds*, l. 150. The cautious reverence, or reverent caution—the fear lest He should oppose God or seem to overpersuade Him—which was heard and answered was expressed in the second petition of the prayer in Gethsemane, "Not my will but thine be done". And **ἀπό** is used in preference to **διά**, apparently because the source of the particular petition is meant to be indicated, that we may understand that the truest answer to this reverent submission was to give Him the cup to drink and thus to accomplish through Him the faultless will of God. To have removed the cup and saved Him from death would not have answered the **εὐλάβεια** of the prayer. The meaning of the clause is further determined by what follows.

Ver. 8. **καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ἔμαθεν ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν** [having been heard . . .] although He was a son He learned obedience from the things He suffered. The result of his being heard was therefore that he suffered, but in the suffering He learned obedience, perfect unison with the will of God for the salvation of men so that He became a perfected Priest. He learned obedience **καίπερ ὢν υἱός**: "this is stated to obviate the very idea of assumption on his part" (Davidson). Perhaps, therefore, we should translate, with a reference to ver. 5, "although He was Son". Although Son and therefore possessed of Divine love and in sympathy with the Divine purpose, He had yet to learn that perfect submission which is only acquired by obeying in painful, terrifying circumstances. He made deeper and deeper experience of what obedience is and costs. And *the particular obedience* [**τὴν ὑπακ.**] which was required of Him in the days of His flesh was that which at once gave Him perfect entrance into the Divine love and human need. It is when the child is told to do something which pains him, and which he shrinks from, that he learns obedience, learns to submit to another will. And the things which Christ suffered in obeying God's will taught Him perfect submission and at the same time perfect devotedness to man. On this obedience, see Robertson Smith in *Expositor* for 1881, p. 424. **καίπερ** is often joined with the participle to emphasise its concessive use [see Burton, 437], as in Diod. Sic., iii. 17, **οὗτος ὁ βίος καίπερ ὢν παράδοξος. ἔμαθεν ἀφ᾽ ὧν ἔπαθε**, a common form of attraction and also a common proverbial saying, of which Wetstein gives a number of instances; Herodot. i. 207; Æsch., *Agam.*, 177, **πάθει μάθος**, Demosth., 1232 **τοὺς μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν μανθάνοντας.** Carpzov also quotes several from Philo, as from the *De Somn.*, **ὁ παθὼν ἀκριβῶς ἔμαθεν**, and *De Profug.*, 25. **ἔμαθον μὲν ὃ ἔπαθον.** see also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 299 E. Tr.

Ver. 9. **καὶ τελειωθεὶς . . . αἰωνίου** "and having [thus] been perfected became to all who obey Him the source [originator] of eternal salvation". **τελειωθεὶς** (v. ii. 10) having been perfectly equipped with every qualification for the

θεὶς ἐγένετο τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ πᾶσιν αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου· 10. προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ.

11. Περὶ οὗ πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, ἐπεὶ

priestly office by the discipline already described. Several interpreters (Theodoret, Bleek, Westcott) include in the word the exaltation of Christ, but illegitimately. The word must be interpreted by its connection with ἔμαθεν ὑπακοήν; and here it means the completion of Christ's moral discipline, which ended in His death. He thus became **αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου** author, or cause of eternal salvation, in fulfilment of the call to an eternal priesthood, ver. 6 **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** and ver. 10. **αἴτιος** frequently used in a similar sense from Homer downwards, as in Diod. Sic., iv. 82, **αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῆς σωτηρίας.** Aristoph., *Clouds*, 85, **οὗτος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς αἴτιός μοι τῶν κακῶν.** Philo, *De Agri.*, 22, **πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ** with a reference to **τὴν ὑπακ.** of ver. 8. The saved must pass through an experience similar to the Saviour's. Their salvation is in learning to obey. Thus they are harmonised to the one supreme and perfect will. This is reversely given in ii. 10.

Ver. 10. **προσαγορευθεὶς . . . Μελχισεδέκ** "styled by God High Priest after the order of Melchizedek". "**προσαγορεύειν** expresses the formal and solemn ascription of the title to Him to whom it belongs ('addressed as,' 'styled')" (Westcott). "When the Son ascended and appeared in the sanctuary on High, God saluted Him or addressed Him as an High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and, of course, in virtue of such an address constituted Him such an High Priest" (Davidson). Originally called to the priesthood by the words of Ps. cx., He is now by His resurrection and ascension declared to be perfectly consecrated and so installed as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. It may be doubted, however, whether the full meaning of **προσαγορεύειν** "address" should here be found. The commoner meaning in writers of the time is "named" or "called". Thus in Plutarch's *Pericles*, iv. 4, Anaxagoras, **ὃν Νοῦν προσηγόρευον,** xxvii. 2, **λευκὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην προσαγ.,** xxiv. 6, of Aspasia, **Ἥρα προσαγορεύεται.** and viii. 2 of Pericles himself, **Ὀλύμπιον . . . προσαγορευθῆναι.** So in Diod. Sic., i. 51, of the Egyptians, **τάφους ἀϊδίους οἴκους προσαγορεύουσιν.** It cannot be certainly concluded either from the tense or the context that this "naming" is to be assigned to the date of the ascension and not to the original appointment. The emphasis is on the words **ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ,** not by man but by God has Christ been named High Priest; and on **κατὰ . . . Μελχ.** as warranting **αἰωνίου.**

The passage v. 11 to vi. 20 is a digression occasioned by the writer's reflection that his argument from the priesthood of Melchizedek may be too difficult for his hearers. In order to stimulate attention he chides and warns them, pointing out the danger of backwardness. He justifies, however, his delivery of difficult doctrine notwithstanding their sluggishness, and this on two grounds: (1) because to lay again the foundations after men have once known them is useless (vi. 1-8); and (2) because he cannot but believe that his readers are after all in scarcely so desperate a condition. They need to have their hope renewed. This hope they have every reason to cherish, seeing that their fathers have already entered into the enjoyment of it, that God who cannot lie has sworn to the fulfilment of the promises, and that Jesus has entered the heavenly world as their forerunner. Ver. 11-14. Complaint of their sluggishness of mind.

Ver. 11. **περὶ οὗ.** "Of whom," not, as Grotius (*cf.* Delitzsch and von Soden) "De quâ," of which priesthood. It is simplest to refer the relative to the last word **Μελχισεδέκ**; possible to refer it to **ἀρχιερεὺς . . . Μελχ.** The former seems justified by the manner in which c. vii. resumes **οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχ.** No doubt the reference is not barely to Melchizedek, but to Melchizedek as type of Christ's priesthood. Concerning Melchisedek he has much to say **πολὺς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος,** not exactly equivalent to **ἡμῶν ὁ λόγος,** but rather signifying "the exposition which it is incumbent on us to undertake". [*Cf. Antigone*, 748, **ὁ γοῦν λόγος σοι πᾶς ὑπὲρ κείνης ὅδε.**] The exposition is necessarily of some extent (c. vii.), although of his whole letter he finds it possible to say (xiii. 22) **διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα.** It is also **δυσερμήνευτος** "difficult to explain," "hard to render intelligible," "ininterpretabilis"

νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. 12. [k] καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον, πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, τίνα [1] τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν

k 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2, 3; 1 Peter ii. 2.

[1] τίνα as in Syr., vg., "quae sint elementa". So Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril. τινὰ Lachmann, WH, Baljon; after Œcumenius and as giving better sense.
"Theory is the guide of practice, practice the life of theory" (Roberts, *Clavis Bibliorum*). "The interpreter needs oratio, meditatio, tentatio."

(Vulg.); used of dreams in Artemidorus, τοῖς πολλοῖς δυσερμήνευτοι (Wetstein). This difficulty, however, arises not wholly from the nature of the subject, but rather from the unpreparedness of the readers, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς "seeing that you are become dull of hearing". νωθρός = νωθής [see *Prom. Vinct.*, 62] slow, sluggish; used by Dionysius Hal., to denote λίθον φύσιν ἀναίσθητον, ἀκίνητον. But Plato was said to be νωθρός in comparison with Aristotle. Babrius uses the word of the numbed limbs of the sick lion and of the "stupid" hopes of the wolf that heard the nurse threaten to throw the child to the wolves. ταῖς ἀκοαῖς "in your sense of hearing." Both in classical and biblical Greek ἀκοή has three meanings, "the thing heard," as in John xii. 38; "the sense of hearing," as in 1 Cor. xii. 17; and "the ear," as in Mark vii. 35, ἠνοίγησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί; *cf.* Plummer on Luke, p. 194. Here the ear stands for intelligent and spiritual reception of truth. γεγόνατε, "ye are become," and therefore were not always. It is not a natural and inherent and pardonable weakness of understanding he complains of, but a culpable incapacity resulting from past neglect of opportunities.

Ver. 12. καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες. . . . "For indeed, though in consideration of the time [since you received Christ] ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the beginning [the elements] of the oracles of God."—διὰ τὸν χρόνον, *cf.* ii. 3, x. 32; how long they had professed Christianity we do not know, but quite possibly for twenty or thirty years. Those who had for a time themselves been Christians were expected to have made such attainment in knowledge as to become διδάσκαλοι. This advance was their duty, ὀφείλοντες. Instead of thus accumulating Christian knowledge, they had let slip even the rudiments, so far at any rate as to allow them to fall into the background of their mind and to become inoperative. Their primal need of instruction had recurred. The need had again arisen, τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τινὰ "of some one teaching you," the genitive following χρείαν, as in ver. 12 and in x. 36. The indefinite pronoun seems preferable, as the form of the sentence requires an expressed subject to bring out the contrast to εἶναι διδάσκαλοι, and to ὑμᾶς. τὰ στοιχεῖα . . . Θεοῦ. The meaning of τῆς ἀρχῆς would seem to be determined by τῆς ἀρχῆς τ. Χριστοῦ in vi. 1, where it apparently denotes the initial stages of a Christian profession, the stages in which the elements of the Christian faith would naturally be taught. Here, then, "the beginning of the oracles of God" would mean the oracles of God as taught in the beginning of one's education by these oracles. This of itself is a strong enough expression, but to make it stronger τὰ στοιχεῖα is added, as if he said "the rudiments of the rudiments," the A B C of the elements. τῶν λογίων τ. Θεοῦ, "oraculorum Dei, *i.e.*, Evangelii, in quo maxima et summe necessaria sunt Dei oracula, quae et sic dicuntur, 1 Peter iv. 11" (Grotius). The "Oracles of God" sometimes denote the O.T., as in Rom. iii. 2, Acts vii. 38; but here it is rather the utterance of God through the Son (i. 1), the salvation preached by the Lord (ii. 3) (so Weiss). καὶ γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες γάλακτος . . . "and are become such as have need of milk and not of solid food," "et facti estis quibus lacte opus sit, non solido cibo" (Vulgate). For the metaphor, *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 1-3, a strikingly analogous passage, *cf.* John xvi. 12, and the Rabbinic term for young students "Theenekoth" "Sucklings" (Schoettgen). The same figure is found in Philo, *De Agric.*, ii. (Wendland, vol. ii., p. 96) ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μέν ἐστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα· καὶ ψυχῆς κ.τ.λ. Abundant illustrations from Greek literature in Wetstein. Instead of becoming adults, able to stand on their own feet, select and digest their own food, they had fallen into spiritual dotage, had entered a second childhood, and could

ἔχοντες γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ στερεᾶς τροφῆς. 13. [1] πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος, ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης· νήπιος γάρ ἐστι· 14. τελείων δέ ἐστιν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἕξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνα-

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 2, et xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 14.

only receive the simplest nourishment. Milk represents traditional teaching, that which has been received and digested by others, and is suitable for those who have no teeth of their own and no sufficiently strong powers of digestion. This teaching is admirably adapted to the first stage of Christian life, but it cannot form mature Christians. For this, **στερεὰ τροφή** is essential.

Ver. 13. **πᾶς γὰρ . . . νήπιος γάρ ἐστι.** "For every one who partakes of milk [as his sole diet] is without experience of the word of righteousness; for he is a babe." The reference of **γὰρ** is somewhat obscure. It seems intended to substantiate the last clause of ver. 12: "Ye cannot receive solid food, *for* you have no experience of the word of righteousness". But he softens the statement by generalising it. Every one that lives on milk is necessarily unacquainted with the higher teaching, which is now **λόγος δικ.** **ἄπειρος** having no experience of, ignorant; as **κακότητος ἄπειροι**, Empedocles in Fairbanks, *Phil. of Greece*, p. 202. **ἄπειρος ἀγρεύειν**, Babrius, lxix. 2; **ἄπ. τοῦ ἀγωνίζεσθαι**, Antiphon, Jebb, p. 8. **λόγου δικαιοσύνης**, with teaching of righteous conduct the suckling has nothing to do; he cannot act for himself, but can merely live and grow; he cannot discern good and evil, and must take what is given him. Righteousness is not within the suckling's horizon. He cannot as yet be taught it; still less can he be a teacher of it (ver. 12) **νήπιος γάρ ἐστι**, for he cannot even speak [**νη-ἔπος** = infans], he is an infant. The infant can neither understand nor impart teaching regarding a life of which he has no experience, and whose language he does not know. Indirectly, this involves that the higher instruction the writer wished to deliver was important because of its bearing on conduct. [Other interpretations abound. Chrysostom and Theophylact understand the reference to be either to the Christian life or to Christ Himself and the knowledge of His person. Others, as Beza, Lünemann, and many others, take it as "a periphrasis for Christianity or the Gospel, inasmuch as the righteousness which avails with God is precisely the contents of the Gospel". Riehm also thinks that the Gospel is meant, "because it leads to righteousness". Westcott understands it of the "teaching which deals at once with the one source of righteousness in Christ, and the means by which man is enabled to be made partaker of it". The view of Carpzov, and also that of Bleek, is governed by the connection of Melchizedek with righteousness in vii. 2.]

Ver. 14. **τελείων δέ. . . .** "But solid food is for the mature, those who, by reason of their mental habits, have their senses exercised to discern good and evil." **τέλειος** commonly opposed in classical and Biblical Greek to **νήπιος**; as in Polyb. v. 29, 2, **ἐλπίσαντες ὡς παιδίῳ νηπίῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ Φιλίππῳ, εὗρον αὐτὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα.** *Cf.* Eph. iv. 13; and Xen., *Cyr.*, viii. 7, 3. They are here further defined as **τῶν . . . κακοῦ.** **ἕξις** [from **ἔχω**, as habitus from habeo], a habit of body, or of mind; as in Plato, *Laws* (p. 666), **τὴν ἐμμανῆ ἕξιν τῶν νέων.** Also, p. 966, **Ἀνδραπόδου γάρ τινα σὺ λέγεις ἕξιν.** Aristotle (*Nic. Eth.* ii. 5) determines that virtue is neither a **δύναμις** nor a **πάθος**, but a **ἕξις**, a faculty being something natural and innate, while virtue is not. Plutarch (*Moral.*, 443), following him, defines **ἕξις** as **ἰσχὺς . . . ἐξ ἔθους ἐγγινομένη**, which resembles Quintilian's definition (x. 1, 1), "firma quaedam facilitas, quae apud Graecos **ἕξις** nominatur". Aristotle (*Categor.*, viii. 1) distinguishes **ἕξις** from **διάθεσις, τῷ πολὺ χρονιώτερον εἶναι καὶ μονιμώτερον**, but elsewhere he uses the words as equivalents. Longinus (xliv. 4) uses it of faculty. **ἕξις**, then, is the habitual or normal condition, the disposition or character; and the expression in the text means that the mature, by reason of their maturity or mental habit, have their senses exercised, etc. **αἰσθητήρια**: "senses". Bleek quotes the definition of the Greek lexicographers and of Damascene **τὰ ὄργανα ἢ τὰ μέλη δι' ὧν αἰσθανόμεθα.** So Galen in Wetstein, "organs of sense". Here the reference is to spiritual faculties of perception and taste. **γεγυμνασμένα . . . πρὸς διάκρισιν . . .**, "exercised so as to discriminate between good and evil," *i.e.*, between what is wholesome and what is hurtful in teaching. [Wetstein quotes from Galen, *De Dignot. Puls.*, **ὃς μὲν γὰρ τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει**

σμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ. VI. 1. **Διὸ ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώ-**

γεγυμνασμένον ἱκανῶς οὗτος ἄριστος ἂν εἴη γνώμων.] The child must eat what is given to it; the boy is warned what to eat and what to avoid; as he grows, his senses are exercised by a various experience, so that when he reaches manhood he does not need a nurse or a priest to teach him what is nutritious and what is poisonous. The first evidence of maturity which the writer cites is ability to teach; the second, trained discernment of what is wholesome in doctrine. The one implies the other. *Cf.* Isa. vii. 16, **πρὶν γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν,** and Deut. i. 39. Chrysostom says **οὐ περὶ βίου ὁ λόγος . . . ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν καὶ ὑψηλῶν διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν**; the whole passage should be consulted.

Chapter VI.—Ver. 1. **Διὸ** "wherefore," *i.e.*, because beginnings belong to a stage which ought long since to have been left behind (v. 12), **ἀφέντες . . .** let us abandon [give up] the elementary teaching about Christ and press on to maturity. [Of the use of **ἀφιέναι** in similar connections Bleek gives many instances of which Eurip., *Androm.*, 393 may be cited: **ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφεὶς πρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν ὑστέραν οὖσαν φέρῃ. ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα** is an expression which was in vogue in the Pythagorean schools. [Westcott and Weiss press the passive. "The thought is not primarily of personal effort . . . but of personal surrender to an active influence." But **φέρομαι** is used where it is difficult to discover a passive sense.] It is questioned whether the words are merely the expression of the teacher's resolution to advance to a higher stage of instruction, or are meant as an exhortation to the readers to advance to perfectness. Davidson advocates the former view, Peake the latter. It would seem that the author primarily refers to his own teaching. The context and the use of **λόγον** favour this view. He has been chiding them for remaining so long "babes," able to receive only "milk"; let us, he says, leave this rudimentary teaching and proceed to what is more nutritious. But with his advance in teaching, their advance in knowledge and growth in character is closely bound up. What the writer definitely means by **τὸν τ. ἀρχῆς τ. Χριστοῦ λόγον,** he explains in his detailed description of the "foundation," which is not again to be laid. It consists of the teaching that must first be given to those who seek some knowledge of Christ. Westcott explains the expression thus: "*the word*, the exposition, *of the beginning*, the elementary view *of the Christ*"; although he probably too narrowly restricts the meaning of "the beginning of Christ" when he explains it as "the fundamental explanation of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises in Jesus of Nazareth". Weiss thinks the writer urges abandonment of the topics with which he and his readers had been occupied in the Epistle ["also des bisherigen Inhalts des Briefes".] But this is not necessarily implied, and indeed is excluded by the advanced character of much of the preceding teaching. What was taught the Hebrews at their first acquaintance with the Christ must be abandoned, not as if it had been misleading, but as one leaves behind school books or foundations: "non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est haerendum". Calvin: as Paul says, **τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος,** Phil. iii. 13. **μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι** "not again and again laying a foundation". **θεμέλιον** possibly a neuter (see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 119) as in Acts xvi. 16; certainly masculine in 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. xi. 10; Rev. xxi. 14, 19 twice. **καταβαλλ.** the usual word for expressing the idea of "laying" foundations, as in Dionys. Hal., iii. 69; Josephus *Ant.*, xv. 11, 3; metaphorically in Eurip., *Helena*, 164; hence **καταβολὴ κόσμου,** the foundation of the world. Then follow six particulars in which this foundation consists. Various arrangements and interpretations have been offered. Dr. Bruce says: "We are tempted to adopt another hypothesis, namely, that the last four are to be regarded as the foundation of the first two, conceived not as belonging to the foundation, but rather as the superstructure. On this view we should have to render 'Not laying again a foundation for repentance and faith, consisting in instructions concerning baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection, and judgment.' In favour of this construction is the reading **διδαχήν** found in B, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, which being in opposition with **θεμέλιον** suggests that the four things following form the foundation

μεθα· μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι μετανοίας ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ Θεόν, 2. βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς,[1] ἐπιθέσεώς τε

[1] T.R. in ℵACDEKL, vg.; διδαχην in B.

of repentance and faith." But Dr. Bruce returns to the idea that six articles are mentioned as forming the foundation, and Westcott, although adopting the reading διδαχήν, makes no use of it. Balfour (*Central Truths*) in an elaborate paper on the passage suggests that only four articles are mentioned, the words, βαπτισμῶν . . . χειρῶν being introduced parenthetically, because the writer cannot refrain from pointing out that repentance and faith were respectively taught by two legal rites, baptism and laying on of hands. The probability, however, is, as we shall see, that six fundamentals are intended, and that they are not so non-Christian as is sometimes supposed. These six fundamentals are arranged in three pairs, the first of which is μετανοίας . . . Θεόν "repentance from dead works and faith toward God". Repentance and faith are conjoined in Mark i. 15; Acts xx. 21; *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 9. They are found together in Scripture because they are conjoined in life, and are indeed but different aspects of one spiritual act. A man repents because a new belief has found entrance into his mind. Repentance is here characterised as ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. Many explanations are given. ["Hanc vero phrasin apud scriptores Judaicos mihi nondum occurrisse lubens fateor" (Schoettgen).] The only other place where works are thus designated is ix. 14, where the blood of Christ is said to cleanse the conscience from dead works and thus to fit for the worship of the living God; on which Chrysostom remarks εἴ τις ἥψατο τότε νεκροῦ ἐμιαίνετο· καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἴ τις ἅψαιτο νεκροῦ ἔργου, μολύνεται διὰ τῆς συνειδήσεως, as if sins were called "dead" simply because they defile and unfit for God's worship. [On this view Weiss remarks, "wenigstens etwas Richtiges zu Grunde".] Others think that "dead" here means "deadly" or "death-bringing"; so Peirce; or that it is meant that sins have no strength, are "devoid of life and power"; so Tholuck, Alford; or are "vain and fruitless" (Lünemann). Hofmann says that every work is dead in which there is not inherent any life from God. Similarly Westcott, who says: "There is but one spring of life and all which does not flow from it is 'dead'. All acts of a man in himself, separated from God, are 'dead works'." Davidson thinks that this is "hardly enough," and adds "they seem so called because being sinful they belong to the sphere of that which is separate from the living God, the sphere of death (ii. 14, etc.)". Rather it may be said that dead works are such as have no living connection with the character but are done in mere compliance with the law and therefore accomplish nothing. They are like a dead fleece laid on a wolf, not a part of his life and growing out of him. *Cf.* Bleek and Weiss. Such repentance was especially necessary in Jewish Christians. καὶ πίστεως ἐπὶ Θεόν, the counterpart of the preceding. The abandonment of formal, external righteousness results from confidence in God as faithful to His promises and furnishing an open way to Himself. What is meant is not only faith in God's existence, which of course had not to be taught to a Jew, but trust in God. Faith is either εἰς, πρός, ἐν, or ἐπί as union, relation, rest, or direction is meant (Vaughan).

Ver. 2. The next pair, βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν "instruction regarding washings and laying on of hands". "The historical sequence is followed in the enumeration". Some interpreters make all three conditions directly dependent on θεμέλιον, "foundation of baptisms, teaching, and laying on of hands". Bengel makes διδαχῆς dependent on βαπτ. He says: "βαπτισμοὶ διδαχῆς erant *baptismi*, quos qui suscipiebant, *doctrinae* sacrae Judaeorum sese addicebant. Itaque adjecto διδαχῆς *doctrinae* distinguuntur a lotionibus ceteris leviticis". Similarly Winer (*Gramm.*, p. 240): "If we render βαπτ. διδ. *baptisms of doctrine or instruction*, as distinguished from the legal baptisms (washings) of Judaism, we find a support for this designation, as characteristically Christian, in Matt. xxviii. 19, βαπτίσαντες αὐτοὺς . . . διδάσκοντες αὐτούς". It is better to take the words as equivalent to διδαχῆς περὶ βαπτισμῶν. In N.T. βάπτισμα is regularly used of Christian baptism or of John's baptism, while βαπτισμός is used of ceremonial washings as in ix. 10 and Mk. vii. 4. [*Cf.* Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 62. Josephus,

χειρῶν, ἀναστάσεώς τε[1] νεκρῶν, καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου. 3. [a]καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν,[2] ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός. 4. [b]Ἀδύνατον γὰρ

a Acts xviii. 21; 1 Cor. iv. 19; Jac. iv. 15.
b x. 26; Matt. xii. 31, 45; Joan. iv. 10; 2 Peter ii. 20; 1 Joan v. 16.

[1] τε in ℵACD^{c}EKL, vg.; omitted in BD gr. P, and rightly rejected by Tr., WH and Weiss.

[2] T.R. in ℵBKLN, 17, d, e, f, vg., etc.; ποιησωμεν in ACDEP, Arm. The indicative agrees better with ἐάνπερ, κ.τ.λ.

(*Ant.*, xviii. 5, 2) uses βαπτισμός of John's baptism.] Probably, therefore, "teaching about washings" would include instruction in the distinction between the various Jewish washings, John's baptism and that of Christ (*cf.* Acts xix. 2); and this would involve instruction in the cleansing efficacy of the Atonement made by Christ as well as in the work of the Holy Spirit. It was very necessary for a convert from Judaism to understand the difference between symbolic and real lustration. The reference of the plural must, therefore, not be restricted to the distinction of outward and inward baptism (Grotius), nor of water and spirit baptism (Reuss) nor of infant and adult baptism, nor of the threefold immersion nor, as Primasius, "pro varietate accipientium". **ἐπιθέσεώς τε χειρῶν** closely conjoined to the foregoing by τε because the "laying on of hands" was the accompaniment of baptism in Apostolic times. "As through baptism the convert became a member of the House of God, through the laying on of hands he received endowments fitting him for service in the house, and an earnest of his relation to the world to come (vi. 5)" (Davidson, *cf.* Delitzsch). The laying on of hands was normally accompanied by prayer. Prayer was the essential element in the transaction, the laying on of hands designating the person to whom the prayer was to be answered and for whom the gift was designed. *Cf.* Acts xix. 1-6; viii. 14-17; xiii. 3; vi. 6; and Lepine's *The Ministers of Jesus Christ*, p. 141-4. In Apostolic times baptism apparently meant that the baptised believed in and gave himself to Christ, while the laying on of hands meant that the Holy Ghost was conferred upon him. In baptism as now administered both these facts are outwardly represented. **ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν καὶ κρίματος αἰωνίου**: "resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment," "constituting the believer's outlook under which he was to live" (Davidson). The genitives depend on διδαχῆς, not on θεμέλιον, as Vaughan. The phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν naturally includes all the dead both righteous and unrighteous (see John v. 29 and Acts xxiv. 15. κρίμα though properly the result of κρίσις is not always distinguished from it, see John ix. 39; Acts xxiv. 25; and *cf.* Heb. ix. 27). It is "eternal," timeless in its results. These last-named doctrines, although not specifically Christian, yet required to be brought before the notice of a Jewish convert that he might disentangle the Christian idea from the Jewish Messianic expectation of a resurrection of Israel to the enjoyment of the Messianic Kingdom, and of a judgment on the enemies of Israel (*Cf.* Weiss).

Ver. 3. **καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσομεν**: "and this will we do," that is, we will go on to perfection and not attempt again to lay a foundation. So Theoph.: τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φέρεσθαι. And Primasius: "et hoc faciemus, *i.e.*, et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quae enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necesse ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum". Hofmann refers the words to the participial clause, an interpretation adopted even by von Soden ["nämlich abermal Fundament Einsenken"] which only creates superfluous difficulty. The writer, feeling as he does the arduous nature of the task he undertakes, adds the condition, **ἐάνπερ ἐπιτρέπῃ ὁ Θεός**, "if God permit". The addition of περ has the effect of limiting the condition or of indicating a *sine qua non*; and may be rendered "if only," "if at all events," "if at least". This clause is added not as if the writer had any doubt of God's willingness, but because he is conscious that his success depends wholly on God's will. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Vv. 4-6 give the writer's reason for not attempting again to lay a foundation. It is, he says, to attempt an impossibility. The statement falls into three parts: (1) A description of a class of persons **τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας . . . καὶ παραπεσόντας**. (2) The statement of a fact re-

garding these persons **ἀδύνατον πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν.** (3) The cause of this fact found in some further characteristics of their career **ἀνασταυροῦντας . . . παραδειγματίζοντας.**

Ver. 4. First, the description here given of those who have entered upon the Christian life is parallel to the description given in vv. 1, 2 of elementary Christian teaching; although the parallel is not carried out in detail. The picture, though highly coloured, is somewhat vague in outline. "The writer's purpose is not to give information to *us*, but to awaken in the breasts of his first readers sacred memories, and breed godly sorrow over a dead past. Hence he expresses himself in emotional terms such as might be used by recent converts rather than in the colder but more exact style of the historian" (Bruce). **ἀδύνατον γὰρ**: The **γὰρ** does not refer to the immediately preceding clause (Delitzsch) but points directly to **τοῦτο ποιήσομεν** and through these words to **ἐπὶ τὴν τελ. φερώμεθα,** the sense being "Let us go on to perfection and not attempt to lay again a foundation, *for* this would be vain, seeing that those who have once begun and found entrance to the Christian life, but have fallen away, cannot be renewed again to repentance, cannot make a second beginning. **τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας,** "those who were once enlightened". **τοὺς** includes all the participles down to **παραπεσόντας,** which therefore describe one class of persons; and it is governed by **ἀνακαινίζειν. ἅπαξ**: "once for all" *semel* (not **πότε** = quondam) may be taken as remotely modifying the three following participles as well as **φωτισθ.** Its force is that "once" must be enough; no **πάλιν** can find place; and it refers back to **πάλιν** of ver. 1, and forward to **πάλιν** of ver. 6. **φωτισθέντας** is used in this absolute way in x. 32 where a comparison with ver. 26 indicates that it is equivalent to **τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας.** *Cf.* also 2 Cor. iv. 4 and Eph. i. 18. The source of the enlightenment is **τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον,** the result is repentance and faith, ver. 1. Hatch refers to this passage in support of his contention that the language and imagery of the N.T. are influenced by the Greek mysteries (*Hibbert Lect.*, pp. 295-6). "So early as the time of Justin Martyr we find a name given to baptism which comes straight from the Greek mysteries —the name 'enlightenment' (**φωτισμός, φωτίζεσθαι**). It came to be the constant technical term." But as Anrich shows (*Das antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 125) **φωτισμός** was not one of the technical terms of the mysteries ["Der Ausdruck **φωτισμός** begegnet in der Mysterienterminologie nie und nirgends".] The word is of frequent occurrence in the LXX, see esp. Hos. x. 12. **φωτίσατε ἑαυτοὺς φῶς γνώσεως** ["Ausdruck und Vorstellung sind alttestamentlich"]. Of course it is the fact that **φωτισμός** was used by Justin and subsequent fathers to denote baptism (*vide* Suicer, s.v.), and several interpret the word here in that sense. So the Syrian versions; Theodoret and Theophylact translate by **βάπτισμα** and **λουτρόν.** For the use made of this translation in the Montanist and Novatian controversies see the Church Histories, and Tertullian's *De Pudic.*, c. xx. The translation is, however, an anachronism. [In this connection, the whole of c. vi. of Clement's *Paedag.* may with advantage be read. **ἐφωτίσθημεν· τὸ δ' ἐστιν ἐπιγνῶναι τὸν Θεόν. . . . Βαπτιζόμενοι φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα.**]

γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, "and tasted the heavenly gift". **γευσαμ.** here as elsewhere, to know experimentally; *cf.* ii. 9; Matt. xvi. 29. The heavenly gift, or the gift that comes to us from heaven and partakes of the nature of its source, is according to Chrys. and Œcum: "The forgiveness of sins"; and so, many moderns, Davidson, Weiss, etc.; others with a slight difference refer it to the result of forgiveness "pacem conscientiae quae consequitur peccatorum remissionem" (Grotius). Some finding that **δωρεά** is more than once (Acts ii. 38, x. 45) used of the Holy Spirit, conclude that this is here the meaning (Owen, von Soden, etc.); while Bengel is not alone in rendering, "Dei filius, ut exprimitur (ver. 6.) *Christus*, qui per fidem, nec non in sacra ipsius Coena gustatur". Bleek, considering that this expression is closely joined to the preceding by **τε,** concludes that what is meant is the gift of enlightenment, or, as Tholuck says, "the **δωρεά** is just the Christian **φῶς** objectively taken". The objection to the first of these interpretations, which has much in its favour, is that it is too restricted: the last is right in emphasising the close connection with **φωτισθ.,** for what is meant apparently is the whole gift of redemption, the new creation, the fulness of life eternal freely bestowed, and

τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου, καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, 5. καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους

made known as freely bestowed, to the "enlightened". *Cf.* Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 15. **καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,** "and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost"; a strong expression intended to bring out, as Westcott remarks, "the fact of a personal character gained; and that gained in a vital development". The bestowal of the Spirit is the invariable response to faith. The believer is **πνευματικός**. In chap. x. 29, when the same class of persons is described, one element of their guilt is stated to be their doing despite to the Spirit of grace. Grotius and others refer the words to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit; rather it is the distinctive source of Chris ian life that is meant. It is customary to find a parallel between the two clauses of ver. 2, **βαπτ. διδ. ἐπιθέσ. τε χειρῶν** and the two clauses of this verse **γευσαμ. και μετόχους**. There are, however, objections to this idea.

Ver. 5. **καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους . . .** "and tasted God's word that it is good". **ῥήματα καλά** in LXX (*vide* Josh. xxi. 43) are the rich and encouraging promises of God, *cf.* Zech. i. 13, **ῥήματα καλὰ καὶ λόγους παρακλητικούς**. Here it probably means the Gospel in which all promise is comprehended; *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 25, **ῥῆμα Κυρίου . . . τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς.** Persons then are here described who have not only heard God's promise, but have themselves tasted or made trial of it and found it good. They have experienced that what God proclaims finds them, in their conscience with its resistless truth, in their best desires by quickening and satisfying them. The change from the genitive, **δωρεᾶς**, to the accusative, **ῥῆμα**, after **γευσ.** is variously accounted for. Commonly, verbs of sense take the accusative of the nearer, the genitive of the remoter source of the sensation; but probably the indiscriminate use of the two cases in LXX and N.T. arises from the tendency of the accusative in later Greek to usurp the place of the other cases. Yet it is not likely that so careful a stylist as our author should have altered the case without a reason. That reason is best given by Simcox (*Gram.*, p. 87), "**γεύεσθαι** in Heb. vi. 4 5, has the genitive, where it is merely a verb of sense, the accusative where it is used of the recognition of a fact—**καλόν** being (as its position shows) a predicate". With this expression may be compared Prov. xxxi. 18, **ἐγεύσατο ὅτι καλόν ἐστι τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι.** Bengel's idea that the genitive indicates that a part, while accusative that the whole was tasted, may be put aside. Also Hofmann's idea, approved by Weiss, that the accusative is employed to avoid an accumulation of genitives. **δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος** "and [tasted] the powers of the age to come" [that they were good, for **καλάς** may be supplied out of the **καλόν** of the preceding clause; or the predicate indicating the result of the tasting may be taken for granted]. **δυνάμεις** is so frequently used of the powers to work miracle imparted by the Holy Spirit (see ii. 4, 1 Cor. xii. 28; 2 Cor. xii. 12; and in the Gospels *passim*) that this meaning is generally accepted as appropriate here. See Lünemann. **αἰὼν μέλλων** is therefore here used not exactly as in Matt. xii. 32, Eph. i. 21 where it is contrasted with this present age or world, but rather as the temporal equivalent of the **οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα** of chap. ii. 5, *cf.* also ix. 11, x. i.; and Bengel's note. It is the Messianic age begun by the ministry of Christ, but only consummated in His Second Advent. A wider reference is sometimes found in the words, as by Davidson: "Though the realising of the promises be yet future, it is not absolutely so; the world to come projects itself in many forms into the present life, or shows its heavenly beauty and order rising up amidst the chaos of the present. This it does in the powers of the world to come, which are like laws of a new world coming in to cross and by and by to supersede those of this world. Those "powers," being mainly still future, are combined with the good word of promise, and elevated into a distinct class, corresponding to the third group above, *viz.*: resurrection and judgment (ver. 2)." The persons described have so fully entered into the spirit of the new time and have so admitted into their life the powers which Christ brings to bear upon men, that they can be said to have "tasted" or experienced the spiritual forces of the new era.

Ver. 6. **καὶ παραπεσόντας,** "and fell away," *i.e.*, from the condition depicted

Θεοῦ ῥῆμα, 6. δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν

by the preceding participles; "grave verbum subito occurrens" (Bengel). The word in classical Greek has the meaning "fall in with" or "fall upon"; in Polybius, "to fall away from," "to err," followed by τ. ὁδοῦ, τ. ἀληθείας, τ. καθήκοντος; also absolutely "to err". In the Greek fathers the lapsed are called οἱ παραπεπτωκότες or οἱ παραπεσόντες. The full meaning of the word is given in ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν of x. 39. The translation of the A.V. and early English versions "if they shall fall away," although accused of dogmatic bias, is justifiable. It is a hypothesis that is here introduced. Thus far the writer has accumulated expressions which present the picture of persons who have not merely professed the Christian faith but have enjoyed rich experience of its peculiar and characteristic influence, but now a word is introduced which completely alters the picture. They have enjoyed all these things, but the last thing to be said of them is that they have "fallen from" their former state. The writer describes a condition which he considers possible. And of persons realising this possibility he says ἀδύνατον . . . πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, "it is impossible to renew [them] again to repentance," "impossible," not "difficult" [as in the Graeco-Latin Codex Claromontanus, "difficile"]; impossible not only to a teacher, but to God, for in every case of renewal it is God who is the Agent. [Bengel says "hominibus est impossibile, non Deo," and that therefore the ministers of God must leave such persons to Him and wait for what God may accomplish "per singulares afflictiones et operationes". But *cf.* x. 26-31.] πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν, πάλιν is not pleonastic, but denotes that those who have once experienced ἀνακαινισμός cannot again have a like experience. It suggests that the word ἀνακαιν. involves, or naturally leads on to, all that is expressed in the participles under ἅπαξ from φωτισθέντας to αἰῶνος of ver. 5. A renewed person is one who is enlightened, tastes the heavenly gift, and so on. But as the first stone in the foundation was μετάνοια (ver. 1), so here the first manifestation of renewal is in μετάνοια. The persons described cannot again be brought to a life-changing repentance—a statement which opens one of the most important psychological problems. The reason this writer assigns for the impossibility is given in the words ἀνασταυροῦντας . . . παραδειγματίζοντας, "crucifying [or "seeing that they crucify"] to themselves the Son of God, and putting Him to open shame". Edwards understands these participles as putting a hypothetical case, and renders "they cannot be renewed after falling away if they persist in crucifying, etc.". This, however, reduces the statement to a vapid truism, and, although grammatically admissible, does not agree with the οὐκέτι of the parallel passage in x. 26. The mitigation of the severity of the statement is rather to be sought in the enormity and therefore rarity of the sin described, which is equivalent to the deliberate and insolent rejection of Christ alluded to in x. 26, 29, and the suicidal blasphemy alluded to in Mk. iii. 29. On the doctrine of the passage, see Harless, *Ethics*, c. 29. In classical and later Greek the word for "crucify" is not σταυρόω (of which Stephanus cites only one example, and that from Polybius), but ἀνασταυροῦν, so that the ἀνα does not mean "again" or "afresh," but refers to the lifting *up* on the cross, as in ἀναρτάω or ἀνασκολοπίζω. In the N.T. no doubt σταυρόω is uniformly used, but never in this Epistle; and it was inevitable that a Hellenist would understand ἀνασταυρ. in its ordinary meaning. There is no ground therefore for the translation of the Vulg. "rursum crucifigentes," although it is so commonly followed. Besides, any crucifixion by the Hebrews [ἑαυτοῖς] must have been a *fresh crucifixion*, and needs no express indication of that feature of it. The significance of ἑαυτοῖς seems to be "so far as they are concerned," not "to their own judgment" or "to their own destruction". The apostate crucifies Christ on his own account by virtually confirming the judgment of the actual crucifiers, declaring that he too has made trial of Jesus and found Him no true Messiah but a deceiver, and therefore worthy of death. The greatness of the guilt in so doing is aggravated by the fact that apostates thus treat τὸν υἱὸν τ. Θεοῦ, *cf.* x. 29. καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας, the verb is found in Numb. xxv. 4, where it implies ex-

τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας. 7. γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα τὸν ἐπ' αὐτῆς πολλάκις ἐρχόμενον ὑετὸν, καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ· 8. ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους, ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατά-

posing to ignominy or infamy, such as was effected in barbarous times by exposing the quarters of the executed criminal, or leaving him hanging in chains. Archilochus, says Plutarch (*Moral.*, 520), rendered himself infamous, **ἑαυτὸν παρεδειγ.**, by writing obscene verses. The verb is therefore a strong expression; "put Him to open shame" excellently renders it. "This was the crime the Hebrew Christians were tempted to commit. A fatal step it must be when taken; for men who left the Christian Church and went back to the synagogue became companions of persons who thought they did God service in cursing the name of Jesus" (Bruce).

Vv. 7 and 8 present an analogy in nature to the doom of the apostate.

Ver. 7. **γῆ γὰρ ἡ πιοῦσα . . . ὑετόν,** "For land which drank in the rain that cometh oft upon it"; this whole clause is the subject of vv. 7 and 8; the subject remains the same, the results are different. It might almost be rendered, in order to bring out the emphasis on **γῆ,** "For, take the case of land". Such constructions are well explained by Green (*Gram.*, 34): "The anarthrous position of the noun may be regarded as employed to give a prominence to the peculiar meaning of the word without the interference of any other idea, while the words to which the article is prefixed, limit by their fuller and more precise description the general notion of the anarthrous noun, and thereby introduce the determinate idea intended." The comparison of human culture with agriculture is common. *Cf.* especially Plut., *De Educ. Puer.*, c. 3; and the remarkable lines of the *Hecuba*, 590-596. To make the comparison with the persons described in vv. 4, 5 apt, the advantageous conditions of the land are expressed in **ἡ πιοῦσα κ.τ.λ.** The abundant and frequently renewed rain represents the free and reiterated bestowal of spiritual impulse; the enlightenment, the good word of God, the energetic indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which the Hebrews had received and which should have enabled them to bring forth fruit to God. **πιοῦσα,** as in Anacreon's **ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει,** and Virgil's (*Ecl.* iii. 3) "sat prata biberunt". Bengel's note, "non solum in superficie" brings out the meaning. The aorist expressing a completed past contrasts with **τίκτουσα** and **ἐκφέρουσα** continuous presents. **καὶ τίκτουσα . . . γεωργεῖται,** "and produces herbage meet for those on whose account also it is tilled". This is one of the possible results of the natural advantage. **τίκτουσα βοτάνη** are found in classic Greek. See examples in Wetstein and Bleek. **εὔθετον** originally "conveniently situated" and hence "suitable" "fit" as in Luke ix. 62. **ἐκείνοις** follows **εὔθετον,** not **τίκτουσα.** The measure of a field's value is its satisfying the purpose of those on whose account it is tilled. **δι' οὓς,** "for whose sake" or "on whose account," not, as Calvin, "quorum opera"; not the labourers, but the owners are intended or those whom the owners mean to supply. **καὶ γεωργεῖται, καὶ** introduces a consideration which "brings into relief the naturalness of the **τίκτειν βοτάνην εὔθετον ἐκείνοις**" (Lünemann). Westcott seems to lean to Schlichting's explanation: "The laborious culture of the soil seems to be contrasted with its spontaneous fruitfulness". *Cf.* the "justissima tellus" of Vergil, *Georg.* ii. 460. Land so responding to the outlay put upon it **μεταλαμβάνει εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ,** "partakes of a blessing from God". God's approval is seen in the more and more abundant yield of the land. The reality here colours the figure.

Ver. 8. **ἐκφέρουσα δὲ . . .** "but if it brings forth thorns and thistles it is rejected and nigh unto a curse and its end is burning". The other alternative, which corresponds to the possible state of the Hebrews, is here introduced. With all its advantages, the land may prove disappointing, may not stand the sole test (**ἀδόκιμος**) of land, its production of a harvest. **ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβ.** frequently conjoined in LXX, Gen. iii. 17, Hos. x. viii, and expressive of useless and noxious products. [**τρίβολος,** frequently **τριβελής,** three pointed, and originally meaning a caltrop]. **ἀδόκιμος** is used under the influence of the personal reference rather than of the

c Prov. xiv. 31; Matt. x. 42, et xxv. 40; Marc. ix. 41; Joan. xiii. 20; Rom. iii. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 6, 7.

ρας ἐγγύς, ἧς τὸ τέλος εἰς καῦσιν. 9. Πεπείσμεθα δὲ περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀγαπητοί, τὰ κρείττονα [1] καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτω λαλοῦμεν. 10. ᶜοὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τοῦ κόπου [2] τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονή-

[1] κρεισσονα is better authenticated than κρειττονα.

[2] T.R. in DcE**KL, Copt., Chrys., Thdrt., a gloss from 1 Thess. i. 3; του κοπου omitted in ℵABCD*E*P, d, e, f, vg., Basm., Syr., Arm., Aeth.

figure. κατάρας ἐγγύς with a reference to Gen. iii. 18 ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ, and suggested by the εὐλογίας of the previous verse. Wetstein quotes from Aristides the expression κατάρας ἐγγύς, and from the ἐγγύς Chrys. and Theophyl. conclude, rightly, that the curse is not yet in action. ὁ γὰρ ἐγγὺς κατάρας δυνήσεται καὶ μακρὰν γενέσθαι. ἧς τὸ τέλος. What is the antecedent? γῆ, say the Geeek commentaries, Bengel, Riehm, Delitzsch, Lünemann, Alford; κατάρας, say Stuart, Bleek, Weiss, von Soden. The former seems distinctly preferable. *Cf.* Phil. iii. 19, ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια. But here it is εἰς καῦσιν instead of καῦσις "for burning," it serves for nothing else, and is thus contrasted with the use served by the productive land. The burning has with an excess of literality been ascribed to the soil itself, and therefore the example of Sodom and Gomorrah has been adduced. But Grotius is right who finds a metonymy: "de terra dicitur quod proprie iis rebus convenit quae terrae superstant". Reference may be made to Philo, *De Agric.* c. 4: ἐπικαύσω καὶ τὰς ῥίζας αὐτῶν ἐφιείσ' ἄχρι τῶν ὑστάτων τῆς γῆς φλογὸς ῥιπήν. *Cf.* John xv. 6. Certainly it points not to a remedial measure, but to a final destructive judgment.

Verses 9-12, sudden transition, characteristic of the author, from searching warning to affectionate encouragement. "Startled almost by his own picture" he hastens to assure the Hebrews that he is convinced it does not represent their present condition. On the contrary he recognises in their loving care of Christ's people a service God cannot overlook and which involves "salvation". They have only to abound in hope as already they are rich in love, and they will no longer be slothful and inanimate but will reproduce in their lives the faith and endurance which have brought others into the enjoyment of the promised and eternal blessing.

Ver. 9. πεπείσμεθα δὲ. . . . "But of you, beloved, we are persuaded things that are better and associated with salvation, though we thus speak." "Alarm at the awful suggestion of his own picture (vv. 4-8) causes a rush of affection into his heart" (Davidson). He hastens to assure them that he does not consider them apostates, although he has described the apostate condition and doom. "This is very like St. Paul's way of closing and softening anything he had said that sounded terrible and dreadful" (Pierce). *Cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 13; Eph. iv. 20; Gal. v. 10. "The form [πεπείσμεθα] implies that the writer had felt misgivings and overcome them" (Westcott). περὶ ὑμῶν is emphasised, and the unique (in this Epistle) ἀγαπητοί is introduced to reassure them and as the natural expression of his own reaction in their favour. τὰ κρείττονα "things better" than those he has been describing (neither limiting the reference to the condition, although necessarily it is mainly in view, nor to the doom, although the σωτηρίας indicates that it also is in view); and things indeed that so far from being κατάρας ἐγγύς are ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας closely allied to salvation. [*Cf.* Hamlet's "no relish of salvation in it."] ἐχόμενα = next, from ἔχομαι. I hold myself to, adhere. So locally Mark i. 38, εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις: temporally, Acts xxi. 26, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, here, as in Herodotus, Plato, and Lucian, "pertaining to," so Herod., i. 120, τὰ τῶν ὀνειράτων ἐχόμενα. εἰ καὶ and καὶ εἰ generally retain in N.T. their distinctive meanings.

Ver. 10. οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος. . . . "For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and the love which ye shewed toward His name in that ye ministered and still do minister to the saints." He recognises in their Christian activities (ἔργου ὑμῶν) and in their practical charities (τῆς ἀγάπης) things that are associated with salvation, because God's justice demands that such service shall

σαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες. 11. ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους· 12. ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.

not be overlooked. God will bless the field which already has yielded good fruit. He will cherish Christian principle in those that have manifested it. To him that hath shall be given. *Cf.* especially Phil. i. 6. On the doctrinal bearing of the words, see Tholuck in *loc*. It is impossible to think of God looking with indifference upon those who serve Him or affording them no help or encouragement. **τῆς ἀγάπης ἧς . . .** the love which found expression in personal service (**διακονήσαντες**) to Christians (**ἁγίοις**), and of which examples are specified in x. 34, was love **εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**, because it was prompted not by natural relationship or worldly association but by the consideration that they were God's children and people.

Ver 11. **ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ. . . .** You have manifested earnest *love*, cultivate as earnestly your *hope;* that is what I desire. The translation should therefore be "*But* we desire". **ἕκαστον ὑμῶν,** "each one of you," not merely as Chrysostom interprets **πολλὴ ἡ φιλοστοργία· καὶ μεγάλων καὶ μικρῶν ὁμοίως κήδεται,** not as Bruce, "The good shepherd goeth after even one straying sheep"; but directly in contrast to the whole body and *general* reputation of the Church addressed. The writer courteously implies that some already showed the zeal demanded; but he desires that each individual, even those whose condition prompted the foregoing warning, should bestir themselves. *Cf*. Bengel's "non modo, ut adhuc fecistis, in communi". **τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν . . . τέλους.** The same earnest diligence [**σπουδή** in exact opposition to **νωθροί** of v. 11, vi. 12] which had been given to loving ministries, he desires they should now exercise towards a corresponding perfectness of hope—a hope which should only disappear in fruition. **πληροφορία** "hic non est *certitudo*, sed *impletio* sive *consummatio*, quo sensu **πληροφ.** habemus, Col. ii. 2, *et* 1 Thess. i. 5, **πληροφορεῖν** 2 Tim. iv. 5, 17" (Grotius). Alford insists that the subjective sense of the word is uniform in N.T. and therefore translates "the full assurance". But the objective meaning, "completeness," certainly suits Col. ii. 2 **πᾶν τὸ πλοῦτος τ. πληροφορίας τ. συνέσεως** and is not unsuitable in Heb. x. 22 and 1 Thess. i. 5, while the verb **πληροφορεῖν,** at least in some passages, as 2 Tim. iv. 5, has an objective sense. Besides, in the case before us, the one meaning involves the other, for, as Weiss himself says, hope is only then what it ought to be when a full certainty of conviction (eine volle Ueberzeugungsgewissheit) accompanies it. See also Davidson, who says "fulness or full assurance of faith and hope is not anything distinct from faith and hope, lying outside of them and to which they may lead; it is a condition of faith and hope themselves, the perfect condition". **ἄχρι τέλους** the hope was to be perfect in quality and was also to be continuous "to the end," *i.e*, until it had accomplished its work and brought them to the enjoyment of what was hoped for. The words attach themselves to **ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδήν.**

Ver. 12. **ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε**: "that ye become not sluggish," "be not, misses the fine delicacy of the writer" (Alford). "The **γένησθε,** pointing to the future, stands in no contradiction with **γεγόνατε** at v. 11. There, the sluggishness of the intellect was spoken of; here, it is sluggishness in the retaining of the Christian hope" (Lünemann). Sluggishness would result if they did not "manifest diligence". **μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν . . .**: "but imitators of those who, through faith and patient waiting, are now inheriting the promises". The positive aspect of the conduct that should accompany cultivation of hope. They were not the first who had launched into that apparently shoreless ocean. Others before them had crossed it, and found solid land on the other side. There are many who are fairly described as **κληρον. τὰς ἐπαγγελίας.** Whether alive or now dead, they have entered on possession of that good thing which they could not see but which God had promised. Alford, apparently following Peirce, denies that **κληρονομούντων** can mean "who are inheriting," and renders "who are inheritors". To this conclusion he is led, as also Peirce, by the consideration that in c. xi. it is said of

d Gen. xii. 3, et xvii. 4, et xxii. 16, 17; Ps. cv. 9; Luc. i. 73.

13. [d] Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ Θεὸς, ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς εἶχε μείζονος ὀμόσαι, ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, 14. λέγων, "Ἦ μὴν [1] εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε, καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε". 15. καὶ οὕτω

[1] T.R. in KL*, al pler and Greek fathers; ει μην in ℵABD*EP, 17, 23, 31, 47*, 71, 137; ει μη in CD^bL^con, d, e, f., vg., Ambr., Primas. *nisi*. Bleek is of opinion that εἰ μήν is a corrupt form resulting from the mixture of the classical ἦ μήν and the Hebraizing εἰ μή. But Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstud.*, p. 34) adduces examples of εἰ μήν from the Papyri, which prove that it is not a merely Biblical form.

Abraham and the other heroes of faith that they did not receive the promise. But it is also indicated in the same passage that by the coming of Christ the fulness of the promise was fulfilled. It was only "without us" of the Christian period that the patriarchs were imperfect. Those who are presently enjoying the promises attained their present victory and joy, **διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας**. Necessarily, they first had to believe the promises, but faith had to be followed up by patient waiting. Alford translates **μακροθ.** by "endurance," but this word rather represents **ὑπομονή**, while **μακροθ.** indicates the long-drawn-out patience which is demanded by hope deferred.

Vv. 13-20. Reasons for diligently cultivating hope and exercising patience, thus becoming imitators of those who have patiently waited for the fulfilment of the promises, the reasons being that God has made the failure of the promises impossible, and that already Jesus has passed within the veil as our forerunner.

Ver. 13. **Τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ. . . .** "For when God made promise to Abraham, since he could sware by none greater, He sware by Himself, saying, etc." Abraham is introduced because to him was made the fundamental and comprehensive promise (*cf.* Luke i. 73, and Gal. iii.) which involved all that God was ever to bestow. And in Abraham it is seen that the promise is secure, but that only by patient waiting can it be inherited. It is secure because God pledged Himself to perform it. The promise referred to in **ἐπαγγειλάμενος** seems to be that which was confirmed by an oath, and which is recorded in Gen. xxii. 16-18, **κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὤμοσα κ.τ.λ.** But Westcott prefers to consider that previous promises are referred to, as in Gen. xii. 3, 7, xiii. 14, xv. 5, xvii. 5. The aorist participle **ἐπαγγ.** admits of either construction. **ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐδενὸς . . . ὀμνύω** followed by **κατά** as frequently in classics (Arist., *Frogs*, 94) and LXX, Isa. xlv. 23, Amos iv. 2, viii. 7, Zeph. i. 5, Matt. xxvi. 63. See references. **εἶχε . . . ὀμόσαι**, a classical use of **ἔχειν** from Homer downwards, "to have means or power to do," "to be able". The greater the Being sworn by, the surer the promise. *Cf.* Longinus, *De Subl.*, c. 16, on swearing by those who died at Marathon. **ὤμοσε καθ' ἑαυτοῦ**, how this oath was given, and how the knowledge of it was conveyed to men, this writer does not say. But it was somehow conveyed to the mind of Abraham that the fulfilment of this promise was bound up with the life of God; that it was so implicated with His purposes that God could as soon cease to be, as neglect the fulfilment of it. Lying as it did at the root of all further development, and marking out as it did the true end for which the world exists, it seemed to be bound up with the very being of God. Paul's way of expressing a similar idea is more congruous to our ways of looking at things, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 20. *Cf.* Philo's discussion in *De Leg. Allegor.*, iii. 72, 3.

Ver. 14. The oath runs **εἰ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε. . . .** "Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." "Sentences which denote assurance . . . are in classical Greek introduced by **ἦ μήν**, which in the Hellenistic and Roman period is sometimes written in the form of **εἰ** (accent ?) **μήν**; so in the LXX and in a quotation from it in Heb. vi. 14" (Blass, *Gram.*, p. 260); and *cf.* Jannaris, *Hist. Greek Gram.*, 2055. **μήν** is used to strengthen asseveration, suitably therefore in oaths. On the emphatic participle in imitation of the Hebrew absolute infinitive, see Winer, sec. 45, 8, p. 445. The oath here cited was a promise to bless mankind, a promise that through all history God's gracious purpose should run; that, let happen what might, God would redeem and bless the world.

Ver. 15. **καὶ οὕτω μακροθυμήσας . . .** "and thus having patiently waited he

μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. 16. [e] ἄνθρωποι μὲν [1] γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσι, καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος· 17. ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιδεῖξαι τοῖς κληρονόμοις τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς

e Exod. xxii. 11.

[1] Omit μεν with ℵABD*E*P, 47, d, e, f, vg.; T.R. in CDcE**KL, al pler, Cop., Aeth., Chr., Thdrt.

[Abraham] obtained the promise". **οὕτω**, in these circumstances; that is, thus upheld by a promise and an oath. The oath warned him of trial. It would not have been given had the promise been a trifling one or had it been destined for immediate fulfilment. **μακροθυμήσας**, having *long* kept up his courage and his hope. Delay followed delay; disappointment followed disappointment. He was driven out of the promised land, and a barren wife mocked the hope of the promised seed, but he waited expectant, and at length **ἐπέτυχε τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**, for although it was true of him, as of all O.T. saints, that he did *not* obtain the promise, [**μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας**, xi. 13; **οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν**, xi. 39], but could only wave his hand to it and salute it at a distance, yet the initial fulfilment he did see and was compensated for all his waiting by seeing the beginnings of that great history which ran on to the consummate performance of the promise in Christ. Bleek and Rendall understand by **ἐπέτυχε** . . . "obtained from God a promise of future blessing," and not the thing itself. But in this case **μακροθυμήσας** would be irrelevant. He had not to wait for the promise, but for its fulfilment.

Ver. 16. **ἄνθρωποι γάρ, κ.τ.λ.** "For men swear by the greater." The procedure of God in confirming His promise by an oath is justified by human custom, and the confident hope which God's oath warrants is justified by the fact that even a human oath ends debate. **ἄνθρωποι** refers back to **ὁ Θεός** of ver. 13 and forward to ver. 17. **τοῦ μείζονος**, him who is greater than the persons taking the oath, the idea of an oath being that a higher authority is appealed to, one of inviolable truth and power to enforce it. **καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς** . . . "and of all gainsaying among them an oath is an end for confirmation". "The oath has two results negative and positive; it finally stops all contradiction; and it establishes that which it attests" (Westcott). On **βεβαίωσις** as a technical term, see Deissmann, *Bibl. Studies*, p. 104. **ἀντιλογία** is rendered by "strife" in A.V., and by "dispute" in R.V.; and this meaning is found in Exod. xviii. 16; Deut. xix. 17 **οἱ δύο ἄνθρωποι οἷς ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἡ ἀντιλογία.** But in the other instances of its use in N.T., Heb. vii. 7, xii. 3; Jud. xi., it has the meaning of "contradiction" or "gainsaying". So also in Polybius xxviii. 7, 4: **πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν ἀνίσταντο πολλοί.** It is this sense which suits the context here, as it is not a *strife* between God and man which is in question. Besides, **εἰς βεβαίωσιν** is more congruous with this meaning. The meaning is that when one man disputes the assertion of another, an oath puts an end to the contradiction and serves for confirmation. So Davidson, Westcott, Weiss, etc. **πάσης** is added not to indicate the universal deference paid to the oath (Bleek), but the completeness of its effect; no room is left for contradiction. **ὁ ὅρκος** the generic article, best translated "an oath". **πέρας** an end or limit, as in Ps. cxix., 96, **πάσης συντελείας εἶδον πέρας**; and Ps. cxlv. 3 **τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστι πέρας. εἰς βεβαίωσιν** almost in the technical sense of a guarantee. See Deissmann's interesting treatment of the word in *Bibelstud.*, pp. 100-104. On the verse Calvin remarks: "hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum. Quod observandum est contra homines fanaticos qui regulam sancte jurandi, quam Deus lege sua praescripsit, libenter abrogarent."

Ver. 17. **ἐν ᾧ περισσότερον. . . .** "Wherefore God, being minded more abundantly to demonstrate to the heirs of the promise the immutability of His purpose, interposed with an oath." **ἐν ᾧ=διὸ** (Theoph.), and see Winer, 484. It might be rendered "quae cum ita sint," or "this being so". The oath having among men this convincing power, God disregards the insult implied in any doubt of His word and condescending to human infirmity confirms

αὐτοῦ, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, 18. ἵνα διὰ δύο πραγμάτων ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι Θεόν, ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν οἱ καταφυγόντες κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος· 19. ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν

His promise by an oath. περισσότερον neuter adjective for adverb (ii. 1) is to be construed with ἐπιδεῖξαι, the meaning of the comparative being "abundantius quam s ne juramento factum videretur" (Bengel). Carpzov renders by "ex abundanti," and cites Philo, *De Abrahamo* c. 46 where the word of God is said to become an oath, ἕνεκα τοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλινῶς καὶ παγίως ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ἐρηρεῖσθαι. τοῖς κληρονόμοις, not exclusivel, the O T nor exclusively the N.T. heirs, neither Jews nor Gentiles, but a l; see ix. 3, and Gal. iii. 29. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, the unchangeable character of His purpose. [ἀμετάθ. 3 Macc. v. 1, 12; Polybius with ἐπιβολή, ὁρμή, διάληψις. For use of adjective see Rom. ii. 4, viii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 25, etc. Winer, p. 294.] ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, μεσιτεύω, belonging to later Greek, "to act as mediator," but sometimes used transitively "to negotiate," as in Polybius xi. 34, 3. Other examples in Bleek. Here, however, it is used intransitively as in Josephus, *Ant.*, vii. 8, 5. So the margin of A.V. "interposed himself by an oath," improved in R.V. "interposed with an oath". *Cf.* Josephus *Ant.*, iv. 6, 7; ταῦτα δὲ ὀμνύοντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὧν ὑπισχνοῦντο ποιούμενοι. "God descended, as it were, from His own absolute exaltation, in order, so to speak, to look up to Himself after the manner of men and take Himself to witness; and so by a gracious condescension confirm the prom se for the sake of its inheritors" (Delitzsch). "He brought in Himself as surety, He mediated or came in between men and Himself, through the oath by Himself" (Davidson).

Ver. 18. The motive of this procedure on God's part has already been indicated in βουλόμενος, but now it is more fully declared. ἵνα διὰ δύο . . . ἐλπίδος "that by two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who fled for refuge to hold fast the hope set before us". The two immutable things are God's promise and His oath. It is impossible for God to break His promise, impossible also for him to falsify His oath. Both of these were given that even weak men might have strong encouragement. The emphasis is on ἰσχυρὰν, no ordinary encouragement. Interpreters are divided as to the construction of κρατῆσαι, Œcumenius, Bleek, Lünemann, and others maintaining its dependence on παράκλησιν, encouragement to hold fast the hope; while others, as Beza, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Weiss, construe it with καταφυγόντες as in A.V. "who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope". If this latter construction be not adopted, καταφυγ. is left undefined and must be taken in an absolute sense, which is unwarranted. It is the word used in the LXX (Deut. iv. 42, xix. 5; Josh. xx 9) for fleeing from the avenger to the asylum of the cities of refuge. So here Christians are represented as fleeing from the threatened danger and laying hold of that which promises safety. κρατῆσαι (aor. of single act) must therefore be rendered "to lay hold of" and not, as in iv. 14, "hold fast". The former meaning is much more frequent than the latter. τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος, the hope, that is, the object of hope is set before us as the city of refuge was set before the refugee and it is laid hold of by the hope it excites. προκειμ. is used of any object of ambition, "de praemiis laborum ac certaminum" (Wetstein, with examples). *Cf.* Col. i. 5, τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Ver. 19. ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν . . . "which [hope] we have as an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast, and entering into that which is within the veil". An anchor was in ancient as well as in modern times the symbol of hope; see Aristoph., *Knights*, 1224 (1207) λεπτή τις ἐλπίς ἐστ' ἐφ' ἧς ὀχούμεθα. "A slender hope it is at which we ride," and Æsch., *Ag.*, 488: πολλῶν ῥαγεισῶν ἐλπίδων many hopes being torn away [like the flukes of anchors]. *Cf.* Paley in *loc.* Kypke quotes a saying attributed to Socrates: οὔτε ναῦν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀγκυρίου οὔτε βίον ἐκ μιᾶς ἐλπίδος ὁρμιστέον. The symbol appears on ancient coins. ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν, unfailing and firmly fixed; negative and positive, it will not betray the confidence reposed in it but will hold firm. ἀσφ. καὶ βεβ., Wisdom, vii. 23. Cebet., *Tab.*, 31. Bleek, Vaughan, Westcott, and

ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, 20. [f] ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

f iii. 1, et iv. 14, et viii. 1, et ix. 11.

others refer these adjectives to ἥν, not to ἄγκυραν. It seems much more natural to refer them with Chrys., Theoph., etc. to ἄγκυραν. *Cf.* Vulg.: "Quam sicut anchoram habemus animæ tutam ac firmam, et incedentem," and Weizsäcker "in der wir einen sicheren, festen Anker der Seele haben, der hineinreicht," etc. καὶ εἰσερχομένην . . . The anchor has its holding ground in the unseen. Some interpreters who refer the former two adjectives to the anchor, find so much strangeness or awkwardness in this term if so applied that they understand it directly of the hope itself. But as Davidson and Weiss show, the εἰσερχ. gives the ground of the two former adjectives; it is because the anchor enters into the eternal and unchangeable world that its shifting or losing hold is out of the question. (But *cf.* also ver. 16). No doubt the figure is now so moulded to conform to the reality that the physical reference is obscure, unless we think of a ship being warped into a harbour on an anchor already carried in. *Cf.* Weiss. That to which the figure points is obvious. It is in the very presence of God the anchor of hope takes hold. The Christian hope is fixed on things eternal, and is made sure by God's acceptance of it. [Alford quotes from Estius: "sicut ancora navalis non in aquis haeret, sed terram intrat sub aquis latentem, eique infigitur; ita ancora animæ spes nostra non satis habet in vestibulum pervenisse, id est, non est contenta bonis terrenis et visibilibus; sed penetrat usque ad ea, quae sunt intra velum, videlicet in ipsa sancta sanctorum; id est, Deum ipsum et coelestia bona apprehendit, atque in iis figitur".] τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος, the holy of holies, the very presence of God. καταπέτασμα (in non-biblical Greek παραπέτασμα) is used in LXX of either of the two veils in the Temple (מָסָךְ or פָּרֹכֶת, Exod. xxvi. 37; Num. iii. 26; and Exod. xxvi. 31; Lev. iv. 6) but κάλυμμα, according to Philo, *De Vit. Mos.*, iii. 5, was the proper designation of the outer veil, καταπέτ. being reserved for the inner veil; and in this sense alone it is used in N.T. as ix. 3; Matt. xxvii. 51. See Carpzov in *loc.* and Kennedy's *Sources of N.T. Greek*, 113. τὸ ἐσώτερον τ. κ. is therefore the inmost shrine into which the Jewish worshipper could not enter but only the High Priest once a year. For the expression see Exod. xxvi. 33, etc.

Ver. 20. The holding-ground of the anchor of hope, the real presence of God, is further described in the words ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς, "whither as forerunner for us entered Jesus". ὅποι does not occur in N.T. or LXX, ὅπου taking its place, as in English "where" often stands for "whither"; see Matt. viii. 19, Luke ix. 57, James iii. 4. So, too, occasionally, in Attic; examples in Bleek. πρόδρομος as an adjective, "running forward with headlong speed," see Jebb's note on Soph., *Antig.*, 107; as a substantive "scouts" or "advanced guard" of an army, Herodot., i. 60, and Wisdom xii. 8, ἀπέστειλάς τε προδρόμους τοῦ στρατοπέδου σου σφῆκας. The more general meaning is found in Num. xiii. 21, ἡμέραι ἔαρος, πρόδρομοι σταφυλῆς, Isa. xxviii. 4. The idea may be illustrated by ii. 10, Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 23. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν goes better with πρόδρομος—which requires further definition—than with εἰσῆλθεν, although Bleek, Weiss and others prefer to join it to the verb. Ἰησοῦς, the human name is used, because it is as man and having passed through the whole human experience that Jesus ascends as our forerunner. His superiority to the Levitical priest is disclosed in the word πρόδρομος. When the Levitical High Priest passed within the veil he went as the representative, not as the forerunner of the people. Hence indeed the veil. In Christ the veil is abolished. He enters God's presence as the herald and guarantee of our entrance. The ground of this is given in the concluding clause, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν . . . αἰῶνα, "having become [becoming] an High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek". Jesus carries our hope with Him to the realities which lie within the veil, because it is as our High Priest who has made atonement for sin that He is now at God's right hand. By His death He secured for us power to enter, to follow where He has gone before. The parti-

a Gen. xiv. 18, etc. VII. 1. ^a ΟΥΤΟΣ γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ [1] συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς

[1] T.R. only in C*LP, marked "suspected" by WH; ος in ℵABC²DEK, 17, apparently arising from the σ following, "ein für unseren Verf. unmögliches, völlig unmotivirtes Anakoluth" (Weiss). Alford accepts ος with the anacoluthon.

ciple does not determine the precise point at which He became High Priest, before or contemporaneously with His passing through the veil.

Chapter VII. The subject of Christ's priesthood is resumed; the interpolated admonition (v. 11-vi. 20) having been skilfully brought round to a second mention of Melchizedek. The ch ef reason for introducing the priesthood of Melchizedek as the type of Christ's priesthood was that it was "for ever". The Aaronic priesthood was successional, this single; and in this sense "for ever". There were, however, other reasons. The first question with a Jew who was enjoined to trust to Christ's priestly mediation, would be, What are His orders? He belonged to a tribe "of which Moses had spoken nothing concerning priesthood". He might or might not be the true heir to David's throne; but if He was, did not this very circumstance exclude him from the priestly office? Was it credible that the nation had been encouraged rigorously to exclude from the priesthood every interloper, only in order that at last this rigidly preserved order should be entirely disregarded? This writer seizes upon the fact that there was a greater priest than Aaron mentioned in Scripture—a priest more worthy to be the type of the Messianic priesthood, because he was himself a king, and especially because he belonged to no successional priestly order but was himself the entire order. This idea of a priesthood superseding that of Levi's sons found its way into Scripture through the hymn (Ps. cx.) which celebrated the dignity (as priest-king) of Simon the Maccabee. Bickell has shown that the first four verses of the Psalm are an acrostic on the name Simon, שמען. When the Maccabees displaced the Aaronic priesthood, they found their justification in the priestly dignity of Melchizedek, and assumed his style, calling themselves "priests of the Most High God". *Cf.* Charles, *Book of Jubilees*, pp. lix. and 191. The chapter may be divided thus:—

I. Characteristics of Melchizedek, 1-10.
   1. In himself as depicted in Scripture, 1-3.
   2. In his relation to Levi and his line, 4-10.
II. Inadequacy of Levitical priesthood in comparison with the Melchizedek priesthood of Christ, 11-25.
   1. Levi being provisional, Melchizedek being permanent, 11-14.
   2. Official and hereditary: personal and eternal, 15-19.
   3. Without oath: with oath, therefore final, 20-22.
   4. Plural and successional: singular and enduring, 23-25.
III. Summary of the merits of the new Melchizedek Priest, Jesus.

Vv. 1-3. Description of Melchizedek as he appears on the page of Scripture, in five particulars with their interpretation.

Ver. 1. **Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ . . . μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.** **γὰρ** closely connects this passage with the immediately preceding words **ἀρχ. . . . αἰῶνα** and introduces the explanation of them. "For this Melchizedek [mentioned in Ps. cx. and who has just been named as that priest according to whose order Christ is called to be Priest] remains a priest continually." This is the statement on which he wishes to fix attention. It is the "for-everness" of the priesthood which he means especially to insist upon. The whole order is occupied by himself. This one man constitutes the order. He succeeds no one in office and no one succeeds him. In this sense he abides a priest for ever. Between the subject Melchizedek and the verb **μένει**, there are insertedfive historical facts taken from Gen. xiv., with their interpretation. [On the historicity of Gen. xiv., see Buchanan Gray in *Expositor*, May, 1898, and Driver, *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 45 and 73. See also Beazley's *Dawn of Modern Geography*, ii. 189; and esp., Boscawen's *First of Empires*, c. vi.] **βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ**, the description given in this verse is taken *verbatim* [with the needed

κοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν· 2. ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ· πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὅ ἐστι βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης·

grammatical alterations] from Gen. xiv. 17, 18, 19. Whether Salem stands for Jerusalem or for Salim in the vale of Shechem, John iii. 23, has been disputed from Epiphanius downwards. See Bleek, who contends that Jerusalem cannot be meant because Jebus was its old name. This, however, is now denied, see Moore, *Judges*, p. 413, who says that the common opinion that Jebus was the native name of the city, has no real ground in O.T. In the Amarna tablets *Urusalim* is used and no trace is found of any name corresponding to Jebus. But it is not the locality that is important, but the meaning of Salem. **ἱερεὺς . . .** "priest of the Most High God". According to Aristotle (*Pol.*, iii. 14), the king in heroic times was general, judge and priest. *Cf.* Virgil (*Æn.*, iii. 80) "Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phoebique sacerdos," and see Gardner and Jevon's *Greek Antiq.*, 200, 201. The ideal priesthood is also that of a king. **τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου.** In N.T. "the Most High God" is found in the mouth of Demoniacs, Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; *cf.* also Acts xvi. 17 and vii. 58, also Luke i. 32, 35, 70, vi. 35. It was a name known alike to the Canaanites, Phoenicians and Hebrews. See Fairbairn, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, p. 317. **ὕψιστος** was also a title of **Ζεύς**, Pind., xi. 2. *Cf.* also Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 198; and especially Charles' edition of *Book of Jubilees*, pp. 191, 213, who shows that it was the specific title chosen by the Maccabean priest-kings. **ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς** "from the slaughter," rather "overthrow"; "Niederwerfung" (Weizsäcker); "*clades* rather than *caedes*" (Vaughan) translating in Genesis xiv. 17, מֵהַכּוֹת. **τῶν βασιλέων** "the kings"; well-known from Gen. xiv., *viz.:* Amraphel, Arioch, Chedorlaomer and Tidal, *i.e.*, Khammurabi, Eriaku, Kudurlachgumal and Tudchula. But Boscawen (*First of Empires*, p. 179) disputes the identification of Amraphel with Khammurabi. The monuments show us that these kings were contemporaries two thousand three hundred years B.C., and furnish many interesting particulars regarding them; see Driver in *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 39-45.

καὶ εὐλογήσας αὐτόν, asserting thus at once his superiority (ver. 7) and his priestly authority.

Ver. 2. **ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην . . .** "to whom also Abraham divided a tenth of all" [the spoil]. The startling conclusion which this act carried with it is specified in vv. 4-10. The offering of a tithe of the spoils to the gods was a custom of antiquity. See Wetstein for examples and especially Arnold's note on Thucydides, iii. 50. "Frequently the **ἀναθήματα** were of the nature of **ἀπάρχαι,** or the divine share of what was won in peace or war. . . . The colossal statue of Athena Promachos on the Athenian Acropolis hill was a votive offering from a tithe of the booty taken at Marathon" (Gardner and Jevon's *Greek Ant.*, 181.) For the O.T. law of tithe see Num. xviii. 21-24; Lev. xxvii. 30-32. In offering to Melchizedek a tithe Abraham acknowledged him as priest.

The following clauses ought not to be in brackets, because they are inserted as indicating the ground of the main affirmation, **μένει εἰς τὸ διηνεκές.** The name and description of Melchizedek already given are now interpreted, and are so interpreted as to illustrate the clause **ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ** and thus prepare for the closing statement. **πρῶτον μὲν ἑρμηνευόμενος . . .** "being first, by interpretation, King of righteousness and then also King of Salem, which is King of peace". The form of the sentence is significant. [*Cf.* Plutarch, *Timoleon*, iv. 4, **τοῦ δὲ Τιμοφάνους πρῶτον μὲν αὐτῶν καταγελῶντος, ἔπειτα δὲ πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐκφερομένου**] "first" by his very name, "then" by his actual position; probably the peace of his kingdom is considered as a consequence of its righteousness. Righteousness and peace are characteristic properties of the Messianic Kingdom. "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth," Ps. lxxii. 7; similarly Isa. ix. 6, 7; Zech. ix. 9; *cf.* Rom. v. 1; Eph. ii. 4, 15, 17. In Gen. xiv. 18 the name and title occur together מַלְכִּי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם. The chief point in this is that the priest is also a king. **ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος** "without father, without mother, with-

3. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, ἀγενεαλόγητος· μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων· ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. 4. [b] Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πηλίκος οὗτος, ᾧ καὶ [1] δεκάτην

b Gen. xiv. 20.

[1] T.R. in ℵACD^cE**KLP, vg., Syrr, Arm.; omit και with BD*E*, d, e, Syr^scn, Cop. Apparently και has been introduced from verse 2.

out genealogy," that is, he stands in Scripture alone, no mention is made of an illustrious father or mother from whom he could have inherited power and dignity, still less can his priestly office and service be ascribed to his belonging to a priestly family. It is by virtue of his own personality he is what he is; his office derives no sanction from priestly lineage or hereditary rights; and in this respect he is made like to the Son of God. Of course it is not meant that in point of fact he had neither father nor mother, but that as he appears in Scripture he is without father. [τὸ δὲ ἀπάτωρ κ.τ.λ. οὐ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτὸν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ κατὰ τὸ φανερώτατον ἐπωνομάσθαι. Epiphanius in Wetstein.] On Philo's use of the silence of Scrip. see Siegfried's *Philo.*, p. 179. Philo is quite aware that this kind of interpretation will be said γλισχρολογίαν μᾶλλον ἢ ὠφέλειάν τινα ἐμφαίνειν (*De Somn.*, ii. 45). **ἀπάτωρ,** Wetstein quotes from Pollux.: ὁ μὴ ἔχων μητέρα, ἀμήτωρ, ὥσπερ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ· καὶ ἀπάτωρ, ὁ μὴ πατέρα ἔχων, ὡς ὁ Ἥφαιστος. So Apollo was αὐτοφυής, ἀμήτωρ. Other examples in Wetstein. In a slightly different sense the word occurs in *Iph. in Taur.*, 863; in Soph, *Elec.*, 1154 we have μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ; and Ion (Eur. *Ion*, 109) says of himself ὡς γὰρ ἀμήτωρ ἀπάτωρ τε γεγώς.

Ver. 3. **ἀγενεαλόγητος,** resolved in ver. 6 into μὴ γενεαλογούμενος, does not occur in classical nor elsewhere in Biblical Greek. The dependence of Levitical priests on genealogies and their registers is illustrated by Neh. vii. 64. **μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν . . .** "having neither beginning of days nor end of life," *i.e.*, again, as he is represented in Scripture. No mention is made of his birth or death, of his inauguration to his office or of his retirement from it. The idea is conveyed that so long as priestly services of that particular type were needed, this man performed them. He is thus the type of a priest who shall in his single person discharge for ever all priestly functions. **ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τ. Θεοῦ** "but made like to the Son of God". δὲ attaches this clause to the immediately preceding, "having neither etc.," *but* in this respect made like to the Son of God, see i. 2, ix. 14 and i. 10, 12. "Such a comparison is decisive against attributing these characteristics to Melchisedek in a real sense. They belong to the portrait of him, which was so drawn that he was "made like" the Son of God,—that by the features absent as well as by the positive traits a figure should appear corresponding to the Son of God and suited to suggest Him" (Davidson). **μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές** "abideth a priest continually". This statement, directly resting upon the preceding clause, is that towards which the whole sentence (vv. 1, 3) has been tending. It is the permanence of the Melchisedek priesthood on which stress is laid. See below. εἰς τὸ διηνεκές is not precisely "for ever," but "for a continuance," or permanence. Appian (*De Bell. civ.*, i. 4) says of Julius Cæsar that he was created Dictator εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, permanent Dictator. "The permanent character of the priesthood is here described, not its actual duration" (Rendall). It was not destined to be superseded by another. Bruce is not correct in saying: "The variation in expression (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές instead of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, vi. 20) is probably made out of regard to style, rather than to convey a different shade of meaning". But he gives the sense well: "If he had had in history, as doubtless he had in fact, a successor in office, we should have said of him, that he *was* the priest of Salem in the days of Abraham. As the case stands, he *is* the priest of Salem."

Vv. 4-10 Superiority of Melchizedek to Levitical priests. The argument is: he was greater than Abraham, the great fountain of the people and of blessing. How much more is he greater than the descendants of Abraham, the Levitical priests?

Ver. 4. **Θεωρεῖτε δὲ πηλίκος οὗτος.** "But observe how great this man was." His greatness is recognisable in his receiving tithes of Abraham, and in giving him his blessing, *cf.* vv. 1, 2. These

Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων ὁ πατριάρχης. 5. [c] καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ τὴν ἱερατείαν λαμβάνοντες, ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν ἀποδεκατοῦν τὸν λαὸν κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τουτέστι, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ· 6. [d] ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεα-

c Num. xviii. 21, 26; Deut. xviii. 1; Josh. xiv. 4; 2 Par. xxxi. 5.
d 1 Gen. xiv. 19, 20; Rom. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 16.

points are emphasised by several details. The first evidence of greatness is that it was no less a man than Abraham who gave him a tithe of the spoils ᾧ δεκάτην, κ.τ.λ. Ἀβραὰμ is in emphatic place, but the emphasis is multiplied by the position of ὁ πατριάρχης. It is as if he heard some of his readers saying, "He must be mistaken, or must refer to some other Abraham and not the fountain of all our families and of Levi and Aaron". He adds ὁ πατρ. to indicate that it is precisely this greatest of men to whom the people owe even their being, of whom he says that Melchizedek was greater. ἀκροθινίων is perhaps chosen also for the purpose of magnifying the gift. The Greeks after a victory gathered the spoils in a heap, θῖνι, and the top or best part of the heap, ἄκρον, was presented to the gods. *Cf.* Frazer's *Pausanias*, v. 281.

Ver. 5. The significance of this tithing is perceived when it is considered that, although the sons of Levi take tithes of their brethren, this is the result of a mere legal appointment. Those who pay tithes are, as well as those who receive them, sons of Abraham. Paying tithes is in their case no acknowledgment of personal inferiority, but mere compliance with law. But Abraham was under no such law to Melchizedek, and the payment of tithes to him was a tribute to his personal greatness. καὶ adds a fresh aspect of the matter. οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὶ . . . "those of the sons of Levi who receive the priestly service have an ordinance to tithe the people in accordance with the law, that is, their brethren, although these have come out of the loins of Abraham". Not all the tribe of Levi, but only the family of Aaron received (*cf.* v. 4) the ἱερατεία (also in Lk. i. 9), which Bleek shows to have been used by classical writers of priestly service, while ἱερωσύνη was used of the priestly office. See vv. 11, 12, 24. ἀποδεκατοῖν, "The best MSS. make the infinitive of verbs in -όω to end in -οῖν" (Westcott and Hort, *G.*, *T.* ii., sec. 410, and *cf.* Jannaris, *Greek Gram.*, 851). The verb occurs only in Biblical Greek, the classical form being δεκατεύω. κατὰ τὸν νόμον follows ἀποδεκ. τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτῶν, κ.τ.λ. Not their fellow-Levites, although it is true that the Levites tithed the people, and the priests tithed the Levites (Num. xviii. 21-24 and 25-28), but the words are added in explanation of λαόν in order to emphasise the fact that the priests exacted tithes not in recognition of any personal superiority. Those who paid tithes were Abraham's descendants equally with the priests; it was merely the law which conveyed the right to tithe their brethren καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος Ἀβραάμ.

Ver. 6. In striking contrast, ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος . . . "but he whose genealogy is not counted from them hath taken tithes of Abraham, and blessed [see below] him that hath the promises". γενεαλογέω is classical Greek, meaning, to trace ancestry, see Herod. ii. 146. ἐξ αὐτῶν, not "from the sons of Israel" (Epiphanius in Bleek), but "from the sons of Levi," ver. 5; and who therefore had no claim to tithe appointed by law, and yet tithed Abraham. καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα, in Vulgate "qui habebat"; in Weizsäcker "der die Verheissungen hatte," not "hat"; so Vaughan correctly, "The possessor of". "Him who owned the promises." *Cf.* Burton, 124 and 126. εὐλόγηκε, on the perfects of this verse and of this Epistle (viii. 5, xi. 5, etc.), Mr. J. H. Moulton asks, "Has anyone noticed the beautiful parallel in Plato, *Apol.*, 28 c., for the characteristic perfect in Hebrews, describing what *stands written* in Scripture? ὅσοι ἐν Τροίᾳ τετελευτήκασι (as is written in the Athenian's 'Bible') is exactly like Heb. vii. 6, xi. 17, 28" (*Expositor*, April, 1901, p. 280). Vaughan also says: "The γέγραπται (so to say) *quickens the dead*, and gives to the *praeterite* of the history the *permanence* of a *perfect*". Yes; but to translate by the perfect sacrifices English idiom to Greek idiom. See Burton, 82, "When the Perfect Indicative is used of a past event which is by reason of the context necessarily thought of as separated

λογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν, δεδεκάτωκε τὸν[1] Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα τὰς ἐπαγγελίας εὐλόγηκε· 7. χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται. 8. καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνουσιν· ἐκεῖ δέ, μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ. 9. καί, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευῒ ὁ δεκάτας λαμβάνων δεδεκάτωται· 10. [e] ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν, ὅτε συνήν-

e Gen. xiv. 18.

[1] τον inserted in ADb, etc., E**KLP, Chr., Thdrt.; omitted in ℵBCD*E*, 17, 23, 57, 109. Bleek omits because "gemäss dem Sprachgebrauche des Verfassers".

from the moment of speaking by an interval, it is impossible to render it into English adequately". The point which the writer here brings out is that, although Abraham had the promises, and was therefore himself a fountain of blessing to mankind and the person on whom all succeeding generations depended for blessing, yet Melchizedek blessed him; and as the writer adds:—

Ver. 7. **χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ἀντιλογίας . . . εὐλογεῖται.** "And without any dispute the less is blessed of the greater." Therefore, Abraham is the less, and Melchizedek the greater. The principle [expressed in its widest form by the neuter] applies where the blessing carries with it not only the verbal expression of goodwill, but goodwill achieving actual results. But man blesses God in the sense of praising Him, or desiring that all praise may be His. So God is **ὁ εὐλογητός**, Mk. xiv. 61. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 31, etc.

Ver. 8. Another note of the superiority of Melchizedek. **καὶ ὧδε μὲν δεκάτας . . .** "And here men that die receive tithes, but there one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." **ὧδε** "here," *i.e.*, in this Levitical system with which we who are Hebrews are familiar, **ἐκεῖ**, "there" in that system identified with that ancient priest. **ἀποθνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι**, "dying men," who therefore as individuals passed away and gave place to successors, and were in this respect inferior to Melchizedek, who, so far as is recorded in Scripture, had no successor. Giving to the silence of Scripture the force of an assertion, the writer speaks of Melchizedek as **μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ**, a person of whom it is witnessed; note absence of article. So Theoph., **ὡς μὴ μνημονευομένης τῆς τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ.** Westcott distinguishes between the plural of this verse, **δεκάτας**, appropriate to the manifold tithings under the Mosaic system and the singular, **δεκάτην**, of ver. 4, one special act.

Ver. 9. **καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν,** "And, I might almost say," adding a new idea with a phrase intended to indicate that it is not to be taken in strictness. It is frequent in Philo, see examples in Carpzov and add *Quis rer. div. her.*, 3. Adam's note on Plato, *Apol. Soc.*, 17A, is worth quoting "**ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν** i. q. paene dixerim: in good authors hardly ever, if at all = ut ita dicam. The phrase is regularly used to limit the extent or comprehension of a phrase or word. It is generally, but by no means exclusively, found with **οὐδείς** and **πάντες**, **οὐδεὶς ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν** 'hardly anyone'; **πάντες ὡς ἔ. εἰπ.** = nearly everyone." A significant use occurs in the *Republic*, p. 341B, where Socrates asks Thrasymachus whether in speaking of a "Ruler" he means **τὸν ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἢ τὸν ἀκριβεῖ λόγῳ.** The phrase is discussed at great length by Raphel. The further idea is, that "through Abraham even Levi, he who receives tithes, has paid tithes," the explanation being **ἔτι γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὀσφύϊ . . .** "for he [Levi] was yet in the loins of his father [Abraham] when Melchizedek met him," Isaac not yet having been begotten. There was a tendency in Jewish theology to view heredity in this realistic manner. Thus Schoettgen quotes Ramban on Gen. v. 2 "God calls the first human pair Adam [man] because all men were in them potentially or virtually [virtualiter]". And so some of the Rabbis argued "Eodem peccato, quo peccavit primus homo, peccavit totus mundus, quoniam hic erat totus mundus." Hence Augustine's formula "peccare in lumbis Adam," and his explanation "omnes fuimus in illo uno quando omnes fuimus ille unus" (*De Civ. Dei*, xiii. 14). On Traducianism see Loofs' *Leitfaden*, p. 194.

Vv. 11-14. The imperfection of

τησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ. 11. [f]Εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευϊτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν· ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῇ[1] νενομοθέτητο[2]· τίς ἔτι χρεία, "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ" ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα, καὶ οὐ "κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν" λέγεσθαι; 12. μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μετάθεσις γίνεται. 13. ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ

[f] ver. 18, 19; Gal. ii. 21.

[1] T.R. in D^cE^**K, Chrys., Thdrt.; επ αυτης in ℵABCD*E*LP, 17, 31, 37, 46, 73, 118.

[2] T.R. in D^cEKL; νενομοθετηται in ℵABCD*P.

the Levitical priesthood, and by implication of the whole Mosaic system, proved by the necessity of having a priest of another order.

Ver. 11. εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις. . . . "If then there was [or had been] perfecting by means of the Levitical priesthood—for upon it [as a basis] the people have received the law—what further need was there [or would have been] that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedek and be styled not after the order of Aaron?" εἰ μὲν οὖν introduces a statement of some of the consequences resulting from the introduction of a priest of another order. It argues the failure of the Levitical priesthood to achieve τελείωσις. "*Perfection* is always a relative word. An institution brings perfection when it effects the purpose for which it was instituted, and produces a result that corresponds to the idea of it. The design of a priesthood is to bring men near to God (ver. 19), and this it effects by removing the obstacle in the way, *viz.* men's sin, which lying on their conscience impedes their free access to God; compare ix. 9, x. 1, 14" (Davidson). On the rendering of ἦν see Sonnenschein's *Greek Gram.*, 355, Obs. 3. ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νενομοθέτηται, the omitted clause is "and we are justified in demanding perfectness from the priesthood," because it is the soul of the entire legislation. All the arrangements of the law, the entire administration of the people, involves the priesthood. If there is failure in the priestly service, the whole system breaks down. It was idle to give a law without providing at the same time for the expiation of its breaches. The covenant was at the first entered into by sacrifice, and could only be maintained by a renewal of sacrifice. The priesthood stood out as the essential part of the Jewish economy. νομοθετεῖν to be a νομοθέτης used in classics sometimes with dative of person, as in LXX, Exod. xxiv. 12, τὰς ἐντολὰς ἃς ἔγραψα νομοθετῆσαι αὐτοῖς. Sometimes it is followed by accusative of that which is ordained by law. The use of the passive here is peculiar, *cf.* also viii. 6. The νόμος contained in the word, and expressed separately in ver. 12, is not the bare law contained in commandments, but the whole Mosaic dispensation. τίς ἔτι χρεία, this use of ἔτι is justified by an instance from Sextus Empiricus quoted by Wetstein: τίς ἔτι χρεία ἀποδεικνύναι αὐτά; ἕτερον, not ἄλλον but another of a different kind. ἀνίστασθαι so Acts vii. 18, ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος and *cf.* the transitive use in Acts ii. 24, 32, iii. 22, 26, vii. 37. καὶ οὐ . . . λέγεσθαι. The negative belongs rather to the description κ. τ. τάξιν Ἀ. than to the verb and Burton's rule (481) applies. "When a limitation of an infinitive or of its subject is to be negatived rather than the infinitive itself, the negative οὐ is sometimes used instead of μή." λέγεσθαι "be spoken of" or "designated".

Ver. 12. μετατιθεμένης γάρ. . . . "For if the priesthood is changed, there is of necessity a change also of the law". Or, This change of priesthood being made, as it is now being made, a change of the law is also being made. The connection is: What need was there for a new priesthood? It must have been a crying need, for to change the priesthood is to change all. It means nothing short of revolution. Chrysostom rightly τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας, τί ἔδει καινῆς διαθήκης;

Ver. 13. This enormous change is in fact being made. ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα. . . . "For He with reference to whom this [110th Ps. 4] is said hath partaken of another tribe from which no man hath given attendance at the altar". Here for the first time definitely in this chapter the writer introduces the fulfilment of the Psalm. It was spoken of the Messiah, and He did not belong to the tribe of Levi, but

λέγεται ταῦτα, φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν, ἀφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς προσέσχηκε τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ· 14. [g] πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣν φυλὴν οὐδὲν περὶ ἱερωσύνης [1] Μωσῆς ἐλάλησε.

15. Καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα

g Esa. xi. 1; Matt. i. 2, etc.; Luc. iii. 33.

[1] T.R. in DcKL; περι ιερεων ουδεν in ℵ*, etc., ABC*D*EP, 17, d, e (de sacerdotibus nihil), arm.

φυλῆς ἑτέρας μετέσχηκεν, has thrown in his lot with, or become a member of (*cf.* ii. 14) a tribe of a different kind from the Levitical (ver. xi. 11, 12) being characterised by this, that from it **ἀφ' ἧς** issuing from which, not **ἐξ**, [as in ver. 14] no one has given attendance at the altar. [*Cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 13; Acts xx. 28; Hdt., ix. 33, **γυμνασίοισι**; Thuc., i. 15, **τοῖς ναυτικοῖς**; and the equivalent in 1 Cor. ix. 13, **οἱ τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσεδρεύοντες.**] It is doubtful whether the perfect **μετέσχηκεν** can bear the meaning put upon it by Vaughan: "a striking suggestion of the identity of Christ in heaven with Christ upon earth". So too Weiss. It might seem preferable to refer it with Burton (88) to the class of perfects which in the N.T. have an aorist sense, **γέγονα, εἴληφα, ἔσχηκα.** So Weizsäcker "gehörte"; the Vulgate, however, has "de alia tribu est," and *cf.* **ἀνατέταλκεν** of ver. 14. But the perfects are best accounted for as referring to the statement of the previous verse. This great change is being made, for he of whom the 110th Psalm was spoken has actually become a member of another tribe. The result reaches to the change of priesthood.

Ver. 14. He now proceeds to name the tribe **πρόδηλον γὰρ ὅτι . . .** "For it is evident that out of Judah our Lord has sprung, concerning which tribe Moses said nothing about priests". With **πρόδηλον** may be compared **δήπου** of ii. 16. The facts of our Lord's birth were so far known that everyone connected Him with Judah. The accounts of Matthew and Luke were accepted (*cf.* Rev. v. 5). This fact of his origin would naturally militate against His claims to be Priest; but this writer here skilfully reconciles them with Scripture. Weizsäcker translates by "längst bekannt" giving to **πρό** the temporal meaning. On Clem., *ad Cor.*, xii., Lightfoot says: "It may be a question in many passages whether the preposition denotes *priority in time* or *distinctness.*" Wetstein quotes from Artemidorus **καὶ ἐφάνη πρόδηλον τὸ ὄναρ μετὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν** and from Polyaenus **τί καὶ χρὴ γράφειν; πρόδηλον γάρ. ἀνατέταλκεν** is possibly a reminiscence of Zech. vi. 12, **Ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ· καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ,** a passage referred to by Philo, see Carpzov in *loc.* **εἰς ἣν φυλήν,** "**εἰς** is applied to the direction of the thought, as Acts ii. 25. **Δαυὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν,** aiming at Him, E. i. 10, v. 32." Winer, 49, and so in Dion. Hal., **πολλοὶ ἐλέχθησαν εἰς τοῦτο λόγοι,** and *cf.* our own expression, "He spoke *to* such and such points". Vulg. translates "in qua tribu". Whatever Moses spoke regarding priests was spoken with reference to another tribe and not with reference to Judah.

Vv. 15-19. Imperfection of the Levitical priesthood more abundantly proved by contrast with the nature of the Melchizedek priest.

Ver. 15. **καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλόν ἐστιν.** "And more abundantly still is it evident" [Weizsäcker excellently "Und noch zum Ueberfluss weiter liegt die Sache klar". What is it that is more abundantly evident? Weiss says, It is, that an alteration of the priesthood has been made. Similarly Vaughan, "And this insufficiency and consequent supersession of the Levitical priesthood is still more conclusively proved by the particular designation of the predicted priest (in Ps. cx. 4) as a priest, etc.". So too Westcott. But from the twelfth verse the argument has been directed to show that there has been a change of law, and this argument is continued in ver. 15. This change of law is evident from the fact that Jesus belongs to the non-Levitical tribe of Judah, and yet more superabundantly evident from the nature of the new priest who is seen to be no longer "after the law of a carnal commandment'. So Bleek after Œcumenius, Davidson, Farrar and others. **κατάδηλον,** quite evident, as in Xen., *Mem.*, i. 4, 14, **οὐ γὰρ πάνυ σοι κατάδηλον**; Wetstein quotes from Hippocrates, **ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον κατάδηλον γίνεται.** In **πρόδηλον** the preposition has the force of "ob" in "obvious"; in

Μελχισεδὲκ ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, 16. ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς[1] γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου· 17. [h] μαρτυρεῖ[2] γάρ, "Ὅτι σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ".

h v. 6; Ps. cx. 4.

[1] T.R. in C^corr D^c EK; σαρκινης in ℵABC*D*LP.

[2] T.R. with CD^c E**KL; μαρτυρειται in ℵABD*E*P.

καταδηλον the preposition strengthens. εἰ κατὰ, κ.τ.λ. "if as is the case" or "since" (*cf.* ver. 11) "after the likeness of Melchizedek" the κατὰ τ. ταξιν of previous verses changed now into κατὰ τ. ὁμοιότητα, because attention is directed to the similarity of nature between Melchizedek and this new priest.

Ver. 16. ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον . . . ἀκαταλύτου, "who has become such not after the law of a fleshen ordinance but after the power of an indissoluble life". This relative clause defines the "likeness to Melchizedek," and brings out a double contrast between the new priest and the Levitical – the Levitical priesthood is κατὰ νόμον, the other κατὰ δύναμιν, the one is dependent on what is σαρκίνη, the other on what belongs to ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος. These contrasts are significant. The Levitical priesthood rested on law, on a regulation that those should be priests who were born of certain parents. This was an outward νόμος, a thing outside of the men themselves, and moreover it was a νόμος σαρκίνης ἐντολῆς, regulating the priesthood not in relation to spiritual fitness but in accordance with fleshly descent. No matter what the man's nature is nor how ill-suited and reluctant he is to the office, he becomes a priest because his fleshly pedigree is right. The new priest on the contrary did what He did, not because any official necessity was laid upon Him, but because there was a power in His own nature compelling and enabling Him, the power of a life which death did not dissolve. The contrast is between the official and the personal or real. All that is merely professional must be dispossessed by what is real. Hereditary kings gave way to Cromwell. The Marshals of France put their batons in their pockets when Joan of Arc appeared. For the difference between σάρκινος and σαρκικός see Trench, *Synonyms*, 257, who quotes the reason assigned by Erasmus for the use of the former in 2 Cor, iii. 3, "ut materiam intelligas, non qualitatem". The enactment was σαρκίνη inasmuch as it took to do only with the flesh. It caused the priesthood to be implicated with and dependent on fleshly descent. Opposed to this was the inherent energy and potentiality of an indissoluble or indestructible life. The life of the new priest is indissoluble, not as eternally existing in the Son, but as existing in Him Incarnate and fulfilling priestly functions. The term itself "indestructible" used in place of "eternal," directs the thought to the death of Jesus which might naturally seem to have threatened it with destruction. His survival of death was needful to the fulfilment of His functions as priest (see ver. 25). The meaning and reference of the term is brought out by the contrast of ver. 28 between "men who have weakness" and υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον. "Unquestionably that which enables the Son to be Messianic King and High Priest of men is His rank as Son. But it is true on the other hand that it is as Son come in the flesh that He is King and Priest. And the expression 'hath become priest' (ver. 16) points to a historical event. It is, therefore, probable that indissoluble life is attributed to Him not in general as the eternal Son, but as the Son made man."

Ver. 17. That Jesus carries on His work perennially is proved by Scripture. "For it is witnessed Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," not merely as in ver. 11, κατὰ τ. τάξιν Μ., although this itself involves the perpetuity of the priesthood, but expressly and emphatically εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Vv. 18 and 19 taking up the idea of ver. 16 affirm the negative and positive result of the superseding of the fleshly ordinance by the power of an indestructible life. On the one hand there is an ἀθέτησις προαγούσης ἐντολῆς, "a setting aside of a foregoing enactment," that namely which is referred to in ver. 17, and on the other hand, there is "a further bringing in of a better hope". ἐπεισαγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, the ἐπί in ἐπεισαγωγή balances προαγούσης, and indicates that the better hope was introduced over and above all that had already been done in the same

18. [i] Ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται προαγούσης ἐντολῆς, διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές· 19. [k] οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος· ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ. 20. Καὶ καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας· [l] οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, 21. ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκωμοσίας, διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος

i Gal. iv. 9. k iv. 16; Joan. i. 17; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 21, 28, et viii. 3; Eph. ii. 18, et iii. 12; Gal. ii. 16. l Ps. cx. 4.

behalf of bringing men to God. The μὲν . . . δὲ indicate that the sentence must thus be construed, and not as rendered in A.V. The reason of this replacement of the old legal enactment is given in the clause, διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές "on account of its weakness and uselessness". This arrangement depending on the flesh was helpless to achieve the most spiritual of achievements, the union of man with God, the bringing together in true spiritual fellowship of sinful and earthly man with the holy God. So Paul found that arrangements of a mechanical and external nature were ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα, Gal. iv. 9. "The *uselessness* (unhelplessness) of the priesthood was proved by its inability to aid men in that ἐγγίζειν τῷ Θεῷ, which is their one want" (Vaughan). The ordinance regulating the priesthood failed to accomplish its object; and indeed this characterised the entire system of which it was a characteristic part. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, "for nothing was brought to perfection by the law". The law made beginnings, taught rudiments, gave initial impulses, hinted, foreshadowed, but brought nothing to perfection, did not in itself provide for man's perfect entrance into God's fellowship. Therefore there was introduced that which did achieve in perfect form this reconcilement with God, *viz.:* a better hope, which is therefore defined as δι' ἧς ἐγγίζομεν τῷ Θεῷ, "by which we draw near to God". The law said (Exod. xix. 21) διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ μήποτε ἐγγίσωσι πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. The "better" hope is that which springs from belief in the indestructible life of Christ and the assurance that that life is still active in the priestly function of intercession. It is the hope that is anchored within the veil fixed in Christ's person and therefore bringing us into God's presence and fellowship.

Vv. 20-22. Another element in the superiority of the covenant established upon the priesthood of Jesus is that in the very manner of the institution of His priesthood it was declared to be permanent. The long parenthesis of ver. 21 being held aside the statement of 20-22 reads thus: "And [introducing a fresh consideration] in proportion as not without an oath [was He made priest] . . . in that proportion better is the covenant of which Jesus has become the surety". The parenthesis of ver. 21 is inserted to confirm by an appeal to Scripture [Ps. cx. 4] the fact that by the swearing of an oath the Melchizedek priest was appointed, and to indicate the significance of this mode of appointment, *viz.:* that repentance or change of plan is excluded. That is to say, this priesthood is final, eternal. And the superiority of the priesthood involves the superiority of the covenant based upon it. The oath signifies therefore the transition from a provisional and temporary covenant to that which is eternal. καθ' ὅσον. This form of argument is frequent in Philo, see *Quis. Rev. Div. H.*, 17, etc. οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας, "not without oath-swearing"; the clause may be completed from that which follows, "has he been made priest," as in A.V., although Weiss maintains that this is "sprachwidrig" and that the broken clause "kann natürlich nur aus dem Vorigen ergänzt werden". But it is most natural and grammatical to complete it from the sentence in which it stands: "As not without an oath, so of a better covenant *has Jesus become surety*". The parenthesis thus furnishes the needed ground of this statement. He became surety by becoming priest, and as priest he was constituted with an oath. οἱ μὲν γὰρ "For the one [that is, the Levitical priests] εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες "have been made priests" Vaughan renders "are having become priests—are priests having become so". So Delitzsch, Weiss and von Soden. Westcott says: "The periphrasis marks the possession as well as the impartment of the office;" and on the "periphrastic conjugation" see Blass, sec. 62; Stephanus Thesaurus *s.v.* εἰμί, and *cf.* Acts

πρὸς αὐτὸν, "Ὤμοσε Κύριος καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται, Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ[1]". 22. [m] κατὰ τοσοῦτον[2] m viii. 6.

[1] T.R. in ℵcADEKLP, d, e, Copt., Syrutr, Aeth.; om. κατα τ. ταξιν Μελχ. with ℵ*BC, 17, 80, f, vg., Sah., Basm., Arm.

[2] T.R. ℵcD3EKL; τοσουτο with ℵ*ABC, 17, 23, 39, 115. Both forms found in Attic though τοσουτον is more frequent. See Blass, *Gram.*, p. 36.

xxi. 29, ἦσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες.]. ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὁρκ. "but the other [the new priest] with an oath," μετὰ of course not being instrumental, but "interposito jurejurando"; where and how this oath is to be found is next explained, it is διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος . . . "through Him that saith to him. The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art," etc. There is no call to translate πρὸς αὐτόν "in reference to Him"; neither is there any difficulty in referring the words ὤμοσε . . . μεταμελ. to God. "Though the words are not directly spoken by the Lord, they are His by implication. The oath is His" (Westcott). On the distinction between μετανοέω and μεταμέλομαι see Trench, *Synonyms*, 241. "He who has *changed his mind* about the past is in the way to change everything; he who has an *after care* may have little or nothing more than a selfish dread of the consequences of what he has done." This, however, does not apply to the LXX (from which the quotation of this verse is taken) where both words are used to translate נִחַם. *Cf.* 1 Kings xv. 29 and 35. κατὰ τοσοῦτο "by so much," that is, the superiority of the new covenant to the old is in the ratio of eternity to time, of what is permanent and adequate to what is transitory and provisional. κρείττονος διαθήκης "of a better covenant" ["id est, non infirmae et inutilis. Frequens in hac epistola epitheton, κρείττων, item αἰώνιος, ἀληθινὸς, δεύτερος, διαφορώτερος, ἕτερος, ζῶν, καινὸς, μέλλων, νέος, πρόσφατος, τέλειος" (Bengel)], here first mentioned in the Epistle. but whose character and contents and relation to the "foregoing" covenant are fully explained in the following chapter. Here already its "betterness" is recognisable in this, that it supersedes the older, and is itself permanent because perfectly accomplishing the purposes of a covenant.

Ver. 22. διαθήκη in classical Greek means a *disposition* (διατίθημι) of one's goods by will; frequent in the orators and sometimes as in Aristoph., *Birds*, 439, a covenant. In the LXX it occurs nearly 280 times and in all but four passages it is the translation of בְּרִית "covenant". (See Hatch. *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, 47.) It is used indifferently of agreements between men and of contracts or engagements between God and man. See Introduction and on ix. 16 and Thayer *s.v.* Of this "better covenant" Jesus "has become and is" [γέγονεν] ἔγγυος "surety". ἔγγυος is explained in the Greek commentators by ἐγγυητής, which is the commoner of the two forms, at least in later Greek. ἔγγυος occurs several times in the fragments from the second century B.C. given in Grenfell and Hunt's *Greek Papyri*, series ii.; also in the fragments from first century A.D. given in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. It is not the exact equivalent of μεσίτης (found in a similar connection viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24) which is a more comprehensive term. It has been questioned why in this place ἔγγυος is used, and Peirce answers: "I am apt to think he was led to this by his having just before used the word ἐγγίζομεν, and that he did it for the sake of the paronomasia". And Bruce says: "There is literary felicity in the use of the word as playfully alluding to the foregoing word ἐγγίζομεν. There is more than literary felicity, for the two words probably have the same root, so that we might render ἔγγυος., *the one who insures permanently near relations with God.*" More likely he chose the word because his purpose was not to exhibit Jesus as negotiating the covenant, but especially as securing that it should achieve its end. It has been debated whether it is meant that Jesus was surety for men to God, as was held by both Lutheran and Reformed writers, or with others (Grotius, Peirce, etc.), that He was surety for God to men ["His being a surety relates to His acting in the behalf of God towards us and to His assuring us of the divine favour, and to His bestowing the benefits promised by God" (Peirce)] or, with Limborch, Baumgarten and Schmid (see Bleek) that he was surety for both

κρείττονος[1] διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς. 23. Καὶ οἱ μὲν, πλείονές εἰσι γεγονότες ἱερεῖς,[2] διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν· 24. ὁ δὲ, διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην· 25. [n] ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται

n ix. 24; om. viii. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Joan ii. 2.

[1] T.R. in ℵcACcDEKLP; και κρειττονος in ℵ*BC*.

[2] γεγονοτες ante ιερεις with ℵBLP; post ιερεις in ACDE, 17, d, e.

parties. There is no reason to suppose that the writer particularised in any of these directions. He merely wished to express the thought that by the appointment of Jesus to the priestoood, the covenant based upon this priesthood was secured against all failure of any of the ends for which it was established.

Vv. 23-25. Another ground of the perfectness of the new priesthood is found in the continued life of the priest, who ever lives to make intercession and can therefore save completely, whereas the Levitical priests were compelled by death to give place to others.

Ver. 23. καὶ, as above, ver. 20, introducing a new element in the argument. οἱ μὲν, as in ver. 21, the Levitical priests, πλείονες . . . "have been made priests many in number," not many at one and the same time [Delitzsch], although that also is true, but many in succession, as is shown by the reason assigned διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν "because of their being prevented by death from abiding" "in their office," Peirce, as Œcumenius, ἐν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ δηλονότι. Others think that remaining in life is meant. Possibly πλείονες is used instead of πολλοί, because there is a latent comparison wi h the one continuing priest, or with those already priests; always more and more. He, on the contrary, ὁ δὲ, by reason of his abiding for ever ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην "has his priesthood inviolable," that is, no other person can step into it. The form of expression is similar to that used by Epiphanius of the Trinity, ἡ δὲ ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν φύσιν. The meaning of ἀπαράβ. is contested, some interpreters (Weiss, etc.) supposing that it signifies "indefeasible," or "untransmitted" or "nontransferable". Indeed, Œcumenius and Theophylact translate it by ἀδιάδοχον. But in every instance of its occurrence given by Stephanus and Wetstein it has a passive sense, as νόμος, ὅρκος, etc., ἀπαράβ., and means unalterable or inviolable. This suits the present passage perfectly, and returns upon the thought of ver. 3, that the new priest is sole and perpetual occupant of the office, giving place to no successor. ὅθεν, "whence," *i.e.*, because of His having this absolute priesthood; His saving power depends upon His priesthood. He is able καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελές, "even to save to the uttermost," not to be referred merely to time as in Vulgate "in perpetuum," and Chrysostom, οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ. If referred to time, it might mean either ability to save the individual eternally, or to save future generations. Peirce joins it with δύναται, and renders "whence also he is perpetually able to save". But the phrase uniformly means "completely," "thoroughly," as in Luke xiii. 11 of the woman, μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές and in the examples cited by Wetstein. This, as Riehm shows (p. 613, note), *includes* the idea of perpetuity. The Levitical priests could not so save: no τελείωσις was achieved by them; but everything for which the priesthood existed, everything which is comprised in the great [ii. 3] and eternal [v. 9] salvation, the deliverance [ii. 15] and glory [ii. 10] which belong to it, are achieved by Christ. The objects of this saving power are τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, "those who through Him approach God"; "through Him" no longer relying on the mediation of Levitical priests, but recognising Jesus as the "new and living way," x. 19-22. This complete salvation Jesus can accomplish because πάντοτε ζῶν . . . αὐτῶν, "ever living to intercede on their behalf". The particular mo e in which His eternal priesthood applies itself to those who through Him approach God is that He intercedes for them, thus effecting their real introduction to God's presence and their acceptance by Him, and also the supply of all their need out of the Divine fulness. ἐντυγχάνειν, "to meet by chance," "to light upon," takes as its second meaning, "to converse

τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. 26. °τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν[1] ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ

o iv. 14, 15, et ix. 24; Rom. viii. 34; 1 Joan ii. 2.

[1] T.R. in ℵCKLP it vg.; insert και before επρεπεν ABDE, Syrutr.

with" (followed by dative), hence "to entreat one to do something" (Plut., *Pomp.*, 55; *Ages.*, 25), and when followed by περί (Polyb., iv. 76, 9) or by ὑπέρ (Plut., *Cato Maj.*, 9) "to intercede". (See Liddell and Scott.) It is not the word itself, but the preposition following, that gives the idea of *intercession*. The word with a different preposition can be used in the sense of appealing *against*, as in Rom. xi. 2, ὡς ἐντυγ. τ. Θεῷ κατὰ τ. Ἰσραήλ, see also 1 Mac. xi. 25. With ὑπέρ it occurs in Rom. viii. 27, 34, and with περί in Acts xxv. 24. Christ, then, treats with God in our behalf; and He lives for this. As His life on earth was spent in the interests of men, so He continues to spend Himself in this same cause. He ever lives, and being "the same yesterday, to-day and for ever" (xiii. 8) His present fulness of life is devoted to those ends which evoked His energies while on earth. He secures that the fulness of Divine resource shall be available for men. "All things are ours." This intercession is not the same as the Atoning sacrifice and its presentation before God, which was accomplished once for all (ix. 26, x. 18); but it is based upon the sacrifice which is also to men the guarantee that His intercession is real, and comprehensive of all their needs. [*Cf.* Sir Walter Raleigh's *Pilgrimage.*]

Vv. 26-28. A summary description of the Melchizedek ideal priest, drawn in contrast to the Levitical High Priest, and realised in the Son who has been perfected as Priest for ever. Melchizedek is here dropped, and the priesthood of the Son is now directly contrasted with that of the Aaronic High Priest.

Ver. 26. **Τοιοῦτος γὰρ . . . ἀρχιερεύς.** "*Such* seems to refer to the Melchizedek character delineated in the preceding part of the chapter, or to all that was said of the nature and character of the Son from iv. 14 onward. The sense will not differ if it be supposed to refer to the epithets and statements that follow, for these but summarise what went before" (Davidson and others). But it must not be overlooked that ὅς (ver. 27) is one of the usual relatives after τοιοῦτος (*cf.* viii. 1, and Soph., *Antig.*, 691, λόγοις τοιούτοις οἷς; *cf.* also Longinus, *De Sublim.*, ix. 2. So that Farrar's statement on chap. viii. 1, "τοιόσδε is prospective, τοιοῦτος is retrospective," is incorrect), and that the adjectives ὅσιος, κ.τ.λ. prepare for and give the ground of the statement made in the relative clause. The sentence therefore reads: "So great a high priest as need not daily, etc., . . . became us," ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν, not, as in viii. 1, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα (*cf.* iv. 14, 15), because the writer wishes to draw attention to the needs of those for whom the priest was appointed [ἡμῖν emphatic] and his suitableness to those needs. We, being what we are, sinful and dependent on the mediation of others, need a priest in whom we can wholly trust, because He Himself is holy, separate from sinners, without human weakness. Westcott's distribution of the terms is neat, although of doubtful validity. "Christ is personally in Himself *holy*, in relation to men *guileless*, in spite of contact with a sinful world, *undefiled*. By the issue of His life He has been *separated from sinners* in regard to the visible order, and, in regard to the invisible world, He has *risen above the heavens*". ὅσιος frequently in the Psalms, where it translates חָסִיד] denotes personal holiness, while ἅγιος and ἱερός express the idea of consecration. [See Trench, *Synon.*] Weiss, however, says: "ὅσιος, ein Synonym von ἅγιος" (Vulg., Ps. iv. 4, xvi. 10) "bezeichnet die religiöse Weihe des Gottangehörigen" (Tit. i. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8). Peirce understands that here the word means "merciful". But this is scarcely consistent with N.T. usage. ἄκακος, "innocent," and frequently with the idea of inexperience which attaches to the English word [*cf.* the definition which Trench, *Synon.*, p. 197, quotes from Basil; and see also the use of ἀκακία in Ps. xxxvi. 37, and of ἄκακοι in Ps. xxiv. 21. Its use in Jer. xi. 19 is significant, ἐγὼ δὲ ὡς ἀρνίον ἄκακον ἀγόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι.] Here the word seems to point to that entire absence of evil thought and slightest taint of malice

p v. 3, et ix. 12, 28, et x. 12; Lev. ix. 7, et xvi. 6, 11.
q ii. 10, et v. 1, 2, 9.

ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος· 27. [p]ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν ἐφάπαξ, ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας.[1] 28. [q]ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν· ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον, υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον.

[1] T.R. with BDEKLP; προσενεγκας in ℵA, 17, 73, 80, Cyrnest 93.

which might prompt disregard of human need. ὅσιος denotes His oneness with God, ἄκακος His oneness with His fellow-men. He is not separated from them, or rendered indifferent by any selfishness. Neither has His contact with the world left any soil; He is ἀμίαντος, "stainless," and so fit to appear before God. *Cf.* the stringent laws regarding uncleanness and blemish laid down for the Levitical priests in Lev. xxi. 1, xxii. 9. And as the high priest in Israel was not permitted to go out of the sanctuary nor come near a dead body, though of his father or mother (Lev. xxi. 11, 12), and as the later law enjoined a seven-days' separation of the high priest before the day of Atonement (Schoettgen in *loc.*), so our Lord fulfilled this symbolic isolation by being in heart and life κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. If there is anything in the symbol, then this separation occurred before the sacrifice was made, and as a preparation for it, but almost all modern interpreters (Grotius, Bengel, "separatus est, relicto mundo," Peirce, Tholuck, Bleek, Alford, Davidson, Rendall, von Soden, but not Milligan) refer the separation to His exaltation. "In virtue of His exaltation He is now for evermore withdrawn from all perturbing contact with evil men" (Delitzsch). Being co-ordinate with the previous adjectives, while the ὑψηλότερος γεν. is added by καὶ, it would seem that κεχωρ. refers to the result achieved by His earthly life with all its temptations. By the seclusion of the high priest it was hinted that before entering God's presence the priest must be isolated from the contamination of human intercourse: there must be a period of quarantine; but our High Priest has carried through all the confusion and turmoil and defilement and exasperation of life an absolute immunity from contagion or stain. He was with God throughout, and throughout was separated by an atmosphere of His own from sinners. καὶ ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν γενόμενος, "and made higher than the heavens," which apparently has a meaning similar to iv. 14, "We have a great High Priest who has passed through the heavens," *cf.* also Eph. iv. 10. It is not "and has been set," but γενόμενος, has by His own career and character attained that dignity. It is by right, as the necessary result of His life, that He is above the heavens. "He is now become, strictly speaking, as to His mode of being, supra-mundane" (Delitzsch). [For the word, *cf.* Lucian, *Nigr.*, 25, ἑαυτὸν ὑψηλότερον λημμάτων παρέχειν, to show himself superior to gains.] ὃς οὐκ ἔχει καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνάγκην . . . "who does not need daily, like the high priests, to offer sacrifices first for His own sins, then for the people's; for this He did once for all by offering Himself". As shown by the relative, this is the main affirmation to which the preceding clauses lead up. The one offering of Christ is contrasted with the continually repeated offerings of the Levitical high priests; and His Sonship priesthood to which He was instituted by an oath is set over against the service of men who had first to be cleansed from their own defilements before they could sacrifice for the sins of the people. In the words καθ' ἡμέραν, when κατ' ἐνιαυτόν (x. 1) might have been expected, a difficulty has been found. It was on the Day of Atonement, once a year, that the high priest offered first for himself and then for the people, see ix 7. Accordingly, several interpreters, such as Bleek, Lünemann, Davidson, adopt the idea that the writer blends in one view the ordinary daily sacrifice and the sacrifice of the day of Atonement. Others again, as Hofmann, Delitzsch, Alford, maintain that the position of καθ' ἡμέραν shows that it belongs only to ὃς [Christ], not to οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, so that the sentence really means: "Who has not need day by day, as the high priests had year by

year". Weiss renders this interpretation more probable by pointing out that the words have a reference to πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυγχάνειν of ver. 25. His intercession is continuous, from day to day, but in order to accomplish it He does not need day by day to purify Himself and renew His sacrifice. *Cf.* also the seven days' purification of the high priest on entering his office, Exod. xxix. 13-8. **θυσίας ἀναφέρειν**, a phrase resulting from the *carrying up* of the sacrifice to the raised altar, and only found in Hellenistic, frequently in LXX. The more usual word in this Epistle (twenty times and frequently in LXX) is προσφέρειν. "ἀναφέρειν properly describes the ministerial action of the priest, and προσφέρειν the action of the offerer (Lev. ii. 14, 16, vi. 33, 35), but the distinction is not observed universally; thus ἀναφέρειν is used of the people (Lev. xvii. 5), and προσφέρειν of the priests (Lev. xxi. 21)" (Westcott). **πρότερον . . . ἔπειτα**, as in v. 3, "they must first offer for themselves, because they may not approach God sin-stained; they must also offer for the people, because they may not introduce a sin-stained people to God" (Weiss). **τοῦτο γὰρ ἐποίησεν . . .** This, *i.e.*, offering for the sins of the people. But it must be borne in mind that this writer keeps in view that Christ also had a preparation for His priestly ministry in the sinless temptations and sufferings He endured, vv. 7-10. The emphasis is on **ἐφάπαξ**, in contrast to the καθ' ἡμέραν, and the ground of the ἐφάπαξ is given in **ἑαυτὸν ἀνενέγκας**, an offering which by the nature of the case could not be repeated, ix. 27, 28, and which by its worth rendered repetition superfluous. This difference between the new priest and the old is based upon their essential difference of nature, "For the law appoints as high priests men who have weakness," which especially gives the reason, as in v. 3, why they must sacrifice for themselves. In v. 3 the weakness is ascribed to the same source as here; the high priest is ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος. In c. 5, however, the fact that the high priest is taken from among men is introduced chiefly for the sake of illustrating his sympathy: here it is introduced in contrast to υἱόν of the next clause, which is thus raised to a higher than human dignity. For had this contrast not been intended, τούς would have been used, and not ἀνθρώπους. The law only made provision for the appointment of priests who had human weakness: the word of the oath (already explained in vv. 20-22), **τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον**, "which [oath-swearing] came after the law," and therefore showed that the law needed revisal and supplementing ["Debent posteriora in legibus esse perfectiora" (Grotius)]. It might have been argued that the Law coming after Melchizedek introduced an improved priesthood. It is therefore worth while to point out that the adoption of the Melchizedek priesthood as the type of the Messianic was subsequent to the Law, and consequently superseded it. **υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον** [appoints], "a son who has been made perfect for ever". **υἱόν**, without the article, because attention is called to the nature of the new priest, as in i. 1. "Son," in the fullest sense, as described in i. 1-4, and in contrast to ἀνθρώπους. He also, though a Son, became man, and was exposed to human temptations, but by this experience was "perfected" as our Priest. *Cf.* vv. 7-10. "For ever perfected" is directly contrasted with the sinful yielding to infirmity exhibited by the Levitical priests, and must therefore be referred to moral perfecting, as explained in chap. v. This perfectness of the Son is confirmed and sealed by His exaltation; He is for ever perfected in the sense, as Grotius says, "ut nec morti nec ullis adversis subjaceat". *Cf.* ix. 27, 28. The A.V. translates "consecrated," which Davidson denounces, with Alford, as "altogether false". But this translation at any rate suggests that it is perfectness as our priest the writer has in view; and the use of τελειόω in Lev. xxi. 10 and other passages cannot be thus lightly set aside.

CHAPTER VIII.—Vv. 1-6. The idea of Christ's priesthood, merely suggested in i. 3, expressly affirmed in ii. 17, has been from iv. 14 onwards enlarged upon and illustrated. It has been shown that Christ is a priest, called by God to this office and proclaimed by God as High Priest. The superiority of His orders as belonging not to the hereditary Aaronic line, but as being "after the order of Melchisedek," has also been exhibited. Passing now from the person and qualifications of the Priest, the author proceeds in chap. viii. to illustrate his greatness from a consideration of the *place* of His ministry. It is in heaven He is seated, a minister of the real tabernacle, not of that which had been pitched by Moses as an image and

VIII. 1. [a]ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ὃς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς

a i. 3, 13, et iii. 1, et iv. 14, et vi. 20, et ix. 11, et xii. 2; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1.

symbol of it. The priesthood to which God called Him *must* be a heavenly ministry, for were He on earth He would not even be a priest, not to say a High Priest. His ministry, therefore, being in the heaven of eternal realities, is a "better ministry," in accordance with the fact that he is mediating a "better covenant".

Ver. 1. **κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις**, not, as A.V., "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum" (*cf.* Grotius "post tot dicta haec esto summa"), but with Field "Now to crown our present discourse" or with Rendall "Now to crown what we are saying". **κεφάλαιον** is used to denote either *the sum*, as of numbers added up from below to the *head* of the column where the result is set down, and in this sense it is here understood by Erasmus, Calvin and A.V.; or, *the chief point* as of a cope-stone or capital of a pillar, as in Thucyd., vi. 6. **λέγοντες ἄλλα τε πολλὰ καὶ κεφάλαιον, οἱ Συρακόσιοι, κ.τ.λ.** Other examples in Field's O.N., to which add Plutarch, *De Educ. Puer.*, 8, **ἓν πρῶτον καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευταῖον ἐν τούτοις κεφάλαιον ἀγωγὴ σπουδαία.** This latter sense alone satisfies the present passage, and also agrees better with **ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις** for **ἐπὶ** must here be taken in a quasi-local sense, as Vaughan paraphrases "as a capital upon the things which are being said—as a thought (or fact) forming the headstone of the argument—we add this". *Cf.* Luke xvi. 26 **καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις.** That **λεγομένοις** is in the present is manifestly no objection to this rendering. The absence of the article before **κεφάλ.** does not involve, as Lünemann supposes, that the writer means "*a* main point" among others, for such words do not in similar situations require the article, *cf.* Demosth., p. 924, **τεκμήριον δὲ τούτου. κεφάλαιον** is most easily construed as a nominative absolute (*cf.* Buttmann, p. 381) not, as Bruce, "an accusative in apposition with the following sentence". **τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα** . . . "so great a High Priest have we as took His seat (or, is set down) on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens". **τοιοῦτον**, not, as Farrar and Rendall, "retrospective," although as contrasted with **τοιόσδε** this is its proper meaning; but here, as frequently in classics [Soph., *Antig.*, 691, **λόγοις τοιούτοις οἷς σὺ μὴ τέρψει κλύων,** and Demosth., p. 743, followed also by **ὥστε**] it finds its explanation in **ὃς ἐκάθισεν** [**τοιοῦτον** weist naturlich nicht rückwärts sondern vorwärts auf den dasselbe erläuternden Relativsatz. Weiss.] The greatness of the High Priest is manifested by the place where He ministers. His greatness is revealed in his sitting down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. Westcott thinks that the thought of a High Priest who . . . "is King as well as priest is clearly the prominent thought of the sentence". And Moulton on x. 12 says: "The words 'sat down' (Ps. cx. 1), add to the priestly imagery that of kingly state". But undoubtedly Weiss is right in saying "Durch den Relativsatz soll nicht auf die königliche Herrlichkeit Christi hingewiesen werden". The writer means to magnify Christ's priesthood by reminding his readers that it is exercised "in the heavens"; as he says in ix. 24 he has passed **εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν** into heaven itself, the very presence of God and eternal reality, the ultimate, highest possible. On the words *cf.* note on i. 3. **ἐκάθισεν** is considered by Buttmann to be one of those aorists which stand for the perfect (see his instructive remarks on the aversion to the perfect, *Gram.*, p. 198); but this may be doubted, as the sitting is not mentioned as the permanent attitude, but merely as suggesting the exaltation of the High Priest, and the finality of His purification of sins, as in i. 3. Augustine, *De Fide et symbolo*, 7, warns against the suggested anthropomorphism of the words "sitteth at the right hand" and says "*ad dextram* intelligendum est dictum esse, in summa beatitudine, ubi justitia et pax et gaudium est". Here, however, it is rather Christ's *majesty* that is suggested, and as Pearson on this clause of the Creed says, "The belief of Christ's glorious session is most necessary in respect of the immediate consequence which is his most gracious intercession," rather his *availing* intercession. *Cf.* Hooker, Book V., chap. 55.

οὐρανοῖς, 2. [b] τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς, καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος, καὶ [1] οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. 3. [c] πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ προσφέρειν δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας καθίσταται· ὅθεν ἀναγκαῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκῃ. 4. εἰ μὲν γὰρ [2] ἦν ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐδ' ἂν ἦν ἱερεὺς, ὄντων τῶν ἱερέων [3] τῶν προσφερόντων κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὰ δῶρα,

b ix. 8, 11, 24, et x. 21.
c v. 1; Eph. v. 2.

[1] ADcE**KLP, f, vg., Copt., insert **και**; ℵBD*E* 17, d, e, omit **και**.

[2] T.R. in DcEKL Syrp, Arm.; **ουν** in ℵABD*P, 17, 73, 80, 137, d, e, f, vg.

[3] T.R. in DcE**KL Syrutr, Chrys.; ℵABD*E*P, 17, 73, 137, d, e, f, vg. omit **των ιερεων**.

Ver. 2. **τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργὸς** . . . "a minister of the [true] holy place and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man". **τῶν ἁγίων** not = **τῶν ἡγιασμένων** as Œcumenius translates, but as in ix. 8, 12, 25; x. 19; xiii. 11 = **ἅγια ἁγίων** of ix. 3. In ix. 2, 3, the outer part of the tabernacle is called **ἅγια,** the inner **ἅγια ἁγίων,** but ver. 8 is conclusive proof that **ἅγια** without addition was used for the holiest place. **λειτουργὸς** *cf.* note on i. 14. **καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς,** the ideal, antitypal tabernacle; **ἀληθ.** used as in the fourth gospel in contrast not to what is false, but to what is symbolical. It is to be taken with **ἁγίων** as well as with **σκηνῆς.** *Cf.* Bleek; and see ix. 11, **τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου,** which is the equivalent of the clause added here, **ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος.** See also Mark xiv. 58 and the striking words of Wisdom ix. 8. In a different sense in Numb. xxiv. 6, **ὡσεὶ σκηναὶ ἃς ἔπηξε Κύριος.** According to the fifth verse, man pitched a tabernacle which was a shadow of the true, and the very words in which was uttered the command so to do, might have reminded the people that there was a symbolic and a true tabernacle.

Ver. 3. **πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς.** . . . "For every High Priest is appointed for the offering of gifts and sacrifices, and therefore it was necessary that this man also have something to offer". That Christ is in heaven as a **λειτουργός,** as an active minister in holy things, is proved by the universal law, that every High Priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices. Christ is not idle in heaven, but being there as High Priest He must be offering something; what that is, He has told us in vii. 27, but here no emphasis is on the *what*, but merely on the fact that He must be offering something, must be actively ministering in heaven as a **λειτουργός.** [Bruce therefore overlooks vii. 27 in his interpretation: "He is content for the present to throw out the remark: 'This man must have something to offer,' and to leave his readers for a while to puzzle over the question, What is it?"] With **ἀναγκαῖον** some have understood **ἦν** rather than **ἐστὶ** "necesse fuit habere quod offerret" (Beza) followed by Westcott, etc., on the ground that the reference is to our Lord's presentation to the Father of His finished sacrifice. But it is better to give the word a merely logical and subjective force; it is a necessary inference that this man, etc. Behind and beyond this lies no doubt the reference to Christ's sacrifice. As the High Priest could not enter into the Holiest without the blood of the victim (ix. vii.), so must Jesus accomplish His priestly office by offering His own blood (ix. 12). For the words of the former part of the verse see note on vi. 1.

Ver. 4. **εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ γῆς** . . . "And indeed if He were on earth He would not even be a priest, since there are those who according to law offer the gifts". **μὲν οὖν** = et quidem (Devarius, p. 125) or, it might be rendered "If however," see Hermann's *Viger*, p. 442. Vaughan says: "The **οὖν** is (as usual) *in accordance with the above statement*; here, namely, that *He must have something to offer*". The apodosis in ver. 6. **νυνὶ δὲ.** The argument is, given or assumed as already proved that Christ is our High Priest, it must be in Heaven He exercises His ministry, for if He were on earth, He would not even be a priest, not to say, a High Priest. [As Bleek has it, 'er würde nicht einmal Priester sein,—geschweige denn Hohe priester".] He could not be a priest, because the priestly office on earth is already filled. The law [**κατὰ νόμον**], which can not be interfered with, regulates all that concerns the earthly priesthood (vii. 12), and by this law He is excluded from priestly office, not being of the tribe of Levi (vii. 14). **τὰ δῶρα** "the gifts" further

d x. 1; Exod. xxv. 40; Acts vii. 44; Col. ii. 17.

5. [d] οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσι τῶν ἐπουρανίων, καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωσῆς μέλλων ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν, "Ὅρα," γάρ φησι, "ποιήσῃς[1] πάντα κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ

[1] T.R. in minuscules; ποιησεις in ℵABDEKLP.

emphasises the rigorous prescriptions of the law. The absence of the article before *νόμον* does not necessitate though it suggests the translation "according to law".

Ver. 5. **οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι . . .** "priests who serve a suggestion and shadow of the heavenly things, even as Moses when about to make the tabernacle was admonished, for 'See,' He says, 'that thou make all things after the pattern shown thee in the Mount'". **οἵτινες** with its usual classifying and characterising reference, priests distinguished by the fact that they serve a shadow. **λατρεύουσιν**, originally to work for hire, from **λάτρις**, *a hired servant* (Soph., *Trach.*, 70, etc.), but used especially in classics, LXX, and N.T. of service of God. It is followed by the dative of the person served (see reff.) Heb. ix. 14, xii. 28, and xiii. 10 as here **οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες**. **ὑποδείγματι**, Phrynichus notes, **ὑπόδειγμα· οὐδὲ τοῦτο ὀρθῶς λέγεται· παράδειγμα λέγε.** To which Rutherford adds, "In Attic **ὑποδείκνυμι** was never used except in its natural sense of *show by implication;* but in Herodotus and Xenophon it signifies *to mark out, set a pattern*". The meaning of **ὑπόδειγμα** accordingly is "a sign suggestive of anything," "a delineation," "outline," perhaps "suggestion" would satisfy the present passage. **σκιᾷ**, "an adumbration of a reality which it does not embody" (Vaughan). A shadow has no substance in itself, no independent existence. It merely gives assurance that there is a reality to cast it, but itself is nothing solid or real. So the tabernacle gave assurance of the existence of a real dwelling of God which itself was not. *Cf.* x. 1, and Col. ii. 17. **τῶν ἐπουρανίων**, as in ix. 23 **τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς . . . αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια**, heavenly things, in a comprehensive sense. **καθὼς κεχρημάτισται . . . καθὼς**, *i.e.* the description of the Mosaic tabernacle as a shadow of the heavenly accords with the directions given to Moses in its erection. **κεχρημάτισται**, **χρηματίζω** (from **χρῆμα**) originally means "to transact business," "to advise" or "give answer to those asking advice"; hence "to give a response to those who consult an oracle"; then, dropping all reference to a foregoing consultation, it means "to give a divine command" and in passive to be commanded; see Thayer. The perfect tense is explained by Delitzsch thus: "as thou Moses hast received (in our Scriptures) the divine injunction (which we still read there)". But *cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 82. **ἐπιτελεῖν**, not, to complete what was already begun; but to realise what was determined by God; *cf.* Num. xxiii. 23, and Heb. ix. 6; so that it might be rendered "to bring into being". **Ὅρα γάρ φησιν . . .** He now cites the authoritative injunction referred to and which determines that the earthly tabernacle was but a copy of the heavenly. **γάρ** of course belongs to the writer, not to the quotation, and **φησιν** has for its nominative the **Θεός** implied in **κεχρημάτισται**. **ποιήσεις. . . .** The words are quoted from Exod. xxv. 40 (adding **πάντα** and substituting **δειχθέντα** for **δεδειγμένον**) and are a literal rendering of the Hebrew, so that nothing can be gathered from them regarding N.T. usage. The future indicative being regularly used as a legal imperative (an unclassic usage) it naturally occurs here. **κατὰ τὸν τύπον**, a stamp or impression (**τύπτειν**) struck from a die or seal; hence, a figure, draft, sketch, or pattern. How or in what form this was communicated to the mind of Moses we do not know. "In the Mount," *i.e.*, in Sinai where Moses retired for communion with God, he probably pondered the needs of the people to such good purpose that from suggestions received in Egypt, together with his own divinely guided conceptions, he was able to contrive the tabernacle and its ordinances of worship. It is his spiritual insight and his anticipation of his people's wants which give him his unique place in history. And it is both to trifle and to detract from his greatness to say with some of the Rabbis (*vide* Schoettgen) that models of the Ark and the candlestick and the other equipment descended from heaven, and that Gabriel in a workman's apron showed him how to reproduce the articles shown.

ὄρει". 6. [e] νυνὶ δὲ διαφορωτέρας τέτευχε[1] λειτουργίας, ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστι διαθήκης μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται. 7. Εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν

e vii. 22; 2 Cor. iii. 6.

[1] τετευχε with ℵcBDcE; τετυχε with ℵ*AD*KL, 80, 116; τετυχηκεν with P, 17. Veitch gives τετυχηκα as the Homeric form, τετευχα Arist. and Demosth.; τετυχα here and in Diod., "late if correct".

Ver. 6. νυνὶ δὲ . . . "But, as it is, He hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much He is also mediator of a better covenant, which has been enacted upon better promises." νυνὶ δὲ, *i.e.*, He not being on earth, the δὲ pointing back to μὲν in ver. 4. For νυνὶ δὲ in its *logical* significance, *cf.* ix. 26; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Arist. *Ethics*, I. iv. 4. διαφορωτέρας λειτουργίας, more excellent, as what is heavenly or real is more excellent than what is earthly and symbolic. ὅσῳ καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης, the ministry being a part of the work of mediating the better covenant, it must participate in the superior excellence of that covenant. And the superiority of the covenant consists in this, that it has been legally based on better promises. Had Paul so connected the law and the promises, a quip might have been supposed; but this writer uses νενομ. in its ordinary sense without any allusion to its etymology. What these "better promises" are he shows in vv. 8-12. ἥτις introduces the explanation of the κρείττονος, almost equivalent to "inasmuch as it has been, etc." The μεσίτης (*cf.* xii. 24) is more comprehensive than the ἔγγυος of vii. 22, although μεσίτης is Hellenistic for the Attic μεσέγγυος, and in *Diod. Sic.* iv. 54 μεσίτης has exactly the sense of ἔγγυος. The full title in 1 Tim. ii. 5 μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων presents the mediator as one who negotiates for both parties, and is something more than a guarantor. Moses was μεσίτης of the first covenant (Gal. iii. 19; Exod. xx. 19); so that as already intimated in iii. 1, Christ absorbed in His ministry the work of both Moses and Aaron.

Vv. 7-13. A justification of the establishment of a better covenant, on the grounds (1) that the first covenant was not faultless; (2) that Jeremiah had predicted the introduction of a new covenant (*a*) not like the old, but (*b*) based upon better promises; and (3) that even in Jeremiah's days the first covenant was antiquated by the very title "new" ascribed to that which was then promised.

Ver. 7. εἰ γὰρ ἡ πρώτη... "For if that first had been faultless, no place would have been sought for a second." ἡ πρώτη sc. διαθήκη. πρώτη for προτέρα as in Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 47, and this epistle *passim*. The covenant did not accomplish the purpose for which it was enacted; it did not bring men into spiritual and permanent fellowship with God. *Cf.* vii. 11, 19; Gal. iii. 20. οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος. "There would not have been—as we know there *was*—any demand for a second" (Farrar). Probably, however, ἐζητεῖτο refers to God's purpose, ["Inquisivit Deus locum et tempus opportunum" (Herveius)] not to man's craving; although necessarily the two must concur. τόπος is frequently used in the sense of "room" "opportunity" in later Greek, Rom. xv. 23; Luke xiv. 19; and *cf.* especially Rev. xx. 11. τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῖς. μεμφόμενος γὰρ . . . "For finding fault with them He says, Behold, there come days, etc." The γὰρ obviously refers to ἄμεμπτος and justifies it, "For it is with fault finding, etc." But now the object of the blame is slightly changed. "There is a subtle delicacy of language in the insensible shifting of the blame from the covenant to the people. The covenant itself could hardly be said to be faultless, seeing that it failed to bind Israel to their God; but the true cause of failure lay in the character of the people, not in the law, which was holy, righteous and good" (Rendall). This is the simplest construction and agrees with the ascription of blame in ver. 9. Thayer says "it is more correct to supply αὐτήν, *i.e.*, διαθήκην, which the writer wishes to prove was not faultless, and to join αὐτοῖς with λέγει". No doubt this would be more logically consistent, but the question is, What did the writer say? He seems not to distinguish between the covenant and the people who lived under it. The old covenant was faulty because it did not provide for enabling the people to live up to the terms or conditions of it. *It* was faulty inasmuch as it did not sufficiently provide against *their* faultiness. Ἰδοὺ, κ.τ.λ. The quotation which here occupies five verses is taken from

f Jer. xxxi. 31, etc. δευτέρας ἐζητεῖτο τόπος. 8. f μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς[1] λέγει, "Ἰδού, ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰούδα διαθήκην καινήν· 9. οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἣν ἐποίησα τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐξαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου· ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν, λέγει Κύριος. 10. g ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς

g Jer. xxxi. 33, etc.; Zach. viii. 8.

[1] αυτοις with ℵcBDcEL; αυτους in ℵ*AD*KP, 17, 39, 114, 137, Thdrt., Chrys.

Jeremiah xxxviii. 31-34 in LXX, xxxi. 31-34 A.V. ἡμέραι ἔρχονται is a frequent formula in Jeremiah. καὶ "The ubiquitous Hebrew *and*, serving here the purpose of the ὅτε which might have been expected" (Vaughan). συντελέσω, the LXX has διαθήσομαι, and Augustine (*De Spir. et Lit.* xix.) thinks this word (consummabo) is chosen for the sake of emphasising the sufficiency of the New Covenant. So Delitzsch: "Our author seems here to have purposely selected the συντελέσω to express more clearly the conclusive perfecting power of the new covenant of the gospel." So, too, Weiss, who also calls attention to the fact that it is followed by ἐπὶ as in the expression συντελ. τ. ὀργὴν ἐπὶ . . . But in the face of the occurrence in Jer. xxxiv. 8, (LXX, xli. 8) of the expression συντελέσαι διαθήκην πρὸς . . ., it is precarious to maintain that our author in selecting this word meant more than "complete a covenant". ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ . . ., comprehensive of the whole people of God. Their blameworthy rupture had not severed them from God's grace and faithfulness. διαθήκην καινήν, the expression first occurs in our Lord's institution of the sacrament, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τ. αἵματί μου, repeated in 1 Cor. xi. 25. In 2 Cor. iii. 6, the καινὴ διαθ. is contrasted with τ. παλαιᾶς διαθ. of ver. 14. The new covenant is also called νέα in xii. 24; καινή properly meaning new in character, νέα young or new in date. As in ver. 7 the condemnation of the old implied a promise of the new; so in ver. xiii., the promise of the new is considered as involving the condemnation of the old.

Ver. 9. οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην . . . "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers." These words express negatively wherein the καινότης of the covenant consists. It was not to be a repetition of that which had failed. It was to be framed with a view to avoiding the defects of the old. It must not be such a covenant as dealt in symbols and externals. That former covenant is further defined in the words ἣν ἐποίησα . . ., a clause which is intended to remind the readers that it was through no lack of power or grace on God's part that the covenant had failed. His intention and power to fulfil His part was put beyond doubt by the deliverance from Egypt. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τ. χειρὸς αὐτῶν . . . "sicut nutrix apprehendit manum parvuli, vel qui de fovea per manum attrahit aliquem sive secum ducit" (Herveius). The construction determined by the Hebrew, which, however, has the infinitive not the participle, is, according to Winer (710) "perhaps unusual, but not incorrect." Buttmann, however, (316) condemns it as "a perfectly un-Greek construction" and "nothing more than a thoughtless imitation of the original Hebrew, of which no other similar example is to be found in the N.T." *Cf.* Baruch, ii. 28 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐντειλαμένου σου, κ.τ.λ. *Cf.* Viteau, *Gram.* p. 209-10. On ἐπιλαβ. see ii. 16. ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐνέμειναν "because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord". Both parties abandoned the covenant and so it became null. Bengel's note on this clause is this: "Correlata, uti ver. 10, ex opposito: *Ero eis in Deum, et illi erunt mihi in populum;* sed ratione inversa: populus fecerat initium tollendi foederis prius: in novo omnia et incipit et perficit Deus". The pronouns are emphatic in both clauses κἀγὼ ἠμέλησα αὐτῶν representing וְאָנֹכִי בָּעַלְתִּי בָם which in A.V. is rendered "although I was an husband to them." Grotius suggests a variant in the Hebrew as giving rise to the translation ἠμέλησα but it seems to be justified by an analogous Arabic expression (see Moses Stuart *in loc.* and Bleek).

Ver. 10. ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι . . . "For this is

ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς Θεὸν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν. 11. [h] καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον[1] αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Γνῶθι τὸν Κύριον· ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσί με, ἀπὸ μικροῦ

[h] x. 16; Joan. vi. 45, 65. 1 Joan. ii. 27.

[1] T.R. in P, f, vg., Syrp.mg; πολιτην in ℵABDEKL, d, e, Copt.

the covenant which I will covenant with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord." The ὅτι justifies the differentiation of this covenant from the Sinaitic, and the ascription to it of the term "new". It also introduces the positive aspect of the newness of the covenant. This consists in three particulars. It is inward or spiritual; it is individual and therefore universal; it is gracious and provides forgiveness. **μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας**, *i.e.*, after the days, spoken of ver. 8, have arrived. **διδοὺς νόμους μου . . .** The LXX (vat.) has **διδοὺς δώσω**, but this writer omits **δώσω** in x. 16 as well as here. The participle cannot be attached either to **διαθήσομαι** or to **ἐπιγράψω** without intolerable harshness. We must, therefore, suppose that the writer was simply quoting from the Alexandrian text which omits **δώσω** (so also Q = Codex Marchalianus), and does not concern himself about the elegance or even correct grammar of the words. See Buttmann, p. 291. **νόμους μου.** "The plural occurs again in the same quotation, x. 16, but not elsewhere in the N.T.; nor does the plural appear to be found in any other place of the LXX as a translation ot תּוֹרָה" Westcott. **εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν.** "In Aristotle **διάνοια** includes *all* intellect, theoretical and practical, intuitive and discursive" (Burnet's *Nic. Eth.*, p. 276). Plato defines it in *Soph.* 263 E thus: **ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς αὑτὴν διάλογος ἄνευ φωνῆς γιγνόμενος.** In N.T. it is sometimes used for the "mind," as in Eph. iv. 18, 1 Pet. i. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 1; sometimes for the thoughts produced in the mind, Eph. ii. 3; sometimes for the inner man generally, as in Luke i. 51, Col. i. 21. And in this sense here. **καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν** "and on their heart". **καρδίας** may be either genitive singular, or accusative plural, both constructions being found after **γράφειν ἐπί.** The meaning is that God's law, instead of being written on tables of stone, should under the new covenant be written on the spirit and desires of man. "Unde significavit eos non forinsecus habere, sed ipsam legis justitiam dilecturos" (Atto). This "better promise" involves a new spirit, effecting that man's own will shall concur with the divine. *Cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 3. **καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς . . .** "and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people". For the distinction between the Hebraistic construction **ἔσομαι εἰς** and the legitimate Greek **εἶναι** or **γένεσθαι εἰς** see Buttmann, p. 150. This of course was the aim of the old covenant as well, and is expressed in the original promise, Exod. vi. 7: "I will take you to myself as my people, and I shall be to you a God". See also Jerem. vii. 23. xi. 4. This is the ultimate statement of the end or aim of all religion.

Ver 11. **καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν. . . .** "And they shall not teach, each man his fellow-citizen and each man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' for all shall know me from small to great among them". This second "better" promise follows on the first as its natural consequence. The inward acceptance of God's will involves the knowledge of God. In the new covenant all were to be "taught of God" (Isa. liv. 13, Jo. vi. 45) and independent of the instruction of a privileged class. Under the old covenant, none but the educated scribe could understand the minutiæ of the law with which religion was identified. The elaborate ritual made it impossible for the private individual to know whether a ram or a pigeon was the appropriate sacrifice for his sin, or whether his sin was mortal or venial. A priest had to be consulted. Under the new covenant intermediates were to be abolished. The knowledge of God was to lie in the heart alongside of the love of parent or friend, and would demand for its expression no more external instruction than those primal, instinctive and home-grown affections. **οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν,** "The intensive **οὐ μὴ** (of that which *in no wise* will or shall happen) is sometimes—indeed most commonly—joined with the conjunctive aorist, sometimes with the conjunctive present, sometimes also with the indicative future". Winer, p. 634, who also discusses Hermann's canon and Dawes' regarding this form. **εἰδήσουσιν,** for

i Rom. xi. 27.

αὐτῶν ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν· 12. [i]ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι." 13. Ἐν τῷ λέγειν "Καινὴν," πεπαλαίωκε τὴν πρώτην· τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον, ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ.

a Exod. xxv. 8.

IX. 1. [a]ΕΙΧΕ μὲν οὖν καὶ [1] ἡ πρώτη σκηνὴ [2] δικαιώματα λατρείας,

[1] και in ℵADEKLP, d, e, f, vg., Syrp, Arm.; om. in B, 3, 38, 52, Syrsch, Copt., Thphyl.

[2] σκηνη omitted in ℵABDEKLP, f, vg., and by T., Tr., WH, R.; found in 47, 73, 74, 80, 137, Thdrt.

this form of the future Veitch (p. 216) quotes Homer, Theognis, Herodotus, Isocrates. ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, an expression commonly used in LXX to denote universality, Gen. xix. 11, where possibly it is equivalent to ἀπὸ νεανίσκου ἕως πρεσβυτέρου of ver. 4; 1 Sam. xxx. 19, where it is used of spoils of war. Gesenius (117, 2) understands the adjectives as superlatives.

Ver. 12. ὅτι ἵλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν . . . "For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and their sins will I remember no more." This third better promise is united to the former by ὅτι, showing that the forgiveness of sins or God's grace is fundamental to any possible renewal and maintenance of covenant.

Ver. 13. ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινήν. "In saying 'New,' He hath antiquated the first; and that which is antiquated and growing old is near extinction [lit. disappearance]." That is to say, by speaking in the passage quoted, ver. 8, of a new covenant, God brands the former as old. Thus even in Jeremiah's time the Mosaic covenant was disparaged. The fact that a new was required showed that it was insufficient. It was condemned as antiquated. And that which is antiquated and aged has not much longer to live. πεπαλαίωκεν, the active is found in LXX, Job. ix. 5; xxxii. 15, etc.; the mid. is common, in Plato and elsewhere in the sense of "growing old". ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ, *cf.* ἐγγὺς κατάρας, vi. 8. ἀφανισμός, is suggestive of utter destruction, abolition; thus in *Polyb.* v. 11, 5 it is joined with ἀπώλεια. *Cf. Diod. Sic.* v. 32, ἀποκτείνουσιν, ἢ κατακαίουσιν, ἢ τισιν ἄλλαις τιμωρίαις ἀφανίζουσι.

CHAPTER IX. Ver. 1-14. The insufficiency of the first covenant is further illustrated from the character of its ordinances. For it was not devoid of elaborate and impressive appointments and regulations for worship, but these only pictured their own inefficiency. Especially did the exclusion from the holiest place of all but the High Priest, who himself could only enter once a year, and with blood, signify that so long as these ordinances remained there could be no perfect approach of the worshipper to God. But this approach was achieved by Christ who ministered in the tabernacle not made with hands, and by His own blood cleansed the conscience and thus brought men into true fellowship with God.

CHAPTER IX. Ver. 1. Εἶχε μὲν οὖν καὶ ἡ πρώτη . . . "Even the first covenant, however, had ordinances of worship and the holy place suitable to this world," *i.e.*, as hinted in viii. 2, a tent pitched by man, constructed with earthly materials, "of this creation," ver. 11., and thus appealing to sense. Farrar renders "and its sanctuary—a material one". οὖν is continuative, and might almost be rendered "to resume". μὲν find its correlative δὲ in ver. 6; the first covenant had, indeed, a sanctuary with elaborate arrangements, but after all it was only a symbol. That διαθήκη, not σκηνή, is to be understood after πρώτη, is demanded by the context and is now universally recognised. So Chrysostom, ἡ πρώτη, τίς; ἡ διαθήκη. Of the reading σκηνή Calvin says, "nec dubito, quin aliquis indoctus lector, pro sua inscitia . . . perperam addiderit." εἶχε at first sight seems to require us to date the epistle after the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is quite possible that, as Delitzsch says, the writer is looking back upon the old from the platform of the new covenant. "The author in saying *had* merely looks back from his own historical position to the Mosaic tabernacle and its ordinances, which are everywhere assumed as the standard of the O.T. things; the past 'had' no more implies that the O.T. ministry had passed away in fact or even in principle, than the present 'go in' (ver. 6) implies the reverse" (Davidson.) δικαιώματα λατρείας. δικ-

τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν· 2. [b]Σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη, ἡ πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ ἥ τε λυχνία καὶ ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων· ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια[1]. 3. μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα σκηνὴ ἡ

b Exod. xxv. 30, et xxvi. 1, etc., et xxxvi. 1, etc.; Lev. xxiv. 5.

[1] Add αγιων AD*E, d, e.

αιώματα is used, because the writer wishes to draw attention to the fact that the ritual of the first covenant was divinely appointed. He does this because he means to point out (vv. 8, 9) that the Holy Spirit intended these arrangements to be a parable of their own incompetence and transitory nature. **κοσμικόν** is best illustrated in Rendel Harris' *Teaching of the Apostles*, p. 71 ff. He has collected a number of passages from early Christian writers which show that a "cosmic" mystery or symbol was "a symbol or action wrought upon the stage of this world to illustrate what was doing or to be done on a higher plane". His quotation from Athanasius is especially convincing **Ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ κυρίῳ, οὕτω καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν πᾶσι. ἀπ' αὐτῶν γὰρ τῶν κοσμικῶν, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, καὶ τὰ ἄνω νοοῦμεν.** This significant word standing at the close of the sentence sufficiently indicates the incompetence of the whole. The first covenant had its holy place but it was **κοσμικόν**. For the same reason he goes on to enumerate the articles contained in the **ἅγιον**. He wishes to bring before us the care with which all its arrangements were made: nothing was haphazard and meaningless. The succeeding verses are indeed the resumption of viii. 5, "See that you make *all* things according to the type shown thee in the mount".

Ver 2. **σκηνὴ γὰρ κατεσκευάσθη . . .** "For a tent was constructed, the fore-tent, in which were" its appropriate contents. **σκηνή**, a tent. "Observandum est in primis hanc descriptionem non ad templum sed ad tabernaculum accommodari; quia nimirum noster hic scriptor ea proprie quae Moses secundum exemplar ipsi in monte propositum fabricavit, cum rebus ipsis coelestibus comparat" (Beza). On the construction in which the noun is first conceived indefinitely and is then more clearly defined by the attributive, whose import thus receives special prominence, see Winer, p. 174. **ἡ πρώτη**, the outer, that into which anyone *first* entered, twice the size of the inner and entered from the east (see Macgregor on Exodus, and appendix by Gillies on construction of tabernacle). Large tents were usually divided into an outer and an inner, a first and a second. And a tent being windowless, **ἡ λυχνία** was a necessary article of furniture; the lamp-stand, or "candlestick" reminding men that the light of day, the light common to all, was not sufficient to guide to God. *Cf.* Exod. xxv. 31-39; and Zech., c. iv. **καὶ ἡ τράπεζα** for the making of the table instructions are recorded in Exod. xxv. 23-30, concluding with the injunction "Thou shalt set upon the table showbread before me alway." In Lev. xxiv. 6 it is called "the pure table," because made of "pure" gold. **καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων** "and the setting forth of the loaves" called in Exod. xl. 23 (P.) "loaves of the setting forth". In Exod. xxv. 30 the command is given **ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τ. τράπεζαν ἄρτους ἐνωπίους ἐναντίον μου**, the loaves here being called לֶחֶם פָּנִים bread of the face or presence. In Lev. xxiv. 5-9 minute instructions for their composition are given and for their "setting forth," and it is added **ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τ. Κυρίου.** In 1 Chron. the loaves are called **τ. προθέσεως** translating לֶחֶם הַמַּעֲרֶכֶת bread of the row. On the meaning of the "show bread" see Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, 207 ff. "The table of show bread has its closest parallel in the *lectisternia* of ancient heathenism, when a table laden with meats was spread beside the idol." "But the idea that the gods actually consume the solid food that is deposited at their shrines is too crude to subsist without modification beyond the savage state of society; the ritual may survive, but the sacrificial gifts . . . will come to be the perquisite of the priests '. *Cf.* Warde Fowler's *Roman Festivals*, 215-20. **ἥτις λέγεται ἅγια.** "The qualitative relative directs attention to the features of the place which determine its name as 'Holy'" (Westcott). **ἅγια** is neuter plural, as in ver. 3. So Theodoret rejecting the reading **ἁγία**. For this name see Lev. x. 4; Num. iii. 22; but in LXX always with the article, here omitted, possibly, to bring out more prominently the holy character of the place.

Ver. 3. **μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον**

c Exod. xvi. 33, et xxv. 10, 21, et xxvi. 33, et xxxiv. 29; Num. xvii. 10; 1 Reg. viii. 9; 2 Par. v. 10.

λεγομένη ἅγια ἁγίων, 4. [c]χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον, καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν τῆς διαθήκης περικεκαλυμμένην πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ᾗ στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστή-

καταπέτασμα. "And after the second veil the tent which is called 'Holy of Holies,'" not, as Westcott, "a tent [was prepared] which is called," for "when attributives are placed after with the article, the article before the substantive is dropped" (Buttmann, p. 92). The participle with the article as usual takes the place of a relative clause. **μετὰ** in a local sense [non-classical, Blass, p. 133], which is here closely akin to the temporal = after the entrant has passed the second veil. The second veil separated the Holy place from the Holy of Holies, and as being the significant veil was sometimes spoken of without **δεύτερον,** simply as **τὸ καταπέτασμα,** see chap. vi. 19; Mat. xxvii. 51, etc. Instructions for making and hanging it are given in Exod. xxvi. 31-35; and in ver. 36 the outer veil is described. The outer veil is sometimes called **καταπέτασμα** but more commonly **ἐπίσπαστρον,** Exod. xxvi. 36, xxxv. 15 etc. The inner tent was called the **ἅγια ἁγίων,** translating קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים which in Hebrew idiom is equivalent to a superlative.

Ver. 4. **χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον. . . .** The inner tent is characterised by its furnishings, a golden altar of incense and the ark of the covenant. **θυμιατήριον** is rendered both in A.V. and R.V. by "censer" following the Vulgate, "aureum habens thuribulum;" Grotius "**θυμ**: hic non est mensa, sed impositum mensae *batillum*;" and others. In doing so the usage of the LXX is followed, for in 2 Chron. xxvi. 19, Ezek. viii. 11, 4 Mac. vii. 11—the only instances of its occurrence—it renders מִקְטֶרֶת = censer; while "altar of incense" is rendered by **θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος,** see Lev. iv. 7, 1 Chron. vii. 49, etc. But Philo (p. 512 A, 668, C), Josephus *Ant.*, iii. 6, 8, and the versions of Symmachus and Theodotion in Exod. xxxi. use **θυμιατήριον** for "altar of incense". Besides, the form of the word indicates that it could be used of anything on which incense is offered. It was, therefore, understood of the "altar" by Clement Alex. and other fathers; by Calvin, who says, "quo nomine altare suffitus vel thymiamatis potius intelligo quam thuribulum;" and by most modern scholars. As has frequently been urged it is incredible that in describing the furniture of the tabernacle there should be no mention of the altar of incense. Difficulty has been felt regarding the position here assigned to it, for in fact it stood outside the veil; and the author has been charged with error. But the change from **ἐν ᾗ** of ver. 2 to **ἔχουσα** is significant, and indicates that it was not precisely its local relations he had in view, but rather its ritual associations, "its close connection with the ministry of the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement, of which he is speaking" (Davidson). The altar was indeed so strictly connected with the Sancta Sanctorum that in the directions originally given for its construction this was brought out (Exod. xxx. 1-6). "Thou shalt set it before the veil (**ἀπέναντι τ. καταπετάσματος**) that is over the ark of the testimony," and in ver. 10, "it is most holy (**ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων**) to the Lord". In 1 Kings vi. 20 it is also said of Solomon that he made the altar of incense **κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβίρ** "in front of the oracle," which brings it into direct connection with the ark *Cf.* also 1 Kings ix. 25. **χρυσοῦν,** although made of shittim wood it was overlaid with gold and is often called "golden". Here emphasis is laid upon its golden appearance as being worthy of its use. **καὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν . . .** "and the ark of the covenant covered all over with gold". **κιβωτός,** a box or chest (in Aristoph. *Wasps*, 1056, wardrobe) or ark (a word still used in Scotland, where the meal-chest is known as the meal-ark). In LXX and N.T. appropriated to the chest in the Holy of Holies or to the ark in which Noah was rescued. For its construction see Exod. xxv. 10. **περικεκ. πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ** representing "inside and outside" **ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν χρυσώσεις αὐτήν** of Exod. xxv. 11. Here called **τῆς διαθήκης** because in it were kept **αἱ πλάκες τ. διαθήκης** "the tables of the covenant" on which were written the ten commandments, the sum of the terms to which the people swore on entering the covenant. Therefore called in Exod. xxxi. 18 **πλάκες**

σασα, καὶ αἱ πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· 5. [d] ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς Χερουβὶμ [1] δόξης, κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον· περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἔστι νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος. 6. [e] Τούτων δὲ οὕτω κατεσκευασμένων, εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν διαπαντὸς εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπι-

d Exod. xxv. 18.

e Num. xxviii. 3.

[1] χερουβειν in BDcE; χερουβειμ AP, 37. The LXX also has the same variants.

μαρτυρίου. These tables were, in LXX, first spoken of as πυξία (τὰ πυξία τὰ λίθινα, Exod. xxiv. 12). They are called πλάκες in Exod. xxxi. 18. Paul also uses this word in contrasting the stone tables of the Law with the σάρκιναι πλάκες of the heart. In 1 Kings viii. 9 it is stated that when Solomon's Temple was dedicated these tables were the sole contents of the ark. In the tabernacle, however, as here described the ark also contained στάμνος χρυσῆ ἔχουσα τὸ μάννα "a golden jar containing manna," as directed in Exod. xvi. 33, 34, Moses said to Aaron λάβε στάμνον χρυσοῦν ἕνα, where it is masculine; in Aristoph. *Plut.* 545, feminine (see Stephanus, s.v.). Usually it was of earthenware and used for holding wine, honey, etc. τὸ μάννα in Exod. μάν is the form used; in the other books μάννα. καὶ ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρὼν ἡ βλαστήσασα, as related in Num. xvii. 1-10, when the rods of the tribes were laid up before the Lord to determine who were the legitimate priests, ἰδοὺ ἐβλάστησεν ἡ ῥάβδος Ἀαρών. Chrysostom remarks that the contents of the ark were venerable and significant memorials of Israel's rebellion; the tables of the covenant for the first were broken on account of their sin; the manna reminding them of their murmuring; the rod that budded of their jealousy of Aaron.

ὑπεράνω δὲ αὐτῆς χερουβεὶν δόξης . . . "And over it [the ark] Cherubim of glory, overshadowing the mercy-seat" ["obumbrantia propitiatorium" (Vulg.)]. According to Exod. xxv. 18-22, the Cherubim were to be two in number, made of gold, one at each end of the ark, looking towards one another, and overshadowing the mercy seat with their wings [συσκιάζοντες ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου]. The Cherubim seem to have symbolised, in the manner of the Assyrians and Egyptians, the creatures of God, all that is best in creation, by a combination of excellences found in no single creature. In Ezekiel, i. 10 they have four faces, of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, representing respectively intelligence, strength, steadfastness, rapidity. But *cf.* Davidson, p. 173 and Cheyne's art. in *Encycl. Bibl.* δόξης, the Cherubim are here called "of glory," probably because closely attached to and, as it were, attendant upon, the place of the manifestation of the divine glory. ["Als *Träger* der Herrlichkeit, in welcher die göttliche Gnadengegenwart sich kund that" (Weiss).] τὸ ἱλαστήριον. In Exod. xxv. 17 Moses is instructed to make a golden cover [כַּפֹּרֶת] to be laid upon the lid of the ark, and this instruction the LXX renders by the words ποιήσεις ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ. The word ἐπίθεμα alone, without any qualifying adjective, would have been an adequate translation of כַּפֹּרֶת, for both words mean "a cover". But ἐπίθεμα is nowhere else used in the LXX to translate כַּפֹּרֶת, which is regularly translated by ἱλαστήριον, although this word does not express the idea of a material covering. [Philo more than once remarks upon this. In *De Profug.*, 19, in speaking of symbols, he says τῆς ἵλεω δυνάμεως τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἱλαστήριον. And in *Vit. Mos.* iii. 68, ἧς ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πῶμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον.] The reason of this usage is to be found in the fact that this "cover" was sprinkled with blood on the day of atonement, and came, therefore, to be associated with the *covering* of sin. Indeed, the Hebrew word which denotes the material covering is that which is regularly used to express the covering of sin. The original ἐπίθεμα thus became a ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα and finally ἱλαστήριον. (See Deissmann, *Bibelstud.* p. 121-132.) περὶ ὧν . . . μέρος "of which we cannot now speak in detail". ἔστιν, as commonly in classical Greek = ἔξεστι. κατὰ μέρος = one by one. Examples in Wetstein and Bleek (see especially Plato, *Theaet.* 157B, where it is opposed to ἄθροισμα).

Vv. 6-10. Significance of these arrangements.

Ver. 6. τούτων δὲ οὕτως κατεσκευασμένων . . . "And after these things had been thus furnished, into the fore-tent, indeed, the priests enter con-

f ver. 25; Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi. 2, 15, 34.

τελοῦντες· 7. [f] εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, ὃ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ

tinually in the performance of their services, but into the inner the High Priest alone once a year not without blood." This is the particular δικαίωμα λατ. (ver. 1) to which he wishes to direct attention, the inaccessible sacredness of the inner chamber, as revealed in the constant openness of the outer-tent, the mysterious closeness of the inner. κατεσκευασμένων perfect; the arrangements were made with a view to the abiding service of the first covenant. διαπαντὸς, continuously, opposed to ἅπαξ. ver. 7. εἰσίασιν present tense, as in Homer, Aristoph., Plato, Xenophon. It is not easy to determine whether this present implies the contemporaneous continuance of the services referred to. Tholuck thinks Bleek very "unreasonable" in concluding that it involves that the ark and the services connected with it were extant; but Bleek after reconsideration, finds himself unable to yield the point to "Freund Tholuck". Davidson says, "The present 'go in' does not imply that the Levitical service still continued when this was written; the present is that of the record in Scripture." The Vulgate shows its preference by tendering "introibant". The truth seems to be that although the temple services were yet upheld, the use of the present tense here and in vv. 7, 11, etc., does not involve that. τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες, not, as Vulg., "sacrificiorum officia consummantes," for these rather belonged to the court of the priests; but "performing their services" of trimming the lamp and offering incense; see Edersheim, *The Temple: Its ministry, etc.*, p. 130-140. ἐπιτελεῖν is used in Herod. and in Diod. Sic., and in Philo, for the accomplishing of religious services but it is not so used in the LXX.

Ver. 7. εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ . . . The law is given in Lev. xvi., both negatively and positively; negatively in ver. 2 μὴ εἰσπορευέσθω πᾶσαν ὥραν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ἐσώτερον τ. καταπετάσματος—promiscuous or continuous, daily entrance was forbidden; and positively, in ver 34 ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, *i.e.*, one day each year, *viz.*, on the day of Atonement, the tenth of the seventh month the High Priest is to enter. On that day the High Priest was to enter the Holiest at least *thrice*, first with the incense, then with the blood of the bullock which atoned for his own sins and those of his house, and finally with the blood of the goat for the sins of the people. μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς in contrast with οἱ ἱερεῖς of ver. 6. This point is also emphasised by Philo, *De Mon.*, p. 821 E., where he says that the things inside the veil were hidden from everyone πλὴν ἑνὶ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, and by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* v. 5, 7) εἰσῄει ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν μόνος. See also Lev. xvi. 17. The law was emphasised by the destruction of Nadab and Abhu, Lev. x. 1. The Holiness of the Presence and the difficulty of access was further illustrated and enforced by the demand that sacrifice should open the way οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος. This blood was offered, *i.e.*, sprinkled with the finger on the ἱλαστήριον, first, the blood of the calf to cleanse from his own sins, and then, the blood of the goat to atone for the people's sins. [ἑαυτοῦ is manifestly under the direct government of ὑπὲρ and does not follow ἀγνοημάτων. This word does not occur in Lev. xvi.; on the contrary the strongest words are used, ἀνομία, ἁμαρτία, ἀδικία, but *cf.* v. 2.] These three points, then, bring out the impossibility of free access to the Presence; not διαπαντὸς but ἅπαξ τ. ἐνιαυτοῦ; not οἱ ἱερεῖς promiscuously, but μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς; not freely, but οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος. This was the δικαίωμα λατρείας which could not be neglected under pain of death. What did it signify? τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τ. πνεύματος . . . "*this* the Holy Spirit signifying, that the way into the Holy of Holies has not yet been made manifest, while the fore-tent has still a place". δηλοῦντος, the Holy Spirit is viewed as the author of the ritual and as meaning to teach by every part of it. Vaughan compares 1 Pet. i. 11 and adds, "As there O.T. *prophecy*, so here O.T. *ritual*, is ascribed to the Holy Spirit." τὴν τ. ἁγίων ὁδὸν "the way into the Holiest" as in viii. 2. Access to the Holy of Holies being thus barred was an intimation that the true access to God had not yet been furnished and that therefore worship and fellowship with God (that is, religion) were not yet perfect. [*Cf.* Theoph. ἡ τ. ἁγίων ὁδός, τουτέστιν ἡ εἰς τ. οὐρανὸν εἴσοδος. Weiss, "der Weg zum himmlischen Heiligthum".] So long as the fore-tent (τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς) has an appointed

λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων 8. [g] τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν, ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης στάσιν· 9. [h] ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, καθ' ὃν[1] δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται, μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα, 10. [i] μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασι καὶ πόμασι καὶ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς, καὶ δικαιώμασι[2] σαρκός, μέχρι

g x., 19, 20; Joan. xiv. 6.
h Acts xiii. 39; Gal. iii. 21.
i Lev. xi. 2; Num. xix. 7, etc.

[1] ον in DcEKLP; ην in ℵABD*, 17, 27, 71, 73, 137, f, vg.

[2] δικαιωμασι in DcEKL, f, vg., Syrp; δικαιωματα (sine και) in ℵABP, 6, 17, 27, 31, 73, 137.

place as part of the Divine arrangements for worship (ἐχούσης στάσιν as in *Polyb.* v. 5, 3) this signifies that the very Presence of God is inaccessible. The very object of the division of the Tabernacle into two rooms, an outer and an inner, was to impress men with the fact that the way of access had not actually been disclosed (πεφανερῶσθαι). Hence the appropriateness of the rending of the veil as the symbol that by the perfected work and sacrifice of Christ the new and living way (x. 20) was opened.

Ver. 9. ἥτις παραβολὴ εἰς . . . "for this is a parable for the time [then] present," for the contemporary period. ἥτις has for its antecedent σκηνῆς. This is the simplest construction (*Cf.* Winer, p. 207). That suggested by Primasius and Vaughan—"Which thing (the fact of there being a πρώτη σκηνὴ separate from the Holy of Holies) was a parable"—is grammatically admissible. εἰς τ. καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, "for the time being". In the usual division of time into past, present and future, the present was termed ὁ ἐνεστώς. But present to whom? Several interpreters reply, To those living under the Christian dispensation. So especially Delitzsch and Alford. But N.T. usage, and especially the usage of this Epistle which speaks of the Christian dispensation as "the coming age" (vi. 5), "the future world" (ii. 5), indicates that "the present time" must refer to the O.T. period. Besides, the opposition to καιρὸς διορθώσεως points in the same direction; as also does the clause under καθ' ἥν. εἰς is here "with reference to". And the meaning is, that the outer tent which did not itself contain God's presence, but rather stood barring access to it, was a parable of the entire dispensation. In other words, this Tabernacle arrangement was a striking symbol of the Mosaic economy which could not of itself effect spiritual approach and abiding fellowship with God. The Levitical δικαιώματα themselves, on the ground of which all these arrangements proceed, emphatically declared their own inadequacy. Wrapped up in them was the truth that they could not bring the worshipper into God's presence. καθ' ἣν δῶρά τε . . . "in accordance with which [parable] are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot perfect him that doth the service as regards conscience, being only ordinances of the flesh resting upon meats and drinks and divers washings, imposed until a time of rectification". καθ' ἥν- referring to παραβολή; it is in accordance with the parabolic significance of the Tabernacle and its arrangements, that gifts and sacrifices were offered which could only purge the flesh, not the conscience. μὴ δυνάμεναι, Winer's note (p. 608) is misleading. *Cf.* Jebb's Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's *Modern Greek*, p. 340. "In later Greek, μή tended to usurp the place of οὐ," especially with participles. *Cf.* Blass, 255. κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι means, to give to the worshipper the consciousness that he is inwardly cleansed from defilement and is truly in communion with God; to bring conscience finally into peace.

Ver. 10. μόνον ἐπὶ βρώμασιν . . . μόνον evidently introduces the positive aspect of the virtue of the "gifts and sacrifices," thus more closely defining μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι . . . the gifts and sacrifices are not able to bring the worshipper into a final rest *as regards conscience*, only having effect so far as regards meats and drinks and divers washings—ordinances of the flesh, not of the conscience, imposed until a time of rectification. The change of preposition from κατὰ to ἐπὶ need excite no surprise (*cf.* Aristotle's frequent change of preposition, *e.g.*, *Eth. Nic.*, iv. 3, 26); and here there is a slight distinction in the reference. ἐπὶ has frequently the meaning "in connection with," "with regard to" as in Luke xii. 52; John xii.

k iii. 1, et iv. 14, et vi. 20, et viii. 1.

καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα. 11. [k] Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων[1] ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας

[1] μελλοντων in ℵADcEKLP, f, vg., Copt., Basm., Syrp.mg; γενομενων in BD*, d, e, Syrp text. But the former was more likely to be changed into the latter reading than *vice versâ*.

16; Acts xxi. 24 [see especially Donaldson's excellent treatment of this preposition (*Greek Gram.*, p. 518) showing that with the dative it signifies *absolute superposition*, *i.e.*, *rest upon*, or *close to*, hence addition, subsequence and succession, then "that which is close by us as a suggesting cause, accompaniment, motive, or condition". ἐπὶ τοῖς τ. φίλων ἀγαθοῖς φαιδροὶ γιγνόμεθα, "we are cheerful on account of the prosperity of our friends". ὀνομάζοι δὲ πάντα ταῦτα ἐπὶ ταῖς δόξαις τοῦ μεγάλου ζώου "but were to give all these things names from in accordance with) the opinions of the great monster" (Plato, *Rep.* 493, c).] The meaning then is that the virtue (δυνάμεναι) of the gifts and sacrifices is only in relation to defilements occasioned by eating and drinking or neglecting the enjoined purifications. δικαιώματα σαρκὸς may either be construed as a contemptuous exclamation appended, or it may be softened by οὖσαι "which are". μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως "usque ad tempus correctionis". διόρθωσις is a making straight or right; used by Hippocrates of reducing a fracture, by Aristotle of repairing roads and houses, by Polybius of paying debts, of education, etc. It means, putting things right, bringing matters into a satisfactory state, and is thus used of the introduction of the new covenant, in confirmation of viii. 8. No term could better express this writer's view of the characteristic of Messianic times.

Ver. 11. Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος . . . "But Christ having arrived a High Priest of the good things that were to be, He, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, nor yet through blood of he-goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered once for all into the Holy of Holies, and obtained eternal redemption." The main thought of the verse is that Christ has obtained eternal redemption; the δὲ, therefore, which introduces it, refers to the inability of the Levitical gifts and sacrifices to perfect the worshipper. The greater efficiency of Christ's ministry results from its being exercised in a more perfect tabernacle and with a truer sacrifice. παραγενόμενος, scarcely, as Vulg. "assistens" rather "having arrived," as in Matt. ii. 1, iii. 1, 13; and frequently in Luke and Acts. *Cf.* Isa. lxii. 11. Ἰδού σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται . . . Here it is in fulfilment of the expectation aroused by μέχρι. ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελ. "The genitive gives the *subject* of the high priestly action. *High Priest, concerned about, ministering in, securing and applying by His ministry* τὰ μέλλ. ἀγαθά. The genitive here is nearly equivalent to the accusative τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν in ii. 17" (Vaughan). The good things that were to be under the new covenant are specified in viii. 10-12; they surpassed all expectation, however. "The High Priest" of the good things coming, is a notable title. Possibly it is only equivalent to "High Priest of the new covenant," the contents being used to stand for the whole dispensation, but more probably the writer has in view the slender benefits obtained by the Levitical High Priest, and contrasts them with the illimitable good mediated by Christ. διὰ τῆς . . . σκηνῆς . . . οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως. The meaning of διὰ in ver. 11 favours the understanding of it here not in a local (Weiss, etc.) but an instrumental sense, "by means of". It was because He was High Priest not in the earthly but the heavenly tabernacle that He was able to secure these great results. No doubt διὰ in a similar connection in iv. 14 and x. 20 is used locally. But this sense is not so applicable here. Christ is represented here as the High Priest ministering in the tabernacle, not passing through it (*Cf.* Davidson and Westcott). τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελ. σκηνῆς, the tabernacle greater and more perfect than that which has been described in the preceding verses, and which has itself been mentioned as the scene of Christ's ministry, viii. 2. This tabernacle is "not made with hands" οὐ χειροποιήτου, as in ver. 24; equivalent to ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ Κύριος οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, viii. 2. Our Lord characterised the temple as χειροποίητον, Mark xiv. 58. Being of human manufacture, viii. 2, it could be only a symbolic dwelling for God and a symbolic worship was appropriate. The words οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως are added in ex-

σκηνῆς, οὐ χειροποιήτου, τουτέστιν, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, 12. [l] οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. 13. [m] εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων καὶ σποδὸς δαμάλεως ῥαντίζουσα

l x. 10; Acts xx. 28; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; 1 Peter i. 19; Apoc. i. 5, et v. 9.

m x. 4; Lev. xvi. 14, 16; Num. xix. 2, 4.

planation, although, as Bleek remarks, they are certainly no clearer than the words they are meant to explain. They are, however, more significant; for they point out that the tabernacle in which Christ ministers does not belong to this world at all, has no place among created things and is thus in striking contrast to the ἅγιον κοσμικόν of ver. 1. It must, however, be acknowledged that Field (*Otium Norv.*, p. 229) has shown reason for believing that we should translate "not of ordinary erection". "By ταύτης I understand *vulgaris, quae vulgo dicitur*"; and κτίσις he sees no occasion to take in any other sense than that in which κτίζειν is commonly applied to a city (3 Esd. iv. 53) or to the tabernacle itself (Lev. xvi. 16). This meaning of ταύτης, though warranted by the LXX cited by Field is, however, rare; and the sense is a little flat, whereas the other interpretation is full of significance.

Ver. 12. οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων . . . Not only was the place of ministry different, the sacrifice offered also was different. "Not without blood," could the High Priest make his annual entry (ver. 7), but it was with the blood of a calf for himself and of a he-goat for the people. In LXX of Lev. xvi. the τράγος is uniformly called χίμαρος but in Aquila's version τράγος is used in ver. 8 and in Symmachus in vv. 8 and 10. διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, "So only could He enter *for us*. As the Eternal Son He has a right there; as the High Priest of man, He enters in virtue of the sacrifice of Himself" (Vaughan). ἐφάπαξ, as in vii. 27, in contrast to the ever-recurring annual entrance; and preparing the way for the statement of the last clause, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος. Rutherford (*New Phryn.*, p. 215) says εὑράμην for εὑρόμην represents a common corruption of late Greek, but Veitch seems to think instances of its occurrence in Attic have been tampered with. See Tholuck *in loc.*; and Blass, *G.G.*, p. 45. Probably the aorist participle here expresses the result of the action of the main verb, εἰσῆλθεν. "But it is possible that εἰσῆλθεν is used to describe the whole High Priestly act, including both the entrance into the holy place and the subsequent offering of the blood, and that εὑράμενος is thus a participle of identical action. In either case it should be translated not *having obtained* as in R.V. but *obtaining* or *and obtained*" (Burton *M. & T.*, 66). [Weiss accurately "Der nachgestellte Participialsatz drückt aus, was in und mit diesem Eingehen geschah".] On the use of the Mid. in N.T. see Thayer, *s.v.* Here it can only mean that Christ obtained salvation by offering Himself. λύτρωσις must, in consistency with the passage, be understood of the deliverance from guilt which enabled the worshipper to enter God's presence. From this flow all other spiritual blessings. It is here termed αἰωνία in contrast to the deliverance achieved by the Levitical High Priest, which had to be repeated year by year. Christ obtained a redemption which was absolute and for ever valid.

Ver. 13. εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα . . . "For if the blood of goats and bulls and an heifer's ashes sprinkling the unclean purify as regards the cleanness of the flesh, how much rather shall the blood of the Christ, who through eternal spirit offered Himself without blemish to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" The writer thus justifies the affirmation of ver. 12 that by offering His own blood Christ obtained eternal redemption. σποδὸς δαμάλεως, the law of purification with the ashes of the δάμαλις πυῤῥὰ ἄμωμος is given in Num. xix., where we find the characteristic words of this verse, σποδός, ἄμωμος, ἁγνίζω, ῥαντισμός, καθαρός, but κοινοῦν (not used in LXX) is replaced by ἀκάθαρτος. κεκοινωμένους, "made common," *i.e.*, profane, ceremonially unclean. Defilement was contracted by touching a dead body, or entering into a house in which a corpse was lying, or touching a bone or a tomb; and to enter the Tabernacle while thus defiled was to incur the penalty of being cut off from Israel. The water in which lay the ashes of the burned heifer was therefore provided for purification (ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ) and by using it the worshipper was again rendered fit for entrance to the worship of

τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἁγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, 14. [n] πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ Θεῷ, καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ

n vi. 1; Luc. i. 74; Rom. vi. 13; Eph. v. 2; Gal. i. 4, et ii. 20; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Peter i. 19, et iii. 18, et iv. 2; 1 Joan. i. 7; Apoc. i. 5.

God. ῥαντίζουσα governs κεκοιν. and is not to be translated as if it were a passive; so Vulg., "aspersus inquinatos sanctificat" (*cf.* Calvin and Bengel). ἁγιάζει, the meaning is determined by its use in Num. xix., where it signifies the removal of ceremonial defilement: the taking away of that which rendered the person "common" or "profane," and the qualifying him for again worshipping God. This ἁγιασμός extended πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, "in the direction of" (vi. 11) or "in relation to" (ii. 17, v. 1) (*cf.* Weiss). The flesh is here opposed to "the conscience" of ver. 14. It was only the flesh that was defiled by attending to the dead; and only the flesh that was cleansed by the prescribed sprinkling. Defilement and cleanring were alike symbolic. It was within a well-defined ceremonial limit these sacrifices and washings availed. What kind of water, no matter how mixed with heifer's ashes, could reach and wash the soul?

Ver. 14. πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. . . . The Levitical sacrifices had their congruous effect, the sacrifice of Christ must also have its appropriate result. The blood offered was not of bulls and goats but of "the Christ;" it was not with another's blood (vicarious, ver. 25) but with His own He entered God's presence. His was not a bodily sacrifice but διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου . . . Θεῷ. This clause is inserted to justify the efficacy of the blood of Christ in cleansing the conscience. It had virtue to cleanse the conscience because it was the blood of one "who through eternal spirit offered Himself blameless to God". How are we to understand διὰ πν. αἰωνίου? Riehm considers it a parellel expression to that of vii. 16, κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, and that it is here used to bring out the idea that Christ having an eternal spirit was thereby able to perform the whole work of atonement, not merely dying on the cross but passing through that death to present Himself before God. So too Davidson, Weiss and others. This involves that προσήνεγκεν refers not to the cross but to the appearance before God, subsequently to the death. And it does not account for the absence of the article. It seems more relevant to the passage and more consistent with the purpose of the clause (to show the ground of the efficacy of the blood of Christ) to understand the words as expressing the spiritual nature of the sacrifice which gave it eternal validity. It had superior efficacy to the blood of bulls and goats because it was not of the flesh merely, but was expressive of the spirit. It is the spirit prompting the sacrifice and giving it efficacy, which the writer seeks to indicate. Over against the "ordinances of the flesh" which made the slaughter of animals compulsory and a mere matter of letting material blood, he sets this wholly different sacrifice which was prompted and inspired by spirit and belonged wholly to the sphere of spiritual and eternal things. [*Spiritus opponitur conditioni animantum ratione carentium* (ver. 13, Bengel); "bezeichnet das Lebensprinzip, in dessen Kraft, von dem beseelt und angetrieben Christus sich opferte" (Kübel)]. It was the spirit underlying and expressed in the sacrifice which gave it all its potency. Spirit is eternal and can alone be efficacious in eternal things. ἑαυτόν. The Levitical High Priest, as stated in ver. 25, entered the holy place ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, but Christ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. Also goats and calves were of no great value, but what Christ offered was of infinite value. Two points are brought out by ἑαυτόν. (1) He offered not a vicarious victim; but, as Priest, offered the only true sacrifice, Himself. Therefore His blood had cleansing efficacy. (2) He offered not a cheap animal, but the most precious of sacrifices. προσήνεγκεν, *i.e.*, on the cross; for the clause is an explanation of the value of the blood. *Cf.* ver. 28. ἄμωμον without blemish, perfect, as required in the Levitical sacrifices, but now with an ethical significance, and therefore possessing an ethical validity. This explains how the blood of Christ should not merely furnish ceremonial cleanness but καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, a characterisation of sins suggested by the context. Works that defile; as the touching of a dead body defiled the

νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι; 15. °Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, 16. θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· 17. ᵖδια-

o xii. 24; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iii. 25, et v. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 18.
p Gal. iii. 15.

worshipper. Works from which a man must be cleansed before he can enter God's presence. A pause might be made before ἔργων, from dead—(not bodies but) works. [καθαρίζω, Hellenistic; see Anz. *Subsidia*, 374. In class. καθαίρω is used, as in Herod. i, 44, τὸν αὐτὸς φόνον ἐκάθηρε, and Æsch. *Choeph.* 72.] This cleansing is preparatory to the worship of the living God εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι. The living God, who is all life, can suffer no taint of death in His worshippers. Death moral and physical cannot exist in His presence. λατρεύειν, "ad serviendum, in perpetuum, modo beatissimo et vere sacerdotali" (Bengel).

Ver. 15. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, "And on this account," that is to say, because, as stated in ver. 14, Christ's blood cleanses the conscience from dead works and thus fits men to draw near to God, διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης ἐστίν, "He is mediator of a new covenant". The old covenant with sacrifices which could only cleanse the flesh allowed sins to accumulate. But Christ, as above stated, obtained cleansing from sins, and so laid the essential foundation of a new covenant, viii. 12. ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου . . . "that a death having taken place for deliverance from the transgressions [committed] under the first covenant, those who have been called might receive the promised eternal inheritance". Even under the old covenant this inheritance had been promised. A gospel had been preached to them, and they had been invited, iv. 2. God being during that period the covenant God of the people, this involved eternal good. But until their transgressions were atoned for they could not receive the inheritance. The sacrifices under the old covenant could not atone for sin, therefore a new covenant with a death which could atone was necessary; in order that such a death having taken place and their sins being removed they might receive fulfilment of the promise. The retrospective reference of the death of Christ is here affirmed; as in xi. 40 it is stated that without us, *i.e.*, without the Christian dispensation, the O.T. believers could not be perfected, The words οἱ κεκλημένοι, therefore, include not only the Hebrews addressed but all who had lived under the O.T. dispensation. ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . παραβάσεων, the genitive is of the object from which redemption is achieved, and ἐπὶ is scarcely "against" as in Vaughan, but rather "in the time of," as in ix. 26, Phil. i. 3.

Ver. 16. ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη . . . The meaning of these words is doubtful. In the LXX διαθήκη occurs about 280 times and in all but four instances translates בְּרִית, covenant. In classical and Hellenistic Greek, however, it is the common word for "will" or "testament" (see especially *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Grenfell and Hunt, Part I., 105, etc., where the normal meaning of the word appears also from the use of ἀδιάθετος for "intestate" and μεταδιατίθεσθαι for "to alter a will"). Accordingly it has been supposed by several interpreters that the writer, taking advantage of the double meaning of διαθήκη, at this point introduces an argument which applies to it in the sense of "will" or "testament," but not in the sense of "covenant"; as if he said, "where a testamentary disposition of property is made, this comes into force only on the decease of the testator". θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου "it is necessary that the death of him who made the disposition be adduced". On the very common omission of the copula in the third singular indicative see Buttmann, p. 136. φέρεσθαι, "necesse est *afferri* testimonia de morte testatoris" (Wetstein). For passages establishing its use as a term of the courts for the production of evidence, etc., see Field *in loc.* and especially Appian, *De Bell. Civil.* ii. 143, διαθῆκαι δὲ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὤφθησαν φερόμεναι. (See also Elsner *in loc.*) φέρειν is apparently even used for "to register" in the *Oxy. Papyri*, Part II., 244. The reason of this necessity is given in ver. 17. διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία . . . "for a testament is of force with reference to dead people, since it is never of any force when the testator is alive". On this interpretation the

θήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μή ποτε[1] ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. 18. ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται. 19. [q]λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ νόμον[2] ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τράγων, μετὰ ὕδατος καὶ ἐρίου κοκκίνου καὶ ὑσσώπου, αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον

[q] Exod. xxiv. 5, 6; Lev. xvi. 14, 15, 18.

[1] μη ποτε ℵ^c AD^c EKLP; μη τοτε ℵ*D*.
[2] T.R. in ℵ*; insert art. with ℵ^c ACD*₂.

words mean that before the inheritance, alluded to in ver. 15, could become the possession of those to whom it had been promised, Christ must die. He is thus represented as a testator. The illustration from the general law relating to wills or testaments extends only to the one point that Christ's people could inherit only on condition of Christ's death. The *reason* of Christ's death receives no illustration. He did not die merely to make room for the heir. The objections to this interpretation are (1) the constant Biblical usage by which, with one doubtful exception in Gal. iii., **διαθήκη** stands for "covenant," not for "will". On this point see the strong statement of Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 48. "There can be little doubt that the word must be invariably taken in this sense of "covenant" in the N.T., and especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the LXX as the epistle to the Hebrews". (2) His argument regarding covenants receives no help from usages which obtain in connection with testaments which are not covenants. The fact that both could be spoken of under the same name shows that they were related in some way; but presumably the writer had in view things and not merely words. To adduce the fact that in the case of wills the death of the testator is the condition of validity, is, of course, no proof at all that a death is necessary to make a covenant valid. (3) The argument of ver. 18 is destroyed if we understand vv. 16, 17 of wills; for in this verse it is the first covenant that is referred to.

But is it possible to retain the meaning "covenant"? Westcott, Rendall, Hatch, Moulton and others think it is possible. To support his argument, proving the necessity of Christ's death, the writer adduces the general law that he who makes a covenant does so at the expense of life. What is meant becomes plain in the 18th verse, for in the covenant there alluded to, the covenanting people were received into covenant through death. That covenant only became valid **ἐπὶ νεκροῖς** over the dead bodies of the victims slain as representing the people. Whatever this substitutionary death may have meant, it was *necessary* to the ratification of the covenant. The sacrifices may have been expiatory, indicating that all old debts and obligations were cancelled and that the covenanters entered into this covenant as clean and new men; or they may have meant that the terms of the covenant were immutable; or that the people died to the past and became wholly the people of God. In any case the dead victims were necessary, and without them, **χωρὶς αἵματος**, the covenant was not inaugurated or ratified. Great light has been thrown on this passage by Dr. Trumbull in his *Blood Covenant*, in which he shows the universality of that form of compact and the significance of the blood. The rite of interchanging blood or tasting one another's blood, indicates that the two are bound in one life and must be all in all to one another. On the whole, this interpretation is to be preferred. Certainly it connects much better with what follows. For having shown that by dead victims all covenants are ratified, the writer proceeds **ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται**, "wherefore not even the first,"—although imperfect and temporary—"was inaugurated without blood," *i.e.*, without death. [The perfect here as elsewhere in Hebrews is scarcely distinguishable from the aorist.] Proof that this statement regarding the first covenant is correct he forthwith gives in vv. 19-20.

Ver 19. **λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς**. . . . "For when Moses had spoken to the people every commandment of the law," this being the needful preliminary, that the people might clearly understand the obligations they assumed on entering the covenant, he then took the blood of the calves and the goats, etc. In Exod. xxiv. 3 ff., an account is given of the inauguration of the first covenant. To that narrative certain

καὶ πάντα τὸν λαὸν ἐρράντισε, 20. [r] λέγων, "Τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ Θεός"· 21. [s] καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τῆς λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ὁμοίως ἐρράντισε. 22. [t] καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ χωρὶς

r Exod. xxiv. 8; Matt. xxvi. 28. s Exod. xxix. 36; Lev. viii. 15, 19, et xvi. 14. t Lev. xvii. 11.

additions of no importance are here made. In Exodus no mention is made of goats, only of **μοσχάρια**. (See Westcott on this discrepancy.) Probably this addition is due to an echo of vv. 12, 13. *Water*, which was added to the blood to prevent coagulation or possibly as a symbol of cleansing; (*cf.* Jo. xix. 34; 1 Jo. v. 6) *scarlet wool*, **κόκκινος**, so called from **κόκκος** "the grain or berry of the *ilex coccifera*" used in dyeing (*cf.* Lev. xiv. 4) and the *hyssop* or wild marjoram on which the wool was tied, are all added as associated with sacrifice in general, and all connected with the blood and the sprinkling. **ἐράντισεν** here takes the place of the **κατεσκέδασε** of Exodus and the action is not confined to the people as in the original narrative but includes **αὐτὸ τὸ βιβλίον**, the book itself, that is, even the book in which Moses had written the words of the Lord, the terms of the covenant. Everything connected with the covenant bore the mark of blood, of death. Again, in ver. 20, instead of the **ἰδοὺ** of the LXX, which literally renders the Hebrew we have **τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα κ.τ.λ.**, a possible echo of our Lord's words in instituting the new covenant, and instead of **διέθετο** of Exod. xxiv. 8 we have **ἐνετείλατο** corresponding with the **ἐντολή** of ver. 19.

Ver. 21. **καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν δὲ....** "And he also in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the instruments of the service". The tabernacle, however, was not yet erected when the covenant was instituted. Delitzsch supposes that a subsequent though kindred transaction is referred to; and colour is given to this supposition by the separation of this verse from ver. 19. But against it is the article in **τῷ αἵματι**, "the blood," apparently the blood defined in vv. 19 and 20; although it is just possible the writer may have meant "the blood" which formed part of the means of service. Neither was it by Moses but by Aaron the tabernacle and the altar were sprinkled with blood and so cleansed on the day of Atonement. When first erected **ἡ σκηνὴ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς** were anointed with oil (Exod. xl. 9) but Josephus records a tradition that it was consecrated not only with oil but also with blood (*Ant.* iii. 8, 6). It seems that the author adopts this tradition, and ascribes to Moses at the original consecration of the tabernacle the cleansing rites which afterwards were annually performed by Aaron on the day of Atonement.

Ver. 22. **καὶ σχεδὸν ἐν αἵματι πάντα...** "And one may almost say that according to the law all things are cleansed with blood, and without blood-shedding is no remission". **σχεδὸν** qualifies the whole clause and not only **πάντα.** Whether it qualifies both clauses, as Bleek, Weiss and others suppose, is more doubtful. Westcott and Delitzsch confine its reference to the first clause. **ἐν αἵματι** "with blood" the usual instrumental **ἐν. πάντα,** all things, especially, of course, those that were used in God's worship or brought into His tabernacle. Water was used for cleansing from certain pollutions. **κατὰ τὸν νόμον,** it was not only a contrivance of man but the law of God which enacted that cleansing must be by blood. **καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας,** "without blood-shedding," a word which occurs only here in Bibl. Greek. See Stephanus *s.v.* In all the instances cited in Stephanus it means the shedding of blood. Rendall, then, is quite wrong in maintaining (after Tholuck and De Wette) that it means, not the shedding but the outpouring of the blood at the foot of the altar. "The essential idea attached to the one act was destruction of life, of the other devotion of the same life to God. Hence the typical significance of the two acts was also quite distinct; outpouring of blood typified in fact, not physical death, but spiritual martyrdom by the surrender of a living will to God in perfect obedience 'even unto death". Weiss is strictly accurate in his remark, "**αἱμ.** kann ohne eine lokale Näherbestimmung nicht die Ausgiessung des Blutes am Altare bezeichnen". The evidence is furnished by Bleek. The words, if not suggested by, inevitably recall our Lord's words (Matt. xxvi. 28) **τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον**

αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις. 23. Ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι· αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. 24. [u] οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα ἅγια εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς,[1] ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν, νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπὲρ

u vii. 25; Rom. viii. 34; 1 Joan. ii. 2.

[1] T.R. C^{c}D^{b,c}EKLP; om. ο with ℵAC*D*, 17, 71, 118.

εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Cleansing was required of everything connected with God's worship, because it was stained through contact with men. And that this stain was guilt is implied in the use of ἄφεσις. It is by remission of sin the stain is removed. And according to the great law of Lev. xvii. 11, this remission was attained by the shedding of blood τὸ γὰρ αἷμα ἀντὶ ψυχῆς ἐξιλάσεται. ἄφεσις is used absolutely only here and in Mark iii. 29; elsewhere it is used with ἁμαρτιῶν or παραπτωμάτων. In Luke iv. 18 it signifies "release".

Vv. 23-28. The necessity of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary and the efficiency and finality of Christ's one sacrifice.

Ver. 23. ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα . . . "It was necessary, therefore, that the copies indeed of the heavenly things be cleansed with these, but the heavenlies themselves with better sacrifices than these." ἀνάγκη οὖν, the οὖν carries to its consequence ver. 22; and the necessity arises from the injunction of the law there mentioned. τὰ μὲν ὑποδ. the μὲν . . . δὲ show that the second clause is that to which attention is to be given, the first clause introducing it. The statement is almost equivalent to "As it was necessary . . . so it was necessary" . . . The ὑποδείγ. are the tabernacle and its furnishings, in accordance with viii. 5; which see. τούτοις, *viz.*, the things mentioned in ver. 19. αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια. If the copies were cleansed by material rites, realities being spiritual and eternal can only be cleansed by what is spiritual and eternal, *cf.* ver 14. κρείττοσιν θυσίαις, the plural is suggested by τούτοις, and states an abstract inference. But do the "heavenlies" need cleansing? Bruce says, "I prefer to make no attempt to assign a theological meaning to the words. I would rather make them intelligible to my mind by thinking of the glory and honour accruing even to heaven by the entrance there of 'the Lamb of God'. I believe there is more of poetry than of theology in the words. For the writer is a poet as well as a theologian, and on this account, theological pedants, however learned, can never succeed in interpreting satisfactorily this epistle". But it is scarcely permissible to exclude at this point of the author's argument the theological inference that in some sense and in some relation the heavenlies need cleansing. The earthly tabernacle, as God's dwelling, might have been supposed to be hallowed by His presence and to need no cleansing, but being also His meeting-place with men it required to be cleansed. And so our heavenly relations with God, and all wherewith we seek to approach Him, need cleansing. In themselves things heavenly need no cleansing, but as entered upon by sinful men they need it. Our eternal relations with God require purification.

Ver. 24. οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα. . . . The connection, indicated by γὰρ, is "I say αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια, *for* it is not into a holy place constructed by man that Christ has entered, but into heaven itself". Others prefer to connect this verse with κρείττοσιν θυσίαις. "Better sacrifices" were needed, for not into, etc. The humanly constructed tabernacle, being made after the divine pattern, viii. 5, is here called ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν. According to viii. 5 a τύπος of the heavenly realities was shown to Moses, and what he constructed from that model was an ἀντίτυπον, answering to the type. But as here used with τῶν ἀληθ., ἀντίτυπα (in agreement with ἅγια) must mean what we usually speak of as a type, that which corresponds to and prefigures. In the only other instance of its occurrence, 1 Pet. iii. 21, it has the converse meaning, the reality of baptism which corresponds to or is the antitype of the deluge. The ἀντίτυπα are contrasted with αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, heaven itself [αὐτὸν in contrast to the mere likeness or copy] the ultimate reality, the presence of spiritual and eternal things. "Coelum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum coelum creatum quodcunque fuerit, sed est coelum in quo Deus est etiam quando coelum creatum nullum est, ipsa

ἡμῶν· 25. [v] οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτόν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ· 26. [w] ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου· νῦν [1] δὲ ἅπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας,[2] διὰ τῆς θυσίας

v ver. 7; Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xvi 2, 34.
w 1 Cor. x. 11; Eph. i. 10; Gal. iv. 4.

[1] νυνι in ℵACP, 37, 39, 47, 73; νυν in DEK.
[2] T.R. CDcEKL; insert της with ℵAP, 17, 73.

gloria divina" (Seb. Schmidt in Delitzsch). νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι . . . "now to appear openly before the face of God in our behalf". νῦν "now," after His completed work on earth, and as his present continuous function; in contrast both to the past ministries, in which face to face communion was impossible, and to Christ's reappearance to men, ver. 28. ἐμφανισθῆναι τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ. The meaning of ἐμφανίζω is most clearly seen from such passages as Exod. xxxiii. 18, Jo. xiv. 21. In the passive it means "to be manifest," "to appear openly" or "clearly," "to show one's self," as in Mat. xxvii. 53 of the bodies of the saints, ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς. The infinitive is the infinitive of designed result common in N.T., as in classics, especially after verbs of motion, *cf.* Mat. ii. 2, xi. 8, etc. The aorist may here be used to denote that "the manifestation of Christ, in whom humanity is shown in its perfect ideal before the face of God is 'one act at once'"; but this is doubtful. The force of ἐμφαν. is strengthened still more by the emphatic τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ. In the earthly sanctuary the law was τὸ πρόσωπόν μου οὐκ ὀφθήσεται (Exod. xxxiii. 23) but ἐν νεφέλῃ ὀφθήσομαι ἐπὶ τ. ἱλαστηρίου (Lev. xvi. 2). In Ps. xlii. 2 we find indeed πότε ἥξω καὶ ὀφθήσομαι τ. προσώπῳ τ. θεοῦ; but this is the non-literal expression of a poet. In the present passage the words are not the loose expression of the ordinary worshipper but are meant to be taken literally. And the intentionally emphatic character of the whole phrase is best accounted for by the fact that the darkness and clouds of incense in the old sanctuary were meant as much to veil the unworthiness of the priest from God as the glory of God from the priest. Now Christ appears before God face to face with no intervening cloud. Perfect fellowship is attained by His perfect and stainless offering of Himself. All is clear between God and man. For it is ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν "for us" He enters this presence and fellowship; not that He alone may enjoy it, but that we may enter into the rest and blessedness that He has won for us.

Ver. 25. οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις. . . . "Nor yet [did He enter in] in order to offer Himself repeatedly," that is, He did not enter in for a brief stay from which He was to return to renew His sacrifice. Westcott holds that the "offering" corresponds with the offering of the victim upon the altar, not with the bringing of the blood into the Holy of Holies. He refers to ver. 14 ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν, to ver. 28, and also to x. 10. Similarly Weiss and others. But in ix. 7 προσφέρει distinctly refers to the bringing in and application of the blood in the Holy of Holies, and the context of the present passage seems decidedly to make for the same interpretation. The sequence of the ἵνα clause after εἰσῆλθεν; the analogy presented in the clause under ὥσπερ; and the consequence stated under ἐπεὶ (ver. 26) all combine in favouring this meaning. The High Priest enters the Holiest annually, but Christ's entering in was of another kind, not requiring repetition. The reason for the reiterated entering in of the High Priest, as well as the possibility of it, is given in the words ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ. ἐν: "The High Priest was, as it were, surrounded, enveloped, in the life sacrificed and symbolically communicated" (Westcott). It is safer to take ἐν in its common instrumental sense: the blood was the instrument which enabled the High Priest to enter. The reason why the entrance had to be annually renewed is given in x. 4. The same contrast between αἷμα ἀλλότριον and αἷμα ἴδιον is found in ix. 12. A sacrifice of blood not one's own is necessarily imperfect, Christ's entrance to God being διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος and διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου had eternal efficacy.

Ver. 26. ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν . . . "Since in that case he must often have suffered since the creation." If Christ's one offering of Himself were not eternally efficacious, if it required periodical renewal, then this demanded periodical sacrifice. It was "not without blood"

x Matt. xxvi. 28; Rom. v. 6, 8, 15, et vi. 10; 1 Peter iii. 18.

αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. 27. καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις· 28. [x] οὕτως [1] ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν.

[1] Insert και with ℵACDEKLP.

the entrance was made, and if the entrance required repetition, so must the sacrifice be repeated. And as sin prevailed ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, the παθεῖν must also date from the first. The contrast is with the one offering ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ κ.τ.λ. "If his offering of Himself were not independent of time and valid as a single act, if it were valid only for the generation for whom it is immediately made, then in order to benefit men in the past, He must have suffered often, indeed in each generation of the past" (Davidson). νυνὶ δὲ ἅπαξ . . . "But now once at the consummation of the ages He has been manifested for sin's abolition by His sacrifice". νυνὶ, "as things are," in contrast to the case supposed in ver. 25, the possibility of His repeated entrance and sacrifice. For the word, see viii. 6. ἅπαξ not πολλάκις, vv. 25, 26; and this, ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων [for ἐπὶ in this use see Winer, p. 489] at that period of history in which all that has happened since the foundation of the world (ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου) finds its interpretation and adjustment. If there was to be one sacrifice for all generations, the occurrence of that sacrifice itself marked the period as the consummation. It closes the periods of symbolism, expectation and doubt, suggesting, perhaps, the word πεφανέρωται for Christ's appearance, as that which was dimly foreshadowed, blindly longed for. εἰς ἀθέτησιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας. The object of Christ's appearance, the abolition of sin, made the repetition of His sacrifice unnecessary. In vii. 18 ἀθέτησις is used of permanent displacement, removal, or setting aside, that is, abolition. τῆς ἁμαρτίας of sin, in its most general and comprehensive sense, all sin. This was the great object of Christ's manifestation, the annulling of sin, its total destruction, the counteraction of all its effects. This was to be accomplished διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ "through His sacrifice," the simple subjective genitive. The sentence draws attention not to the nature of the sacrifice, but to its three characteristics, that it was made once for tall, in the consummation, for sin's abolition.

Ver. 27. καὶ καθ' ὅσον . . . "And inasmuch as it is reserved for men once to die and, after this, judgment, so, also, Christ, etc." To confirm his statement that Christ's sacrifice was "once for all," he appeals to the normal conditions of human death. To men generally, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, it is appointed once to die, men are not permitted to return to earth to compensate for neglect or failure, but immediately succeeding upon death, if not in time, yet in consequence, follows judgment. The results of life are entered upon. So Christ died but once and the results will be apparent in His appearing the second time without sin unto salvation. ἀπόκειται "is reserved" as in Longinus' *De Subl.* ix. 7, ἡμῖν δυσδαιμονοῦσιν ἀπόκειται λιμὴν κακῶν ὁ θάνατος, *cf.* iii. 5; also Dion. Hal. v. 8, ὅσα τοῖς κακούργοις ἀπόκειται παθεῖν, and especially 2 Tim. iv. 8. What is destined for all men is not simply death, but ἅπαξ ἀποθ. once to die. *Cf.* the fragment of Sophocles θανεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔξεστι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι δίς. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις "after this," but how long, the author does not say. "Man dies once, and the next thing before him is judgment. So Christ died once and the next thing before Him is the Advent" (Vaughan).

Ver. 28. οὕτως. The comparison extends to both terms, the once dying and the judgment. [*Cf.* Kübel, "die Korrespondenz ist nicht bloss die der gleichen Menschennatur, sondern das, dass mit dem Tod das, was das Leben bedeutet, abgeschlossen, fertig ist"]. The results of the life are settled. And in Christ's case the result is that He appears the second time without sin unto salvation, the sin having been destroyed by His death. ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς corresponds to ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν of ver. 27. The passive is used to be more in keeping with the universal *law* expressed in ἀπόκειται of ver. 27. Though the "offering" as we have seen includes both the death and the entrance into the Holiest with the blood, it is the death which is here prominent. εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, "to bear the sins of many". Westcott

X. 1. [a] ΣΚΙΑΝ γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων, κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις [1] ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, οὐδέποτε δύναται [2] τοὺς προσερχο-

[a] viii. 5, et ix. 9; Col. ii. 17.

[1] ℵP add αυτων.

[2] T.R. in D*, etc., EHKL, d, e, f, vg., Basm., Copt.; δυνανται in ℵACDbP.

says, "the burden which Christ took upon Him and bore to the cross was 'the sins of many' not, primarily, or separately from the sins, the punishment of sins." But in what intelligible sense can sins be borne but by bearing their punishment? In Numbers xiv. 33, *e.g.*, it is said "your sins shall be fed in the wilderness forty years καὶ ἀνοίσουσι τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν, where the same verb is used as here to express the idea of suffering punishment for the sins of others. πολλῶν, although it was the death of but one, *cf.* Rom. v. 12-21, but probably only a reminiscence of Isa. lviii. 12. αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε. ἐκ δευτέρου . . . a second time He shall appear, ὀφθήσεται, visible to the eye. The word is probably used because appropriate to the appearances after the resurrection, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 34, Acts ix. 17, xiii. 31, 1 Cor. 5, 6, 7, 8 where ὤφθη is regularly used. But on this "second" appearance His object is different. He will come not εἰς τὸ πολ. ἀνεν. ἁμαρτίας, but χωρὶς ἁμ. εἰς σωτηρίαν irrespective of sin, not to be a sin offering but to make those who wait for Him partakers of the great salvation, ii. 3, *cf.* x. 37-39; and ix. 12. τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις "There may be an illusion to the reappearance of the High Priest after the solemn ceremonial in the Holy of Holies on the day of atonement to the anxiously waiting people" (Vaughan). *Cf.* Luke i. 21. The word is used in 1 Cor. i. 7 and Phil. iii. 20 of the expectation of the second advent, and in 2 Tim. iv. 8 is varied by the beautiful expression "they that have loved His appearing".

CHAPTER X.—Vv. 1-18. *Finality of Christ's one sacrifice.* The law merely presents a shadow of the essential spiritual blessings and does not perfect those who seek God through it. Its sacrifices therefore must be continually repeated and the consciousness of sins is annually revived, for animal blood cannot take sins away. Accordingly, when Christ comes into the world He says, "Sacrifice and offering Thou wouldst not, I am come to do Thy will". He proclaims the uselessness of O.T. sacrifices, that He may clear the ground for "the offering of the body of Christ". This is the great distinction between Christ and all other priests. They stand daily ministering, He by one offering has perfected those who approach God through Him.

Vv. 1-4. The sacrifices of the law inadequate.

Ver. 1. Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων . . . The γὰρ intimates that we have here a further explanation of the finality of Christ's one sacrifice (ix. 28) and therefore of its superiority to the sacrifices of the law. The explanation consists in this that the law had only "a shadow of the good things that were to be, not the very image of the things". Σκιὰν is in the emphatic place, as that characteristic of the law which determines its inadequacy. "A shadow" suggests indefiniteness and unsubstantiality; a mere indication that a reality exists. εἰκών suggests what is in itself substantial and also gives a true representation of that which it images. "The εἰκών brings before us under the conditions of space, as we can understand it, that which is spiritual" (Westcott). So Kübel, etc. The contrast is between a bare intimation that good things were to be given, and an actual presentation of these good things in an apprehensible form. It is *implied* that this latter is given in Christ; but what is asserted is, that the law did not present the coming realities in a form which brought them within the comprehension of the people. [Bleek cites from Cicero, *De Off.*, iii. 17, 69, "nos veri juris germanaeque justitiae solidam et expressam effigiem nullam tenemus, umbra et imaginibus utimur".]

That the law possessed no more than a shadow of the coming good was exhibited in its constantly renewed sacrifices. κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν belongs to ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, "with the same annually repeated sacrifices," further explained and emphasised by the relative clause, ἃς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, "which they perpetually offer". οὐδέποτε δύναται . . . the law can never with these perpetually renewed offerings perfect the worshippers". "No repetition of the shadow can amount to the substance" (Davidson). The proof is given in the following words, ver. 2: ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύ-

μένους τελειῶσαι. 2. ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας, ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους[1]· 3. ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν· 4. [b] ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας. 5. [c] Διὸ εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει, "Θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι· 6. ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας[2]· 7. τότε εἶπον, Ἰδοὺ ἥκω· ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ· τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεός, τὸ

b ix. 13; Lev. xvi. 14; Num. xix. 4.

c Ps. xl. 6, 7, et l. 8, etc.; Esa. i. 11; Jer. vi. 20; Amos v. 21.

[1] κεκαθαρισμενους ℵDEHKP, 17, 37, 71.

[2] ηυδοκησας in ACD*HP, 37, 73.

σαντο προσφερόμεναι. The constant renewal of the yearly round of sacrifices proves that they were inefficacious, for had the worshippers once been cleansed they would have had no longer any consciousness of sins and would therefore have sought no renewal of sacrifice. **ἐπεί,** "since," if the O.T. sacrifices had perfected those who used them. **προσφερόμεναι** corresponding to **προσφέρουσιν,** and **τοὺς λατρεύοντας** to **τοὺς προσερχομένους** of previous verse. **ἅπαξ κεκαθ.,** that is, once delivered from a sense of guilt, *cf.* ix. 14, where **συνείδησις** is also used in same sense as here, the consciousness of sin as barring approach to God. The sinner once cleansed may, no doubt, be again defiled and experience a renewed consciousness of guilt. But in the writer's view this consciousness is at once absorbed in the consciousness of his original cleansing. *Cf.* John xiii. 10. **ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς. . . .** So far from these O.T. sacrifices once for all cleansing the conscience and thus perfecting the worshippers, "by and in them there is a yearly remembrance of sins," that is, of sins not yet sufficiently atoned for by any past sacrifice. *Cf.* Num. v. 15. **θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμιμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν,** and Philo, *De Plantat.*, 25, **αἱ θυσίαι ὑπομιμνήσκουσαι τὰς ἑκάστων ἀγνοίας, κ.τ.λ.** This remembrance of sins is **κατ' ἐνιαυτόν,** which is most naturally referred to the annual confession of the whole people on the day of Atonement. The remembrance was not of sins previously atoned for but of sins committed since the previous sacrifice; there was no perception that any previous atonement was sufficient for all sin. The underlying ground of this inadequacy being expressed in ver. 4. **ἀδύνατον γάρ. . . .** "For it is impossible that the blood of oxen and goats should take away sins". This obvious truth needs no proof. There is no relation between the physical blood of animals and man's moral offence. *Cf.* the *Choephori* of Æschylus, 70, "all waters, joining together to cleanse from blood the polluted hand, may strive in vain". **ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας,** "to take away sins," in the sense of removing their guilt as in Num. xiv. 18, Lev. x. 17, Rom. xi. 27.

Vv. 5-10. The adequacy of Christ's sacrifice as fulfilling God's will. **διὸ** "wherefore," "such being the ineffectiveness of the sacrifices of the law and the condition of conscience of those under them," "when He—that is **ὁ Χριστὸς** ix. 28 to whom alone **εἰσερχόμ.** is applicable—comes into the world," referring generally to His incarnate state, not to His entrance on his public ministry. **λέγει,** the words are quoted from Ps. xl. 6-8 and put in the mouth of Christ although the whole Psalm cannot be considered Messianic, *cf.* ver. 12. In what sense can **λέγει** be used of Christ? It is not meant that He was present in the psalmist and so uttered what is here here referred to Him. This idea is negatived by **εἰσερχόμ.** It was when incarnate he used the words. Neither is it merely meant that by his conduct Christ showed that these words were a true expression of his mind. Rather, the words are considered prophetic, depicting beforehand the mind of Christ regarding O.T. sacrifice, and His own mission. In several O.T. passages God's preference for obedience is affirmed (1 Sam. xv. 22, Ps. l. 8, Micah, Isa. i. 11, Hosea, vi. 6) but this psalm is here selected because the phrase "a body hast thou prepared for me" lends itself to the writer's purpose. In the Psalm, indeed, sacrifice is contrasted with obedience to the will of God. A body is prepared for Christ that in it He may obey God. But it is the offering of this body as a sacrifice in contrast to the animal sacrifices of the law, which this writer emphasises (ver. 10). "The con-

θέλημά σου". 8. Ἀνώτερον λέγων, "Ὅτι θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν[1] καὶ ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας"·

[1] θυσιας και προσφορας in ℵ*ACD*P, 17, 23, d, e, f, vg., Sah., Copt.; T.R. in ℵᶜDᶜEKL, Aeth.

trast is between animal offerings and the offering of Himself by the Son. And what is said is that God did not will the former, but willed the other, and that the former are thereby abolished, and the other is established in their room, and as the will of God is effectual. The passage in the epistle is far from saying that the essence or worth of Christ's offering of Himself lies simply in obedience to the will of God. It does not refer to the point wherein lies the intrinsic worth of the Son's offering, or whether it may be resolved into obedience unto God. Its point is quite different. It argues that the Son's offering of Himself is the true and final offering for sin, because it is the sacrifice, which, according to prophecy, God desired to be made" (Davidson).

The writer, in citing Ps. 40, follows the LXX, slightly altering the construction of the last clause by omitting ἠβουλήθην, and thus making τοῦ ποιῆσαι depend upon ἥκω, "I am come to do thy will". *Cf.* ver. 9.

θυσίαν καὶ προσφοράν representing זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה of the Psalm, animal sacrifice and meal offering. *Cf.* Ephes. v. 2. **οὐκ ἠθέλησας** "thou didst not will," a contrast is intended between this clause and τὸ θέλημά σου of the last clause of ver. 7. **σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι** "but a body didst Thou prepare for me," implying that in this body God's will would be accomplished. *Cf.* ver. 10. The words are the LXX rendering of אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִּי, "ears didst Thou dig [or open] for me". The meaning is the same. The opened ear as the medium through which the will of God was received, and the body by which it was accomplished, alike signify obedience to the will of God. **ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας** representing עוֹלָה וַחֲטָאָה of the psalm, whole burnt offering and sin-offering. περὶ ἁμαρτ. occurs frequently in Leviticus to denote sin offering, θυσία being omitted. **οὐκ ηὐδόκησας** "thou didst not take pleasure in". **τότε εἶπον.** "Then," that is, when it was apparent that not by animal sacrifices or material offerings could God be propitiated, "I said, Lo! I am come to do Thy will, O God," to accomplish that purpose of Thine which the sacrifices of the O.T. could not accomplish. That this is the correct construction is shown by ver. 9. For construction, *cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 397; and Prof. Votaw, *Use of Infin. in N. T.* **ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ** "in a book [lit. in a roll of a book] it has been written concerning me". κεφαλίς denoting "a little head" was first applied to the end of the stick on which the parchment was rolled, and from which in artistically finished books two *cornua* proceeded. [See Bleek, Rich's *Dict. of Antiq.*, and Hatch's *Concordance*] In the Psalm the phrase is joined with the previous words and might be read, "Lo! I am come, with a roll of a book written for me," in other words, with written instructions regarding the divine will as affecting me. The words can hardly mean that in Scripture predictions have been recorded regarding the writer of the Psalm. This, however, may be the meaning attached to the words as cited in the epistle, although it is quite as natural and legitimate to retain the original meaning and understand the words as a parenthetical explanation that Christ acknowledged as binding *on Him* all that had been written for the instruction of others in the will of God. But the likelihood is that if the writer was not merely transcribing the words as part of his quotation without attaching a definite meaning to them, he meant that the coming of the Messiah to do God's will had been written in the book of God's purpose. (*Cf.* Ps lvi. 9.)

Ver. 8. The significance of the quotation is now explained. "He takes the first away, that he may establish the second." He declares the incompetence of the O.T. sacrifices to satisfy the will of God, in order that he may make room for that sacrifice which is permanently to satisfy God. **Ἀνώτερον,** "Higher up," here meaning "in the former part of the quotation," corresponding to and contrasted with τότε in ver. 9. **λέγων,** *i.e.*, Christ, the subject of εἴρηκεν and ἀναιρεῖ. This is necessitated by λέγει in ver. 3. Yet it is not Christ directly, but the mind of Christ uttered by God in Scripture. εἴρηκεν, perfect, as expressing that which

αἵτινες κατὰ τὸν νόμον προσφέρονται· 9. τότε εἴρηκεν, "Ἰδοὺ ἥκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι, ὁ Θεός,[1] τὸ θέλημά σου". ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ· 10. [d] ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν οἱ[2] διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ. 11. Καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεὺς[3] ἕστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας, αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρ-

d ix. 12.

[1] ο θεος omitted in ℵ*ACDEKP, 17, d, e, Sah., Copt.

[2] οι omitted in ℵACD*E*P, 17, 47, 73.

[3] T.R. in ℵDEKL, 17, 47, d, e, f, vg.; αρχιερευς in ACP, Syr sch et p, Basm., Arm.

permanently fulfils the will of God. ἀναιρεῖν is used in classic Greek of the destruction or abolition or repeal of laws, governments, customs, etc.

Ver. 10. ἐν ᾧ θελήματι . . . "in which will," that is, in the will which Christ came to do (ver. 9), "we have been made fit for God's presence and fellowship by means of the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all". The will of God which the O.T. sacrifices could not accomplish was the "sanctification" of men, that is, the bringing of men into true fellowship with God. This will has been accomplished, we have been cleansed and introduced into God's fellowship through the offering of the body of Christ. By the use of the word προσφορᾶς the writer shows that it was not a mere general obedience to the will of God he had in view, but the fulfilment of God's will in the particular form of yielding Himself to a sacrificial death. His obedience in order to become an atoning sacrifice took a particular form, the form of "tasting death for every man". [For a different view see Bruce *in loc.* and Gould's *N.T. Theol.*, p. 169. On the other hand see Riehm and Macdonell's *Donellan Lectures*, p. 49-59.] τοῦ σώματος Ἰ. Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ, the offering of the body must of course be taken in connection with ix. 14, διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου and also with the defining words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἐφάπαξ is added in contrast to the note of inferiority attaching to the O.T. sacrifices, as given in ver. 1, their need of continual renewal.

Vv. 11-14. That Christ's one sacrifice has accomplished its end of bringing men to God is illustrated by His sitting down at God's right hand.

Ver. 11. καὶ introduces a new aspect of the finality of Christ's sacrifice, to wit, that "whereas every priest stands daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices,—inasmuch as they are such as never can take sins away—this man having offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on God's right hand, henceforth waiting till his enemies be set as a footstool for his feet. For by one offering He hath perfected for ever the sanctified." The argument is in this statement advanced a step. For although the three points urged in vv. 1-4 are here still in view, *viz.*, that "the Levitical service consists of repeated acts (καθ' ἡμέραν, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν) and these the same (αἱ αὐταὶ θυσίαι) and essentially ineffective (οὐδέποτε δύνανται, κ.τ.λ), yet it is now the action of the priest rather than the nature of the sacrifice that comes to the front, and the finality of Christ's offering is argued from the historical fact that He was not any longer standing ministering but had sat down as one who had quite finished His work. Therefore in ver. 14 τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους takes the place of ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν of ver. 10. Nothing further requires to be done to secure in perpetuity the fellowship of man with God. In the one sacrifice of Christ there is cleansing which fits men to draw near to God, to enter into covenant with Him, and there is also ground laid for their continuance in that fellowship. The future (εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς) is provided for as well as the past. Limborch quoted by Bleek says "perficit, *i.e.*, perfecte et plene a peccatorum reatu liberavit, ita ut in perpetuum sanctificati sint et ulteriore aut nova oblatione non indigeant". "His one offering gathers up into itself both the sacrifice that inaugurates the covenant, and all the many sacrifices offered year by year to maintain it and to realise it; it reaches the idea which they strove towards in vain, and by reaching it for ever sets them aside" (Davidson).

In ver. 11 the more expressive περιελεῖν replaces ἀφαιρεῖν of ver. 4. It means "to take away something that is all

τίας· 12. [e] αὐτὸς[1] δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 13. τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶσιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. 14. μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους. 15. Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ προειρηκέναι,[2] 16. "[f] Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἣν διαθήσομαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, λέγει Κύριος, διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν διανοιῶν[3] αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς· 17. καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ[4] ἔτι". 18. Ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.

19. [g] Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοὶ, παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, 20. ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ

e i. 3, 13, et viii. 1; Ps. cx. 1; Acts ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 20; Col. iii. 1.

f viii. 8; ver. xxxi. 31, etc.; Rom. xi. 27.

g ix. 8, 12; Joan. x. 9, et xiv. 6; Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 13, 18, et iii. 12.

[1] ουτος in ℵACD*EP, d, e, f, vg.
[2] ειρηκεναι in ℵACDEP, it, vg.
[3] επι την διανοιαν in ℵACDgr*P, 17, 47, 73.
[4] μνησθησομαι in ℵ*ACD*, 17.

round" as δέρματα σωμάτων, a garment, the covering of a letter. In Gen. xli. 42 it is used of Pharaoh taking off his ring. The phrase therefore suggests that man is enwrapped in sin; or if this is to press too hard the etymological meaning, it at least suggests *complete* deliverance. οὗτος *cf.* iii. 3 and viii. 3. εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς cannot be construed with προσενέγκας but must be taken with ἐκάθισεν. "To say of the Levitical priests that they προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς (ver. 1) is appropriate; to say of Christ that He προσήνεγκεν εἰς τὸ διην. is almost a self-contradiction" (Vaughan). εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν balances ἕστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν, and *cf.* especially i. 3. No doubt the usual position of εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς is after the word it qualifies, x. 1-14 and vii. 3. τοὺς ἁγιαζ. has no time reference, *cf.* ii. 11.

Vv. 15-18. Proof from Scripture that the one sacrifice of Christ, the mediator of the new covenant is final.

Ver. 15. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν . . . "And the Holy Spirit also bears witness to us," that is, that the one offering of the Son is final, for under the new covenant there is no further remembrance of sins. ἡμῖν is more naturally construed as a dativus commodi than as the object of μαρτυρεῖ. μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι. "For after saying . . ." we expect the apodosis to begin and the sentence to be concluded by an introductory ἔπειτα λέγει or τότε (*cf.* ver. 9), but ver. 17 is not so introduced. The sense, however, is unmistakable. After defining the covenant in its inwardness and spirituality (*v.* c. viii. 10), the writer introduces that feature of it which specially serves his present purpose καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν . . . οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι ἔτι, "And I will never any more remember their sins and their transgressions". The conclusion is obvious, "But where there is remission of these, there is no longer offering for sin". For the terms of the new covenant see viii. 8-12. μνησθήσομαι is here used instead of μνησθῶ of LXX and of viii. 12, because the writer emphasises the extens on of the forgetting to all futurity.

CHAPS. X. 19—XII. 29. Exhortation to use the access to God opened by Christ and to maintain faith in Him in spite of all temptation to fall away.

CHAP. X. 19-25. Exhortation to draw near to God, to hold fast the Christian hope, and to encourage one another.

Ver. 19. Ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί. . . . "Having then, brethren, confidence for the entrance into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, a way which He inaugurated for us fresh and living, through the veil, that is, His flesh." For the form of the sentence *cf.* iv. 14. παρρησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον, *cf.* iii. 6 and iv. 16 προσερχώμεθα μετὰ παρρησίας, also Eph. iii. 12. ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγήν. εἴσοδος may either mean an entrance objectively considered, or the act of entering. Weiss adopts the former meaning, compelled as he supposes by the ὁδὸν which follows in apposition and referring to Jud. i. 24 and Ezek. xxvii. 3. He would therefore

h iv. 14, 16. i Ezech. xxxvi. 25; Eph. ii. 12; Jac. i. 6.

ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, τουτέστι, τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, 21. [h] καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 22. [i] προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς

translate "boldness as regards the entrance". The objection to this interpretation is the meaning put upon εἰς which more naturally expresses the object or end towards which the παρρησία is directed, the entering in, not merely the object *about which* the παρρησία is exercised. *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 10, μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν. But *cf.* Winer on εἰς. The expression in ix. 8, τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδὸν, also favours Weiss's interpretation. τῶν ἁγίων as the Greek commentators remark, here means "heaven". ἐν τ. αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, on the whole, it is better to join these words not with παρρησίαν but with εἴσοδον. Bleek sees a reference to ix. 25, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ. ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν . . . "The new and living way which He inaugurated [or dedicated] for us." The antecedent of the clause is εἴσοδον, and this way into the holiest is here further described as first used by Christ that it might be used by us. For ἐγκαινίζειν means to handsel, to take the first use of a new thing. See Deut. xx. 5. He has entered within the veil as our πρόδρομος (vi. 19, 20) and has thus opened a way for us. It is πρόσφατον, recent, fresh. The lexicographers are agreed that, originally meaning fresh-slain and applied to νεκρός, πρόσφατος came to be used of flowers, oil, snow, misfortune, benefits, in *Sirac.* ix. 10, of a friend; in Eccles. i. 9 οὐκ ἔστι πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον. It was a way recently opened. Christ was the first who trod that way. Wetstein, who gives many examples of the use of the word, cites also from *Florus*, i. 15, 3, an interesting analogy: "Alter [Decius Mus] quasi monitu deorum, capite velato, primam ante aciem diis manibus se devoverit, ut in confertissima se hostium tela jaculatus, novum ad victoriam iter sanguinis sui semita aperiret". καὶ ζῶσαν, not as a way that abides (Chrys., etc.) nor as leading to life eternal (Grotius, etc.), nor as a way which consists in fellowship with a Person (Westcott), but as effective, actually bringing its followers to their goal. *Cf.* iv. 12. So Davidson and Weiss. διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος, a further characteristic of the way, it passed through the veil, that is, His flesh, which must first be rent before Christ could pass into the holiest. "This beautiful allegorizing of the veil cannot, of course, be made part of a consistent and complete typology. It is not meant for this. But as the veil stood locally before the holiest in the Mosaic Tabernacle, the way into which lay through it, so Christ's life in the flesh stood between Him and His entrance before God, and His flesh had to be rent ere He could enter" (Davidson).

Ver. 21. καὶ ἱερέα μέγαν. The opened way into the holiest is not the only advantage possessed by the Christian, he has also "a great priest," *cf.* iv. 14 ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν . . . προσερχώμεθα. Philo (*Leg. ad Gai.*, p. 1035) calls the High Priest ὁ μέγας ἱερεύς, and so Lev. xxi. 10, Num. xxxv. 25. But it is not to the fact that He is High Priest that this designation here points, but to His greatness as Son of God and as one who has passed into the Holy Presence. Especially is His greatness manifested in His administration ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, over God's house (*cf.* iii. 6) that is, over those heavenly realities which replace the house of God on earth, and necessarily over those for whom the priest is appointed to minister τὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν (v. 1).

Ver. 22 Being thus secure of an acceptable entrance προσερχώμεθα, "let us keep approaching," that is, to God (vii. 25, xi. 6); a semi-technical term. μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας, "with a true heart" (*cf.* Isa. xxxviii. 3), not with a merely bodily approach as if all were external and symbolic, but with that genuine engagement of the inner man which constitutes true worship. Chrysostom has χωρὶς ὑποκρίσεως. Davidson has "with fundamental genuineness"; but it is the genuineness which is elicited in presence of realities. καρδία is interpreted in 1 Pet. iii. 4, ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος. It is the inevitable qualification of one who comes ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως, "in full assurance of faith," believing not only that God is (xi. 6) but that a way to His favour and fellowship is opened by the Great Priest. To engender this full assurance has been the aim of the writer throughout the Epistle. ῥεραντισμένοι . . . λελουσμένοι. These participles express not conditions of approach to God which are yet to be achieved, but con-

καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς· 23. [k] καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ· πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος· 24. καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, 25. [l] μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυν-

k iv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. v. 24.
l Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Peter iii. 9, 11, 14.

ditions already possessed, "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our body washed with pure water". Both participles must be construed with **προσερχώμεθα.** The obvious connection of "heart" and "body" forbids the attachment of **λελουσμένοι** to **κατέχωμεν.** To connect both participles with **κατεχ.** is equally impossible. "**προσέρχεσθαι** is a technical liturgical word, and sprinkling and washing are liturgical acts of preparation" (Delitzsch). Possibly the mention of sprinkling and washing is an echo of the injunctions of Exod. xxix. 4, 21, xxx. 20, xl. 30, prescribin g similar preparation for the priestly functions. Our heart or inner man by the application of the **αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ** (*cf.* 1 Pet. i. 2) is delivered from the consciousness of guilt (ix. 14); our body by the application of the purifying water of baptism becomes the symbol of complete purity. "Sprinkled with that blood which speaketh evermore in the heavenly sanctuary, and washed with baptismal water sacramentally impregnated with the same, we are at all times privileged to approach by a new and living way the heavenly temple, entering by faith its inner sanctuary, and there presenting ourselves in the presence of God" (Delitzsch). *Cf.* especially Ps. li. 6-7, and Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*, c. 80 (p. 383) where ceremonial purifications are explained on the principle that the Pure and Undefiled must be worshipped by the pure in body and soul.

Ver. 23. A second branch of the exhortation is given in the words **κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν** . . . "Let us hold fast and unbending the confession of our hope," as in iii. 6. *Cf.* also vi. 11. For as yet in this life the fulness of blessing which comes of fellowship with God is not experienced, the perfected salvation and the heavenly country (xii. 22-23) are yet to be reached. But these are the contents of the Christian hope, and this hope is confessed and maintained in presence of a commonplace, scoffing and alluring world. It is to be maintained for the best of all reasons: **πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος.** The promises of God are necessarily the ground of hope, *v.* vi. 12. These promises cannot fail, because God cannot lie, vi. 18.

Ver. 24. To the exhortation to faith and hope he adds an exhortation to love: **καὶ κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους,** "and let us consider one another," taking into account and weighing our neighbour's circumstances and especially his risks, but this with a view not to exasperating criticism but **εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης,** "with a view to incite them to love and good works," acknowledging honest endeavour and making allowance for imperfection. **παροξυσμός** is "stimulation" either to good or evil. In Acts xv. 39 it is used of angry irritation, as in LXX, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. 37. So in medical writers of a *paroxysm*. But frequently in classics the verb is used of stimulating to good as in Plato, *Epist.* iv. p. 321 and in Xen. *Cyrop.* 6, 2, 5, **τούτους ἐπαινῶν παρώξυνε.** Isocrates, *ad Demon.*, etc. The writer, in vi. 9-10, has set his readers a good example of this considerate incitement. In order to fulfil his injunction they must not neglect meeting together for Christian worship and encouragement **μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν.** Delitzsch suggests that the compound word is used instead of the simple **συναγωγή** in order to avoid a word with Judaic associations; but **συναγωγή** might rather have suggested the building and formal stated meetings, while **ἐπισυν. ἑαυτῶν** denotes merely the meeting together of Christians. That these meetings were for mutual edification is shown by the **ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες.** Some made a practice of neglecting these meetings, whether from fear of persecution or from scorn or from business engagements. *Cf.* Jude, 18-20, and Moberly's *Minist. Priesthood*, p. 14. This good custom of meeting together and mutually exhorting one another was to be all the more punctually and zealously attended to, **ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν,** "in proportion as ye see the day drawing near". "The day" is of course the day of the Lord's return (ix. 28), the day of days. The Epistle being written in all probability a year or two before the destruction of Jerusalem, the signs of the coming day which could be "seen" were probably the restlessness, forebodings of coming disaster, and initial collisions with

αγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισὶν, ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες· καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ βλέπετε ἐγγίζουσαν τὴν ἡμέραν. 26. [m] Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία· 27. [n] φοβερὰ δέ τις ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως, καὶ πυρὸς ζῆλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. 28. [o] ἀθετήσας τις νόμον Μωσέως, χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν ἐπὶ δυσὶν

m vi. 4; Num. xv. 30; Matt. xii. 31; 2 Peter ii. 20, 21; 1 Joan v. 16.
n Ezech. xxxvi. 5; Sophon i. 18, et iii. 8.
o Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6, et xix. 15; Matt. xviii. 16; Joan. viii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

the Romans which heralded the great war.

Vv. 26-39. Dreadful result of falling from faith.

Ver. 26. **Ἑκουσίως γὰρ ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν. . . .** "For if we go on sinning wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no more remains a sacrifice for sins, but a certain dreadful waiting for judgment and a fury of fire which is to devour the adversaries." **γὰρ**, introducing an additional reason for the preceding exhortation. The emphasis is on **ἑκουσίως**; and the present tense of **ἁμαρτ.** must not be overlooked. *Cf.* **τῶν ἀκουσίων ἁμαρτημάτων καταφυγὴν εἶναι τοὺς βωμούς**, Thuc. iv. 98. Wilful sin, continued in, means apostasy, repudiation of the covenant. *Cf.* vi. 6, **καὶ παραπεσόντας**, and v. 2, **τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν**, and iii. 12. Apostasy can only occur **μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν . . .** a condition which is explained in detail in chap. 6. Without this preceding knowledge of the covenant its wilful repudiation is impossible. Those spoken of in ver. 25, as having abandoned meeting with their fellow Christians, and possibly as having neglected, if not renounced, the confession of their hope, were perhaps alluded to here, as on their way to apostasy. They are warned that they are drifting into an irredeemable condition, for to those who have repudiated and keep repudiating the one sacrifice of Christ, **οὐκέτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία.** The only sacrifice has been rejected, and there is no other sacrifice which can atone for the rejection of this sacrifice. "The meaning is not merely that the Jewish sacrifices to which the apostate has returned have in themselves no sin-destroying power, nor even that there is no second sacrifice additional to that of Christ, but further that for a sinner of this kind the very sacrifice of Christ itself has no more atoning or reconciling power" (Delitzsch). That this is the meaning is shown by the positive assertion of what the future does contain, a terrifying prospect of waiting for inevitable judgment. The expression is not equivalent to **φοβερᾶς ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως**, which, as Bleek remarks, would not be so impressive. **φοβερός** means either "causing fear" or "feeling fear"; "scaring" or "affrighted". Here it is used in the former sense. **ἐκδοχὴ** occurs elsewhere only in the sense of receiving something or of the acceptation or interpretation of a word; but ver. 13 and ix. 28 guide to the meaning given by the Vulg. *expectatis*. The **τις** by leaving the expectation indefinite heightens the terror of it. The imagination is allowed scope. **κρίσεως** is general, but immediately suggests **πυρὸς ζῆλος μέλλοντος**, the destined fire; for which see 2 Thess. i. 8-10. "Fiery indignation" very well renders **πυρὸς ζῆλος**, an anger which expresses itself in fire. The expression is derived from such O.T. phrases as Ps. lxxix. 5 **ἐκκαυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ὁ ζῆλός σου.** *Cf.* Zeph. i. 18 and Deut. iv. 21. This fiery anger is destined to devour the adversaries; as in Isa. xxvi. 11 **ζῆλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον, καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδεται**, and lxiv. 2 **κατακαύσει πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους.** *Cf.* also Isa. xxx. 27 **ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἔδεται**, a natural figure used by Homer and others. **ὑπεναντίους**, see Lightfoot on Col. ii. 14, who shows that it means "direct, close, persistent opposition".

Ver. 28. **ἀθετήσας τις νόμον. . . .** "Any one who has set aside Moses' law dies without mercy on the evidence of two or three witnesses," in accordance with the law laid down in Deut. xvii. 6 regarding apostasy; although capital punishment was not restricted to this sin. For **ἀθετεῖν** *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 8; and Isa. xxiv. 16, **οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν, οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον**, also Ezek. xxii. 26. **ἀθέτησις** is used absolutely in 1 Sam. xxiv. 12. **ἐπὶ . . . μάρτυσιν**, *cf.* ix. 17; **ἀποθνήσκει**, perhaps the tense does not carry with it the inference that the law was still being enforced. It may only mean "he dies" according to the law as it stands. **χωρὶς οἰκτιρμῶν**, to emphasise the inexorableness of the

ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν ἀποθνήσκει· 29. [p] πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος ἀξιωθή-σεται τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας; 30. [q] οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα, "Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος"· καὶ πάλιν, "Κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ". 31. Φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς χεῖρας Θεοῦ ζῶντος. 32. [r] Ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν

p 1 Cor. xi. 29.
q Deut. xxxii. 35, 36; Rom. xii. 19.
r Gal. iii. 4; Phil. i. 29, 30; Col. ii. 1.

law and the inevitable character of the doom. *Cf.* Josephus, c. *Apion*, ii. 30, ὁ νόμος ἀπαραίτητος and Ignatius, *ad Eph.* c. 16.

Ver. 29. **πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρονος.** . . . "Of how much sorer punishment, think ye, will he be counted worthy, who, etc." The argument of ii. 1-4 and xii. 25. By the parenthetically interjected **δοκεῖτε** he appeals to their own sense of proportion and fitness; although the judgment alluded to in **ἀξιωθήσεται** is not theirs but God's. **ὁ . . . καταπατήσας** . . . The guilt of the apostate which justifies this sorer punishment is detailed in three particulars. He has trampled on the Son of God. The highest of Beings who has deserved best at his hands is spurned with outrageous scorn. **καὶ τὸ αἷμα . . . ἡγιάσθη** "and has reckoned the blood of the covenant with which he was sanctified, a common thing". "The blood of the covenant" is the blood of Christ (*cf.* ix. 15 ff., xiii. 20); here it is thus designated because repudiation of the covenant is in question. This blood is the purifying agent by which men are fitted for the fellowship and service of God, and so brought within the covenant. *Cf.* **ἡγιάσθη** with **ἁγιάζει** of ix. 13 and **καθαριεῖ** of ix. 14. This sole means of purification, the sanctifying virtue of which the supposed apostate has experienced, he now counts **κοινόν**, common or unclean. [The Vulg. has "pollutum," the Old Latin "communem". Chrysostom **ἀκάθαρτον ἢ τὸ μηδὲν πλέον ἔχον τῶν λοιπῶν**; and so Kübel, "which has no more worth than the blood of other men". All these meanings lie close to one another. *Cf.* Mark vii. 2, Acts x. 14. What is "common" is unsanctified, ceremonially unclean.] The third point in the heinousness of the sin of apostasy is **τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας**, "and has insulted the spirit of grace". This seems the direct antithesis to "Moses' law" of ver. 28. The spirit of grace is the distinctive gift of Christian times, and is not only the Pauline but the universal antithesis to the law. To have blasphemed this gracious Spirit, who brings the assurance of God's presence and pardon, and gifts suited to each believer, is to renounce all part in things spiritual. *Cf.* vi. 4, ii. 4; Eph. iv. 7.

Ver. 30. **οἴδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα.** . . . "For we know Him who said, vengeance is mine, I will repay." The certainty of the punishment spoken of is based upon the righteousness of God. "We know who it is that said"; it is the living God (v. 31). The quotation is from Deut. xxxii. 35 not as in the LXX but as given in Rom. xii. 19 where it is used as an argument for the surrender of private vengeance. In Deut. LXX the words are **Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω.** The second quotation, **κρινεῖ κύριος** . . . is from the following verse where the words intimate God's protecting care of His people, using **κρινεῖ** in the sense common in O.T. Delitzsch thinks that sense may be retained here, but this is less relevant and consistent with the passage. *Cf.* Ecclus. xxvii. 28 **ἡ ἐκδίκησις ὡς λέων.** and xxviii. 1. **φοβερὸν τὸ ἐμπεσεῖν.** . . . "It is dreadful to fall into the hands of the living God". Where David (2 Sam. xxiv. 14) prefers to do so [**ἐμπεσοῦμαι δὴ εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου**] it is because he knows his chastisement will be measured and that no unjust advantage will be taken. The dreadfulness of the impenitent's doom arises from the same certainty that absolute justice will be done. As Judge, God is "the living God," who sees and has power to execute just judgment, *cf.* iii. 12, xii. 22, *cf.* xii. 29.

Ver. 32. As in the parallel passage in chap. 6, the writer at ver. 9 suddenly turns from the presentation of the terrifying aspect of apostasy to make appeal to more generous motives, so here he now encourages them to perseverance by reminding them of their praiseworthy past. As Vaughan remarks, the thought is that of Gal. iii. 3. **ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας.**

ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων· 33. [s] τοῦτο μὲν, ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι· τοῦτο δὲ, κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων γενηθέντες· 34. [t] καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς [1] μου συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ἁρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μένουσαν. 35. [u] μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἔχει μισθαποδοσίαν

s Phil. i. 7, et iv. 14.
t Matt. v. 12, et vi. 20, et xix. 21; Luc. xii. 33; Acts v. 41, et xxi. 33; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 19; Jac. i. 2.
u Matt. x. 32.

[1] T.R. in ℵDᶜEHKLP, d, e, Aeth.; δεσμιοις AD* f, vg., Syr^{utr}, Copt., Arm.

. . . "But recall the former days, in which after being enlightened ye endured much wrestling with sufferings". **ἀναμιμ.**, "remind yourselves," as in 2 Cor. vii. 15. See Wetstein's examples, where the genitive not the accusative follows the verb, and M. Aurelius, v. 31. **τὰς πρότερον ἡμ.** [as in Thucyd., vi. 9 **ἐν τῷ πρότερον χρόνῳ**.] days separated from the present by some considerable interval, as is implied in v. 12. They are further described as **ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες** as in vi. 4; equivalent to "receiving the knowledge of the truth," ver. 26. It was the new light in Christ, shed upon their relation to God and on their prospects, which enabled them to endure much wrestling or conflict with sufferings. **ἄθλησις** in the next generation came to mean "martyrdom," as in *Mart. of S. Ignatius*, chap. 4. [For the genitive *cf.* "certamina divitiarum," Hor. *Epp.*, i. 5 8.] What these sufferings were is described in two clauses, they were partly in their own persons, partly in their sympathy and voluntary sharing in the suffering of others, **τοῦτο μὲν . . . θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ . . .** For the distributive formula, "partly," . . . "partly," see abundant examples from the classics in Wetstein. See also Plutarch's *Them.*, v. 4. It may be rendered "as well by," "as by". **θεατριζόμενοι**, "made a spectacle," [**ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θεάτρου παραδειγματιζόμενοι**, Theophyl., *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 9], literally true of the Christians who were exposed to wild beasts in the amphitheatre. See Renan's *L'Antéchrist*, pp. 162 ff., "A la barbarie des supplices on ajouta la dérision". But here it was not by lions and leopards and wild bulls they were attacked, but **ὀνειδισμοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν**, "reproaches and distresses," "opprobriis et tribulationibus" (Vulg.). **ὀνειδισμός** is frequent in LXX, and several times in the phrase **λόγοι ὀνειδ.** In this Epistle it occurs again in xi. 26 and xiii. 13, and *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 14. Some who have not directly suffered persecution in these forms suffered by sympathy and by identifying themselves with those who were experiencing such usage, **τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφομένων**. *Cf.* Phil. iv. 14. Farrar renders well, "who lived in this condition of things". In what sense they became **κοινωνοί** is immediately explained; they sympathised with those who were imprisoned and welcomed the violent seizure of their possessions. **καὶ γὰρ**, as always, must here be rendered "For indeed," "for in point of fact," proving by more definite instances that they had become partakers with the persecuted. They had felt for the imprisoned, as was possibly alluded to in vi. 10, and as they are in xiii. 3 exhorted still to do. *Cf.* Mat. xxv. 36, which probably formed a large factor in the production of that care for the persecuted which characterised the early Church. They had also suffered the loss of their goods. **ἁρπαγὴν**, the violent and unjust seizure, as in Mat. xxiii. 25, Luke xi. 39. **ἁρπαγὴ ὑπαρχόντων** occurs in Lucian and Artemidorus. See Stephanus. That which enables them to take joyfully the loss of their possessions is their consciousness that they have a possession which is better and which cannot be taken away. **γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοὺς** [for **ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς**]. If the true reading is **ἑαυτοῖς** then the meaning is easy "knowing that you have for yourselves". If we read **ἑαυτοὺς**, this may mean, as Davidson, Westcott and others suppose, "knowing that you have yourselves a better possession". But this seems not very congruous with the writer's usual style. It is more likely that the writer uses the emphatic "you yourselves" in contrast to those who had robbed them and now possessed their goods. So von Soden. Or it may mean "ye yourselves" in contrast to the possession itself of which they have been deprived, ye yourselves however stripped of all earthly goods.

Ver. 35. **μὴ ἀποβάλητε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν** . . . "Cast not away, then, your

μεγάλην. 36. [v] ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες, κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. 37. [w] Ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, "ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει, καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. 38. ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως[1] ζήσεται· καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή

v Luc. xxi. 19.
w Hab. ii. 3, 4; Agg. ii. 6; Luc. xviii. 8; Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11; 1 Peter i. 6, et v. 10; 2 Peter iii. 8.

[1] In B of LXX **μου** follows **πιστεως**, in A it follows **δικαιος**. B gives the more probable reading. In the text of Hebrews T.R. omits **μου** with DEH**KLP. **μου** is inserted after **δικαιος** in ℵAH*, f, vg., Arm., Clem., Thdrt. Cp. Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11.

confidence, for it has great recompense of reward'. The exhortation begun in ver. 19 is resumed, with now the added force springing from their remembrance of what they have already endured and from their consciousness of a great possession in heaven. A reason for holding fast their confidence is now found in the result of so doing. It has great reward. **μισθαποδοσία** used in ii. 2 of requital of sin, here and in xi. 26 of reward. *Cf.* Clem. *ad Cor.* 6, **γέρας γενναῖον**, and Wisdom iii. 5. Therefore, **μὴ ἀποβάλητε**, do not throw it away as a worthless thing you have no further need of. Retain it, **ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρείαν**, "for ye have need of endurance," of maintaining your hopeful confidence to the end under all circumstances. Without endurance the promise which secures to them the enduring possession cannot be enjoyed, for before entering upon its enjoyment, the whole will of God concerning them must be done and borne. **ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τ. θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν**, Davidson and Weiss agree in thinking that "the will of God is His will that they should hold fast their confidence". Rather, that accepting all privation, as they once did (ver. 32) and recognising all they were called to endure as God's will concerning them, they should thus endure to the end (*cf.* iii. 6) and so receive the promised good (**ἐπαγγελία** = the thing promised as in vi. 12, 15). **κομίσησθε**, the verb properly means to carry off or to recover what is one's own. See Mat. xxv. 27; 2 Cor. v. 10; Heb. xi. 13, 19, 39. And their entrance on the reward of their endurance will not long be delayed **ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον**. . . . "For yet a little—a very little—while and He that cometh will have come and will not delay." ["Es ist noch ein Kleines, wie sehr, wie sehr Klein" (Weiss), "noch eine kleine Zeit, ganz Klein" (Weizsäcker). "Adhuc enim modicum aliquantulum" (Vulg.). "For yet a little—ever so little—while" (Hayman)]. The phrase **μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον** is found in Isa. xxvi. 20, "Go, my people . . . hide thyself *for a very little*, till the indignation be overpast". The double **ὅσον** is found in Aristoph. *Wasps*, 213, where however Rogers thinks the duplication due to the drowsiness of the speaker. Literally it means "a little, how very, how very". The following words from **ὁ ἐρχόμενος** to **ἐν αὐτῷ** are from Heb. ii. 3-4, with some slight alterations, the article being inserted before **ἐρχόμενος, οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ** instead of the less forcible words in Hebrews, and the two clauses of ver. 4 being transposed. In Habakkuk the conditions are similar. God's people are crushed under overwhelming odds. And the question with which Habakkuk opens his prophecy is **ἕως τίνος κεκράξομαι καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσεις**; The Lord assures him that deliverance will come and will not delay. By inserting the article, the writer of Hebrews identifies the deliverer as the Messiah, "the coming One". *Cf.* Mat. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19; Jo. vi. 14. **ὁ δὲ δίκαιος**. . . . "And the just sha'l live by faith," *i.e.*, shall survive these troublous times by believing that the Lord is at hand. *Cf.* Jas. v. 7-9. **καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται**, "and if he withdraw himself" or "shrink". The verb, as Kypke shows, means to shrink in fear, and it is thus used in Gal. ii. 12. It is the very opposite of **παρρησία**. Accordingly it is thoroughly displeasing to God, whose purpose it is to bring men to Himself in confident hope. But the idea that any of the "Hebrews" can be in so ignominous and dangerous a position is at once repudiated. **ἡμεῖς δὲ**. . . . "But as for us we are not of those who shrink (literally of shrinking) to perdition but of faith to the gaining of the soul". That is, we are not characterised by a timid abandonment of our confession (ver. 23) and confidence. *Cf.* 1 Thess. v. 5. What such timidity leads to (**εἰς ἀπώλειαν**, *cf.* Acts viii. 20; Rom. ix. 22) is hopeless perdition. *Cf.* M. Aurelius on the **δραπέτης**, x. 25. **ὁ φοβούμενος**

μου ἐν αὐτῷ." 39. Ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς.

a Rom. viii. 24; 2 Cor. iv. 18.

XI. 1. ᵃἜΣΤΙ δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων

δραπέτης. But we are of faith whose end is περιποίησις ψυχῆς the acquisition of one's soul. Very similar is Luke xxi. 19, "By your endurance win your souls". See also James v. 20, and 1 Thess. v. 9. Like our word "acquisition" περιποίησις sometimes means the acquiring as in 1 Thess. v. 9 and 2 Thess. ii. 14; sometimes the thing acquired, as in Eph. i. 14. [In Isocrates, 2nd Ep., occurs the expression διὰ τὸ περιποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχήν (Wetstein)].

Chaps. XI. 1—XII. 3. That the Hebrews may still further be encouraged to persevere in maintaining faith the writer exhibits in detail its victories in the past history of their people and especially in the life of Jesus. (*Cf. Sirach*, 44-50.)

Ver. 1. Ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις . . . "Now faith is assurance of things hoped for, proof [manifestation] of things not seen". When ἔστι stands first in a sentence it sometimes means "there exists," as in John v. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 44. But it has not necessarily and always this significance, *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 6; Luke viii. 11; Wisdom vii. 1. There is therefore no need to place a comma after πίστις as some have done. The words describe what faith is, although not a strict definition. "Longe falluntur, qui justam fidei definitionem hic poni existimant: neque enim hic de tota fidei natura disserit Apostolus, sed partem elegit suo instituto congruentem, nempe quod cum patientia semper conjuncta sit" (Calvin). ὑπόστασις, literally foundation, that which stands under; hence, the ground on which one builds a hope, naturally gliding into the meaning "assurance," "confidence," as in iii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; Ruth i. 12; Ps. xxxix. 7, ἡ ὑπόστασίς μου παρὰ σοί ἐστιν. Ἔλεγχος regularly means "proof". See Demosthenes, *passim*; especially *Agt. Androtion*, p. 600, ἔλεγχος, ὧν ἂν εἴπῃ τις καὶ τἀληθὲς ὁμοῦ δείξῃ. It seems never to be used in a subjective sense for "conviction," "persuasion"; although here this meaning would suit the context and has been adopted by many. To say with Weiss that the subjective meaning *must* be given to the word that it may correspond with ὑπόστασις is to write the Epistle, not to interpret it. Theophylact renders the clause φανέρωσις ἀδήλων πραγμάτων. Faith is that which enables us to treat as real the things that are unseen. Hatch gives a different meaning to both clauses: "Faith is the ground of things hoped for, *i.e.*, trust in God, or the conviction that God is good and that He will perform His promises, is the ground for confident hope that the things hoped for will come to pass. . . . So trust in God furnishes to the mind which has it a clear proof that things to which God has testified exist, though they are not visible to the senses." The words thus become a definition of what faith does, not of what it is. Substantially the words mean that faith gives to things future, which as yet are only hoped for, all the reality of actual present existence; and irresistibly convinces us of the reality of things unseen and brings us into their presence. Things future and things unseen must become certainties to the mind if a balanced life is to be lived. Faith mediating between man and the supersensible is the essential link between himself and God, "for in it lay the commendation of the men of old," ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. That is, it was on the ground of their possessing faith that the distinguished men of the O.T. received the commendation of God, being immortalised in Scripture. It might almost be rendered "by faith of this kind," answering to this description. ἐν ταύτῃ has an exact parallel in 1 Tim. v. 10, the widow who is to be placed on the Church register must be ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη, well-reported of on the score of good works. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, those of past generations, men of the O.T. times; as Papias [Euseb., *H.E.*, iii. 39] uses the term to denote the "Fathers of the Church" belonging to the generation preceding his own. The idea that faith is that which God finds pleasure in (x. 38) and is that which truly unites to God under the old dispensations as well as under the new is a Pauline thought, Gal. iii. 6. This general statement of ver. 2 is exhibited in detail in the remainder of the chapter; but first the writer shows the excellence of faith in this, that it is by it that we recognise that there is an unseen world and that out of things unseen this visible world has taken

ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. 2. ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. 3. [b] Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα [1] γεγονέναι. 4. [c] Πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Κάϊν προσήνεγκε τῷ Θεῷ, δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ·

b Gen. i. 1; Ps. xxxiii. 6; Rom. iv. 17; 2 Peter iii. 5.
c xii. 24; Gen. iv. 4, 10; Matt. xxiii. 35.

[1] το βλεπομενον in ℵAD*E*P, 17, d, e, Copt., Aeth.; T.R. in DcE**KL, f, vg., Syrutr, Arm.

rise. This idea is suggested to him because his eye is on *Genesis* from which he culls the succeeding examples and it is natural that he should begin at the beginning. "Before exhibiting how faith is the principle that rules the life of men in relation to God, down through all history, as it is transacted on the stage of the world, the author shows how this stage itself is brought into connection with God by an act of faith" (Davidson). By faith we perceive, with the mental eye **νοοῦμεν**, *cf.* Rom. i. 20, that the worlds (**αἰῶνας**, *cf.* i. 2; the visible world existing in time, the temporary manifestation of the unseen is meant, see i. 10, 11) have been framed (**κατηρτίσθαι**, as in x. 5, **σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι**. In xiii. 21 **καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς**, "perfect you" as in Luke vi. 40; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 10. The word is perhaps used in the present connection to suggest not a bare calling into existence, but a wise adaptation of part to part and of the whole to its purpose) by God's word, **ῥήματι θεοῦ**. This is the perception of faith. The word of God is an invisible force which cannot be perceived by sense. The great power which lies at the source of all that is does not itself come into observation; we perceive it only by faith which is (ver. 1) "the evidence of things not seen". The result of this creation by an unseen force, the word of God, is that "what is seen has not come into being out of things which appear". **εἰς τὸ . . . γεγονέναι. εἰς τὸ** with infinitive, commonly used to express purpose, is sometimes as here used to express result, and we may legitimately translate "so that what is seen, etc." *Cf.* Luke v. 17; Rom. xii. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 6; Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 16. *Cf.* Burton, *M. and T.*, 411. **μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων**, the Vulgate renders "ex invisibilibus," and the Old Latin "ex non apparentibus" having apparently read **ἐκ μὴ φαιν. τὸ βλεπόμενον** the singular in place of the plural of T.R. and Vulgate, presents all things visible as unity. Had the visible world been formed out of materials which were subject to human observation, there would have been no room for faith. Science could have traced it to its origin. Evolution only pushes the statement a stage back. There is still an unseen force that does not submit itself to experimental science, and that is the object of faith. To find in this verse an allusion to the noumenal and phenomenal worlds would be fanciful.

Ver. 4. **πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν. . . .** "By faith Abel offered to God a more adequate sacrifice than Cain." **πλείονα** literally "more," but frequently used to express "higher in value" "greater in worth," as in Mat. xii. 41, 42. **πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε**, Luke xii. 23; Rev. ii. 19. Does the writer mean that faith prompted Abel to make a richer sacrifice, or that it was richer because offered in faith? Many interpreters prefer the former alternative; ["Der grössere Wert seines Opfers ruhte auf dem Glauben, der Herzenshingabe, die ihn das Beste der Herde wählen liess" (Kübel).] and the choice of the word **πλείονα** is certainly in favour of this interpretation. **δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη . . .** "through which he was certified [or attested] as righteous". It is questioned whether **ἧς** is the relative of **θυσίαν** or of **πίστει**. The succeeding clause which states the ground of the attestation, **ἐπὶ τ. δώροις**, determines that it refers to **θυσίαν**. God bore witness **ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ**, which is explained in Genesis iv. 4 where it says **ἐπεῖδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἄβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ**. God looked favourably on Abel and on his gifts. How this favourable reception of his offering was intimated to Abel we are not told; but by this testimony Abel was pronounced **δίκαιος**, not "justified" in the Pauline sense but in the general sense "a righteous man"; as in Mat. xxiii. 35 **ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου**. But this is not all that faith did for Abel, for **καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ**, "and through the same he, though dead, yet speaks," *i.e.*, speaks notwithstanding

d Gen. v. 24; Eccl. xliv. 16, et xlix. 14.
e Gen. vi. 13; Eccl. xliv. 17; Rom. iii. 22; Phil. iii. 9.

καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖται. 5. [d] Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, καὶ "οὐχ εὑρίσκετο,[1] διότι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός"· πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταθέσεως αὐτοῦ μεμαρτύρηται "εὐηρεστηκέναι τῷ Θεῷ"· 6. χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι· πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται. 7. [e] Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ

[1] ηυρισκετο in ℵADE.

death. His death was not the end of him as Cain expected it to be. Abel's blood cried for justice. The words of xii. 24 are at once suggested, αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ, where the blood of sprinkling is said to speak to better purpose than the blood of Abel. This again takes us back to Gen. iv. 10. "The voice of thy brother's blood cries to me from the ground." The speaking referred to, therefore, is not the continual voice of Abel's example but the voice of his blood crying to God immediately after his death. *Cf.* Ps. ix. 12 and cxvi. 15. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints." In the case of Abel, then, the excellence of faith was illustrated in two particulars, it prompted him to offer a richer, more acceptable offering, and it found for him a place in God's regard even after his death.

Ver. 5. **Πίστει Ἐνὼχ μετετέθη. . . .** "By faith Enoch was translated so that he did not see death; and he was not found, because God had translated him. For before his translation he had witness borne to him that he had pleased God well; but without faith it is impossible to please Him well." In the dry catalogue of antediluvian longevities a gem of faith is detected. What lay at the root of Enoch's translation? Faith, because before he was translated he was well-pleasing to God, which implies that he believed in God, or as Chrysostom neatly puts it: πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη ὁ Ἐνώχ; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρεστήσεως ἡ πίστις. In Ecclus. xliv. 16 he is exhibited as ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς. μετετέθη "was transferred," removed from one place to another, as in Acts vii. 16, *cf.* also Gal. i. 6, Jude 4. In Ecclus. lxix. 14 it is represented by ἀνελήφθη ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. The succeeding clauses imply that his body disappeared. How the tradition arose we have no means of knowing, *cf.* Suicer, i. 1130, and the Bible Dictionaries. τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν may either imply purpose or result. For the former see Mat. ii. 13, Luke ii. 24, Phil. iii. 10; for the latter, Mat. xxi. 32, Acts vii. 19, Rom. vii. 3, Heb. x. 7. The use of the passive μετετέθη favours the supposition that result is here expressed, and throughout the sentence it is the translation that is prominent rather than the escape from death, which is introduced rather as an explanation of μετετέθη. **καὶ οὐχ ηὑρίσκετο. . . .** These words are verbatim from the LXX of Gen. v. 24, and are quoted for the sake of bringing out clearly that God was the author of the translation. (*Cf.* the misquotation in Clem. *Ep.*, chap. 9, οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος.) God translated him, and this is proved by the fact that preceding the statement of his translation Scripture records that he pleased God well, where the Hebrew has "he walked with God". **χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστῆσαι.** "But without faith it is impossible to please Him well." The ground of this proposition is given in the following words: **πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον. . . .** "For he who cometh to God must believe that He exists and that to those who seek Him He turns out to be a rewarder." To please God one must draw near to Him (τὸν προσερχόμενον in the semi-technical sense usual in the Epistle), and no one can draw near who has not these two beliefs that God is and will reward those who seek Him. So that Enoch's faith, and the faith of every one who approaches God, verifies the description of ver. 1: the unseen must be treated as sufficiently demonstrated, and the hoped for reward must be considered substantial.

Ver. 7. **Πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε. . . .** "By faith Noah, on being divinely warned of things not as yet seen, with reverential heed prepared an ark to save his household." Both here and in Mat. ii. 12, 22 χρηματ. is translated "warned of God," although "divinely instructed" as in viii. 5 is admissible in all the passages. πίστει must be construed with εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασεν and these words must be kept together, although some join εὐλαβηθεὶς with

τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ· δι᾽ ἧς κατέκρινε τὸν κόσμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο κληρονόμος. 8. [f] Πίστει καλούμενος [1] Ἀβραὰμ ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃν ἤμελλε λαμβάνειν εἰς

f Gen. xii. 1, 4; Acts vii. 2.

[1] ο καλουμενος in AD* 17, Arm., a reading which Calvin censures as "nimio dilutum ac frigidum".

the preceding words. τῶν μηδέπω βλεπ, *i.e.*, the flood; *cf.* Gen vi. 14. εὐλαβηθεὶς here used in preference to φοβηθεὶς because it is not a timorous dread of the catastrophe that is signified, but a commendable caution springing from regard to God's word. In obedience to this feeling he prepared an ark [κιβωτὸν used of the ark of the covenant in ix. 4, and of Noah's ship in Gen. vi. 15, because it was shaped like a box with a roof. In Wisdom x. 4 it is spoken of as "worthless timber," to magnify the salvation accomplished by its means. δι' εὐτελοῦς ξύλου τὸν δίκαιον (Σοφία) κυβερνήσασα and in Wisdom xiv. 7 it is ξύλον δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη.] This ark he built for the saving of his family; as in Gen. vii. 1 God says to Noah, εἴσελθε σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου. By this faith [δι' ἧς] and its manifestation in preparing the ark, "he condemned the world"; of which the most obvious meaning is that Noah's faith threw into relief the unbelief of those about him. *Cf.* Mat. xii. 41. But to this, Weiss objects that in Hebrews κόσμος is not used to denote the world of men. He therefore concludes that what is meant is that Noah by building the ark for his own rescue showed that he considered the world doomed, thus passing judgment upon it. Certainly the former meaning is the more natural and the objection of Weiss has little weight. A second result of his faith was that "he entered into possession of the righteousness which faith carries with it". The original significance of κληρονόμος is here, as often elsewhere, left behind. It means little more than "owner". But no doubt underneath the word there lies the idea, familiar to the Jewish mind, that spiritual blessings are a heritage bestowed by God. ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη is rendered by Winer (p. 502) "the righteousness which is in consequence of faith" and he instructively compares Mat. xix. 3, ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, and Acts iii. 17, κατ' ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε. The first statement in the history of Noah (Gen. vi. 10) is, Νῶε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος, τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ, τῷ θεῷ εὐηρέστησε Νῶε. *Cf.* Wisdom x. 4. In Genesis the warning of God is communicated to Noah because he was already righteous; in Hebrews a somewhat different aspect is presented, Noah "became" righteous by building the ark in faith. He was one of those who διὰ πίστεως ἠργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, ver. 33.

From ver. 8 to ver. 22 the faith of the patriarchs is exhibited, *cf.* Ecclus. xliv. 19.

Ver. 8. Πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβραάμ. . . . "By faith Abraham on being called to go out to a place which he was to receive as an inheritance, obeyed and went out not knowing whither he was going." καλούμενος, as in Mark i. 20 and Isa. li. 2, ἐμβλέψατε Ἀβραὰμ . . . ὅτι εἷς ἦν, καὶ ἐκάλεσα αὐτόν. The present, not κληθεὶς, expresses the idea that no sooner was the call given than it was obeyed ["dass er, so wie der Ruf an ihn ging, gehorsamte" (Bleek)]. The same idea is expressed by the immediate introduction of ὑπήκουσεν, which more naturally would come at the end of the clause, and thus allow ἐξελθεῖν (*cf.* Gen. xii. 1; Acts vii. 2) to follow καλούμενος. The faith of Abraham appeared in his promptly abandoning his own country on God's promise of another, and the strength of this faith was illustrated by the circumstance that he had no knowledge where or what that country was. He went out μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται. The terms of the call (Gen. xii. 1) were ἔξελθε . . . καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω. It was, therefore, no attractive account of Canaan which induced him to forsake Mesopotamia, no ordinary emigrant's motive which moved him, but mere faith in God's promise. "Even still the life of faith must be entered on in ignorance of the way to the inheritance, or even what the inheritance and rest in each one's particular case will be, and of the experiences that the way will bring. This is true even of ordinary life" (Davidson). This did not exhaust the faith of Abraham. Further πίστει παρῴκησεν. . . . "By faith he became a sojourner in a land [his] by the promise as if it belonged to another, dwelling in tents, along with

κληρονομίαν, καὶ ἐξῆλθε μὴ ἐπιστάμενος ποῦ ἔρχεται. 9. Πίστει παρῴκησεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν, ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας μετὰ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ τῶν συγκληρονόμων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς· 10. [g] ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν, ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεός.

11. [h] Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβε, καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν, ἐπεὶ πιστὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν

g iii. 4, et xii. 22, et xiii. 14; Apoc. xxi. 2.
h Gen. xvii. 19, et xxi. 2; Luc. i. 36; Rom. iv. 19.

Isaac and Jacob, co-heirs with him of the same promise." **παρῴκησεν**, as in Acts vii. 6, **πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ**, dwelt alongside of the proper inhabitants. *Cf.* Gen. xvii. 8 and *passim*. **εἰς** in its common pregnant sense, Jo. xxi. 4; Acts viii. 40; Pet. v. 12 and especiially Acts vii. 4. He lived in the promised land, **ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν**, as if it belonged to some other person; neither did he make a permanent settlement in it but dwelt in tents, shifting from place to place, the symbol of what is temporary, see Isa. xxxviii. 12; 2 Cor. v. 4. The presence of his son and grandson must continually have prompted him to settle. They were included in the promise, but they too were compelled to move with him from place to place. But how did this evince faith? It did so by showing that he had given a wider scope and a deeper significance to God's words. He was content to dwell in tents, because he looked for "the city which has the foundations". **ἐξεδέχετο γὰρ τὴν . . . πόλιν.** "For he expectantly waited for the city." **ἐκδέχομαι** (Jas. v. 7, **ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδεχ.**, Acts xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 33) occurs in Soph. *Phil.*, 123, where Jebb says: "The idea of the compound is 'be ready for him,' prepared to deal with him the moment he appears". The city is described as one "that has the foundations" which the tents lacked, and which according to xiii. 14 is by implication not only **μέλλουσαν** but **μένουσαν**. In xii. 22 it is called "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem," and in Gal. iv. 26 **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ**. A city was the symbol of a settled condition, as in Ps. cvii. 7, **πόλις κατοικητηρίου**. *Cf.* the interesting parallel in Philo. *Leg. Alleg.*, iii.-xxvi., p. 103, **πόλις δέ ἐστιν ἀγαθὴ καὶ πολλὴ καὶ σφόδρα εὐδαίμων, τὰ γὰρ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλα καὶ τίμια.** It is further described as **ἧς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός**, "whose constructer and maker is God". **τεχνίτης** is used of the silversmiths in Acts xix. 24, of God as Maker of the world in Wisdom xiii. 1 and xiv. 2, **τεχνίτης δὲ σοφίᾳ κατεσκεύασεν.** Perhaps "artificer" comes nearest to the meaning. **δημιουργός**, originally one who works for the people, but applied by Plato (*Rep.*, p. 530) to God; and so, very often in Josephus and Philo (see Krebs, *in loc.*). For the use of the title among the Gnostics, see Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, p. 19. In Clement, *Ep.*, 20, we have **ὁ μέγας δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης τῶν ἁπάντων**. In 2 Macc. iv. 1, **τῶν κακῶν δημιουργός**. "Maker" most adequately translates the word. Wetstein shows that **τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς** was not an uncommon combination and aptly compares Cicero (*De Nat. D.*, i. 8) "Opificem aedificatorem mundi". The statement of this verse shows that Abraham and other enlightened O.T. saints (*cf.* chap. iv.) understood that their connection with God, the Eternal One, was their great possession, of which earthly gifts and blessings were but present manifestations.

Ver. 11. **Πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα. . . .** "By faith Sarah herself also received power to become a mother even when past the age, since she counted Him faithful who had promised." **καὶ αὐτὴ Σάρρα** is rendered by Vaughan, Sarah "in her place" as [Abraham] in his; she on her part. The reference of **αὐτὴ** is disputed; it has been understood to mean "Sarah the unfruitful". In D. **στεῖρα** is added; or, as Chrysostom and Bengel, "vas infirmius," the weaker vessel. Delitzsch thinks that as in Luke xx. 42, xxiv. 15, it merely means "so Sarah likewise". But apparently the reference is to her previous unbelief. By faith she received strength **εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος**, "the act of the husband not of the wife" (see a score of passages in Wetstein), hence Bleek, Farrar and several others prefer to understand the words of "the founding of a family," citing Plato's **πρώτη καταβολὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων**. But if **εἰς** be taken in the same sense as in x. 19, "as regards" or "in connection with" or "with a view to," the difficulty disappears. [*Cf.* Weiss who says the words signify "nicht ein Thun, zu dem sie Kraft empfing, sondern die Beziehung in welcher sie ein Kraft

ἐπαγγειλάμενον. 12. [i]διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, καὶ ταῦτα νενεκρωμένου, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡσεὶ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναρίθμητος. 13. [k]Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ λαβόντες[1] τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες, καὶ πεισθέντες[2] καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι, καὶ ὁμο-

i Gen. xv. 5, et xxii. 17; Rom. iv. 18.
k Gen. xxiii. 4, et xlvii. 9; 1 Par. xxix. 15; Ps. xxxix. 12, et cxix. 19; Joan. viii. 56.

[1] T.R. in ℵcDEKL; μη κομισαμενοι in ℵ*P, 17, 23, 71; μη προσδεξαμενοι in A.
[2] και πεισθεντες omitted in ℵADEKLP, and verss.

bedürfte, wenn dasselbe für sie wirksam werden sollte". *Cf.* also Gen. xviii. 12.] Her faith was further illustrated (**καὶ** = and this indeed) by the circumstance that she was now **παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας**, the comparative use of **παρά** frequent in this Epistle. For a woman who in her prime had been barren, to believe that in her decay she could bear a son was a triumph of faith. *Cf.* Gen. xviii. 12-13, **ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα.** But she had faith in the promise (*cf.* vi. 13-18), "wherefore also there were begotten of one—and him as good as dead—[issue] as the stars of heaven in multitude and as the sand by the seashore innumerable". Probably the **καὶ** is to be construed with **διὸ** as in Luke i. 35; Acts x. 29, etc. **ἀφ' ἑνὸς**, that is, Abraham (*cf.* Isa. li. 2, **εἷς ἦν**); **καὶ ταῦτα**, a classical expression, see Xenophon, *Mem.*, ii. 3, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 248. **νενεκρωμένου**, "dead" so far as regards the begetting of offspring, *cf.* Rom. iv. 19. **καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα**, a nominative to **ἐγεν.** may be supplied, **ἔκγονοι** or **σπέρμα.** For the metaphors *cf.* Gen. xxii. 17. **ἄστρον** is properly a constellation, but used commonly for "a star". **χεῖλος** found in the classics in same connection.

Ver. 13. Not only in life was the faith of the patriarchs manifested, it stood the test of death, **κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες**, in keeping with their faith (see Winer, p. 502) these all (that is Abraham, Sarah, Isaac and Jacob) died, and the strength of their faith was seen in this that although they had not received the fulfilment of the promises (ver. 39 and x. 36) they yet had faith enough to see and hail them from afar. As Moses endured because he *saw* the Invisible (ver. 27) so the patriarchs were not daunted by death because they saw the day of Christ (John viii. 56), that is to say, they were so firmly persuaded that God's promise would be fulfilled that it could be said that they *saw* the fulfilment. They hailed them from afar, as those on board ship descry friends on shore and wave a recognition. [Wetstein cites from Appian, *De Bell. Civ.*, ver. 46, p. 110 where it is said that the soldiers **τὸν Καίσαρα πόρρωθεν ὡς αὐτοκράτορα ἠσπάσαντο.**] "Such an **ἀσπασμός** we have in the mouth of the dying Jacob (Gen. xlix. 18): For Thy salvation have I waited, Jehovah" (Delitzsch). This they might have done had they merely believed that the promises would be fulfilled to their descendants, but that their faith extended also to their own enjoyment of God's promise was testified by their confessing that so far as regards the land (**τῆς γῆς**) of Canaan they were pilgrims and foreigners. This confession was made no doubt by their whole conduct, but as the aorist indicates it was made verbally by Abraham on the occasion of Sarah's death (Gen. xxiii. 4), **πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγώ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν**, *cf.* xlvii. 9, etc. The article before **γῆς**, together with the sense of the passage, shows that the land of promise, Canaan, was meant. **ἐπὶ γῆς** in the same connection is used for "the earth," *cf.* 1 Chron. xxix. 15. Philo (*De Agricult.*, p. 196) refines upon the same idea, **παροικεῖν οὐ κατοικεῖν ἤλθομεν· τῷ γὰρ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανόν, ξένην δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν.** *Cf. De Conf. Ling.*, p. 331. But such a confession implies that those who make it (**οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες**) have not yet found but are in search of a fatherland, **πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσιν.** [*Cf.* Rom. xi. 7, **ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν.** Frequent in N.T., to seek, search for. "The **ἐπὶ** is that of direction, as the **ἐκ** in **ἐκζητεῖν** (ver. 6) is that of explanation" (Vaughan).] The acknowledgment, cheerful or sad, that such and such a land is not the home-country makes it manifest (**ἐμφανίζουσιν**, Jo. xiv. 21, Acts xxiii. 15) that they think of and have in view and are making for a land which they can call their own. ["Si hic peregrinantur, alibi patria est ac fixa sedes" (Calvin).] And that this home-country of their desire is not that from which Abraham and the patriarchs were really derived (Mesopo-

λογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 14. οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες, ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι πατρίδα ἐπιζητοῦσι. 15. καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον ἀφ' ἧς ἐξῆλθον,[1] εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι· 16. [l] νυνὶ[2] δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τουτέστιν ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς, Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· ἡτοίμασε γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν. 17. [m] Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ πειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀνα-

l Exod. iii. 6; Matt. xxii. 32; Acts vii. 32.
m Gen. xxii. 2, etc.; Eccl. xliv. 20.

[1] T.R. in ℵcDcE**KL; ἐξέβησαν in ℵ*AD*E*P, 17, 73.
[2] T.R. in minusculis; νυν in ℵADEKLP.

tamia) and which they had abandoned, (ἀφ' ἧς ἐξέβησαν) is also evident, because had they cherished fond memories of it they would have had opportunity (εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν, *cf.* Acts xxiv. 25; 1 Macc. xv. 34. The imperfects indicate that this was continuous) to return (ἀνακάμψαι, Mat. ii. 12; Luke x. 6; Acts xviii. 21; frequent in LXX). νῦν δὲ, "but as the case actually stands" (viii. 6, ix. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc.) putting aside this idea that it might be their old home they were seeking, κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐπουρανίου, it is a better, that is, a heavenly they aspire after. That which in point of fact provoked in the patriarchs the sense of exile was that their hearts were set on a better country and firmer settlement than could be found anywhere, but in heaven. And because they thus proved that they were giving to God credit for meaning by His promises more than the letter indicated, because they measured His promises by the spirit of the promises rather than by the thing promised, He is not ashamed of them, not ashamed to be called their God; and the proof that He is not ashamed of them is, that He prepared for them a city. The patriarchs showed that they understood that in giving these promises God became their God; therefore God was not ashamed of them, and this showed itself especially in His naming Himself "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Exod. iii. 15). *Cf.* with this verse, viii. 10 and Mat. xxii. 31, 32. And that He was truly their God He showed by preparing for them a city which should justify the expectations which they had based upon His power and goodness.

Ver. 17. Πίστει προσενήνοχεν Ἀβραὰμ. . . . "By faith Abraham when tried offered up Isaac, yea he who had accepted the promises, to whom it had been said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called, offered his only son." The perfect προσενήνοχεν, Blass (*Gram.*, 200) says "can only be understood as referring to the abiding example offered to us". Similarly Alford, Westcott, Weiss, etc. Surely it is better to have regard to Burton's statement, "The Perfect Indicative is sometimes used in the N.T. of a simple past fact where it is scarcely possible to suppose that the thought of existing result was in the writer's mind". And in Jebb's Appendix to Vincent and Dickson's *Gram. of Mod. Greek* (p. 327, 8) it is demonstrated that "later Greek shows some clear traces of a tendency to use the Perfect as an Aorist". τὸν is probably here intended not merely to indicate the case of the indeclinable Ἰσαὰκ (Vaughan), *cf.* vv. 18, 20, but to call attention to the importance of Isaac; and this is further accomplished in the succeeding clause which brings out the full significance of the sacrifice. It was his only son whom Abraham was offering (προσέφερε imperfect in its proper sense of an unfinished transaction) and therefore the sole link between himself and the fulfilment of the promises to which he had given hospitable entertainment (ἀναδεξάμενος, 2 Macc. vi. 19). "The sole link," because, irrespective of any other children Abraham had had or might have, it had been said to him (πρὸς ὃν, denoting Abraham not Isaac), In Isaac shall a seed be named to thee (Gen. xxi. 12); that is to say, it is Isaac and his descendants who shall be known as Abraham's seed. Others are proud to count themselves the descendants of Abraham but the true "seed" (κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα, *cf.* Gal. iii. 16, 29) to whom along with Abraham the promises were given was the race that sprang from Isaac, the heir of the promise. No trial (πειραζόμενος as in Gen. xxii. 1, ὁ Θεὸς ἐπείρασε τὸν Ἀβραὰμ and *cf.* Gen. xxii. 12) could have been more severe. After long waiting the heir had at last been given, and now after his hope had for several years rooted itself in this one life, he is required to sacrifice

δεξάμενος, 18. [n] πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη, "Ὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα"· 19. λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν[1] δυνατὸς ὁ Θεός, ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο. 20. [o] Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων εὐλόγησεν[2] Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαῦ. 21. [p] Πίστει Ἰακὼβ ἀποθνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσὴφ εὐλόγησε[3]· καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. 22. [q] Πίστει Ἰωσὴφ τελευτῶν περὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐμνημόνευσε, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ἐνετείλατο. 23. [r] Πίστει Μωσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον· καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ διάταγμα[4] τοῦ βασιλέως. 24. [s] Πίστει Μωσῆς

n Gen. xxi. 12; Rom. ix. 7; Gal. iii. 29.
o Gen. xxvii. 27, 39.
p Gen. xlvii. 31, et xlviii. 5, 15, 16, 20.
q Gen. l. 24.
r Exod. i. 16, et ii. 2; Acts vii. 20.
s Exod. ii. 10, 11; Ps. lxxxiv. 10.

[1] **εγειρειν** in ℵDEKL; **εγειραι** in AP, 17, 71. [2] **ηυλογησεν** in A, 17, 37.
[3] **ηυλογησεν** in ADE, 17. [4] **δογμα** in A[vi], 34.

that life and so break his whole connection with the future. No greater test of his trust in God was possible. He conquered because he reckoned (**λογισάμενος** "expresses the formation of an opinion by *calculation* or *reasoning*, as in Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. x. 7" (Vaughan).), that even from the dead God is able to raise up—a belief in God's power to do this universally, see John v. 21. This belief enabled him to deliver his only son to death. "Whence (**ὅθεν**, *i.e.*, **ἐκ νεκρῶν**, although several commentators, even Weiss, render it 'wherefore') also he received him back (**ἐκομίσατο**, for this meaning see Gen. xxxviii. 20 and passages in Wetstein) in a figure (**ἐν παραβολῇ**, not actually, because Isaac had not been dead, but virtually because he had been given up to death. He had passed through the likeness of death, and his restoration to Abraham was a likeness of resurrection. (Whoever wishes to see how a simple expression may be tortured should consult Alford's long note on this place.)

Ver. 20. **Πίστει περὶ μελλόντων. . . .** "By faith Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau in regard to things future," as is recorded in the well-known passage, Gen. xxvii. Isaac thus in his turn exhibited a faith which could be described as **ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις**. "By faith Jacob when dying (**ἀποθνήσκων** *cf.* **καλούμενος**, ver. 8, and **πειραζόμενος**, ver. 17: the participle illustrates ver. 13 and also reminds the reader that Jacob before he died saw his children's children inheriting the promise ("thy two sons are mine," Gen. xlviii. 5) blessed each of the sons of Joseph. **ἕκαστον τ. υἱῶν**, that is, he gave each an individual blessing, crossing his hands, laying his right on the head of Ephraim the younger, his left on Manasseh, thus distinguishing between the destiny of the one and that of the other and so more abundantly illustrating his faith. **καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ**, "and worshipped leaning upon the top of h.s staff". The words are from the LXX rendering of Gen. xlvii. 31 where after Joseph had sworn to bury his father in Canaan, "Israel worshipped, etc.". His exacting this promise from Joseph was proof of his faith that his posterity would inherit the land of promise. The LXX translating from an unpointed text read הַמַּטֶּה the staff and not as it is now read הַמִּטָּה the bed, (as in xlviii. 2). The meaning in either case is that in extreme bodily weakness, either unable to leave his bed or if so only able to stand with the aid of a staff, his faith was yet untouched by the slightest symptom of decay. "The idea of **προσκυνεῖν** is that of *reverence shown in posture*" (Vaughan). Here Jacob "worshipped" in thankful remembrance of the promise of God and that his son had accepted it.

Ver. 22. Similarly Joseph when he in his turn came to the close of his life (**τελευτῶν**, from Gen. l. 26, **καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν Ἰωσὴφ**) made mention of the exodus of the children of Israel ("God will surely visit you and will bring you out of this land to the land concerning which God sware to our fathers," Gen. l. 24) and gave commandment concerning his bones ("ye shall carry up my bones hence with you," Gen. l. 25. For the fulfilment of the command see Josh. xxiv. 32).

Vv. 23-31. The writer passes from the patriarchal age to the times of Moses and the Judges.

μέγας γενόμενος ἠρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, 25. μᾶλλον ἑλόμενος συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ πρόσκαιρον ἔχειν ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσιν· 26. μείζονα πλοῦτον ἡγησάμενος τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θησαυρῶν τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν. 27. [t] Πίστει κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως· τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησε. 28. [u] Πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος,

t Exod. x. 28, 29, et xii. 31, etc., et xiii. 17, etc.
u Exod. xii. 3, 21, 22.

First the faith of the parents of Moses (τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ, in Stephanus' *Thesaur*, several examples are given of the use of πατέρες for "father and mother," parents; and consider Eph. vi. 4 and Col. iii. 21) is celebrated. This faith was shown in their concealing Moses for three months after his birth and thus evading the law that male children were to be killed, called in Wisd. xi. 7 νηπιοκτόνον διάταγμα. They did not fear this commandment of the king. It did not weigh against the child's beauty which betokened that he was destined for something great. Their faith consisted in their confidence that God had in store for so handsome a child an exceptional career and would save him to fulfil his destiny. In Acts vii. 20 Stephen calls him ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ, extraordinarily beautiful (*cf.* Jonah iii. 3) or as Philo, *De Mos.*, p. 82, ὄψιν ἀστειοτέραν ἢ κατ' ἰδιώτην, indicating that he had a corresponding destiny. Moses himself when he had grown up (μέγας γενόμενος, as in Exod. ii. 11 paraphrased by Stephen (Acts vii. 23) ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετὴς χρόνος.) refused to be called a son of a daughter of Pharaoh. The significance and source of this refusal lay in his preferring to suffer ill-usage with God's people rather than to have a short-lived enjoyment of sin. συνκακ., the simple verb in ver. 37, also xiii. 3; the compound here only. τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, it was because they were God's people, not solely because they were of his blood, that Moses threw in his lot with them. It was this which illustrated his faith. He believed that God would fulfil His promise to His people, little likelihood as at present there seemed to be of any great future for his race. On the other hand there was the ἁμαρτίας ἀπόλαυσις, the enjoyment which was within his reach if only he committed the sin of denying his people and renouncing their future as promised by God. For "the enjoyment to be reaped from sin" does not refer to the pleasure of gratifying sensual appetite and so forth, but to the satisfaction of a high ambition and the gratification of his finer tastes which he might have had by remaining in the Egyptian court. Very similarly Philo interprets the action of Moses, who, he says, "esteemed the good things of those who had adopted him, although more splendid for a season, to be in reality spurious, but those of his natural parents, although for a little while less conspicuous, to be true and genuine" (*De Mose*, p. 86). That which influenced Moses to make this choice was his estimate of the comparative value of the outcome of suffering with God's people and of the happiness offered in Egypt. μείζονα πλοῦτον . . . εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν, "since he considered the reproach of the Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt; for he steadily kept in view the reward". The reproach or obloquy and disgrace, which Moses experienced is called "the reproach of the Christ" because it was on account of his belief in God's saving purpose that he suffered. The expression is interpreted by our Lord's statement that Abraham saw his day. It does not imply that Moses believed that a personal Christ was to come, but only that God would fulfil that promise which in point of fact was fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The writer uses the expression rather with a view to his readers who were shrinking from the reproach of Christ (xiii. 13), than from the point of view of Moses. Several interpreters (Delitzsch, etc.) suppose that in virtue of the mystical union Christ suffered in his people. But, as Davidson says, "this mystical union cannot be shown to be an idea belonging to the Epistle, nor is this sense pertinent to the connection." (So Weiss, "die vorstellung liegt unserem Briefe fern".) Weiss' own interpretation is ingenious: "The O.T. church was created by the pre-existent Messiah to be the people who were destined to introduce through Him perfect salvation; therefore each maltreatment of this people was contempt of

ἵνα μὴ ὁ ὀλοθρεύων[1] τὰ πρωτότοκα θίγῃ αὐτῶν. 29. [v] Πίστει διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς· ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι κατεπόθησαν. 30. [w] Πίστει τὰ τείχη Ἱεριχὼ ἔπεσε,[2] κυκλωθέντα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας. 31. [x] Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.

v Exod. xiv. 21, 22.
w Jos. vi. 20.
x Jos. ii. 1, et vi. 23; Jac. ii. 25.

[1] ολεθρευων in ADE. [2] επεσαν in ℵAD*P, 17, 23, 71.

Him as unable to avenge and deliver His people". To say that it means merely "the same reproach that Christ bore" scarcely satisfies the expression. The "treasures of Egypt" must be supposed to include all that had been accumulated during centuries of civilisation. **ἀπέβλεπεν**, he habitually kept in view the reward. *Cf.* Xen., *Hist.*, vi. 1, 8 **ἡ σὴ πατρὶς εἰς σὲ ἀποβλέπει**, also Ps. xi. 4, Philo, *De Opif.*, p. 4. **κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον**, "he forsook Egypt," and fled to Midian. That this flight and not the Exodus is meant appears from the connection of the clause both with what precedes and with what follows. It exhibits the result of his choice (ver. 26), and it alludes to what preceded the Passover (ver. 28). The word **ἐκαρτέρησεν**, denoting long continued endurance also suits better this reference. The only difficulty in the way of accepting this interpretation is found in the words **μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως**, because, according to Exod. ii. 15, the motive of his flight was fear of the king. **ἐφοβήθη δὲ Μωυσῆς**. But what is in the writer's mind is not Pharaoh's wrath as cause but as consequence of Moses' abandonment of Egypt. His flight showed that he had finally renounced life at court, and in thus indicating by this decisive action that he was an Israelite, and meant to share with his people, he braved the king's wrath. This he was strengthened to do because he saw an invisible monarch greater than Pharaoh. Vaughan seems the only interpreter who has precisely hit the writer's meaning: "the two fears are different, the one is the fear arising from the discovery of his slaying the Egyptian, the other is the fear of Pharaoh's anger on discovering his flight. *He feared and therefore fled: he feared not, and there fore fled.*" Having fled and so cutting himself off from all immediate opportunity of helping his people, **ἐκαρτέρησεν**, "he steadfastly bided his time," because he saw the Invisible, being thus an eminent illustration of faith as **ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων**. The aorist gathers the forty years in Midian into one exhibition of wonderful perseverance in faith. It was the upper form of the school which disciplined Moses and wrought him to the mould of a hero. Another point in his career at which faith manifested itself was the Exodus, **πεποίηκεν τὸ πάσχα**, "he hath celebrated the Passover". Alford says the perfect is used on account of the Passover being "a still enduring Feast". But it is Moses' celebration of it that the perfect represents as enduring. The classical treatment of the question, Has **ποιεῖν** a sacrificial meaning in the N.T.? will be found in Prof. T. K. Abbott's *Essays*. **ποιεῖν** is regularly used of "keeping" a feast; and this is a classical usage as well. *Cf.* Exod. xii. 48, xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxxv. 17-19. **τὸ πάσχα** originally the paschal lamb, Exod. xii. 21, **καὶ θύσατε τὸ πάσχα**, Mark xiv. 12 **τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον**, hence the feast of Passover as in Luke xxii. 1. It is written **φασέκ** throughout 2 Chron. xxx. and xxxv., also in Jer. xxxviii. 8. **καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος**, "and the affusion of the blood" the sprinkling of the blood on the door posts as commanded in Exod. xii. 7, 22, the object being that the destroyers of the firstborns might not touch them. As **θιγγάνω** is followed by a genitive in xii. 20 it is probable that the writer here also meant it to govern **αὐτῶν** while **πρωτότοκα** follows **ὀλοθρεύων**. So R.V. **ὁ ὀλοθρεύων** is taken from Exod. xii. 23. **πρωτότοκα**, first-borns of man and also of beasts, Exod. xii. 12. **αὐτῶν** is naturally referred to "the people of God," ver. 25. It was a noteworthy faith which enabled Moses confidently to promise the people protection from the general destruction. On their part also there was the manifestation of a strong faith. **διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν . . .** "they passed through the Red sea as if on dry land". The nominative must be taken out of **αὐτῶν**. **διέβησαν**, the usual term for crossing a river or a space. The Red sea is in Hebrew "the Sea of [red] weeds". **διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς** as in

32. [y] Καὶ τί ἔτι λέγω; ἐπιλείψει γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεὼν, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν καὶ Ἰεφθάε, Δαβίδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ

y Jud. iv. 6, et vi. 11, et xi. 1, et xii. 7, et xiii. 24; 1 Sam. i. 20, et xii. 17, etc., et xiii. 14, et xvii. 45.

Exod. xiv. 29 ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρᾶς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, also xv. 19; and *cf.* the various impressions in the Psalms which celebrate the great deliverance. The greatness of the people's faith is accentuated by the fate of the Egyptians, whose attempt to follow was audacity and presumption not faith. ἧς πεῖραν λαβόντες . . . "of which [*i.e.*, of the sea] making trial the Egyptians were swallowed up," Exod. xv. 4 κατεπόθησαν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ. Another instance of the faith of the people and its effects is found in the fall of the walls of Jericho. The greatness of the faith may be measured by the difficulty we now have in believing that the walls fell without the application of any visible force. God's promise was, πεσεῖται αὐτόματα τὰ τείχη, and believing this promise the people compassed the city seven days. The greatness of their faith was further exhibited in their continuing to compass the city day after day, for in the promise (Josh. vi. 1-5) no mention is made of any delay in its fulfilment and the natural inference would be that the walls would fall on the first day. That none should have felt foolish marching day after day round the solid walls is beyond nature. κυκλωθέντα, see Josh. vi. 6, 14 and for ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, Josh. vi. 14. "When applied to time, ἐπί denotes the period over which something extends, as Luke iv. 25, ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία, during three years" (Winer, p. 508). The fall of Jericho and the extermination of its inhabitants suggest the escape of Rahab. ἡ πόρνη, in its strict meaning ("ista meretrix" (Origen), "fornicaria" (Irenaeus), is introduced to emphasise the power of faith; she did not perish along with the disobedient (iii. 18); ἀπειθήσασιν, they knew that the Lord had given the land to Israel (Josh. ii. 9, 10) but did not submit themselves to the acknowledged purpose of Jehovah. Rahab acted upon her belief in this purpose and instead of delivering up the spies as enemies of her country "received them with peace," that is, as friends, risking her life because of her faith.

Vv. 32-40. Summary of the achievements of faith in the times subsequent to Joshua.

Ver. 32. At this point the writer sees that he cannot pursue the method he has been following and give in detail all the signal manifestations of faith, which are recorded in the annals of his people. τί ἔτι λέγω, "what shall I further say?" deliberative subjunctive (*cf.* Rom. i. 15, etc.) the writer questioning how he is to handle the numberless instances that rise before his mind. He cannot give them all, ἐπιλείψει με γὰρ . . . "for time will fail me if I recount in detail". (Julian, *Orat.*, i. p. 341 B. ἐπιλείψει με τἀκείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος). ἐπιλείψει με ἡ ἡμέρα is frequent, see many examples in Wetstein. *Cf.* Virgil, *Æn.*, vi. 121, quid Thesea magnum, quid memorem Alciden? "a favourite device for cutting short a long list" (Page). διηγούμενον means to relate with particularity, see Luke viii. 39, ix. 10; Acts xii. 17; Gen. xxix. 13. On Gideon see Judges vi.-viii; Barak chronologically earlier, chap. iv, v; Samson, xiii-xvi; Jephthah, who also preceded Samson, xi, xii. Samuel is considered as the first of the prophets as in Acts iii. 24 and xiii. 20. οἵ covers vv. 33, 34, although not every particular cited, while διὰ πίστεως refers to all the verbs to end of 38. This expression supplants the persistent πίστει of vv. 3-31, mainly for euphony. κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, "subdued kingdoms," as is recorded of the Judges and David, who also ἠργάσαντο δικαιοσύνην, which seems to refer to their righteous rule, although the same expression is never used in the LXX except of personal righteousness (Ps. xv. 2) but of David it is thrice said that he was ποιῶν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; Jer. xxiii. 5; and of Samuel testimony is borne that he judged righteously, 1 Sam. xii. 3. ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, "obtained promises" not "*the* promise" of Messianic salvation (*cf.* ver. 39) but promises given on special occasions, *cf.* Josh. xxi. 45; Judges vii. 7, xiii. 5; 1 Kings viii. 56. ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, *cf.* Daniel vi. 22, ἐνέφραξε τὰ στόματα τῶν λεόντων, also Judges xiv. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xvii. 34, xxiii. 20. ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός, probably the rescue of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego was suggested by the allusion to Daniel. δύναμιν is explained by the words of Dan. iii. 22, ἡ κάμινος ἐξεκαύθη ἐκ περισσοῦ. ἔφυ-

καὶ τῶν προφητῶν· 33. [z] οἳ διὰ πίστεως κατηγωνίσαντο βασιλείας, εἰργάσαντο[1] δικαιοσύνην, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιῶν, ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων, 34. [a] ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρὸς, ἔφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας,[2] ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων· 35. [b] ἔλαβον γυναῖκες[3] ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν· 36. [c] ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πεῖραν ἔλαβον, ἔτι δὲ δεσ-

z Judic. xiv. 6; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. viii. 1, et x. 19, et xii. 29; Dan. vi. 22.
a Judic. vii. 21, et xv. 15; 1 Sam. xiv. 1, etc., et xx. 1; 1 Reg. xix. 1, etc.; 2 Reg. vi. 16, et xx. 7; 1 Par. xxii. 9; Job xlii. 10; Ps. vi. 8, et lxxxix. 20, etc.; Esa. xxxviii. 21; Dan. iii. 25.
b 1 Reg. xvii. 23; 2 Reg. iv. 36; 2 Mac. vi. 19, 28, et vii.; Acts xxii. 25.
c Jer. xx. 2.

[1] ηργασαντο in ℵ*D* 47*.
[2] μαχαιρης ℵAD*; μαχαιρας (more classical) in DcEKLP.
[3] γυναικας in ℵ*AD*.

γον στόματα μαχαίρης, "escaped the edge of the sword" of which there are many instances recorded, as 1 Sam. xviii. 11; 1 Kings xix. 2; 1 Mac. ii. 28. ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας . . . "out of weakness became strong, waxed mighty in battle, routed the armies of aliens," having in view, possibly, the deliverance recorded in Judges iv. by Deborah, where παρεμβολή (ver. 16, etc.) is used of the army. Reference may also be made, as von Soden suggests, to the Maccabean deliverances. [παρεμβολή, 1 Macc. iii. 3, 15, 17, etc.; ἀλλοτρ. ii. 7.] On several occasions in Israel's history the three clauses received abundant illustration.

Ver. 35. ἔλαβον γυναῖκες. . . . "Women received their dead by resurrection," as is narrated of the widow of Sarepta, 1 Kings xvii. 17-24, and the Shunamite, 2 Kings iv. 34. ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν . . . "others were beaten to death". τύμπανον (sc. τύπανον from τύπ. strike) a drum, τυμπανίζω, I beat. From the expression in 2 Mac. vi. 17, 28, ἐπὶ τὸ τύμπανον, it might be supposed that some instrument more elaborate than a rod was meant and Josephus speaks of "a wheel" as being used. But that it was substantially a beating to death is proved by what is said of Eleazar (2 Mac. ii. 30), μέλλων ταῖς πληγαῖς τελευτᾶν, εἶπε. That Eleazar and the seven brethren (2 Mac. vii.) are alluded to is obvious, for it was characteristic of them that they died οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, not accepting the offered deliverance. Eleazar was shown a way by which he could escape death (2 Mac. vi. 21), and the seven brethren also were first interrogated and would have escaped death had they chosen to eat polluted food. They endured martyrdom, not accepting the escape that was possible, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν, "that they might obtain a better resurrection," "unto eternal life—'better' than that spoken of in the beginning of the verse, to a life that again ended" (Davidson, Weiss, von Soden). How fully the resurrection was in view of the seven brethren is shown in the saying of the second: "the King of the world shall raise us εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς; of the third who when his hands were cut off declared that he would receive them again from God; of the fourth, who in dying said, "It is good, when put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by Him;" and the youngest said of them all, "they are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life".

Ver. 36. ἕτεροι δὲ . . . introducing a different class of victories achieved by faith, although ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων, "mockings and scourgings" were endured by the martyrs who have just been mentioned (2 Mac. vii. 7 and vii. 1). πεῖραν ἔλαβον, see ver. 29. ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν . . . "yea, moreover of bonds and prison"; as the examples in Bleek prove, ἔτι δὲ is commonly used to express a climax (*cf.* Luke xiv. 26); and such imprisonment as was inflicted, *e.g.*, on Jeremiah (xxxviii. 9) was certainly even more to be dreaded than scourging. ἐλιθάσθησαν, "they were stoned," as was Zechariah, son of Johoiada, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20 (Luke xi. 51). There was also a tradition that Jeremiah was stoned at Daphne in Egypt. ἐπρίσθησαν, "they were sawn asunder," a cruel death some-

d 1 Reg. xxi. 13; 2 Reg. i. 8; Matt. iii. 4.

e ver. 2.

μῶν καὶ φυλακῆς· 37. ᵈ ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπρίσθησαν, ἐπειράσθησαν,[1] ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον· περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι· 38. ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος· ἐν ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσι καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς. 39. ᵉ Καὶ οὗτοι πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, 40. τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι.

[1] T.R. in AD^{c}EK d, e, f, vg., Copt., Arm. In other MSS. the order varies. "Possibly ἐπειράσθησαν is only a reduplication of ἐπρίσθησαν . . . but it may with at least equal probability be a primitive corruption of some other word" (Hort).

times inflicted on prisoners of war (2 Sam. xii. 31; Amos i. 3, ἔπριζον πρίοσι σιδηροῖς). The reference is probably to Isaiah who according to the *Ascensio Is.* (i. 9, v. 1) was sawn asunder by Manasseh with a wooden saw. *Cf.* Justin, *Trypho*, 120, (πρίονι ξυλίνῳ ἐπρίσατε) and Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*. Within our own memory some of the followers of the Bâb suffered the same death. ἐπειράσθησαν, "were tempted". Alford says, "I do not see how any appropriate meaning can be given to the mere enduring of temptation, placed as it is between being sawn asunder and dying by the sword". He would therefore either omit the word as a gloss on ἐπρίσθησαν or substitute ἐπρήσθησαν. That is a tempting reading because not only was one of the seven brothers (2 Mac. vi. vii. 5) fried, but those who sought to keep the Sabbath in a cave (2 Mac. vi. 11) were all burned together by order of Philip, Antiochus' governor in Jerusalem. At the same time, the reading, "were tempted" gives quite a good sense, for certainly the most fiendish element in the torture of the seven brothers was the pressure put on each individually to recant. ἐν φόνῳ μαχαίρης ἀπέθανον, "died by sword-slaughter," for ἐν φ. μαχ. see Exod. xvii. 13; Num. xxi. 24, etc.; and for ἀπεθ. ἐν see Jer. xi. 22. xxi. 9. Examples of this death abounded in the Maccabean period. περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, "they wandered about in sheepskins," (as the mantle of Elijah is called in 2 Kings ii. 8, ἔλαβεν Ἠλιοὺ τὴν μηλωτὴν αὐτοῦ), or even "in goatskins," a still rougher material. This dress they wore not as a professional uniform, but because "destitute," ὑστερούμενοι as in Luke xv. 14. ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι, Phil. iv. 12 καὶ περισσεύειν καὶ ὑστερεῖσθαι, "hard-pressed," θλιβόμενοι, as in 2 Cor. iv. 8 θλιβόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐ στενοχωρούμενοι, κακουχούμενοι, "maltreated," see ver. 25. ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος, "of whom the world was not worthy". "The world drove them out, thinking them unworthy to live in it, while in truth it was unworthy to have them living in it" (Davidson). Vaughan aptly compares Acts xxii. 22. After this parenthetical remark the description is closed with another participial clause, ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι . . . "wandering over deserts and mountains, and in caves and in the holes of the earth," verified 1 Kings xviii. 4; 2 Macc. v. 27 where it is related of Judas and nine others, ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, θηρίων τρόπον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διέζη. *Cf.* also 2 Mac. x. 6, ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι. In the *Ascensio Isaiae*, ii. 7, 12, Isaiah and his companions are said to have spent two years among the mountains naked and eating only herbage.

Ver. 39. καὶ οὗτοι πάντες, "And these all," that is, those who have been named in this chapter, "although they had witness borne to them through their faith," as has been recorded (ver. 2-38), "did not receive the promise," that is, as already said in ver. 13, they only foresaw that it would be fulfilled and died in that faith. But this failure to obtain the fulfilment of the promise was not due to any slackness on the part of God nor to any defect in their faith; there was a good reason for it, and that reason was that "God had in view some better thing for us, that without us they should not be perfected". The κρεῖττόν τι is that which this Epistle has made it its business to expound, the perfecting (τελειωθῶσιν) of God's people by full communion with Him mediated by the perfect revelation (i. 1) of the Son and His perfect covenant (viii. 7-13), and His better sacrifice (ix. 23). And the perfecting of the people of God under the O.T. is said to have been impossible, not as might have

XII. 1. ^a ΤΟΙΓΑΡΟΥΝ καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον

a x. 36; Rom. vi. 4, et xii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Eph. iv. 22; Phil. iii. 13, 14; Col. iii. 8; 1 Peter ii. 1, et iv. 2.

been expected "apart from the Son," but **χωρὶς ἡμῶν**, because the writer has in view the history of the Church, the relation of the people of God in former times to the same people in Messianic times.

CHAPTER XII.—Ver. 1. **Τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς. . . .** "Wherefore, as we have so great a cloud of witnesses encompassing us, let us likewise lay aside every encumbrance and sin that clings so close and run with endurance the race that is set before us, looking to the leader and perfecter of faith, even Jesus, who for the joy set before him endured a cross despising shame and has sat down at the right hand of the throne of God." **τοιγαροῦν**, "wherefore then" more formal and emphatic than the usual, **διὰ τοῦτο, διό, ὅθεν, οὖν. καὶ ἡμεῖς**, we in our turn, we as well as they, and with the added advantage of having so many testimonies to the good results of faith. **νέφος** used frequently in Homer and elsewhere, as "nubes" in Latin and "cloud" in English to suggest a vast multitude. **μαρτύρων**, "witnesses," persons who by their actions have testified to the worth of faith. The cloud of witnesses are those named and suggested in chap. xi.; persons whose lives witnessed to the work and triumph of faith, and whose faith was witnessed to by Scripture, *cf.* xi. 2, 4, 5. This cloud is **περικείμενον**, because, as the writer has just shown, look where they will into their history his Hebrew readers see such examples of faith. It is impossible to take **μάρτυρες** as equivalent to **θεαταί**. If the idea of "spectator" is present at all, which is very doubtful, it is only introduced by the words **τρέχωμεν . . . ἀγῶνα.** The idea is not that they are running in presence of spectators and must therefore run well; but that their people's history being filled with examples of much-enduring but triumphant faith, they also must approve their lineage by showing a like persistence of faith. **ὄγκον ἀποθέμενοι πάντα, ὄγκος**, a mass or weight or burden (= **φόρτος**), hence a swelling or superfluous flesh [*cf.* especially Longinus, iii. 9, **κακοὶ δὲ ὄγκοι καὶ ἐπὶ σωμάτων καὶ λόγων.** and from Hippocrates in Wetstein, **καὶ γὰρ δρόμοι ταχεῖς, καὶ γυμνάσια τοιαῦτα, σαρκῶν ὄγκον καθαίρει.**] The allusion therefore is to the training preparatory to a race by which an encumbering superfluity of flesh is reduced. The Christian runner must rid himself even of innocent things which might retard him. And all that does not help, hinders. It is by running he learns what these things are. So long as he stands he does not feel that they are burdensome and hampering. **καὶ τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν.** Of the difficult word **εὐπερ.** Chrysostom gives two interpretations; "which is easily avoided," and "which easily encompasses or surrounds us". In the sense of "avoid" the verb **περιΐστασθαι** occurs in 2 Tim. ii. 16 and Tit. iii. 9, but it is scarcely credible that in the present context such an epithet could be applied to sin. The second interpretation has been generally accepted ["circumstans nos peccatum" (Vulg.); "qui nous enveloppe si aisément"; "die Sünde, die immer zur Hand ist" (Weizsäcker)]. This meaning suits the context and the action enjoined in **ἀποθέμενοι**, suggesting, as it does, the trailing garment that encumbers the runner. The article **τὴν** does not point to some particular sin, but to that which characterises all sin, the tenacity with which it clings to a man. We might suppose from the word itself that it alluded to sin as an enemy encompassing from well-chosen points of vantage, but this does not suit the figure of the race nor the **ἀποθέμενοι.** [Porphyry, *de Abstin.*, says **γυμνοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀχίτωνες ἐπὶ τὸ στάδιον ἀναβαίνωμεν ἐπὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς Ὀλύμπια ἀγωνισόμενοι.** "Ut cursores vestimenta non solum abjiciunt, nudique currunt, verum etiam crebris exercitationibus, ne corpus nimis obesum et ineptum reddatur, efficiunt: ita et vos omnia impedimenta in studio virtutis, et tarditatem vestram crebris meditationibus vincite" (Wetstein).] **δι' ὑπομονῆς**, after the negative preparation comes the positive demand for endurance, *cf.* x. 36. **τρέχωμεν . . . ἀγῶνα**, as in Herod. viii. 102, **πολλοὺς ἀγῶνας δραμέονται οἱ Ἕλληνες. προκείμενον**, [frequent with **ἀγών**, as in Arrian's *Epict.*, iii. 25, **οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πάλης καὶ παγκρατίου ὁ ἀγὼν πρόκειται.** *Cf. Orestes of* Eurip., 845, and Ignatius to *Eph.*, c. 17. **τοῦ προκειμένου ζῆν.**] appointed, lying before us as our destined

ἁμαρτίαν, δι᾽ ὑπομονῆς τρέχωμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα· 2. [b] ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς, ὑπέμεινε σταυρὸν, αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας, ἐν δεξιᾷ τε τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκάθισεν.[1] 3. ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν[2] ἀντιλογίαν, ἵνα μὴ κάμητε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ἐκλυόμενοι.

4. [c] Οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

b i. 3, 13, et ii. 10, et viii. 1; Luc. xxiv. 26, 46; Acts iii. 15, et v. 31; Phil. ii. 8, etc.; 1 Peter i. 3.

c 1 Cor. x. 13.

[1] κεκαθικεν in ℵADEKLP.

[2] εις εαυτον AP Vulg.; εις εαυτους ℵ*D*E*. ["Looks like the conceit which some reader wrote upon his margin" (Davidson).]

trial. This let us run, not waiting for a pleasanter, easier course, but accepting that which is appointed and recognising the difficulties as constituent parts of the race. Success depends on the condition attached **ἀφορῶντες . . . Ἰησοῦν**, fixing our gaze on Him who sets us the example (**ἀρχηγὸν**) of faith, and exhibits it in its perfect form (**τελειωτής**), who leads us in faith and in whom faith finds its perfect embodiment. **ἀρχηγός** properly means one to whom anything owes its origin (*cf.* ii. 10), but here it rather indicates one who takes the lead or sets the example most worth following. Jesus is the **ἀρχηγὸς τῆς πίστεως** because he is its **τελειωτής**. In Him alone do we see absolute dependence on God, implicit trust, what it is, what it costs, and what it results in. (Hence the human name **Ἰησοῦν**.) On Him therefore must the gaze be fixed if the runner is to endure, for in Him the reasonableness, the beauty, and the reward of a life of faith are seen. Faith manifested itself in Jesus, especially in His endurance of the cross in virtue of His faith in the resulting joy beyond. **ὃς ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς . . . ἀντί** here as in ver. 16 denotes the price paid, or reward offered, "in consideration of". There was a joy set before Jesus, which nerved Him to endure. This joy was the sitting in the place of achieved victory and power, not a selfish joy, but the consciousness of salvation wrought for men, of power won which he could use in their interests. This hope or confident expectation so animated Him that He endured the utmost of human suffering and shame. The shame is mentioned **αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας**, because His despising of it manifests a mind fixed on the glory that was to follow and filled with it.

Ver. 3. **ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ. . . .** The reason for fixing the gaze on Jesus is given. That reason being found in the **τοιαύτην**. This so great contumely and opposition endured by Jesus the Hebrews are to consider, "to bring into analogy, think of by comparing" with their own and so renew their hopeful endurance. **τὸν . . . ἀντιλογίαν**, "Him who has endured at the hands of sinners such contradiction against Himself." The desire on the part of several interpreters to put a stronger meaning into **ἀντιλογία**—although quite unsupported by usage—reveals a feeling that verbal abuse or contradiction was a much less severe trial than such as are enumerated in chap. xi. But not only was it this **ἀντιλογία** which brought Christ to the cross and formed the **αἰσχύνη** of it, but it was the repudiation of His claims throughout His life which formed the chief element in His trial. It was predicted (Luke ii. 34) that He would be a **σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον**, full of significance misinterpreted, full of God rejected. It was precisely this general rejection and contempt from which the Hebrews were themselves suffering. They were finding how hard it was to maintain a solitary faith contradicted and scorned by public sentiment. Think then, says this writer, of Him who has endured at the hands of sinners so much more painful contradiction "against Himself". **ἵνα μὴ κάμητε . . .** "that ye wax not weary, fainting in your souls". **ψυχαῖς** may be construed either with **κάμητε** or with **ἐκλυόμενοι**; better with the latter. [Polybius, xx. 4, 7, speaking of the demoralisation of the Boeotians says that giving themselves up to eating and drinking, **οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἐξελύθησαν ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς**.]

Ver. 4. **Οὔπω μέχρις αἵματος. . . .** "Not yet unto blood have ye resisted in your contest with sin." Bengel says: "a cursu venit ad pugilatum". *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24-27. But this is doubtful.

ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι, 5. [d] καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται· "Υἱέ μου, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας Κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος. 6. ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει· μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται." 7. Εἰ[1] παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοῖς ὑμῖν προσφέρεται ὁ Θεός· τίς γάρ ἐστιν

d Job v. 17; Prov. iii. 11, 12; Apoc. iii. 19.

[1] ει in minusculis; εις in ℵADKLP, Vulg.

μέχρις αἵματος [Theoph., ἄχρι θανάτου, *cf.* Rev. xii. 11.] Does this mean, Ye have not yet become a martyr church, suffering death in Christ's cause; or does it mean, Ye have not yet resisted sin in deadly earnest? The interpretation is determined by the connection. Jesus endured the ἀντιλογία of sinners even to blood, the death of the cross; the Hebrews have not yet been called so to suffer in their conflict, a conflict which every day summons them to fresh resistance against the sin of failure of faith and apostasy. "'Sin' is not here put for sinners, nor is it sin in their persecutors; it is sin in themselves, the sin of unbelief, which is here regarded as their true antagonist, though of course the excesses of their persecutors gave it its power against them" (Davidson and Weiss).

Vv. 5-17. The Hebrews are reminded that their sufferings are tokens of God's fatherly love and care.

Ver. 5. καὶ ἐκλέλησθε. . . . "And ye have clean forgotten the exhortation, which speaks to you as to sons, My Son, etc.". καὶ introduces a fresh consideration. Calvin, Bleek and others treat the clause as an interrogation, needlessly. The παράκλησις is cited from Prov. iii. 11, and includes vv. 5 and 6. The only divergence from the LXX is the insertion of μου after υἱέ. But Bleek calls attention to the fact that the Hebrew of the last clause stands, according to the present punctuation, וּכְאָב אֶת־בֵּן יִרְצֶה = and as a father the son in whom he delights. The LXX instead of כְּאָב have read כָּאֵב the Piel of כָּאַב to feel pain, and so to cause pain; certainly a better sense. In the Book of Proverbs the speaker identifies himself with wisdom, and here the words are justifiably viewed as Divine. ὀλιγώρει is classical, meaning "make light of," "neglect," "despise". παιδεία is discipline, or correction, or the entire training and education of childhood and youth. And it is here urged that by the trials and difficulties of life God trains His children; that to view sufferings in separation from God and to be oblivious of God's design in them is disastrous; and that despondency and failure of faith under suffering are inappropriate, for trials are not evidence of God's displeasure, but on the contrary tokens of His love, the uniform discipline to which every son must be subjected, ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ . . . the emphasis falling on ἀγαπᾷ. ὃν παραδέχεται, "whom He takes to Him as a veritable son, receives in his heart and cherishes" (Alford). The word is similarly used in Polybius, xxxviii. 1, 8. [The same passage from Proverbs is cited by Philo (De Cong. Erud. gratia, p 544) who adds, οὕτως ἄρα ἡ ἐπίπληξις καὶ νουθεσία καλὸν νενόμισται, ὥστε δι' αὐτῆς ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ὁμολογία συγγένεια γίνεται· τί γὰρ οἰκειότερον υἱῷ πατρὸς ἢ υἱοῦ πατρί; *Cf.* Menander's ὁ μὴ δαρεὶς ἄνθρωπος οὐ παιδεύεται, and Seneca's *De Providentia* where the same comparison is elaborated, and the great principle laid down "non quid, sed quemadmodum feras, interest".]

Ver. 7. The inference from the passage cited is obvious, εἰς παιδείαν ὑπομένετε, "it is for training ye are enduring (are called to endure), as sons God is dealing with you". [προσφέρεται is common; as in Xenophon, οὐ γὰρ ὡς φίλοι προσεφέροντο ἡμῖν; and in Josephus, ὡς πολεμίοις προσεφέροντο.] Their sufferings are evidence that God considers them His sons and treats them as such; for what son is there whom his father does not correct? τίς γὰρ υἱὸς . . . similar in form to Matt. vii. 9, τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος;—εἰ δὲ χωρίς. . . . Whereas did they receive no such treatment, were they free from that discipline of which all (God's children) have become partakers (as illustrated in chap. xi.) then in this case they are bastards and not sons; their freedom from the discipline which God uniformly accords His children would prove that they were not genuine sons.

υἱὸς ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ; 8. εἰ δὲ χωρίς ἐστε παιδείας, ἧς μέτοχοι γεγόνασι πάντες, ἄρα νόθοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχ υἱοί. 9. ᵉ εἶτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας εἴχομεν παιδευτάς, καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα· οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα, τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων, καὶ ζήσομεν; 10. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς, ἐπαίδευον· ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ. 11. πᾶσα δὲ[1] παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς

e Num. xvi. 22, et xxvii. 16; Eccl. xii. 1, 7; Esa. lvii. 16, Zach. xii. 1.

[1] WH read μεν with ℵ*P, 17, 21, d; δε is found in ℵcADcKL, f, Vulg., etc. ["None of the particles are satisfactory, though δέ was sure to be introduced" (Hort).]

Ver. 9. With εἶτα a fresh phase of the argument is introduced. [Raphel *in loc.* is of opinion that εἶτα here as frequently in the classics is "nota interrogantis cum vehementia et quasi indignatione quadam"; but it gives a better construction if we take it in the sense of "further" as in 1 Cor. xii. 5, 7, and Mark iv. 28, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα στάχυν, εἶτα πλήρης σῖτος.] The argument is, "the fathers of our flesh we used to have as trainers, and we had them in reverence; shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of our spirits and live?" The article before πνευμάτων makes it probable that there is no reference to angels but only an antithesis to τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν. The position of the two words σαρκός and πνευμάτων confirms this. καὶ ζήσομεν is unexpected, and is inserted to balance καὶ ἐνετρεπόμεθα [on this verb see Anz. p. 269] in the rhythm of the sentence. The thought is that only by subjection to the Father of our spirit can we have life. Delitzsch maintains that this verse strongly favours the theory of Creationism and quotes Hugo de S. Victore, "Nota diligenter hanc authoritatem, per quam manifeste probatur, quod animae non sunt ex traduce sicut caro". It is safer to say with Davidson, "It is as a spirit, or on his spiritual side, that man enters into close relation with God; and this leads to the conception that God is more especially the Author of man's spirit, or Author of man on his spiritual side, and to designations such as those in Num. xvi. 22". Modern science scouts Creationism; although if Wallace's idea of the evolution of man be accepted it might find encouragement.

Ver. 10. οἱ μὲν γάρ. . . . The reasonableness of the appeal of ver. 9 is further illustrated by a comparison of the character and end in the earthly and heavenly fathers' discipline respectively. The earthly fathers exercised discipline for a few days in accordance with what commended itself to their judgment as proper; a judgment which could not be infallible and must sometimes have hindered rather than helped true growth; but the heavenly Father uses discipline with a view to our profit that we may partake of his holiness. Two notes of imperfection characterise the discipline of the fathers of our flesh. (1) It is πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, "for a few days," *i.e.*, during the brief period of youth. It must cease when manhood is attained, whether or not it has attained its end. (2) It is κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς, subject to misconception both of the end to be reached and the means by which it can be attained. In contrast to this second feature the discipline of the Father of our spirit is without fail ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, "for our advantage," which is defined in εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἁγιότητος αὐτοῦ, "that we may partake of His holiness," in which the contrast to the incomplete

Ver. 11. πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία. . . . Another encouragement to endure chastening: if it is allowed to do its work righteousness will result. "Now all chastisement for the present indeed seems matter not of joy but of grief, afterwards however it yields, to those who are disciplined by it, the peaceable fruit of righteousness". [πᾶσα, as Chrys. says, τουτέστι καὶ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη καὶ ἡ πνευματική.] πρὸς τὸ παρόν, see Thucyd., ii. 22. οὐ δοκεῖ . . . λύπης, Chrys. καλῶς εἶπεν· οὐ δοκεῖ. οὐδὲ γάρ ἐστι λύπης ἡ παιδεία, ἀλλὰ μόνον δοκεῖ, see Bleek. Chastisement is here viewed as an opportunity for cultivating faith and endurance and to those who use the opportunity and are exercised and trained by it, δι' αὐτῆς

δι᾽ αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσι δικαιοσύνης. 12. [f] Διὸ "τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε"· 13. [g] καὶ "τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς ποιήσατε[1] τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν," ἵνα μὴ τὸ χωλὸν ἐκτραπῇ, ἰαθῇ δὲ μᾶλλον. 14. [g] Εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν Κύριον· 15. [h] ἐπισκοποῦν-

f Esa, xxxv. 3.
g Matt. v. 8; Rom. xii. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
h iii. 12; Deut. xxix. 18; Acts xvii. 13; 2 Cor. vi.; 1 Gal. v. 12.

[1] ποιησατε in ℵ^cADKL; ποιειτε in ℵ*P, 17.

γεγυμνασμένοις, it necessarily yields, renders as the harvest due, ἀποδίδωσιν, as its fruit increased righteousness of life. But why "peaceful" εἰρηνικὸν? Probably because the result of the conflict (γεγυμνασμένοις) and victory is peace in God and peace of conscience. It is a peace which can only be attained by those who have used their trials as a discipline and have emerged victorious from the conflict.

Ver. 12. διὸ τὰς παρειμένας . . . "Wherefore" introducing the immediate application of this encouraging view of trials, "lift up" to renew the conflict, "the nerveless hands" fallen to your side and "the paralysed knees". ἀνορθώσατε seems at first sight more appropriate to χεῖρας than to γόνατα (Vaughan) but it is here used in the general sense of "restore," "renew the life of"; as in Soph., *O.T.*, 46-51, ἀσφαλείᾳ τήνδ᾽ ἀνόρθωσον πόλιν. It might be rendered "revive". Probably the writer had in his mind Isa. xxxv. 3, ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. In Sir. xxv. 23 the woman that does not increase the happiness of her husband is χεῖρες παρειμέναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα, in other words, makes him despair and cease from all effort. So here, the hands hang down in listless consciousness of defeat. καὶ τροχιὰς ὀρθὰς . . . "and make straight paths for your feet, that that which is lame be not turned out of the way but rather be healed". The words are quoted from Prov. iv. 26, ὀρθὰς τροχιὰς ποίει σοῖς ποσί, and if ποιήσατε is retained they form a hexameter line. The whole verse forms an admonition to the healthier portion of the church to make no deviation from the straight course set before them by the example of Christ, and thus they would offer no temptation to the weaker members [τὸ χωλὸν, the lame and limping] to be turned quite out of the way, but would rather be an encouragement to them and so afford them an opportunity of being healed of their infirmity. [A number of interpreters take ἐκτραπῇ in the sense of "dislocated". Thus Davidson, "The words 'turned out of the way' mean in medical writers 'dislocated,' and this gives a more vigorous sense and forms a better opposition to 'be healed'. Inconsistency and vacillation in the general body of the church would create a way so difficult for the lame, that their lameness would become dislocation, and they would perish from the way; on the other hand, the habit of going in a plain path would restore them to soundness." This is inviting, but there is much against it. (1) The medical use of ἐκτρέπομαι is rare (see Stephanus) and not likely to occur here. (2) When used in a general sense ἰαθῇ is an appropriate antithesis; thus in Niceph. Call. (see Stephanus) occur the words Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Ἱεροσολύμων πατριάρχῃ τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐκτραπεῖσαν ἰᾶται. (3) The passage in Proverbs from which the former part of the verse is cited goes on thus: "Turn not aside to the right hand nor to the left".] Immediately after these words follows a clause which guides to the interpretation of εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, "God will make thy ways straight and will guide thy goings in peace"; and a considerable part of the counsels given in the context in Proverbs concerns the maintenance of peaceful relations with others. The circumstances of the Hebrews were fitted to excite a quarrelsome spirit, and a feeling of alienation towards those weak members who left the straight path. They must not suffer them to be alienated but must restore them to the unity of the faith, and in endeavouring to reclaim them must use the methods of peace not of anger or disputation. καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν . . . "and the consecration without which no one shall see the Lord". The ἁγιασμός which this Epistle has explained is a drawing near to God with cleansed conscience (x. 14, 22), a true acceptance of Christ's sacrifice as bringing the worshipper into fellowship with God.

Ver. 15. ἐπισκοποῦντες μή

i Gen. xxv. 33; Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 3.
k Gen. xxvii. 34, etc.

τες μή τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ· μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας ἄνω φύουσα ἐνοχλῇ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης[1] μιανθῶσι πολλοί[2]· 16. ⁱμή τις πόρνος, ἢ βέβηλος, ὡς Ἠσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο[3] τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ. 17. ᵏἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρο-

[1] T.R. in ℵDKL; δι' αυτης AP, 17, 47.
[2] T.R. in DKLP; οι πολλοι in ℵA, 17, 47.
[3] T.R. ℵDKLP, 17; απεδετο AC.

τις ὑστερῶν... "watching" "taking the oversight" (thoroughly scrutinising as in the case of sick persons," Chrys.) addressed not to the teachers or rulers but to all. The object of this supervision is to prevent the defection of any one of their number. "As if they were travelling together on some long journey, in a large company, he says, Take heed that no man be left behind; I do not seek this only, that ye may arrive yourselves, but also that ye should look diligently after the others" (Chrys.), and *cf.* M. Arnold's *In Rugby Chapel*. μή τις ὑστερῶν . . . may be construed either by supplying ᾖ, or by supposing a break at θεοῦ (so Davidson), or by carrying on the τις ὑστερῶν to ἐνοχλῇ. The simplest seems to be the first: "lest any be failing (= fail) of the grace of God," *i.e.*, lest he never reach the blessings which the grace of God offers. *Cf.* iv. 1. Another contingency to be guarded against by careful watching is expressed in μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας . . . words borrowed from Deut. xxix. 18, μή τίς ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ, "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you". As in Deuteronomy so here the bitter root which might spring up and bring forth its poisonous fruit among them, was one of their own members who might lead them astray or introduce evil practises and so the whole community [οἱ πολλοί] might be defiled [μιανθῶσιν], *i.e.*, rendered unfit for that approach to God and fellowship with Him to which they were urged in the preceding verse. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, Gal. v. 9, where also it is a person that is referred to.

Ver. 16. μή τις πόρνος . . . specific forms in which roots of bitterness might appear among them. πόρνος is to be taken in its literal sense and not as signifying departure from God [but *cf.* Weiss]. Neither is it to be applied to Esau, in spite of the passages adduced by Wetstein to show that he was commonly considered a fornicator, and of Philo's interpretation of "hairy" as "intemperate and libidinous"; v. Delitzsch. From xiii. 4 it appears that fornication was one of the dangers to which these Hebrews were exposed. ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἠσαῦ, a profanity which was especially betrayed in his bartering for a single meal [ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς] his own rights of primogeniture. Esau lightly parting with his religious privileges and his patrimony for a present gratification is an appropriate warning to those who day by day were tempted to win comfort and escape suffering by parting with their hope in Christ. The warning is pointed by the fate of Esau. ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα . . . "for ye know that even though he was afterwards desirous to inherit the blessing he was rejected, though he sought it with tears; for he found no place of repentance". "The term 'repentance' is here used not strictly of mere change of mind, but of a change of mind undoing the effects of a former state of mind" (Davidson). In other words, his bargain was irrevocable. The words must be interpreted by the narrative in Genesis (xxvii. 1-41), where we read that some time after the sale of the birthright (μετέπειτα) Esau sought the blessing with tears (xxvii. 38, ἀνεβόησε φωνῇ Ἠσαῦ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν) but found his act was unalterable. The lesson written on Esau's life as on that of all who miss opportunities is that the past is irreparable, and however much they may desire to recall and alter it, that cannot be. It was this which the writer wished to enforce. If now, through any temptation or pressure, you let go the benefits you have in Christ, you are committing yourselves to an act you cannot recall. It must also be observed that the author is confining his attention to the one act of Esau, not pronouncing on his whole life and ultimate destiny. [μετανοίας τόπον. So Pliny, *Ep.*, x. 97, "poenitentiae locus;" and Ulpian, *Digest.*, xl. Tit. 7, "poenitentiae haeredis is locum non esse" (Wetstein)].

νομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρε, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

18. [l] Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει,[1] καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρί, καὶ γνόφῳ, καὶ σκότῳ, καὶ θυέλλῃ, 19. [m] καὶ σάλπιγγος ἤχῳ, καὶ φωνῇ ῥημάτων, ἧς οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρῃτήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι

l Exod. xix. 10, etc., et xx. 19; Deut. v. 22.

m Exod. xx. 19; Deut. v. 5, 24, et xviii. 16.

[1] T.R. DᵇKL, 37, 116; omit ορει ℵAC, 17, 47, f, Vulg., Cod., Opt., Syr. Pesch.

Vv. 18-29. In this paragraph we have the climax of the Epistle. Its doctrine and its exhortation alike culminate here. The great aim of the writer has been to persuade the Hebrews to hearken to the word spoken by God in Christ (i. 1, ii. 1-4). This aim he still seeks to attain by bringing before his readers in one closing picture the contrast between the old dispensation and the new. The old was characterised by material, sensible transitory manifestations; the new by what is supersensible and eternally stable. The old also rather emphasised the inaccessible nature of God, His unapproachable holiness, His awful majesty, and taught men that they could not come near; the new brings men into the very presence of God, and though He be "Judge of all" yet is He surrounded with the spirits of perfected men. But as the writer seeks to quicken his readers to a more zealous faith He shows also the awful consequences of refusing Him that speaketh from heaven. Not the fire and smoke of Sinai threaten now to consume the disobedient, but "our God is a consuming fire"; not a symbolic and material element threatened, but the very Eternal and All-pervading Himself. And, returning to the idea with which he commenced the Epistle and so making its unity obvious, the writer contrasts the voice that shook the earth with the infinitely more terrible voice that shakes the heavens also, that terminates time and brings in eternal things.

Ver. 18. **Οὐ γὰρ προσεληλύθατε . . .** "For ye have not approached," assigning a further reason for the previous exhortation. Your fathers drew near [Deut. iv. 11, προσήλθετε καὶ ἔστητε ὑπὸ τὸ ὄρος] to hear God's word. The word is used in its general sense, and the idea of drawing near as an accepted worshipper is not intended. **ψηλαφωμένῳ . . .** As MS. authority removes ὄρει, the construction is doubtful. The R.V. renders "*the mount* that might be touched," indicating that "the mount" is not in the text. This is justified by the antithetic clause, ver. 22, ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, which already was in his mind. Others translate "ye are not come to a palpable and kindled fire," which is grammatically possible, but open to the objection that "a palpable fire," a fire that can be touched is precisely what this fire was not, and it is an awkward mode of expressing a "material" fire. A third rendering is "Ye are not come to that which can be touched and is kindled with fire". **κεκαυμένῳ πυρί**, "that burned with fire" is in agreement with Deut. iv. 11, τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· σκότος, γνόφος, θύελλα; see also Deut. v. 22, 23, ix. 15; Exod. xix. 18. The "gloom and mist and tempest (or hurricane) and the blast of trumpet (Exod. xix. 16, φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα) and voice of words" (Deut. iv. 12, ἐλάλησε Κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρὸς φωνὴν ῥημάτων) are enumerated to accentuate the material and terrifying character of the revelation on which the O.T. dispensation was founded. The regularly recurrent καὶ gives emphasis to this enumeration; all the features of the manifestation were of the same character. The article is omitted before each particular, because each is introduced not for its own sake but for the general effect. From ἧς to ἔντρομος (ver. 21) describes the terror induced by these manifestations, (1) first in the people (οἱ ἀκούσαντες) who begged that not a word more should be added to them (προστεθῆναι suggested by Deut. v. 25 and xviii. 16, οὐ προσθήσομεν ἀκοῦσαι τὴν φωνὴν Κυρίου, "we will not any more hear, etc.,") for they could not endure that which was being commanded, "If even a beast touch the mountain it shall be stoned" (Exod. xix. 12, 13); and (2) also in Moses, for, so terrifying was the appearance that Moses said, "I am extremely afraid (Deut. ix. 9) and tremble". (ἔκφοβός εἰμι was uttered by Moses when God's anger was roused by the people's idolatry; Stephen (Acts vii. 32) uses ἔντρομος γενόμενος of Moses at the burning bush.)

n Exod. xix. 13.
o Gal. iv. 26; Apoc. iii. 12, et xxi. 2, 10.

αὐτοῖς λόγον· 20. [n] οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον, "Κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους, λιθοβοληθήσεται, ἢ βολίδι κατατοξευθήσεται [1]". 21. καί, οὕτω φοβερὸν ἦν τὸ φανταζόμενον, Μωσῆς εἶπεν, "Ἔκφοβός εἰμι καὶ ἔντρομος·" 22. [o] ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, καὶ πόλει

[1] This clause occurs in none of the uncials—the sole authority is "nonnulli minusculi".

Ver. 22. The Christian standing and attainment are now described in contrast with the Jewish. Ye are brought into the fellowship of eternal realities. **ἀλλὰ προσεληλύθατε**, "but ye have drawn near" (already you have entered into your eternal relation to the unseen) to **Σιὼν ὄρει**, "in the twenty-three passages in the LXX where the two words are combined the order is uniformly **ὄρος Σιὼν** and not **Σιὼν ὄρος**. Evidently here the '*Zion mountain*' is mentally contrasted with another, the '*Sinai mountain*'. And thus the omission of **ὄρει** in the revised text of ver. 18 is virtually supplied" (Vaughan). The ideal Zion is the place of God's manifestation of His presence (Ps. ix. 11, lxxvi. 2) but also of His people's abode (Ps. cxlvi. 10; Isa. i. 27 and *passim*). It is therefore impossible to find another particular of the enumeration in **πόλει θεοῦ ζῶντος Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ**, as if the former were "the transcendent sphere of God's existence where He is manifested only to Himself," and the latter "the place where His people gather and where He is manifested to them". (*Cf.* Isa. lx. 14, **κληθήσῃ πόλις Κυρίου, Σιών**); the mount and the city are viewed together as the meeting-place of God and His people, where the "living God" manifests fully His eternal fulness and sufficiency. It is "the heavenly Jerusalem" (*cf.* Gal. iv. 26, **ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ** and Rev. xxi. 2, **ἡ πόλις ἡ μέλλουσα [καὶ μένουσα]**, xiii. 14) as being not the earthly and made with hands but the ultimate reality [*cf.* the beautiful description in Philo, *De Som.*, ii. 38, and the *Republic*, ix. p. 592, where after declaring that no such city as he has been describing exists on earth Plato goes on to say, **Ἀλλ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἴσως παράδειγμα ἀνάκειται τῷ βουλομένῳ ὁρᾶν καὶ ὁρῶντι ἑαυτὸν κατοικίζειν.** Also the fine passage in Seneca, *De Otio*, chap. 31, on the two Republics.] **καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων**, and to myriads of angels, the usual accompaniment of God's glory and ministers of His will, as in Deut. xxxii. 2; Rev. v. 11; and Dan. vii. 10, **μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ**. The construction of the following words is much debated. (1) **πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησ.** may be construed in apposition with **μυρ. ἀγγέλων**, to myriads of angels, a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born enrolled in heaven; or, (2) a new particular may be introduced with **καὶ ἐκκλησ.**; or, (3) a new particular may be introduced with **πανηγύρει**, "to myriads of angels, to a festal gathering and assembly of the first-born." On the whole, the first seems preferable. For although angels are not elsewhere called the "first-born" of God, they are called "sons of God" (Job. i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7; Gen. vi. 2, 4; Ps. lxxxix. 6) and the designation is here appropriate to denote those who are the pristine inhabitants of heaven. *Cf.* the first choir of Angelicals in the "Dream of Gerontius,' who sing :—

"To us His elder race He gave
To battle and to win,
Without the chastisement of pain,
Without the soil of sin";

and Augustine in *De Civ. Dei*, x. 7, "cum angelis sumus una civitas Dei . . . cujus pars in nobis peregrinatur, pars in illis opitulatur". **πανήγυρις**, meaning a festal gathering of the *whole* people, and **ἐκκλησία** meaning the assembly of all enrolled citizens, seem much more applicable to angels. They are enrolled as citizens (**ἀπογεγ.** see the *Fayûm* and *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, *passim*) in heaven, and welcome the younger sons now introduced. The myriads of angels which on Sinai had made their presence known in thunders and smoke and tempest, terrifying the people, appear now in the familiar form of a well-ordered community in the peaceable guise of citizens rejoicing over additions to their ranks (Luke xv. 10). **καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων**, "and to a Judge who is God of all," and by whose judgment you must therefore stand or fall (*cf.* x. 27, 30, 31). Among the realities to which they had been introduced this could not be omitted. He who is God of all living is the ultimate

Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουρανίῳ, καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, 23. [p] πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, καὶ κριτῇ Θεῷ πάντων, καὶ πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελειωμένων, 24. [q] καὶ διαθήκης νέας μεσίτῃ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ κρείττονα[1] λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν[2] Ἄβελ. 25. [r] Βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἔφυγον,[3] τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς παραιτησάμενοι χρηματίζοντα, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν

p Luc. x. 20.
q viii. 6, et ix. 15, et x. 22, et xi. 4; Gen. iv. 10; Exod. xxiv. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 5; 1 Peter i. 2.
r ii. 3, et x. 28.

[1] T.R. 17, 47; κρειττον ℵACDKLMP, d, f, Vulg.
[2] T.R. in ℵACDKMP, d, f, Vulg.; παρα το in L, b, 106, 108.
[3] T.R. ℵcDcKLM, Thdrt.; εξεφυγον in ℵ*ACP, 17, 57, 118, Chr. 419.

reality, and the Hebrews have been brought near not only to His city with its original inhabitants, but to Himself; and to Himself as allotting without appeal each soul to its destiny. **καὶ πνεύμασι . . .** "and to spirits of just men made perfect," "spirits," as in 1 Pet. iii. 19, of those who have departed this life and not yet been clothed with their resurrection body. **δικαίων τετελειωμένων** is largely illustrated by Wetstein who quotes many examples of "justi perfecti" from the Talmud. It is perhaps more relevant to refer to xi. 4 and to the whole strain of the Epistle whose aim it is to perfect the righteousness of the Hebrews, see chap. vi. Of course O.T. and N.T. saints are referred to. But as without us, *i.e.*, without sharing in our advantages, they could not be perfected, xi. 40, there is at once introduced the recent covenant (**νέας** "new in time," not, as usual, **καίνης** "fresh in quality,") because the idea first in the writer's mind is not the opposition to the old but the recent origin of the new. (But *cf.* Col. iii. 9; 1 Cor. v. 7). It is remarkable that the Mediator of this covenant is here called by his human name "Jesus". The reason probably is that already there is in the writer's mind the great instrument of mediation, **αἵματι ῥαντισμοῦ**, "blood of sprinkling". In mediating the old covenant Moses, **λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασε τοῦ λαοῦ**, Exod. xxiv. 8. [**αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ**, however, does not occur in LXX, though **ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ** is found four times in *Numbers*]. But in ix. 19 this writer replaces **κατεσκέδασε** with the more significant **ἐράντισεν**; *cf.* ix. 13. In 1 Pet. i. 2 we have **ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. The "blood of sprinkling" is therefore the blood by which the new covenant is established, see xiii. 20, **αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου**, this blood having the power to cleanse the conscience, ix. 14, x. 22. It cleanses because it speaks better than Abel's, **κρεῖττον λαλοῦντι παρὰ τὸν Ἄβελ** for while that of Abel cried for vengeance [Gen. iv. 10, **φωνὴ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρός με ἐκ τῆς γῆς**] that of Jesus is a message of salvation, the **κρεῖττόν τι** of xi. 40. But it may be adverbial. "Ille flagitabat ultionem, hic impetrat remissionem" (Erasmus).

Ver. 25-29. A final appeal. The readers are warned against being deaf to God's final revelation, for if even the revelation at Sinai could not with impunity be disregarded, much less can the revelation which has reached them and which discloses to them things eternal and God in His essential majesty.

Ver. 25. **βλέπετε** (in the same sense and in a similar connection in iii. 12) **μὴ παραιτήσησθε**, "See that you refuse not"—as those mentioned in ver. 19 did—**τὸν λαλοῦντα**, "Him that speaketh," *i.e.*, God as in i. 1 and the close of this verse; "for if those did not escape (punishment) when they refused Him that made to them divine communications on earth, how much less shall we who turn away from Him who does so from heaven"? The argument is the same as in ii. 3. Those who at Sinai begged to be excused from hearing did so in terror of the manifestations of God's presence. But this is taken both as itself rooted in ignorance of God and aversion, and also as the first manifestation of a refusal to listen which in the history of Israel was often repeated. Punishment followed both in the Sinai generation, iii. 7-19, and in after times. The speaking **ἐπὶ γῆς**, *i.e.*, at Sinai (and through the prophets? i. 1) is contrasted with speaking **ἀπ' οὐρανῶν**, which can only mean speaking from the midst of and in terms of eternal reality, without those earthly

s ver. 19; Agg. ii. 6, 7. t Ps. cii. 26; Matt. xxiv. 35; 2 Peter iii. 10. u 1 Peter ii. 5. v Deut. iv. 24, et ix. 3.

ἀποστρεφόμενοι, 26. s οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται, λέγων, "Ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω οὐ μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν". 27. t Τὸ δέ, "Ἔτι ἅπαξ," δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων, ἵνα μείνῃ τὰ μὴ σαλευόμενα. 28. u διὸ βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες, ἔχωμεν χάριν, δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ Θεῷ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας.[1] 29. v καὶ γὰρ "ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον".

[1] T.R. is only supported by KL, Chrys.; ευλαβειας και δεους in ℵ*ACD*, 17, 71, 73.

symbols which characterised the old revelations, vv. 18, 19. The revelation in the Son is a revelation of the essential Divine nature in terms that are eternally true and valid. *Cf.* ix. 14, διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. The difference between the two revelations is disclosed in their results or accompaniments; of the former, τότε, it is said ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσεν, "the voice shook the earth," even that symbolic and earthly manifestation was well fitted to convey just impressions of God's holiness; [ἔδωκε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ Ps. xlvi. 5, also Ps. xviii. 7 and in Ps. lxviii. 8, γῆ ἐσείσθη; Jud. v. 4, 5, sometimes as in Ps. cxiv. 7 more explicitly ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου ἐσαλεύθη ἡ γῆ.] The expression sets forth not only the majesty of God who speaks, but also the effects that follow in agitation and alteration [*cf.* the *Antigone* line 163, τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος θεοὶ πολλῷ σάλῳ σείσαντες]. νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται, "But now he has promised"—the passive used in middle sense as in Rom. iv. 21—the promise is in Hag. ii. 6, 7, where under this strong figure the new order of things introduced by the rebuilding of the temple is announced. (*Cf.* Sir. xvi. 18, 19) λέγων, Ἔτι ἅπαξ . . . saying, "Yet once (or, Once more) I will shake not only the earth but also the heaven". And what the writer especially sees in this promise is declared expressly in ver. 27, τὸ δὲ Ἔτι ἅπαξ δηλοῖ . . . "the expression 'once more' indicates the removal of what has been shaken as of what has been made (created), that what is not shaken may abide". The ἅπαξ indicates the finality of this predicted manifestation of God—only once more was he to reveal Himself. This revelation has made known to us and put us in possession of that which is eternal, so that when all present forms of existence pass away (*cf.* i. 11, 12), what is essential and eternal may still be retained. Underlying the interpretation which the writer gives to ἅπαξ is the belief that some time things temporal must give place to things eternal; else he could not have argued that the final "shaking" was to be equivalent to a removal, (μετάθεσις, change of place in xi. 5; but in vii. 12 removal, displacement; and so here) or destruction of the heavens and the earth. The words ὡς πεποιημένων show that he considered that all that had been made might or would be destroyed, as in i. 10, "the works of God's hands shall perish". (*Cf.* γένεσις φθορᾶς ἀρχή]. ἵνα is dependent on μετάθεσιν, transitory things are removed that the things that are eternal may appear in their abiding value. διὸ, seeing that these perishable things must pass away "let us who are receiving a kingdom (a realm in which we shall be as kings, Luke xii. 32, xxii. 29; Rev. i. 6) that is immovable and inalienable have grace" (iv. 16, xii. 15). Many interpreters (Weiss, Westcott, Weizsäcker, Peake) render ἔχωμεν χάριν as in Luke xvii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12, "let us feel and express thankfulness" which is a very suitable inference to draw from "our receiving an immovable kingdom" and is relevant also to the following clause. But as χάρις is used by this writer in iv. 16 of God's helping favour, and as the τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ of ver. 15 is still in view, it seems simpler and more adequate to render as A.V. It is God's grace, δι' ἧς λατρεύωμεν . . . "by means of which we may acceptably serve God [λατρεύωμεν as in ix. 14, possibly in a broader sense than mere worship] with reverence (v. 7) and fear". An additional or recapitulating reason is given in the closing words, "For indeed our God is a consuming fire," words derived from Deut. iv. 24. The fire and smoke which manifested His presence at Sinai (ver. 18) were but symbols of that consuming holiness that destroys all persistent inexcusable evil. It is God Himself who is the fire with which you have to do, not a mere physical, material, quenchable fire.

XIII. 1. [a] Ἡ ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΙΑ μενέτω. [b] τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· 2. διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους. 3. [c] μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων, ὡς συνδεδεμένοι· τῶν κακουχουμένων,[1] ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. 4. τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ ἡ

a Rom. xii. 10; Eph. iv. 2, 3; 1 Peter i. 22, et ii. 17, et iii. 8, et iv. 8.
b Gen. xviii. 1, et xix. 1; Rom. xii. 13; 1 Peter iv. 9.
c Matt. xxv. 36; Rom. xii. 15; Col. iv. 18; 1 Peter iii. 8.

[1] κακοχουμ. in D^c KLMP.

CHAPTER XIII. In this chapter we find exhortations apparently springing out of a desire to arrest symptoms of a tendency to hide their Christian profession disowning their teachers and fellow Christians and resenting the shame and hardship incident to the following of Christ.

Vv. 1-6. Exhortations to social manifestations of their Christianity. **Ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω.** "Let love of the brethren continue"; it existed (vi. 10) and so, as Chrys. says, he does not write **Γίνεσθε φιλάδελφοι, ἀλλά, μενέτω ἡ φιλ.** In the general decay of their faith tendencies to disown Christian fellowship had become apparent, x. 24, 25. This might also lead to a failure to recognise the wants of Christians coming from a distance, therefore hospitality is urged; not as a duty they did not already practise, but, gently, as that which they might omit through forgetfulness and as that which might bring them a message from God: **τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε,** "Entertainment of strangers do not neglect; for thus some have entertained angels unawares," as in Gen. xviii.-19; Jud. vi. 11-24, xiii. 2-23 [For testimonies to the hospitality of Christians Bleek refers to Lucian, *De Morte Peregrin.*, chap. 16 and to the 49th Epistle of Julian, On the hospitality of the East see Palgrave's *Essays*, p. 246-7.] **ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες** though a common classical idiom, occurs nowhere else in the N.T. Some of their fellow Christians might be in even more needy circumstances and therefore

Ver. 3. **μιμνήσκεσθε** (ii. 6) **τῶν δεσμίων** (x. 34), "Be mindful of those in bonds" (Matt. xxv. 36). This also they had already done (x. 34). The motive now urged is contained in the words **ὡς συνδεδεμένοι,** "as having been bound with them," as fellow-prisoners. The **ὡς ἐν σώματι** of the next clause might invite the interpretation, "for we also are bound as well as they," and colour might be given to this by the Epistle to Diognetus, chap. 6. **χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μὲν ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ τῷ κόσμῳ**; but more likely the expression is merely a strong way of saying that all the members of Christ's body suffer with each, 1 Cor. xii. 26. **τῶν κακουχουμένων,** "the maltreated," *cf.* xi. 37; you must be mindful of these "as being yourselves also in the body," *i.e.*, not emancipated spirits, and therefore liable to similar ill-usage and capable of sympathy. [A striking illustration of the manner in which the early Christians obeyed these admonitions may be found in the *Apology* of Aristides: **ξένον ἐὰν ἴδωσιν, ὑπὸ στέγην εἰσάγουσι καὶ χαίρουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ὡς ἐπὶ ἀδελφῷ ἀληθινῷ· οὐ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ἀδελφοὺς ἑαυτοὺς καλοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ψυχήν.** The Syriac Apology adds "If they hear that any of their number is imprisoned or oppressed for the name of their Messiah, all of them provide for his needs". Accordingly in the *Martyrdom* of Perpetua we read that two deacons were appointed to visit her and relieve the severity of her imprisonment.] It is interesting to find that Philo claims for Moses a **φιλαδελφία** towards strangers, enjoining sympathy, **ὡς ἐν διαιρετοῖς μέρεσιν ἓν ζῷον,** as being all one living creature though in diverse parts; and in *De Spec. Legg.* 30 he has **ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἑτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακούμενοι.** Westcott gives from early Christian documents a collection of interesting prayers for those suffering imprisonment.

Ver. 4. **τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσιν.** "Is **ἔστω** or **ἐστί** to be supplied?" Probably the former, as in ver. 5, "Let marriage be held in honour among all". As a natural result of holding marriage in honour, its ideal sanctity will be violated neither by the married nor by the unmarried. Therefore the **καὶ** links the two clauses closely together and has some inferential force, "and thus let the bed be undefiled" [**μιαίνειν τὴν κοίτην** occurs in Plutarch to denote the violation of conjugal relations. Used with **γυναῖκα** in Ezek. xviii. 6, xxiii. 17]. The next clause shows in what sense the

κοίτη ἀμίαντος· πόρνους δὲ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεός. 5. [d] ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος· ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν. αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν, "Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλίπω [1]"· 6. [e] ὥστε θαρροῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν, "Κύριος ἐμοὶ βοηθός, καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσομαι τί ποιήσει μοι ἄνθρωπος". 7. [f] Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μιμεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν.

8. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς χθὲς [2] καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. 9. [g] διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ περιφέρεσθε [3]·

d Exod. xxiii. 8; Deut. xvi. 19, et xxxi. 6, 8; Jos. i. 5; 1 Par. xxviii. 20; Prov. xv. 16; Matt. vi. 25, 34. Phil. iv. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 6, etc.
e Ps. lvi. 4, 11, et cxviii. 6.
f ver. 17.
g Jer. xxix. 8; Matt. xxiv. 4; Joan. vi. 27; Rom. xiv. 17, et xvi. 17; Eph. iv. 14, et v. 6; Col. ii. 8, 16; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 3; 1 Joan. iv. 1.

[1] εγκαταλειπω in ℵACD^{c}KLMP, 17.
[2] εχθες in ℵAC*D*M; χθες in C^{3}D^{c}KL.
[3] T.R. in KL, 47; παραφερεσθε in ℵACDMP, 17, 23, 37, 73.

words are to be taken. William Penn's saying must also be kept in view: "If a man pays his tailor but debauches his wife, is he a current moralist?" For marriage as a preventative against vice, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. and 1 Thess. iv. 4. Weiss gathers from the insertion of this injunction that the writer is not guided in his choice of precepts by the condition of those to whom he is writing but by "theoretical reflection". But in the face of xii. 16, this seems an unwarranted inference. **πόρνους . . . ὁ Θεός.** Fornicators may escape human condemnation, but God (in emphatic position) will judge them.

Ver. 5. As in Eph. v. 5 and elsewhere impurity and covetousness are combined, so here the precepts of ver. 4 lead on to a warning against love of money: **ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος,** "let your turn of mind [disposition] be free from love of money, content with what you have". [ὁ τρόπος frequently in classical writers in this sense, as Demosthenes, p. 683, αἰσχροκερδὴς ὁ τρόπος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν. Other examples in Kypke. ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς παροῦσι was also commonly used to denote contentment with what one has. Examples in Raphel and Wetstein.] This contentment has the firm foundation of God's promise; αὐτὸς γὰρ εἴρηκεν, "for Himself hath said," *i.e.*, God. **Οὐ μή σε ἀνῶ. . . .** The quotation is from Deut. xxxi. 5, where however the third person is used. Similar promises, similarly expressed, occur in Gen. xxviii. 15; Deut. xxxi. 8; Josh. i. 5; 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Philo (*De Conf. Ling.*, chap. 32, not 33 as in Bleek and Davidson) gives the quotation literatim as in the text here. **ὥστε θαρροῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν,** "so that we boldly say, The Lord is my helper, I will not fear". In Prov. i. 21 wisdom at the gates of the city θαῤῥοῦσα λέγει. The words quoted under λέγειν are from Ps. cxviii. 6, the first word Κύριος and the last ἄνθρωπος being brought into strong contrast.

Vv. 7-16. The Hebrews are exhorted to keep in remembrance their former leaders, to abide steadfastly by their teaching, to rid themselves of the ideas of Judaism, to bear the shame attaching to the faith of Christ, to persevere in good works. **Μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν . . .** "Have in remembrance them who had the rule over you, especially as they are those who spoke to you the word of God". μνημον. might be used, as in xi. 22 and Gal. ii. x, τῶν πτωχῶν μνημ., of keeping living persons in mind (and so Rendall) but what follows makes it more likely that it here refers to the past. These deceased leading men were the persons alluded to in ii. 3 and iv. 2, who first "spoke" the word of the gospel to the Hebrews and who were now no longer present. The word ἡγούμενοι, occurring also in vv. 17 and 24 and in Acts xv. 22 (and *cf.* Sir. xxx. 18, οἱ ἡγούμενοι ἐκκλησίας) is a general term for leading and influential men in whom some undefined authority was vested. Official status was not yet defined and official titles were not yet universal. The chief reason why they are to be held in remembrance is given in the clause under οἵτινες, "for they are they who". But an additional reason is

καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.[1] 10. Ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον, ἐξ οὗ φαγεῖν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες. 11. [h] ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων τὸ αἷμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας εἰς τὰ ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα κατακαίεται ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς· 12. [i] διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν, ἔξω τῆς πύλης ἔπαθε. 13. τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς, τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες· 14. [k] οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν

h Exod. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 12, 21, et vi. 30, et xvi. 27; Num. xix. 3.

i Joan. xix. 17, 18.

k xi. 10, 16; Mich. ii. 10; Phil. iii. 20.

[1] περιπατουντες in ℵ*AD*.

suggested in the following clause, ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες . . . "whose faith imitate as you closely consider the issue of their manner of life". ὧν follows ἀναστροφῆς. ἀναθεωρέω in Theophrastus and Diodorus Siculus is explicitly contrasted with the simple verb to denote a keener and more careful observation. We cannot therefore render, as naturally we might, "look back upon". ἔκβασιν, in 1 Cor. x. 18 has the meaning "escape"; but in Wisd. ii. xvii., as here, it denotes the end of life with a distinct reference to the manner of it, as illustrating the man's relation to God. The leading men among the Hebrew Christians had, whether by martyrdom (as Weiss, etc.) or not, sealed their teaching and exhibited a faith worthy of imitation. Ver. 8 gives force both to ver. 7 and to ver. 9. Imitate their faith, for the object of faith has not changed nor passed away. Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐχθὲς. . . . "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day is the same, yea and for ever." ὁ αὐτὸς exactly as in Plutarch's *Pericles*, xv. 2, where in describing the influence of success upon Pericles it is said οὐκέθ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν, he was no longer the same. ἐχθὲς is the proper Attic form, χθές the old Ionic, see Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, 370. "Yesterday and to-day," in the past and in the present Jesus Christ is the same, and He will never be different. Therefore, διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε. "Be not carried away by teachings various and unheard of, and foreign." παραφερ. is used in Diodorus and Plutarch of being swept away by a river in flood; *cf.* παραρυῶμεν of ii. 1. The teachings against which the Hebrews are here warned are such constructions of Old Testament institutions and practises as tended to loosen their attachment to Christ as the sole mediator of the New Covenant. These teachings were "various," inasmuch as they laid stress now on one aspect, now on another of the old economy ["bald in der Schriftgelehrsamkeit, bald in peinlicher Gesetzseserfüllung, bald im Opferkult, bald in den Opfermahlzeiten" (Weiss)]. They were ξέναι both as being novel and as being irreconcileable with pure Christian truth. καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι. . . . "For it is good that by grace the heart be confirmed, not by meats." The present wavering unsatisfactory condition of the Hebrews is to be exchanged for one of confidence and steadfastness not by listening to teachings about meats which after all cannot nourish the heart, but by approaching the throne where grace reigns and from which it is dispensed, iv. 16. From the following verse (ver. 10) in which sacrificial food is expressly mentioned, it would appear that the reference in οὐ βρώμασιν is not to asceticism nor to the distinction of clean and unclean meats, but to sacrificial meals. These are condemned by experiment as useless, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν . . . "which were of no avail to those who had recourse to them" (Moffatt). *Cf.* the ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές of vii. 18. Sacrificial meals are also shown to be irreconcileable (ξέναι) with the Christian approach to God, for our (the Christian) altar is one from which neither worshippers nor priests have any right to eat. The point he wishes to make is, that in connection with the Christian sacrifice there is no sacrificial meal. As in the case of the great sacrifice of the Day of Atonement the High Priest carried the blood into the Holy of Holies, while the carcase was not eaten but burned outside the camp; so the Christian altar is not one from which food is dispensed to priest and worshipper. οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες refers to the Christian worshippers. The figure introduced in θυσιαστήριον is continued in these words. To refer them to the O.T. priests is to shatter the argument. Literally the words mean "they who serve the tabernacle," that is,

ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζητοῦμεν. 15. [l] Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως διαπαντὸς τῷ Θεῷ, τουτέστι, καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. 16. [m] τῆς δὲ εὐποιΐας καὶ κοινωνίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε· τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ Θεός.

17. [n] Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑπείκετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες· ἵνα μετὰ

l Lev. vii. 12; Ps. l. 23, et li. 19; Ose. xiv. 2; Eph. v. 20; 1 Peter ii. 5.
m 2 Cor. ix. 12; Phil. iv. 18.
n ver. 7; Ezech. iii. 18, et xxxiii. 2, 8; Phil. ii. 29; 1 Thess. v. 12; 1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Peter v. 5.

the priests, *cf.* viii. 5. The peculiarity, he says, of our Christian sacrifice is that it is not eaten. Then follows in support of this statement an analogy from the O.T. ritual, **ὧν γὰρ εἰσφέρεται ζώων. . . .** "For the bodies of those animals, whose blood is brought into the holy place by the High Priest as an offering for sin, are burned outside the camp." *Cf.* Lev. iv. 12, 21. In conformity with this type (**διὸ καὶ Ἰησοῦς**) Jesus, that He by His own blood might purify the people from their sin, suffered outside the gate. "The burning of the victim was not intended to sublimate but to get rid of it. The body plays no part in the atoning act, and has in fact no significance after the blood has been drained from it. The life, and therefore the atoning energy, resides in the blood and in the blood alone. On the writer's scheme, then, no function is left for the body of Jesus. It is 'through his own blood,' that he must 'sanctify the people'. It is thus inevitable that while the writer fully recognises the fact of the Resurrection of Christ (ver. 20), he can assign no place to it in his argument or attach to it any theological significance" (Peake). The suffering **ἔξω τῆς πύλης** is equivalent to the **αἰσχύνη** of xii. 2; the ignominy of the malefactor's death was an essential element in the suffering. The utmost that man inflicts upon criminals he bore. He was made to feel that he was outcast and condemned. But it is this which wins all men to Him. **τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν . . .** "let us therefore go out to him outside the camp bearing his reproach". *Cf.* xi. 26. Do not shrink from abandoning your old associations and being branded as outcasts and traitors and robbed of your privileges as Jews. This is the reproach of Christ, in bearing which you come nearer to Him. And the surrender of your privileges need not cost you too much regret, "for we have not here (on earth) an abiding city, but seek for that which is to be," that which has the foundations, xi. 10, the heavenly Jerusalem, xii. 22. That which is spiritual and eternal satisfies the ambition and fills the heart. *Cf.* Mark iii. 35; Phil. iii. 20. The want of recognition and settlement on earth may therefore well be borne.

Ver. 15. **δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν. . . .** Going without the camp as believers in the virtue of Christ's atoning sacrifice, and bearing His shame as those who seek to be identified with Him, we are brought near to God and are disposed to offer Him a sacrifice of praise (Lev. vii. 2 ff.). The **δι' αὐτοῦ** is in the emphatic position; "through Him" and not through any Levitical device. And this Christian sacrifice is not periodic, but being spiritual is also continual (**διαπαντὸς**). That there may be no mistake regarding the material of the sacrifice of praise, an explanation is added: **τοῦτ' ἔστιν καρπὸν χειλέων,** "that is to say, the fruit of lips (*cf.* Hos. xiv. 3) celebrating His name". Thayer gives this translation, supposing that **ὁμολογ.** is here used in the sense of **ἐξομολογέω,** Ps. xlv. 17, etc.; *cf.* also 1 Esdr. ix. 8. But the sacrifice of praise which can be rendered with the lips is not enough. "Be not forgetful of beneficence and charity for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Vv. 17-End. The conclusion of the Epistle.

Ver. 17. "Obey your rulers and submit; for they watch for your souls, knowing they are to give account, that they may do this with joy not with lamentation—for this would be profitless to you."

Having exhorted the Hebrews to keep in mind their former rulers and adhere to their teaching, the writer now admonishes them, probably in view of a certain mutinous and separatist spirit (x. 25) encouraged by their reception of strange doctrines, to obey their present leaders, and yield themselves trustfully (**ὑπείκετε**)

χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσι, καὶ μὴ στενάζοντες· ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο. 18. Προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν· πεποίθαμεν γάρ, ὅτι καλὴν

to their teaching—an admonition which, as Weiss remarks, shows that these teachers held the same views as the writer. The reasonableness of this injunction is confirmed by the responsibility of the rulers and their anxious discharge of it. They watch, like wakeful shepherds (ἀγρυπνοῦσιν), or those who are nursing a critical case, in the interest of your souls (ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν) to which they may sometimes seem to sacrifice your other interests. They do this under the constant pressure of a consciousness that they must one day render to the Chief Shepherd (ver. 20) an account of the care they have taken of His sheep (ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες). Obey them, then, that they may discharge their responsibility and peform these kindly offices for you (τοῦτο referring not to λόγον ἀποδώσοντες as Vaughan, etc., which would require a much stronger expression than ἀλυσιτελές, but to ἀγρυπνοῦσιν) joyfully and not with groaning (στενάζοντες, the groaning with which one resumes a thankless task, and with which he contemplates unappreciated and even opposed work). And even for your own sakes you should make the work of your rulers easy and joyful, for otherwise it cannot profit you. Your unwillingness to listen to them means that you are out of sympathy with their teaching and that it can do you no good (ἀλυσιτελὲς γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο).

Ver. 18. προσεύχεσθε περὶ ἡμῶν. . . . Both the next clause and the next verse seem to indicate that by ἡμῶν the writer chiefly, if not exclusively, meant himself; the next clause, for he could not vouch for the conscience of any other person; the next verse because one principal object or result of their prayer was his restoration to them. Request for prayer is common in the Epistles, 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. iii. 1; Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18; Col. iv. 3. The reason here annexed is peculiar. "The allusion to his purity of conduct, and strong assertion of his consciousness of it, in regard to them and all things, when he is petitioning for their prayers, implies that some suspicions may have attached to him in the minds of some of them. These suspicions would naturally refer to his great freedom in regard to Jewish practises" (Davidson). But notwithstanding ver. 23 it may be that he was under arrest and shortly to be tried and naturally adds to his request for prayer a protestation of his innocence of all civil offence. [καλῶς ἀναστραφῆναι occurs in *Perg. Inscrip.*, v. Deissmann, p. 194, E. Tr.] The writer was conscious of a readiness and purpose to live and conduct himself rightly in all circumstances. This gives him confidence and will lend confidence to their prayers. He is more urgent in this request (περισσοτέρως παρακαλῶ) because he is desirous to be quickly restored to them; implying that he in some sense belonged to them and that the termination of his present exile from them would be acceptable to them as well as to him. [The verb ἀποκαθ. first occurs in Xenophon, see Anz. p. 338.]

While asking their prayers for himself the writer prays for them: ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης. . . . He prays to the God of peace (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9) because this attribute of God carries in it the guarantee that a termination shall be put to all misunderstanding, disturbance, and inability to do His will. His love of peace is shown in nothing more than in His concluding an eternal covenant with men. This covenant was sealed when "our Lord Jesus," having laid down his life for the sheep, was brought up from the dead in virtue of the perfect and accepted sacrifice (ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης). Elsewhere in the Epistle the blood is spoken of as giving entrance to the presence of God, here as delivering from that which prevented that entrance. As Vaughan says: "The *arrival* in the heavenly presence for us in virtue of the atoning blood is here viewed in its *start* from the grave. . . . It was in virtue of the availing sacrifice that Christ either left the tomb or re-entered heaven." ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης is therefore more naturally connected with ἀναγαγών than with τὸν ποιμένα, although the two connections are closely related. It was as the Great Shepherd that Jesus gave His life for the sheep and by this act established for ever His claim to be the Shepherd of His people. It is this claim also that guarantees that He will lose none but will raise them up at the last day (*cf.* John xv.). [It is probable that the phrasing of this verse was influenced by Zech. ix. 7, σὺ ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης σου ἐξαπέ-

συνείδησιν ἔχομεν, ἐν πᾶσι καλῶς θέλοντες ἀναστρέφεσθαι· 19. περισσοτέρως δὲ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν.

o Esa. xiv. 11; Ezech. xxxiv. 23; Zach. ix. 11; Joan. x. 11; Acts ii. 24; 1 Peter ii. 25, et v. 4.

p 2 Cor. iii. 5; Phil. ii. 13.

20. [o] Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, 21. [p] καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ[1] ἀγαθῷ, εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν[2] ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ εὐάρεστον ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

22. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν. 23. Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον[3] ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται,

[1] ℵD*, d, f, vg. omit εργω; CDcKMP, Syrsch, Arm., Aeth. insert εργω. A has εργω και λογω αγαθω.

[2] ℵ*AC*, 17* read αυτω ποιων; 71 reads αυτος ποιων. T.R. is found in ℵcCbDKMP. [WH say that "there can be little doubt that αὐτὸς ποιῶν is the true reading".]

[3] ημων is found in ℵACD*M, 17, 37, 47, 71, vg.

στείλας δεσμίους σου ἐκ λάκκου οὐκ ἔχοντος ὕδωρ, and by Isa. lxiii. 11, ποῦ ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.] The prayer follows, καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς, "perfectly equip you" (*cf.* xi. 3) ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ, "in every good work," that is, enabling you to do every good work and so equipping you εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, "for the doing of His will," "doing in you that which is well pleasing in His sight through Jesus Christ" (*cf.* Phil. ii. 13). The words διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are apparently attached not exclusively to τὸ εὐάρεστον κ.τ.λ., but to the whole clause and espec ally to καταρτίσαι; it is through Jesus, now reigning as Christ, that all grace is bestowed on His people. The doxology may be to the God of peace to whom the prayer is addressed, more probably it is to Jesus Christ, last-named and the great figure who has been before the mind throughout the Epistle.

Ver. 22. The writer adds, in closing, a request that the Hebrews would take in good part his "word of exhortation"—a request which implies that they were in an irritable state of mind, if not against the writer, then because their own conscience was uneasy. As a reason for their bearing with his exhortation he urges its brevity "for indeed (καὶ γὰρ) I have written (ἐπέστειλα as in Acts xv. 20) to you with brevity" (διὰ βραχέων, *cf.* δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, 1 Pet. v. 12). To them it might seem that he had said too much; his own feeling was that he had been severely cramped by the limits of a letter.

Ver. 23. γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν. . . . "Know that our brother Timothy has been released" (ἀπολελυμένον, for example of this use of the participle, see Winer, sec. 45, 4 b). Evidently Timothy had been under arrest; where, when, or why is not known. The information is given because it would interest these Hebrew Christians, who were therefore friends of his, not Judaizers. μεθ' οὗ . . . "with whom, if he come soon, I will see you". He takes for granted that Timothy would at once go to them; and he speaks as one who is himself free or is immediately to be free to determine his own movements. [τάχειον, = θᾶττον, a comparative in the sense of a positive; a classical usage; and *cf.* John xiii. 27, ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον.] The usual greetings are added. Epistolary form required this (see the Egyptian papyri) but in view of what the writer has said regarding the rulers, and in view of the πάντας here expressed, it may be supposed that the formula was here filled with significant contents. Who was to convey the salutations? Or, in other words, who was directly to receive the letter? Probably one or two of the leading men representing the Church. This would account for the πάντας. The greetings were not on the writer's part only. οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, "they of Italy" joined

ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. 24. Ἀσπάσασθε πάντας τοὺς ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν, καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. 25. ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας διὰ Τιμοθέου.

in them. The form of expression is that which is ordinarily used to denote natives of a place, as in Luke xxiii. 50; John i. 44, xi. 1; Acts xvii. 13, etc. Winer says (p. 785): "a critical argument as to the place at which the Epistle was written should never have been founded on these words". Vaughan is certainly wrong in saying that the more natural suggestion of the words would be that the writer is himself in Italy and speaks of the Italian Christians surrounding him. The more natural suggestion, on the contrary, is that the writer is absent from Italy and is writing to it and that therefore the native Italians who happen to be with him join him in the salutations he sends to their compatriots.

The Epistle closes with one of the usual formulae, "Grace be with you all".

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

INTRODUCTION.

I. Authorship and Date.—§ 1. *External Data.* That parts, at all events, of this Epistle were known and cited by very early Church writers seems certain. It is, however, precarious to build too much upon the fact that similarities of thought and expression are found between this Epistle and other early writings. Such similarities do not necessarily prove anything more than that the thought-movements of the times were exercising the minds of many thinkers and writers. If, that is to say, it is found that various writings belonging to the early ages of Christianity contain thoughts, words, and even sentences which are also seen to occur in this Epistle, it would be arbitrary to assume that this fact necessarily proved the influence of the latter upon the former, or *vice-versa*; and it would, moreover, be dangerous to use this assumption as a basis upon which to found conclusions regarding the date and authorship of the Epistle. We are far from denying that the similarities referred to *may* denote indebtedness on the part of the writer of our Epistle to the writings in question, or *vice versa*—as, for example, in the case of *Sirach*—but in such cases there must be no doubt as to whether the particular writing is earlier or later than our Epistle. A concrete example will make our meaning clear. Some writers regard the similarity of language between the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *St. James* as evidence that the latter influenced the former, and this is regarded as evidence in favour of an early date of our Epistle. Thus Lightfoot (*Galatians*, p. 320, note), says that the language of the writer of the *Testaments* on the subject of the law of God is "formed on the model of the Epistle of St. James," and he refers to Ewald, who makes a similar remark; again, on p. 221, note, he says in reference to this pseudepigraph: "On the whole, however, the language in the moral and didactic portions takes its colour from the Epistle of St. James". So, too, Mayor (*The Epistle of St. James*, p. iv.) speaks of the writer of this work as one "who seems to have been much influenced by the teaching and example of St. James," and a large number of quotations are given to prove this contention.

Now, Charles, who may justly be claimed as our leading authority on all that concerns the *Pseudepigrapha*, has shown conclusively in his edition of the *Testaments* (1908) that this work was written originally in Hebrew in 109-106 B.C.; the Jewish additions he regards as belonging to the years 70-40 B.C., and in its Greek form it appeared "at the latest" in 50 A.D.; the thirty Christian interpolations (approximately) belong probably to different dates, but scarcely any of these come into consideration in the present connection (see pp. l.-lxv.); instances of *St. James* probably utilising the *Testaments* are given on p. xc. Or, to mention another instance, the similarities between *St. James* and the *Epistle to the Corinthians* of Clement of Rome are likewise pointed to as a proof of the early date of *St. James*, because Clement (end of first century and beginning of second century) was influenced by it; but the most striking part of this similarity is the way in which each deals with the subject of faith and works. This subject was, however, one of the fundamental causes of difference between Jews and Christians at all times (indeed, the minds of thinking Jews were exercised by it *before* the Christian era), and it is dealt with in a number of other works of various dates—*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Testament of Abraham*, *Apoc. of Baruch*, 2 (4) *Esdras*, *Book of Enoch*, and often in the later Jewish literature;—therefore it is difficult to see why *St. James* necessarily influenced Clement on a subject which was so much in evidence in a large variety of writings; and the statement of Mayor, that "the fact that Clement balances the teaching of St. Paul by that of St. James is sufficient proof of the authority he ascribes to the latter" (p. lii.), seems a little too strong, especially as St. James is not mentioned by name in Clement. Similarities are also found between *St. James* and pseudo-Clement, the *Didache*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the *Epistles of Ignatius*, Hermas, Justin Martyr, the *Epistle to Diognetus*, Irenæus, Theophilus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and the Clementine Homilies; all these authorities, ranging from the first century to the former half of the third, are often pointed to as showing their recognition of our Epistle, because they show the marks of its influence upon them. The possibility of such indebtedness is not denied, but in the majority of cases it cannot be said that the similarities *prove* it; nor do they necessarily prove the canonicity, and still less the authorship of our Epistle, especially as not in one single instance is the Epistle mentioned by name in the authorities mentioned above. The earliest writer, as far as is known, who refers to the Epistle definitely as Scripture, and as having been written by St. James, is Origen

(d. 254 A.D.). His testimony is as follows: In his commentary on *St. John* xix. 6 he refers to our Epistle in the words, . . , ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν, a phrase which obviously suggests doubt as to its authorship, though apparently it is quoted as Scripture. On the other hand, passages from our Epistle are quoted as the words of "James the Apostle" on at least five occasions; and besides this, there are a number of cases in which direct quotations from it are clearly regarded as Scripture. This is, moreover, definitely asserted in his *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.*, iv. 1, and in *Hom. in Lev.*, ii. 4. On four occasions St. James is mentioned by name, once as the "brother of the Lord". Further, quotations, more or less distinct, from our Epistle are found in the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* (fourth century, but containing earlier material), and in Lactantius (c. 300 A.D.). The next important writer who gives direct evidence on the subject is Eusebius (c. 270-340 A.D.). In speaking of the Catholic Epistles, and after referring to the martyrdom of James the Just, he says: "The first of the Epistles styled Catholic is said to be his. But I must remark that it is held to be spurious (νοθεύεται). Certainly not many old writers have mentioned it, nor yet the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the Epistles called Catholic. But nevertheless we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most churches" (*H.E.*, ii. 23). Then, again, in enumerating the list of New Testament books (*H.E.*, iii. 25), he says: "Among the controverted books (ἀντιλεγόμενα), which are nevertheless well known and recognised by many (γνωρίμων ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς), we class the Epistle circulated under the name of James". In spite of this, however, Eusebius prefaces a quotation from the Epistle (v. 13) with the words, λέγει γοῦν ὁ ἱερὸς Ἀπόστολος (*Comm. in Ps.* i.), and later on in the same work he refers to another passage from the Epistle (iv. 2) as Scripture (. . . τῆς γραφῆς λεγούσης . . .). At the same time it will be wise not to build too much upon these last two references. In a case like this, where the writer would, if anything, be biassed in favour of ascribing Apostolic authorship to the Epistle, a passage which casts doubt upon its genuineness is really more weighty evidence than one in the opposite direction; moreover, a book which went by a certain name might well be quoted by Eusebius in accordance with the common acceptation, without his adding, each time he mentioned it, his doubts concerning the correctness as to its title. Upon the whole, the evidence of Eusebius, though uncertain, seems to point to our Epistle as being genuine Scripture, but not as having been written by St. James. This uncertain testimony is repeated by Jerome (born c. 330-350 A.D.), who says in his *De Viris*

Illustr., ii.: "Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quae de septem Catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem" (quoted by Westcott, *Canon of the N.T.*, p. 452); elsewhere, however, Jerome quotes from the Epistle as from Scripture. This evidence, therefore, runs on somewhat the same lines as that of Eusebius; and when it is remembered that these two writers stand out as the two greatest authorities of antiquity on the subject of the Canon, it must be conceded that their witness ought almost to be regarded as final. It is worth recalling that recently Jerome's *status* as a reliable witness has been greatly strengthened by the discovery of a gospel-fragment[1] which in the MS. in which it has been discovered forms a part of the Longer Ending of the canonical Gospel of St. Mark. "Writing against the Pelagians in 415-416 (*C. Pelag.*, ii. 15), Jerome quoted a passage which 'in some copies [of the Latin Gospels] and especially in Greek codices' followed immediately after St. Mark xvi. 14 [the words are then given]; hitherto Jerome's statement has been entirely without support; now at length it has been recovered in the Greek. . . ."[2] Three other facts of importance must be recorded regarding the external *data* as to authorship; they concern the question of canonicity, and therefore indirectly that of authorship. The Muratorian Fragment, which "may be regarded on the whole as a summary of the opinion of the Western Church on the Canon shortly after the middle of the second century" (Westcott, *op. cit.*, p. 212), omits *St. James* in its list of canonical writings. Secondly, our Epistle is not included in the Syriac version of the N.T. brought to the Syrian Church by Palūt, bishop of Edessa, at the beginning of the third century; "the *Catholic Epistles* and the *Apocalypse* formed no part of the old Syriac version. In the Peshitta this defect is partially supplied by a translation of James, 1 Peter and 1 John, in agreement with the usage of Antioch as represented by Chrysostom" (Burkitt in *Encycl. Bibl.* iv. col. 5004); Prof. Burkitt quotes *Addai*, 46: "The Law and the Prophets and the Gospel . . . and the Epistles of Paul . . . and the Acts of the Twelve Apostles—these writings shall ye read in the Churches of Christ, and besides these ye shall read nothing else"; and adds, "Neither in Aphraates nor in the genuine works of Ephraim are there any quotations from the Apocalypse or the Catholic Epistles." And thirdly, our Epistle

[1] See the *Biblical World*, pp. 138 ff. (1908).

[2] Swete in the *Guardian*, 1st April, 1908; see also Swete, *Zwei neue Evangelienfragmente*, p. 9 (1908); Gregory, *Das Freer-Logion*, pp. 25 ff. (1908).

does not figure in the "Cheltenham List". The first time that the Epistle appears to have been officially recognised as canonical was at the council of Carthage 397 A.D.[1]

The balance of the historical evidence of the first three and a half centuries is thus distinctly against St. James having been the author of this Epistle. If we had external evidence alone to go upon we should assuredly be compelled to follow what seems to have been the opinion of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome; that is to say that, while on the whole regarding the Epistle as canonical, it is difficult to believe that St. James can have been the author.

If the Epistle was written by St. James, it is almost universally granted that it must have been the St. James who presided at the council of Jerusalem—"James the Lord's brother"—who was the author (see § 2 below), the claims of any other of this name being too inconsiderable to be seriously thought of; but in this case it is difficult to account for the fact that doubt was thrown upon the canonicity of the Epistle for so long, and still more difficult is it to account for the fact that the name of St. James was not connected with it from the beginning. The position of authority which the Apostle held in the early Church (Acts xii. 17; Gal. i. 18, 19), the important fact of his having already inspired an Epistle (Acts xv. 19, 20), and the traditions concerning him in later times (see Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. ix. 1; Eusebius, *H.E.* II. 23), all lead to the supposition that if the Epistle had really been written by him it would have been accepted as genuine and canonical from the first, in which case the doubtful expressions of Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and the adverse testimony of the Old Syriac Version and the Muratorian Fragment would have been impossible.

On the other hand, it must be allowed that there are strong *a priori* arguments in favour of St. James' authorship. The position held by him in the early Church compels one to expect writings from him; the head of the mother-Church of Christendom would, of all people, be the most obvious one from whom one would look for communications of one kind or another to daughter-churches. Still more within the natural order of things would be an Epistle of a general character—something in the form of an encyclical—addressed not to any particular local Church, but to the whole body of believers; the fact that this one is addressed to the Dispersion only strengthens the argument, because, in the earliest days, the nucleus of the

[1] It was also accepted by the somewhat earlier but much less important Council of Laodicea, about 363 A.D.

Christian congregations was formed by those who were Jews by race. Secondly, there is the analogy of the Epistle inspired by him at the Council of Jerusalem; this fact proves that the Apostle recognised it to be within his province to inspire—if nothing more—communications to distant Churches; this particular epistle was addressed to Gentiles, whose conversion lay more particularly within the province of St. Paul, the more reason, therefore, that Jewish converts should also be written to by the head of the Church of Jerusalem, the city which these had always looked upon as their "Mother". And then, thirdly, although, as we have already seen, the early patristic evidence is not in favour of St. James' authorship, we are bound to recognise the fact that there was a tradition as early as the beginning of the third century which brought the name of St. James into connexion with this Epistle.

It is fully realised—and the point needs emphasis—that weighty arguments can be adduced against both sets of considerations mentioned above; it is just the most perplexing thing regarding this Epistle that whether an early or a late date be contended for, whether the authorship of St. James be insisted on, or that of some other, unknown, writer, no *conclusive* argument can be put forth on either side; nothing has yet been said on either side which has forced conviction on the other. It must be allowed, further, that the objections raised against the contentions on either side are, in almost every instance, strong, and are not to be brushed aside offhand. Considerations of space forbid even an enumeration of the many arguments which are urged on either side, recourse must be had to the more comprehensive Commentaries for this; but the fact is certainly noteworthy that, no matter how strong the arguments put forth on either side, valid objections can be urged against one and all; either position taken up seems so strong from one point of view, and is yet so weakened from another point of view. The one positive conclusion to be drawn from this seems to be the paradoxical one that both are right; that is to say, that an Epistle, which is embodied in our present one, was originally written by St. James, and that to it were added subsequently other elements. This is a procedure which could be paralleled by other examples, spurious additions made to authentic documents, in perfect good faith, being not unknown—*e.g.*, the Longer Ending of St. Mark's Gospel. Proof for this contention is as little forthcoming as for the various other theories that have been suggested, but it would at least account for the conflicting evidence of Origen, Eusebius and Jerome; and when we come to deal with the internal evidence of the Epistle, it will be seen to account for

more than one perplexing feature. It is at best a *faute de mieux* and, for the present, does not profess to be anything more.

§ 2. *Internal Data.*—The writer of the Epistle calls himself James, and in addressing the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" shows himself to have been a man of more than ordinary authority. According to the evidence of the New Testament, there was only one James who occupied a position of authority such as is implied in this Epistle, namely, "James, the Lord's brother"; thus in Gal. i. 18, 19, St. Paul tells of how after the three years' retirement which followed after his conversion, he went and saw St. Peter and "James the Lord's brother"; in Acts xii. 17 we read that when St. Peter had been released from prison he said to his friends: "Tell these things unto James, and to the brethren"; again, in Gal. ii. 9 St. Paul recounts the action of "James, and Cephas, and John, who were reputed to be pillars," and who, on seeing that grace had been given to him, offered to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, "that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision"; and further, in the same passage, ver. 12, the mention of certain men "who came from James" marks him out as a leader. Then, and perhaps most important of all, there is the account in Acts xv. 4-29 of the council at Jerusalem, at which the leading part is taken by St. James.[1] Once more, in Acts xxi. 18 the position of importance which St. James occupied is again clearly seen in that when St. Paul and his companions had returned to Jerusalem after their missionary journey they were first received, apparently informally, by the brethren, and then on the following day "they went unto James, and all the elders were present"; these words plainly imply something in the nature of an official, formal reception. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 7, St. Paul speaks of the special appearance of our Lord after His resurrection to St. James. It is certainly worth particular notice that among these references to St. James the most important are supplied directly or indirectly by St. Paul; this fact should of itself be sufficient to show the improbability of any conscious antagonism between the teaching on the subject of faith and works as contained respectively in the Pauline Epistles and that of St. James—assuming the latter to be authentic. At all events, the leading position held by St. James which these passages reveal, makes it in the highest degree probable that the James mentioned in the opening verse of our Epistle is to be identified with "James the Lord's brother".

[1] Note how his very words in Acts xv. 20 are incorporated in the letter which he sent (verse 29).

The next point in the internal evidence to emphasise is the similarity to be observed between the letter inspired by St. James, together with his speech, at the council of Jerusalem, and certain parts of the Epistle which bears his name. The most important of these are as follows :—

(i.) The salutation, χαίρειν, Acts xv. 23, Jas. i. 1 ; this form is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Acts xxiii. 26.

(ii.) The words, τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, in Jas. ii. 7, which can only be paralleled in the New Testament by those in Acts xv. 17 : ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς.

(iii.) The occurrence of the word ὄνομα in a specially pregnant sense, Jas. ii. 7, v. 10, 14, and Acts xv. 14, 26 ; this is not used elsewhere in the New Testament in quite the same sense.

(iv.) The pointed allusions to the Old Testament, which are characteristic of St. James' speech, *viz.*, Acts xv. 14, 16-18, 21, also play an important part in the Epistle, or at least in certain parts of it.

(v.) The affectionate term ἀδελφός, which occurs so often in the Epistle (i. 2, 9, 16, 19 ; ii. 5, 15 ; iii. 1 ; iv. 11 ; v. 7, 9, 10, 12, 19), is also found in Acts xv. 13, 23 ; especially noticeable is the verbal identity between Jas. ii. 5, ἀκούσατε ἀδελφοί μου, and Acts xv. 13, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσατέ μου.

(vi.) Other verbal coincidences are : ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 14 ; τηρεῖν and διατηρεῖν, Jas. i. 27, Acts xv. 29 ; ἐπιστρέφειν, Jas. v. 19, 20, Acts xv. 19 ; ἀγαπητός, Jas. i. 16, 19, ii. 5, Acts xv. 25. In some of these cases too much stress must not be laid upon the similarities ; but it is certainly striking that in the rather restricted scope which the short passage in Acts offers there should, nevertheless, be so many points of similarity with portions of the Epistle. The fact almost compels us to recognise the same mind at work in each, though this does not necessarily apply to the whole of the Epistle ascribed to St. James.

Further internal evidence as to authorship is afforded by indications which point to the writer as having been a Jew. And the first point that strikes one here is the copious use of the O.T. which is characteristic of the writer. There are, it is true, only five *direct* verbal quotations, *viz.*, i. 11 from Isa. xl. 7 ; ii. 8 from Lev. xix. 18 ; ii. 11 from Exod. xx. 13.14 ; ii. 23 from Gen. xv. 6 ; iv. 6 from Prov. iii. 34 ; but the atmosphere of the O.T. is a constituent element of the Epistle ; for over and above the O.T. events which are mentioned, there is an abundance of clear references to it, which shows that the mind of the writer was saturated with the spirit of the ancient

Scriptures. Some of the most obvious of these references are the following: i. 10, see Ps. cii. 4-11; ii. 21, see Gen. xxii. 9-12; ii. 23, see Isa. xli. 8, 2 Chron. xx. 7; ii. 25, see Josh. ii. 1 ff.; iii. 6, see Prov. xvi. 27; iii. 9, see Gen. i. 26; iv. 6, see Job xxii. 29; v. 2, see Job xiii. 28; v. 11, see Job i. 21-22, ii. 10; v. 17-18, see 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 41-45. Further, there is the use of the specifically Israelite name for God, "Jehovah Sabaoth" (v. 4), and the references to Law (*Torah*) in ii. 8-12, iv. 11; this use of νόμος, *i.e.*, without the article, is in accordance with the extended use of the word *Torah* among the Jews, meaning as it does, not only the Law given on Mount Sinai, not only the whole of the Pentateuch, but also the entire body of religious precepts in general (see especially ii. 12, where right speaking and acting in general are included under proper *Torah*-observance). The reference to γέεννα in iii. 6, is also a distinct mark of Jewish authorship; and the way in which the prophets are spoken of in v. 10 points in the same direction. It is to be observed that the use of the O.T. is wide, all three of the great divisions of the Jewish Canon—Law, Prophets, and Writings—being represented.

But what speaks still more for Jewish authorship is the accumulation of many small points indicative of Hebrew methods of thought, expression, and phraseology; examples of this abound in the Epistle, indeed its "Hebraic" colouring is one of its most pronounced characteristics. While it will not be necessary to give exhaustive lists, some examples of the different categories of the small points just referred to must be offered.

(i.) There are a number of instances in which the Greek is reminiscent of Hebrew phraseology; it is not meant by this to imply that a Hebrew text was the original form of such passages and phrases, but only that the Greek form of the expression of thought seems to be moulded from a Hebrew pattern, *i.e.*, that the mind of the writer was accustomed to express itself after the manner of one to whom Hebrew ways of thinking were very familiar, and who in writing Greek, therefore, almost unconsciously reverted to the Hebrew mode. The point of what has been said will perhaps be best realised when it is seen how naturally, in a number of instances, a Hebrew equivalent of the Greek suggests itself, *e.g.*: ii. 7 . . . τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, it will be seen that the Hebrew equivalent of this sounds more natural: את־השם הטוב אשר נקרא עליכם . . . ; iii., 18 . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην, although there is no fault to find with the Greek, a Hebrew equivalent suggests itself almost spontaneously:

בשלום יזרע לעשי השלום . . . ; the same may be said of the following: i. 12, . . . τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, עטרת החיים; i. 19 . . . βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, קשה לדבר וקשה לכעוס; ii. 12, οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε, כן דברו וכן עשו; ii. 23, ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, תחשב־לו לצדקה; iii. 18, καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης, פרי הצדקה; iv. 10, ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, השפלו לפני יהוה; iv. 13, ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες . . . , v. 1, ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, for this mode of address *cf.* Am. vi. 1, הוי השאננים בציון; v. 3 ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται, והיתה חלאתם בכם לעדות; v. 8, στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, אמצו לבבכם; v. 10, 14, ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, בשם יהוה; v. 17, προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι, לבלתי היות מטר . . . It is not suggested that in these, as well as in a number of other cases, the Greek is a translation from the Hebrew; but it will not be denied that the form of the Greek does suggest the Hebrew idiom, and therefore that the writer was a Jew.[1]

(ii.) Secondly, the well-known predilection for assonance on the part of Hebrew writers appears in this Epistle, and is further illustrative of the "Hebraic" colouring of it; this is noticeable both in the repetition of the same words or roots, as well as in the tendency to alliteration; so marked a feature of the Epistle is this that it is met with in almost every verse, and therefore only a few examples need be given: i. 4, ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι. i. 13, μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πειράζομαι· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν. i. 19, . . . βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν. iii. 6, καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης. iii. 7, πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις . . . δαμάζεται . . . τῇ φύσει. iii. 18, . . . ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην. iv. 8, ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν. iv. 11. μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων ἀδελφοί· ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτής . . . v. 7-8, μακροθυμήσατε οὖν ἀδελφοί . . .

[1] We are not forgetting Deissmann's very true words: "We have come to recognise that we had greatly over-estimated the number of Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the Bible. Many features that are non-Attic and bear some resemblance to the Semitic and were therefore regarded as Semiticisms, belong really to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible" (*The Philology of the Greek Bible*, pp. 62 f., 1908); but it is not the language so much as the mode of thought, which, when expressed in Hebrew, is so often reminiscent of O. T. phraseology, to which we refer.

μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἕως λάβῃ πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον. μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς . . . The following are some good instances of alliteration: i. 2, πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις. iii. 5, μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν καὶ μεγάλα αὐχεῖ. iii. 8, τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται. iv. 8, καθαρίσατε χεῖρας . . . ἁγνίσατε καρδίας. How thoroughly in the Hebrew fashion this repetition of words and alliterative tendency is may be seen by observing a few examples, taken quite at random, from the O.T., *e.g.*, Am. vi. 7, 13; Isa. ix. 5; Nah. i. 2; Ps. cxix. 13, cxxii. 6, etc., etc.

(iii.) Instances of pleonastic phraseology in the Epistle must also be regarded as witnessing to Jewish authorship; among such are the following: i. 8, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, corresponding to the Hebrew איש; the same is seen in i. 12, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς . . . *Cf.* Ps. i. 1, אשרי האיש אשר; i. 19, ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος . . .; i. 23, οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι . . .; ii. 2, ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος. Suggestive of Hebrew phraseology, again, are such passages as iii. 7, τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν; iv. 2, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς. Reminiscent of Hebrew thought are also the words in i. 15, ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν; for the similar idea see Ps. vii. 14, *Behold he travaileth with iniquity, yea he hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood;* so, too, the words in ii. 7, βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ ὄνομα . . .; here, moreover, the omission of the preposition should be noticed; then also, in v. 7, the familiar πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον (*cf.* Jer. v., 24, גשם יורה ומלקוש), and in v. 17, the regular Hebraism προσευχῇ προσηύξατο (תפלה התפלל).

(iv.) The Hebraic character of the Epistle is further illustrated by a certain terse and forcible way of putting things, reminding one often of the prophetic style, *e.g.*, ii. 3, *Sit thou here in a good place*, and in the same verse, *Stand thou there;* iv. 2 ff., *Ye lust and have not; ye kill, and covet, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war; ye have not because ye ask not. . . . Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity against God?* iv. 7, *Be subject, therefore, unto God; but resist the devil.* v. 1, *Go to now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries which are coming upon you.* Then, again, the way in which vivid pictures are presented in few but pregnant words is also illustrative of the same prophetic style, *e.g.*, in i. 6, the picture of the man who doubts; in ii. 2, of the rich man and the poor man entering the synagogue; and in v. 4, of the defrauded labourers. Under this heading must also be mentioned the distinctive way in which the writer of the Epistle

frames many of his sentences; generally speaking they are short and simple, which points, perhaps, to a natural habit of forming them on the Hebrew or Aramaic pattern; indirect statement is never expressed by the infinitive, but only by ὅτι with the indicative; the simple structure will be seen from the following instances: i. 3, γινώσκοντες ὅτι . . . κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν. i. 7, μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω . . . ὅτι λήμψεται . . . ii. 20, θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι . . . ὅτι ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή ἐστιν; ii. 24, ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος. ii. 19, σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν. ii. 22, βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργει . . . iii., 1, . . . εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα. iv. 5, δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφὴ λέγει . . . ; v. 11, . . . εἴδετε ὅτι πολύσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος. This fact of there being no subordination of sentences, but only co-ordination is very suggestive of the simple Hebrew construction of sentences. Mention should also be made of the entire absence of the optative mood in the Epistle. On the other hand, we have instances of the prophetic perfect, in v. 2, σέσηπεν and γέγονεν, in v. 3, κατίωται; and also of the gnomic aorist, *e.g.*, i. 2, ἀνέτειλεν, where the Hebrew idiom is imitated, see Isa. xl., 7, . . . יבש חציר נבל ציץ. Further, the extended use of the word ποιεῖν is extremely suggestive of Hebrew usage, *e.g.*, ii. 13, ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος, the phrase sounds more natural in Hebrew: . . . לאשר לא־עשה חסד; i. 22, γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου, Hebrew: והיו עשי הדבר, *cf.* i. 25; ii. 8, καλῶς ποιεῖτε, Hebrew: לעשות תיטיבו, *cf.* ii. 19; iii. 12, μὴ δύναται συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι, Hebrew: היוכל עץ התאנה לעשות זיתים; iii. 18, τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην Hebrew: לעשי שלום; iv. 13, . . . καὶ ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν . . . . Hebrew: ונעשה שם שנה . . . And, once more, the extended use of διδόναι in v. 18, is also in accordance with the Hebrew idiom. Lastly, there are a few other minor points which seem to betray greater familiarity with Hebrew than with Greek idiom; among these are; *the use of the genitive of quality*, *e.g.*, i. 15, ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς, ii. 4, κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν, iii. 6, κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας (See Vorst, *Hebr.* . . . pp. 244 ff.); *the lax use of number*, *e.g.*, ii. 15, ἐὰν ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν . . . ; iii. 14, εἰ ἐριθίαν ἔχετε ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν . . . ; iii. 10, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα; *the use of the article is inconsistent;* and *the disregard of cases is, in some instances, irregular*, *e.g.*, iii. 9, καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους (acc. instead of dat.), v. 6, κατεδικάσατε τὸν δίκαιον (acc. instead of gen.) *cf.* Mayor *in loc.* While allowing due weight to "international vulgarisms," one cannot help feeling that many of these features

point to a Jewish atmosphere of thought, and a Jewish mode of expression.

From all that has been said, therefore, it must be clear that the author of our Epistle was a Jew; as far as it goes, this evidence is in the direction of favouring the authorship of St. James; though it is, of course, far from being in any sense conclusive. But while the internal evidence, so far, speaks distinctly in favour of St. James being the writer of the Epistle, there are some other weighty considerations which point in the opposite direction. Firstly, one might reasonably have expected in an Epistle written by St. James that the fact of his having been the brother of the Lord would have been specially mentioned; this, one might think, would have been insisted on for its own sake, quite apart from the authority and prestige which the mention of it would have conferred upon the writer. Though the fact would have been well known in his immediate surroundings, or even throughout Palestine, and would therefore not have necessitated mention in an Epistle addressed to Palestinian congregations, it was different when, as in the present case, the scattered churches of the Dispersion were being written to; the more authoritative the name of the person who addressed them, the more effective would be the influence of the Epistle upon them. The occurrence of the Lord's name in the opening verse of the Epistle—"a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ"—offered a natural and obvious opportunity for the mention of the writer's close tie to Him. In reply to this it may well be said that after the resurrection of Christ, and the consequent proclamation of His Divinity to all the world, there would be a natural and very seemly hesitation, on the part of those who were His relations after the flesh, to assert this tie; but this argument is to some extent weakened by the words in John xix. 25-27, which were written later than our Epistle (on the assumption of St. James' authorship): "But there were standing by the Cross of Jesus His mother and His mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. When Jesus therefore saw His mother, and the disciple standing by whom He loved, He saith unto His mother . . ."; if St. John could record thus distinctly the relationship between our Lord and the Blessed Virgin so long after, there does not seem sufficient reason why St. James should not have referred to his own relationship with our Lord. Apart, however, from the non-mention of this relationship, one might, at any rate, have expected a reference to apostleship in the opening verse of the Epistle; for that St. James was regarded as an apostle in the early Church is clear from 1 Cor. xv. 7, Acts xv. 22, Gal. ii. 8, 9. A second reason

for questioning the authorship of St. James is the absence of any references to the great outstanding events connected with our Lord's Person—His manner of life on earth, His sufferings and death, His resurrection and ascension. There are special reasons for expecting to find such references in this Epistle—assuming it to have been written by St. James. It is almost impossible to believe that one who had known Christ, and had been an eye-witness of His doings and a hearer of His teaching, should maintain such absolute silence on these things when addressing a letter to fellow-believers which touches otherwise on such a large variety of subjects. If there was one thing of paramount importance in the early days of Christianity it was that the fact of Christ's resurrection should be proclaimed; one has but to remember how often reference is made to this in the Acts—about twenty-five times—how it is mentioned or implied in all the Pauline Epistles, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as well as in I Peter and 1 and 2 John, to realise the conviction and practice of the other apostles in this; and yet St. James, to whom had been vouchsafed a special manifestation of the risen Lord, can write an Epistle to Jewish-Christians who were scattered abroad without the slightest reference, implicit or explicit, to this cardinal tenet of the faith! The fact of the Epistle being addressed to the Dispersion makes this omission all the more strange; for on the assumption that St. James wrote it, *i.e.*, that it was probably the earliest in date of all the books of the New Testament, there must have been many among those addressed who would require strengthening in their belief, or who would possibly have heard of the resurrection for the first time from a "pillar" of the Church, supposing it had been mentioned; and, therefore, one might reasonably have expected to have found it occupying a central position in the Epistle. It is fully realised that to argue from omissions is not always safe; it is, however, impossible not to be struck by the omissions referred to if the Epistle was written by St. James. On the assumption of a late date, at all events for the bulk of the Epistle, when the main tenets of the faith, such as the resurrection, were regarded as "first principles" and were meant rather for "babes" in faith (*cf.* Heb. vi. 1 and context), these omissions would not cause surprise; but they would be very difficult to account for on the assumption of St. James' authorship, which would imply a date prior to c. 63 A.D. for its composition. In reply to this it may well be urged that in Acts xv. we have an instance of an Epistle written in the earliest ages of Christianity in which no references to the cardinal tenets of the faith are found; but in an Epistle like this (Acts xv. 23 ff.), written for one specific

purpose, and therefore of small scope, such references cannot well be expected. The possibility is conceivable that a similar letter, though addressed to a different class of hearers, may have constituted the original form of the Epistle that now bears the name of St. James; in this case the absence of the references spoken of above would be quite comprehensible.

Another omission which is likewise difficult to account for on the assumption of the authorship of St. James, is that of any direct reference to Christ as the Messiah of Old Testament prophecy. For a Jew writing to Jewish-Christians in the earliest ages of Christianity such an omission is incomprehensible. The insistence on the Messiahship of our Lord would be the first step in the propagation of the faith among Jews; and if an Epistle of this length and comprehensive character in the subjects touched upon had been written by St. James he could scarcely have omitted some reference, though but a passing one, to the Messiah Whom he had seen and known. The question as to whether our Lord was the promised Messiah or not was one which was naturally surging in the minds of Jews in those early days; the question, "Art Thou He that should come?" perplexed the minds of many others long after the time of the Baptist; for Jews it was all-important, for everything depended upon it. The fact, therefore, that the Messiahship of Jesus is taken for granted in the Epistle (see i. 1, ii. 1) proves that these Jews of the Dispersion regarded this truth as axiomatic; and this would be almost impossible to understand among Jews of the *Dispersion* in the earliest ages of Christianity, if the conditions of the time are taken into consideration; the only way whereby this could be brought within the bounds of probability would be to restrict the meaning of *Dispersion*, but this would be arbitrary and without justification, seeing that in our Epistle the word is used without qualification, and, therefore, evidently intended to mean what was ordinarily understood by it.

A further objection urged against the authorship of St. James is the improbability of one in such a humble walk in life as a Galilæan peasant, the son of Mary and Joseph, being able to pen an Epistle of this kind in Greek. The writer of the Epistle displays a considerable knowledge of the Greek *Wisdom* literature, of various N.T. books, and of other Greek writings. It may be said in reply that opportunities for learning Greek were not wanting in Palestine, and the fact of humble birth was certainly no hindrance to the acquiring of knowledge among the Jews. But in a case like this, in which proof either for or against is not forthcoming, one must to a large extent be guided by a balance of probabilities. As far as our knowledge goes

there was really nothing to induce St. James to learn Greek; there is no evidence for supposing that he extended his evangelistic efforts beyond the confines of Palestine; on the contrary, the evidence is in the other direction; as overseer of the Church in Jerusalem his activity must have been almost, if not altogether, exercised among those of his own race. Moreover, it is certain that the Palestinian Jewish teachers altogether discouraged everything that tended to the spread and influence of the Greek spirit, for they rightly (from their point of view) regarded it as a menace to orthodox Judaism (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, p. 80, etc.); and for a Jew to go to heathen assemblies to learn was, to say the least, improbable in Palestine. As an apostle of the circumcision (Gal. ii. 9) in Palestine the various dialects of the Palestinian vernacular were amply sufficient for St. James' purposes. It must also be confessed that, even granting that St. James knew Greek, the large acquaintance with some of the Pauline Epistles which the writer of our Epistle shows is against the authorship of St. James; for how was St. James to gain such an intimate knowledge of these without having them before him? It is certain that in those early days there were not many copies of them, and whatever copies there were would be needed outside of Palestine rather than inside; nor is it quite clear why St. James should have required them at all. These Epistles must have been treasured by the Churches addressed as their special possession; copies of them are not likely to have been circulated generally until they had become authoritative documents in the Church at large, and this can scarcely have been the case until close upon the end of the first century at the earliest. The two Epistles that come into consideration are *Romans*, written from Corinth in c. 58 A.D., and *Galatians*, probably slightly earlier, perhaps from Antioch (or Ephesus?); these are the earliest dates that can be assigned to them, and as St. James was martyred probably in 63 A.D., there certainly does not appear to have been sufficient time for them to have reached that stage of importance in the eyes of Christians generally for copies to have been circulated outside of the particular congregations addressed. This argument does not appeal, of course, to those who hold that St. Paul was indebted to St. James' Epistle. On the other hand, the analogy of the letter inspired by St. James in Acts xv. suggests the possibility that something of the same kind may have been repeated; but in this case we should look for something more homogeneous than the Epistle (in its entirety) which at present bears his name.

Turning now more specifically to the question of *date*, we have, firstly, the entire absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. This can either imply that the Epistle was written some time before that event, or else some considerable time after. It is an argument which is conclusive neither for an early nor for a late date, and can only be used to emphasise the correctness of a result, concerning the date, reached on other grounds. There is, however, one consideration which suggests (though it certainly cannot be said to amount to proof) an early date; the words in v. 7-9, especially "stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord is at hand," are, in view of such a passage as Mark xiii. 14-37—see especially verses 28 ff.—more natural from one who was writing before the Fall of Jerusalem. Again, the silence in our Epistle regarding the great controversy on the question of the admission of Gentiles into the Church may well be used as an argument in favour of an early date, though it may also imply the opposite. Silence on this subject, which clearly agitated the Church to such an extent as to shake the very pillars (*cf.* Gal. ii. 11 ff.) can only be satisfactorily explained on one of two hypotheses; either the Epistle was written before this controversy arose, or else it was not written until so long after that there was no occasion to refer to it. It is, therefore, an argument which can be used both in favour of an early and a late date, and is thus, like that just referred to, inconclusive. But see further on this below. In the next place, the *data* to be gathered from the Epistle as to the *order and constitution of the Church* are important in seeking to fix an approximate date. The meeting-place for worship of the Jewish-Christians to whom the Epistle is addressed is called the "Synagogue"; from this it has been argued that the Epistle was written at a time when Christian and Jewish places of worship had not yet become differentiated; if, it is said, the Epistle had been written, say, during the first half of the second century, such place of meeting would have been termed ἐκκλησία. In reply to this, however, it can be urged that συναγωγή is used of a distinctively Christian assembly, *e.g.*, by Hermas in *Mand.*, xi. 9. Again, in iii. 1 mention is made of "many teachers," and in v. 14 of the "elders (or presbyters) of the Church" (τῆς ἐκκλησίας); that no reference is made to "bishops" or "deacons" points to an undeveloped constitution of the Church, and therefore to an early date for the Epistle; moreover, the expression "many teachers" may imply a time when regular church officers for this purpose had not yet been ordained. But, on the other hand, it can be argued that the existence of "elders of the Church" does point to an organised system, and that

the "many teachers" is better understood at a time when the number of Christians had greatly increased. Here, again, the argument on either side is inconclusive. Once more, *the condition of the Churches* to which the Epistle is addressed has not unnaturally been pointed to as not suggestive of the very early years of Christianity; the earnestness and zeal which one might expect in those of the first generation of Christians is conspicuously lacking among those addressed; the impression gained as to the characteristics of these is disappointing—the unbridled tongue, worldliness, quarrelling, jealousy, a mercenary spirit, despising of the poor, flattering the rich, lust, and an entire absence of the wisdom that is from above, with the virtues which this brings in its train. This argument is extremely well answered by Mayor (pp. cxxviii. ff.), who gives a number of examples showing that a similar state of morals was exhibited in other newly-formed Christian communities; but his answer is not conclusive, for some of the examples cited—Ananias and Sapphira, Simon—are so obviously exceptional; others, such as the murmuring of Hellenistic Jews against the Hebrews because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration, and the jealousy between Jews and Gentiles mentioned in Acts xv., and the case of those who had not heard "whether there be any Holy Ghost," are not, strictly speaking, analogous. Moreover, a difference must be made between recently converted Jews and those among the Gentiles who became Christians; among the former there had always been a previous training in moral discipline, which was not the case with the Gentiles; the characteristics, therefore, alluded to above, which are spoken of in reference to Jewish-Christians sound stranger than if Gentile-Christians were in question. If, on the other hand, the Epistle—or those parts of it which come into consideration in this connection—was written after Christianity had been established for two or three generations, the conditions described would be more comprehensible.

The conditions just referred to must, in part, have been the cause of the predominantly *ethical character of the Epistle;* morals rather than religion sound the dominant note, and for an Epistle like this to have been written during the Apostolic age, when religious fervour was so pronounced, is certainly a little difficult of explanation. The attempts to solve this problem which have been made only bring into relief the incongruousness of the need of such a tone in an Epistle written in the middle (or shorty after the middle) of the first century; for it differs utterly in this respect from other Apostolic writings. It is, of course, true to say that "no Apostolic writing fails to exhibit

the moral interest as the consistent aim of all doctrine and instruction; the appeal for conduct corresponding to the new teaching is the regular conclusion of all doctrinal exposition";[1] but the Apostles, as the same writer truly observes, always start from "the new revelation of the nature of man's dependence on God and God's work in man, which was contained in the Life, the Death, the Resurrection of the Lord Jesus,"[2] and this is just what is left aside—or perhaps, more correctly, taken for granted—in our Epistle; but in an Apostolic writing we legitimately look for the foundation-truths to be at least as prominent as the ethical standard which is based upon them. The argument based on this fact speaks for a late date. Next, a subject already dealt with, namely, the *Judaic tone* of the Epistle, is sometimes put forward in favour of an early date; but this characteristic could be used in support of any date from 200 B.C.-200 A.D., to give the narrowest margin; the argument, therefore, is wholly inconclusive. More to the point is that based upon the mention of the *Diaspora*. For the "twelve tribes of the Dispersion" to be addressed presupposes a widely-spread Christianity, such as would require many years to permit it to have developed itself, so that the use of the phrase in reference to Jewish-Christians almost compels one to postulate a late date for the bulk of the Epistle. The only reply forthcoming to refute this contention is to restrict the meaning of the term "Dispersion"; but, as already pointed out above, the Epistle gives us no authority for this, and what the Jews meant by the twelve tribes of the Dispersion is so well known that this reply ought scarcely to be considered. Then, on the other hand, the absence of all reference to the Temple and its worship has been used as an argument that the Temple no more existed, and that therefore the Epistle must at any rate be later than the year 70 A.D. This argument, however, seems quite inconclusive, for, unless for some specific purpose, why should it be mentioned in an Epistle to Jewish-Christians?

Finally, it is worth inquiring whether the silence of the Epistle concerning the two great distinctive marks of Judaism—*viz.*, Circumcision and the Sabbath—throws any light upon the question of date. The opinion had been directly expressed by St. James that circumcision was unnecessary for Gentile-Christians (Acts xv. 19, *cf.* xv. 5); on the other hand, Jewish-Christians would, of course, have been circumcised, in the first generation; but there must have arisen at an early stage the question as to whether the children of Jewish-Christians should be circumcised or not; it can hardly be doubted

[1] Parry, *A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James*, p. 93.
[2] *Ibid.*

that the congregations in the Dispersion to whom our Epistle was addressed comprised a certain number of Gentile- as well as Jewish-Christians, and the latter must have known that the former were not circumcised, neither they nor their children, and therefore the question must have arisen as to which was the right course; it was a subject with which St. Paul had had to deal (1 Cor. vii. 18); as soon as the two classes of Christians began to associate, it must have become necessary to have some uniformity in this matter; it concerned the children more especially. On the assumption of an early date for the Epistle one might almost have a right to expect some reference to the question on account of its importance in the eyes of Jews, whereas on the assumption of a late date, when the usage of non-circumcision had been in vogue for some time, the silence on the subject would be natural. It is, perhaps, worth while pointing out that the question was probably to some extent complicated by the fact that baptism, as well as circumcision, was practised among the Jews, as regards proselytes, both before and after the founding of Christianity; during the first centuries of Christianity it became a burning question among the Rabbis whether circumcision without baptism was sufficient; some maintained that baptism alone sufficed. These were things concerning which the scattered congregations of the Dispersion must, in these early years of the planting of the faith, have needed guidance. As regards the Sabbath, some authoritative expression of opinion would also seem to have been demanded if the Epistle were of early date; those who had only comparatively recently become Christians might be expected to have required some guidance as to the observance of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day; even if both were observed, as was probably the case among the early Jewish-Christians, questions as to the relative importance of each can scarcely have been wanting when one remembers the punctiliousness in all that concerns observances which is so characteristic of the Jew. The silence on these two subjects is, of course, inconclusive as to date; all that can be said is that, assuming an early date for the Epistle, some reference to them might reasonably be expected, while if it were written about 125-130 A.D. this silence would be natural.

The net result, then, of these considerations as to authorship and date appears to be as follows: A great deal is to be said in favour of St. James' authorship, and, therefore, in favour of an early date; at least as much is to be said in favour of a late date (say the first or second quarter of the second century), and, therefore, against the authorship of St. James. Against every argument adduced in favour of either view serious objections can be urged; but then these

objections, again, can for the most part be upset by counter-arguments. In view of such a perplexing state of affairs it is extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to reach a satisfactory conclusion ; one thing is quite clear, and that is, that the advocates of either contention have a great deal to urge in support of their position, and that, therefore, dogmatic assertion regarding either is precarious, and belittling of the adversaries' arguments uncalled for. Any conclusion reached must, for the present, be tentative ; and, therefore, the view here held is provisional—the view, that is to say, that the name of St. James attaching to the Epistle is authentic, but that, in the first instance, the Epistle was a great deal shorter than as we now possess it ; sections being added from time to time, probably excerpts from other writings, or adaptations of these. Indeed, it is possible that we have here something in the shape of text and commentary, the latter being enlarged as time went on. If one remembers how, on an infinitely larger scale, of course, the comments of the words of Scripture by degrees became the *Mishna*, the comments on these the *Gemara*, and how ultimately the ponderous mass known as the *Talmud* came into being, the possibility of this intensely Jewish Epistle having grown by a process of comments, which ultimately came to be regarded as part of the Epistle itself, will be realised. One or two tentative examples of the supposed process will be given in III. on the analysis of the Epistle. This view does not profess to be anything more than theory, it is probably incapable of proof ; but it has, at least, the merit of justifying the position both of those who advocate an early as well as those who believe in a late date for the Epistle.

II. Literary Characteristics.—These have to a large extent been already dealt with ; but a brief reference to three other points is demanded on account of their special importance.

(i.) One of the most striking features of the Epistle is the extended acquaintance with the *Wisdom* literature which it exhibits. Many instances of this will be found in the Commentary, here it must suffice to indicate by references some of the more important and striking examples ; the following passages should be compared together : **i. 5**, Sir. i. 1, 26, Wisd. vi. 14, vii. 14, 15 ; **i. 8**, Sir. i. 28, ii. 12, v. 9 ; **i. 12**, Wisd. v. 16 ; **i. 13**, Sir. xv. 11-15 (especially in the Hebrew original), xv. 20 ; **i. 19**, Sir. v. 11 (the words "and let thy life be sincere," which are inserted by A.V., are found neither in the Hebrew nor the Greek ; their absence makes the agreement between the words in Jas. and this passage closer), i. 29, iv. 29, v. 13 ; **i. 27**, Sir. vii. 34-36, *cf.* iv. 10 ; **ii. 6**, Wisd. ii. 10 (in the Greek) ; **iii. 2**,

Sir. xiv. 1, xix. 16, xxv. 8, xxxvii. 18; **iii. 5, 6**, Sir. v. 13, 14, viii. 3 xxviii. 11; **iii. 8**, Sir. xxviii. 16-18; **iii. 10**, Sir. xxviii. 12 (see also context); **iii. 13, 17**, Wisd. vii. 22-24; **v. 4**, Sir. iv. 1-6, xxxiv. 22; **v. 7**, Sir. vi. 19; **v. 16**, Sir. iv. 26; **v. 17**, Sir. xlviii. 3 (*cf.* context). These are very far from being exhaustive, and only two books of the *Wisdom* literature have been referred to, whereas points of contact are to be found in several others. This knowledge and sympathy with the *Wisdom* literature suggest a Hellenistic rather than a Palestinian Jew.

(ii.) A second literary characteristic, and one which is further indicative of Hebraic colouring (see above), is to be found in the large number of parallelisms which the Epistle contains. This well-known Hebrew literary characteristic appears sometimes more clearly than at others in the Epistle, but a few of the most obvious examples are the following:—

i. 9, 10[a]. *Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate;*
And the rich in that he is made low.

i. 15. *Then the lust, having conceived, beareth sin;*
And the sin, being full-grown, bringeth forth death.

i. 17. *Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above,*
Coming down from the Father of lights,
With Whom can be no variation,
Nor shadow that is cast by turning.

i. 19, 20. *But let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath;*
For the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.

i. 22. *Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only,*
Deluding your own selves.

iii. 11, 12. *Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet and bitter water?*
Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?

See, further, iv. 7, 10, v. 4, 5, 9. This, too, is in the style of much of the *Wisdom* literature, and reminds one often of the Book of Proverbs especially.

(iii.) Lastly, one cannot fail to be struck by the number of words —a large number when the shortness of the Epistle is considered— which are either ἅπ. λεγ. in the New Testament, or very rarely found, outside the Epistle, in the Septuagint or New Testament; this denotes a knowledge of Greek literature and of the Greek language generally, which is very noticeable; attention is drawn to such words

in the Commentary whenever they occur. For other literary characteristics see I. § 2.

III. Analysis of the Epistle.—The vast majority of commentators are agreed that no consistent scheme is presented in this Epistle, but that it contains rather a number of unconnected sayings which are for the most part independent of one another. The analysis of the Epistle shows the correctness of this view in the main.[1] In some cases it is possible that a thought-connection of a secondary character exists which is not at once apparent; by a thought-connection of a secondary character is meant, when in two succeeding sections a subordinate, not the main, thought of the earlier is taken up and dealt with in the later; an example may be seen in the two sections i. 2-4, i. 5-8; the main thought in the former is the being joyful in temptations, the subject of patience is a subordinate thought, and still more so, that of lacking in nothing; but it is this last which is taken up in the succeeding section and attached to the thought of lacking in wisdom; so that, although it is perfectly true to say there is no genuine connection between these two sections, yet there is a secondary connection. It is improbable that the two sections come from the same writer, because they are lacking in real mental sequence; and yet a semblance of sequence is apparent; if both came from the same writer one would either expect a genuine sequence of thought if the two were intended to be connected, or else a clear indication of each being self-contained. As they stand, it looks as though the former were a text, and the latter a comment upon it, very much like the similar process which occurs incessantly in the *Mishna*.[2] The next section, i. 9-11, deals with the subject of rich and poor; it stands in an isolated position here, but is intimately connected with the later section, ii. 1-13. With i. 12-16 we have another instance of what looks like text and comment; the subject is that of temptation, and comes most naturally after i. 4; the text is contained in ver. 12, the following verses then comment on the nature of temptation. This is an instructive instance illustrative of the theory of the authorship of the Epistle here tentatively advocated (see above); for on comparing the simple, straightforward character of ver. 12 with the intricate chain of thought in the two following verses, it is almost impossible to postulate identity of authorship.

[1] Parry's attempt to show that the Epistle is "a very careful and logical exposition of a single theme" (*op. cit.* p. 6) is ingenious, but much too artificial to carry conviction.

[2] Catch-words, it would seem, played their part in the formation and grouping of sections.

i. 17 belongs to the preceding, possibly (see IV. § 1), and i. 18 seems to be a comment on the "Father of lights". i. 19^b-20 forms an isolated saying. A self-contained section on the subject of practical religion follows in i. 21-25, to which vv. 26, 27 form an addition. ii. 1-13 has already been referred to; it is followed by a section (ii. 14-26) of deep interest on the subject of faith and works, to which iii. 13-18 belong, according to the subject-matter. iii. 1-12 is a self-contained passage dealing with the subject of self-control as regards the tongue. If these first three chapters show a want of homogeneity, the last two do so in an even more pronounced way; the various sections are clearly divided off, showing no connection with each other, the whole forming a collection of extracts, apparently; thus, iv. 1-10 contains warnings and exhortations concerning the practical religious life; iv. 11, 12 is a short section on the need of observing the second great commandment of the Law; iv. 13-17 lays stress on the uncertainty and fleeting character of earthly life; v. 1-11 is an eschatological section, and extremely practical; v. 12, which prohibits swearing, is almost a quotation from the Sermon on the Mount; v. 13-18 gives directions concerning the visitation of the sick; and the abrupt ending v. 19, 20 speaks of the reward of those who convert sinners from their evil ways.

It will thus be seen that the Epistle is for the most part a collection of independent sections; some of these were evidently originally intended to be comments on the Apostle's words, possibly added by one or more of the elders of the churches addressed for the benefit of the members; others seem to be wholly independent, and not to have had anything to do with the Epistle in the first instance. The various elements of which the Epistle is now composed have to a large extent become so intermingled that the attempt to differentiate between them seems hopeless. But, generally speaking, we should look for the simplest, most direct and straightforward parts as being those which would be the most likely words of the Apostle; so that such parts as i. 13-16 and ii. 14-26 can hardly be regarded as from the same hand as, *e.g.*, ii. 1-13 (in the main).

IV. Some Jewish Doctrines Considered.—As is often mentioned in the notes, there are some points of Jewish theology which figure rather prominently in this Epistle; there are above all two subjects, specifically Jewish, which play an important part, and therefore a brief consideration of these will not be out of place here:—

(i.) *The Jewish doctrine of the Yetser hara'*.—Speculations as to the origin of sin were rife among Jewish thinkers at all times; the perplexity which is so plainly apparent in the words of St. Paul

(Rom. vii. 22-23), *For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members*, had been felt by many long before his day. The origin of the existence of the "law of sin in the members," which asserted itself in spite of the ardent desire of men to be free from its power, was the great problem which had to be solved. The result was the theory, based upon the observed facts of experience, that within man, as part of his created being, there were two tendencies: the tendency towards good, *Yetser ha-tob* (יצר הטוב), and the tendency towards evil, *Yetser hara'* (יצר הרע). But whence originated these two tendencies? If they both formed part of man's nature from the beginning, it followed that their creation was due to God; there was, of course, no difficulty about ascribing the creation of the good tendency to Him, but that He should have created anything evil was obviously a difficulty. The varying thoughts and speculations on the subject will perhaps best be seen by giving a few illustrations as examples. In Sir. xv. 14, 15, we have these interesting words, according to the Greek Version: "He made man from the beginning, and left him in the power of his will" (ἐν χειρὶ διαβουλίου αὐτοῦ); "if thou willest, thou wilt observe the commandments, and to exhibit faithfulness is a matter of thy good pleasure" (καὶ πίστιν ποιῆσαι εὐδοκίας); the significance of these words is only realised when they are read in the Hebrew, *viz.*, "God [this is the reading of the Syriac and Latin as well] created man from the beginning; and He delivered him into the hand of him who took him for a prey (חותפו); and He gave him over into the power of his will (יצרו)"; here it is clear that the second clause is an explanatory gloss (it is wanting in the Greek), the object being to indicate that to be in the power of the *Yetser* (which is here clearly used in reference to the *evil* tendency) is equivalent to being in the power of Satan. This is important as showing that the evil tendency is not ascribed to divine creation, but that over against the good which God created in man there is an opposition of evil which is due to the activity of Satan. This thought of opposing tendencies is apparent elsewhere in the same book, *e.g.*, xxxiii. 15: "Good is set against evil, and life against death; so is the godly against the sinner. So look upon all the works of the Most High; there are two and two, one against another" (the Hebrew of these verses is not extant); here the writer comes perilously near ascribing the creation of evil to God; but in another passage the question is left

open, xxxvii. 3: "O evil tendency (יצר רע), why wast thou made to fill the earth with thy deceit?" It is, at all events, not directly ascribed to God; these pathetic words remind one of those of St. Paul in Rom. vii. 24. The same hesitation to assert that God created evil is observable in a curious passage from the pseudepigraph called *The Life of Adam and Eve* (*Apocalpyse of Moses*), § 19;[1] this describes the origin of evil, and tells of how in the garden of Eden Satan took the form of an angel, but spoke "through the mouth of the Serpent," and aroused within Eve the desire to eat of the fruit of the tree that stood in the middle of the garden; first of all, however, we are told that he made her swear that she would give of the fruit to Adam as well; then the text goes on: "When he (*i.e.*, the Serpent) had, then, made me swear, he came and ascended up into it (*i.e.*, the tree). But in the fruit which he gave me to eat he placed the poison of his malice, namely, of his lust; for lust is the beginning of all sin. And he [other authorities read "I"] bent down the bough to the earth, then I took of the fruit and ate." Here the origin of evil *in man* is satisfactorily accounted for; its existence in Satan is taken for granted, and no attempt is made to follow it up further back. Noticeable here, too, is the way in which lust is brought into connection with the origin of sin; this is an idea which seems to have been widely prevalent in Jewish circles, the lust of Satan towards Eve being described as the beginning of sin in the world (See *Sanhedrin*, 59 *b*; *Sotah*, 9 *b*; *Jebamoth*, 103 *b*; *Abodah Zara*, 22 *b*; *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 18, 19); so that it is very interesting to read in our Epistle, after i., 13, 14 (which will be referred to presently), in which the impulse to sin in man is dealt with, the words: ". . . when he is drawn away by his own lust, and enticed. Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin; and the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death". This thought of a relationship between sin and death is graphically illustrated in the *Jerusalem Targum* to Gen. iii. 6, where it is said that at the moment in which Eve succumbed to temptation she caught sight of Sammael, the angel of death. Other theories as to the origin of sin were that it was brought into existence by man, *e.g.*, Enoch xcviii. 4, "Sin has not been sent upon the earth, but man himself has created it," this is the teaching, apparently, in Jas. i. 14; in ch. lxxxv. of the same book it is taught that fallen angels were the originators of sin (*cf. Bereshith Rabba*, c. 24; *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 42). None of these theories was,

[1] The two works run parallel to a large extent.

however, satisfactory; none really gave the answer to the problem that was constantly presenting itself; if, for a moment, the contention was put forth that man himself originated sin, a very little thought showed that this, too, was untenable, for the very nature of the "evil tendency" forbade the idea that man could have created it. Therefore, at a very early period, comparatively speaking, the teaching which afterwards became crystallised in Rabbinical writings, must have been put forth,—the logical, if dangerous, doctrine, that God, as the Creator of all things, must have also created the *Yetser hara'*, the "evil tendency"; thus in *Bereshith Rabba*, c. 27, it is definitely stated that God created the *Yetser hara'*; in *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 44-47, the Almighty is made to say: "I grieve that I created man of earthly substance; for had I created him of heavenly substance he would not have rebelled against me"; again *ibid.* 61: "It repenteth me that I created the *Yetser hara'* in man, for had I not done this he would not have rebelled against me"; and in *Kiddushin*, 30*b*, we read: "I created an evil tendency (*Yetser ra'*). I created for him (*i.e.*, for man, in order to counteract this) the Law as a means of healing. If ye occupy yourselves with the Law, ye will not fall into the power of it (*i.e.*, the *Yetser ra'*). Once more, according to *Bammidbar Rabba*, c. 22, we are told of how God created the good and the evil tendencies: the former was placed in man's right side, the latter in his left side. In other passages it is pointed out that the *Yetser tob* is Wisdom and Knowledge of the Law (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 218). The danger of such a doctrine is obvious, a danger which could not be more vividly illustrated than in the words of St. Paul, Rom. vii. 15-24: ". . . but if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the Law that it is good. So now it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me. . . . but if what I would not, that I do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me, . . . "; that teaching like this, taken with the belief that the *evil tendency* was created by God, would be perverted was almost inevitable; it was the existence of such perversions which must have called forth the words in i. 13 f. of our Epistle: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He Himself tempteth no man . . . "; then, possibly, the words in verse 17 of the same chapter, "Every good gift and every perfect boon is from above . . . " refer to the *Yetser ha-tob*, and are intended to exclude the belief that the *Yetser hara'*, whereby men were tempted, came from God.

(ii.) *The Jewish Doctrine of Works.*—There are, according to

Rabbinical teaching, two categories of good works: i. *Mitzvôth* (מצוות) lit. "commandments"; these consist in observances of the *Torah;* ii. Works of love, of which the most important is almsgiving, indeed so high does this stand that it has the technical name of צדקה ("righteousness"); these two categories comprise the whole body of מעשים טובים ("good works"), the former representing man's duty to God, the latter His duty to His fellow-creatures; *cf.* Matt. xxii. 36-40, ". . . Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets." According to Jewish teaching, there are certain works of obligation; good works done over and above these are of free-will, and by these justification in the sight of God is attainable. There are two classes of men, those who do a sufficient number of good works to be justified in the sight of God—these are the צדיקים, "the righteous"—and those who do not—these are the רשעים, "the wicked"; these two are differentiated on earth, for it is said in *Sanhedrin*, 47 *a*, that a רשע may not be buried by the side of a צדיק. But besides these two classes, there is an intermediate one, the "ones between" (בינונים), who are half good and half bad; these can, by adding one good work, become reckoned among the "righteous" on the Day of Atonement (*Rôsh hashshana*, 16 *b*). The צדיקים—the "righteous"—were regarded as being in a state of זכות (*Zecûth*), which meant that their accumulation of good works was great enough to enable them to stand justified in the sight of God. In addition to this there was also the doctrine of זכות אבות ("merit of the fathers"), according to which the works of supererogation of departed ancestors went to the account of their descendants. The being in a state of *Zecûth* entitled a man, *per se*, to what was technically known as מתן שכר, lit. "the gift of reward" (*cf. Debarim rabba*, c. 2); and this applied to earthly reward as well as to reward hereafter. So that good works demanded reward from God; thus it is said in *Yalkut Shim. Beresh.*, 109, that it is by right that a man is rewarded with the good things in the Garden of Eden, because he has won them for himself. Justification by faith comes only so far into consideration in that it is reckoned among the מעשים טובים ("good works"), which, like all others, goes to swell the list of a man's מצוות, *cf.* Jas. ii. 24, "Ye see that by works a man is justified and not only by faith".

There is, at bottom, an intimate connection between the doctrine of the good and evil "tendency," dealt with above, and the doctrine of works; for it was by man's free-will that the good tendency was put into action which resulted in the accomplishment of good works; and it was by man's free-will that the evil tendency was resisted, and this constituted *per se* a *mitzvah*; *cf. Kiddushin,* 39 b, 40 a, where it is taught that the desire to do a *mitzvah* (*i.e.*, the calling of the good *Yetser* into action) is reckoned as though it were actually accomplished; and the temptation to do a sinful act (*i.e.*, the motion of the evil *Yetser*) if resisted likewise constitutes a *mitzvah*. It was, perhaps, almost inevitable that the danger would arise of taking merit for good deeds, *i.e.*, for exercising the good tendency, while repudiating responsibility for the often involuntary assertion of the evil tendency; that, however, the danger did arise does not admit of doubt; it was *naïvely* illogical, for while the exercise of the good tendency, resulting in good works, was regarded as solely due to human initiative—such a thing as "prevenient grace" did not come into account, *cf.* Eph. ii. 8-10—the evil tendency came to be looked upon as a human misfortune, and not of the nature of guilt in man, *cf.* Jas. i. 13, where this is combated.

These facts should be taken into consideration in seeking to realise the significance of some passages in our Epistle; thus, in i. 2-4, 12, we have Jewish teaching pure and simple, and the fact goes to substantiate the opinion that these verses, at all events, must be very early; one could not conceive them in the mouth of St. Paul, *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 13, Rom. ii. 4, whose teaching on this subject, though *apparently* more developed, is really fully in accordance with that of Christ;[1] on the other hand, we have in ii. 10 ("For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all") a principle which is certainly not that of normal Jewish teaching. On the very important section, ii. 14-26, see the notes in the Commentary, and what has been said above. Lastly, in v. 19, 20, we have again a thought which is especially Jewish; that a man should be able to "cover a multitude of sins" by virtue of his good deed is directly anti-Christian, because it makes the forgiveness of sins a matter which a man can effect, and thus wholly antagonistic to the doctrines of Grace and Atonement. On the word "to cover," the English equivalent for the Hebrew כפר, see *Church and Synagogue*, April 1908, pp. 43-45.

[1] As an example of this see the writer's article, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard," in the *Expositor*, April, 1908.

V. The Apparatus Criticus.—The following are the authorities, together with their abbreviations, which have been utilised:—

1. Uncials:—

א Cod. Sinaiticus (iv. cen.).
ב Cod. Patiriensis (v. cen.), containing only iv. 14-v. 20.
A Cod. Alexandrinus (v. cen.).
B Cod. Vaticanus (iv. cen.).
C Cod. Ephraemi (v. cen.), wanting from Jas. iv. 3 to the end.
K_2 Cod. Mosquensis (ix. cen.), cited as K.
L_2 Cod. Angelicus Romanus (ix. cen.), cited as L.
P_2 Cod. Porfirianus (ix. cen.), cited as P; much illegible in Jas. ii. 13-21.

2. Cursives:—

Cited by their numbers, but only when they offer readings of interest; curss = the consensus of a number of cursives.

3. Versions:—

The Old Latin:—

m the pseudo-Augustinian *Speculum* (viii. or ix. cen.).
ff Cod. Corbeiensis (vi. cen.).
s Frag. Vindobonensia (vi. cen.); wanting in v. 11-20.

The Vulgate:—

The two most important MSS. are:—
$Vulg^A$ Cod. Amiatinus (viii. cen.).
$Vulg^F$ Cod. Fuldensis (vi. cen.).
Latt = the consensus of the Latin versions.

The Syriac Versions:—

Pesh = Peshiṭṭâ (belongs to the first half of the v. cen.).
Syr^{lec} = A Syriac Lectionary written in the dialect most probably used by our Lord (vi. cen.). Of Jas. it contains only i. 1-12.
Syr^{hk} = The Harḳlean Syriac (vii. cen.).
Syrr = the consensus of the Syriac versions.

The Armenian Version (v. cen.).*
The Coptic (Bohairic) *Version* (vi.-vii. cen.).*
The Ethiopic Version (iv. cen.).*
The Sahidic Version (iii. cen.).*

4. Church Fathers:—

Cyr = Cyril of Alexandria (v. cen.).
Dam = John Damascene (viii. cen.).
Did = Didymus of Alexandria (iv. cen.).
Oec = Oecumenius (xi. cen.).
Orig = Origen (iii. cen.).
Thl = Theophylact (xi. cen.).

5. Printed Editions:—

rec = Textus Receptus.
Ti = Tischendorf.
Treg = Tregelles.
WH = Westcott and Hort.
W = Weiss.

The Greek text used in the following pages is that published by Nestle, 1907.

VI. Literature.—The following selected list of Commentaries, etc., only takes account of the more recent works; for a full bibliography recourse must be had to Mayor's enumeration:—

Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 1887.
Beyschlag, *Der Brief des Jacobus*, 1888.
Plummer, *St. James*, in the "Expositor's Bible," 1891.
Weiss, *Die Katholischen Briefe* . . . 1892.
Spitta, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, 1898.
„ *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, ii., 1896.
Von Soden, *Hand-Commentar* . . . 1899.
Parry, *A Discussion of the General Epistle of St. James*, 1903.
Grafe, *Die Stellung und Bedeutung des Jakobusbriefes in der Entwickelung des Urchristenthums*, 1904.
Knowling, *The Epistle of St. James*, in the "Westminster Commentaries," 1904.
Carr, *The Epistle of St. James*, in the "Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges," 1905.

* These dates refer to the century in which the versions were probably first made, not to any extant MSS. of them.

Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, 1906.
Patrick, *James, the Lord's Brother*, 1906.

See also the *Introductions* of Salmon, Scrivener, Weiss, Zahn, Holtzmann, and Gregory.

The following is a selection of some valuable articles:—

Adeney, in the *Critical Review*, July, 1896.
Brückner, in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1874.
Cone, in *Encycl. Bibl.* art. "James (Epistle)".
Fulford, in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, art. "James".
Moffatt, in the *Expos. Times*, xiii. pp. 201-206, "The Righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees".
Mayor, in Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, artt. "James," "James, General Epistle of".
Sieffert, in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, art. "Jacobus".
Simcox, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1901.
Von Soden, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1884.
Weiss, in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, May, June, 1904.

But perhaps of the greatest help of all are the many side-lights to be gathered from the study of such works as the following:—

Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1908.
Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 1903.[1]
Büchler, *Der galiläische 'Am-ha'Areṣ des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, 1906.
Charles, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908.
„ *The Book of Enoch*, 1893.
Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898.
Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895.
„ *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897.
Fiebig's series of *Ausgewählte Mischnatractate*, 1905, etc.
Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judenthums im Zeitalter Jesu*, 1905.
Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Engl. trans. by Moffatt) 1908.
Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1906.

[1] A new edition of this book has appeared.

Resch, *Agrapha*, 1906.

Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Engl. trans. by Macpherson, Taylor, and Christie), 1890, etc.[1]

Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus-Sirach*, 1906.

Taylor's edition of *Pirqe Aboth*, "Sayings of the Jewish Fathers," 1897.

Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, 1897.

The Talmudical works of Wünsche, Bacher, Strack, Fiebig, etc.

[1] A new edition of this work has appeared.

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ.[1]

I. 1. [a] ΙΑΚΩΒΟΣ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[2] [b] δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα [c] φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ [d] διασπορᾷ[3] [e] χαίρειν.

a Acts xii. 17; *cf.* Matt. xiii. 55.
b Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude i.; *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Tim. ii. 24.
c Luke xxii. 30; Acts xxvi. 17; *cf.* Matt. xix. 28.
d Deut. xxxii. 26; 1 Pet. i. 1; John vii. 35; *cf.* Acts ii. 5-11, viii. 1, xv. 23, xxiii. 6.
e 2 Macc. ix. 19; Acts xv. 23.

[1] Inscr. + **επιστολη** BKP, curss., om. א **επιστολη καθολικη του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου** L, Epistola Catholica beati Jacobi Apostoli Vulg. (Epistulae Catholicae Vulg[A]), **επ. του απ. ιακωβου** Pesh.

[2] דמרן Pesh., Syr[lec].

[3] Add דישראל לדהלין Syr[lec].

Chapter I.—Ver. 1. **Ἰάκωβος**: A very common name among Palestinian Jews, though its occurrence does not seem to be so frequent in pre-Christian times. Some noted Jewish Rabbis of this name lived in the earliest centuries of Christianity, notably Jacob ben Korshai, a "Tanna" (*i.e.*, "teacher" of the Oral Law) of the second century. The English form of the name comes from the Italian Giacomo. **Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**: Only **Κυρίου** here can refer to Christ; in Gal. i. 1 the differentiation is made still more complete . . . **διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.** On the other hand, in John xx. 28, we have **ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου.** But the disjunctive use of **καὶ** in the words before us does not imply a withholding of the divine title from our Lord, for the usage of **Κύριος** in the N.T., especially without the article, when connected with **Χριστός**, is in favour of its being regarded as a divine title, see *e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 1-3, etc. Hellenistic Jews used **Κύριος** as a name for God; the non-use of the article gains in significance when it is remembered that **ὁ Κύριος**, "Dominus," was a title given to the early Roman Emperors in order to express their deity, *cf.* Acts xxv. 26, where Festus refers to Nero as **ὁ Κύριος.** The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary (containing, as generally conceded, the dialect which our Lord spoke), as well as the Peshiṭtâ, read "Our Lord," the expression used in the Peshiṭtâ in Matt. viii. 25, **Κύριε, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα,** and in xx. 33, **Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιγνῶσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν**; both instances of divine power being exercised. **Χριστοῦ**: the use of this title, applied to Jesus without further comment, speaks against an early date for the Epistle; in a letter written to *Jews* during the apostolic age it is inconceivable that the Messiah should be referred to in this connection without some justification; Jewish beliefs concerning the Messiah were such as to make it impossible for them to accept Jesus as the Messiah without some teaching on the subject; this would be the more required in the case of Jews of the Dispersion who could not have had the same opportunities of learning the truths of Christianity as Palestinian Jews. The way in which the title is here applied to our Lord implies that the truth taught was already generally accepted. The absence of the article also points to a late date. **δοῦλος**: Generally speaking, to the Jew **δοῦλος** (עֶבֶד), when used in reference to God, meant a *worshipper*, and when used with reference to men a *slave;* as the latter sense is out of the question here, **δοῦλος** must be understood as meaning worshipper, in which case the deity of our Lord would appear to be distinctly implied. **ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ**: the "twelve tribes" was merely a synonym for the Jewish race (**ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων**), but there was a real

f Phil. iii. 1; *cf.* Matt. v. 12.
g 1 Pet. i. 6.
h Rom. v. 4; 1 Pet. i. 7.

2. Πᾶσαν χαρὰν [f] ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν [g] πειρασμοῖς [1] περιπέσητε ποικίλοις, 3. γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ [h] δοκίμιον [2] ὑμῶν [3] τῆς

[1] Add סגיאא Pesh. [2] δοκιμον 28a. [3] Om. Syrlec.

distinction between the Jews of the Dispersion and the Palestinian Jews. The latter were for the most part peasants or artisans, while the former, congregated almost wholly in cities, were practically all traders (*cf.* iv. 13). In each case there was a restricted circle of the learned. The connection of the Diaspora-Jews with Palestine became less and less close, until at last it consisted of little more than the payment of the annual Temple dues; with very many one visit in a lifetime to Jerusalem sufficed, and this was of course entirely discontinued after the Destruction, when the head-quarters of Jewry became centred in the Rabbinical academy of Jabne. From the present point of view, it is very important to bear in mind, above all, two points of difference between Palestinian and Diaspora-Jews, (1) Language, (2) Religion. (1) Among the former, Aramaic had displaced Hebrew; Aramaic was the language of everyday life, as well as of religion (hence the need of the Methurgeman to translate the Hebrew Scriptures in the Synagogues); among the latter Greek was spoken. It is not necessary to insist upon the obvious fact that this difference of language brought with it a corresponding difference of mental atmosphere; the Jew remained a Jew, but his way of thinking became modified. (2) Their contact with other peoples brought to the Diaspora-Jews a larger outlook upon the world; at the same time, they could not fail to see the immeasurable superiority of their faith over the heathen cults practised by others. This resulted on their laying greater stress on the essentials of their faith: the ethical side of their religion received greater emphasis, the spirituality of belief became more realised, and it therefore followed of necessity that universalistic ideas grew, so that proselytism became, at one time, a great characteristic among the Diaspora-Jews; Judaism contained a message to all peoples, it was felt; and thus the particularistic character of Palestinian Judaism found no place among the Diaspora-Jews. But, at the same time, the Bible of these Jews, which exercised an immense influence upon their thought and literature, was Hebraic in essence though clothed in Greek garb; hence that extraordinarily interesting phenomenon, the Hellenistic Jew. In view of what has been said it is interesting to note that two outstanding characteristics of the Epistle before us are: Hebraic thought and diction expressed in Greek form, and the emphasis laid on ethics rather than on doctrine. The meaning of **διασπορά** is quite unambiguous, and there is no justification for restricting it to the Eastern Dispersion; it includes the Jews of Italy, Macedonia, Greece, Asia Minor and, above all, Egypt, as well as of Asia. For further details see Esther iii. 8, viii. 9, ix. 30, x. 1; Acts ii. 9-11; *Syb. Orac.*, iii. 271; Josephus, *Antiq. XIV.*, vii. 12; *Contra Ap.*, i. 22, etc., etc. **χαίρειν**: *Cf.* Acts xv. 23, xxiii. 26, the only other occurrences of this form of salutation in the N.T. "Historically there is probably no ellipsis even in the epistolary **χαίρειν**" (Moulton, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (1), p. 180). It is of interest to note that in the Epistle inspired by St. James (Acts xv. 23) this form of salutation is used; it would, however, be precarious to draw deductions as to authorship from this, for the use of the infinitive for the imperative is quite common in Hellenistic Greek; as Moulton says: "We have every reason to expect it in the N.T., and its rarity there is the only matter of surprise" (*Ibid.*). The Peshittâ and Syrlec have the Jewish form, *Shalôm*.

Ver. 2. **Πᾶσαν χαράν**: *Cf.* Phil. ii. 29, **μετὰ πάσης χαρᾶς**: the rendering in Syrlec, which is rather a paraphrase than a translation, catches the meaning admirably: בכל חדוא הוו חאדין אחי, "With all joy be rejoicing my brethren." **ἡγήσασθε**: the writer is not to be understood as meaning that these trials *are* joyful in themselves, but that as a means to beneficial results they are to be rejoiced in; it is the same thought as that contained in Heb. xii. 11: **πᾶσα μὲν παιδεία πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, ὕστερον δὲ καρπὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις ἀποδίδωσιν δικαιοσύνης.**

πίστεως[1] [i] κατεργάζεται [k] ὑπομονήν. 4. ἡ δὲ[2] ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω,[3] ἵνα ἦτε [l] τέλειοι καὶ [m] ὁλόκληροι, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπό-

i Rom. v. 3; cf. Luke xxi. 19.
k Luke viii. 15; Rom ii. 7; Heb. x. 36; 2 Pet. i. 6; 2 Thess. i. 4.
l Cf. iii. 2; Matt. v. 48.
m Thess. v. 23.

[1] Om. της πιστεως B^3 (hab B^1), 81, *ff*, Syr[hk]. [2] Om. Vulg[A].
[3] Some lat. MSS. read *habet* others *habeat*.

ἀδελφοί μου: this term of address was originally Jewish; in Hebrew, אח is used, in the first instance, of those born of the same mother, *e.g.*, Gen. iv. 2, etc.; then in a wider sense of a relative, *e.g.*, Gen. xiv. 12, etc.; and in the still more extended meaning of kinship generally, *e.g.*, of tribal membership, Num. xvi. 10; as belonging to the same people, *e.g.*, Exod. ii. 11; Lev. xix. 7, and even of a stranger (גֵּר) sojourning among the people, Lev. xix. 34; it is also used of those who have made a covenant together, Am. i. 9; and, generally, of friends, 2 Sam. i. 26, etc.; in its widest sense it was taken over by the Christian communities, whose members were both friends and bound by the same covenant (*cf.* the origin of the Hebrew word for "covenant," ברית, from the Assryo-Babylonian *Biritu* which means "a fetter"). This mode of address occurs frequently in this Epistle, sometimes the simple **ἀδελφοί** without **μου** (iv. 11, v. 7, 9, 10), sometimes with the addition of **ἀγαπητοί** (i. 16, 19, ii. 5). **πειρασμοῖς**: in vv. 12 ff. **πειρασμός** obviously means allurement to wrong-doing, and this would appear to be the most natural meaning here on account of the way in which temptation is analysed, though the sense of external trials, in the shape of calamity, would of course not be excluded; "it may be that the effect of external conditions upon character should be included in the term" (Parry). It is true that the exhortation to look upon temptations with joy is scarcely compatible with the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation" (Matt. vi. 13; Luke, xi. 4) or with the words, "Pray that ye enter not into temptation" (Matt. xxvi. 41; Luke xxii. 40; see too Mark xiv. 38; Luke xxii. 46; Rev. iii. 10); but, as is evident from a number of indications in this Epistle, the writer's Judaism is stronger than his Christianity, and owing to the Jewish doctrines of free-will and works, a Jew would regard temptation in a less serious light than a Christian (see Introduction § iv.). Most pointedly does Parry remark: "There is a true joy for the warrior when he meets face to face the foe whom he has been directed to subjugate, in a warfare that trains hand and eye and steels the nerve and tempers the will . . . "; this is precisely the Jewish standpoint; while the Christian, realising his sinfulness and inherent weakness, and grounded in a spirit of humility, reiterates the words which he has been taught in the Lord's Prayer. This passage is one of the many in the Epistle which makes it so difficult to believe that it can all have been written by St. James.—**περιπέσητε**: the connection in which this word stands in the few passages of the N.T. which contain it supports the idea that in **πειρασμοῖς** external trials are included (Luke x. 30; Acts xxvii. 41).—**ποικίλοις**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 6., **ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς**, Pesh. adds **πολλοῖς**, *cf.* 3 Macc. ii. 6, **ποικίλαις καὶ πολλαῖς δοκιμάσας τιμωρίαις**.

Ver. 3. **γινώσκοντες**: "recognising"; this seems to be the force of the word **γιγνώσκω** in Hellenistic Greek (see Lightfoot, *Ep. to the Galatians*, p. 171); if so, it comes very appositely after **ἡγήσασθε**.—**τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως**: according to instances of the use of the word **δοκίμιον** given by Deissmann (*Neue Bibelstudien*, pp. 187 ff.) it means "pure" or "genuine"; it is the neuter of the adjective used as a substantive, followed by a genitive; the phrase would thus mean: "That which is genuine in your faith worketh . . . "; this meaning of **δοκίμιον** makes 1 Pet. i. 7 clearer and more significant; *cf.* Prov. xxvii. 21 (Sept.); Sir. ii. 1 ff. On **πίστις** see ver. 6.—**κατεργάζεται**: emphatic form of **ἐργάζεται**, "accomplishes".—**ὑπομονήν**: the word here means "the frame of mind which endures," as distinct from the act of enduring which is the meaning of the word in 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4. Philo calls **ὑπομονή** the queen of virtues (see Mayor, *in loc.*), it is one which has probably been nowhere more fully exemplified than in the history of the Jewish race.

Ver. 4. **ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω**: "But let endurance have its perfect result"; the possibility

μενοι. 5. Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν [n] λείπεται σοφίας, [o] αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος [p] Θεοῦ [1] πᾶσιν [q] ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ [r] ὀνειδίζοντος, καὶ δοθήσεται

n 1 Kgs. iii. 9, xi. 12; Prov. ii. 3-6.
o Matt. vii. 7.
p Sir. i. 1, 26, xxxix. 6; Wisd. vi. 14, 22, vii. 13; *cf.* Job xxxii. 8; Prov. viii. 17, xxviii. 5.
q Rom. xii. 8.
r Sir. xli. 22.

[1] του Θεου του διδοντος A.

of losing heart is contemplated, which would result in something being lacking; the words recall what is said in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. ii. 7. "For endurance (μακροθυμία) is a mighty charm, and patience (ὑπομονή) giveth many good things". *Cf.* Rom. v. 3.—ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι: *Cf.* Matt. v. 48, xix. 21; see Lightfoot's note on the meaning of this word in Phil. iii. 15, "the τέλειοι are in fact the same with πνευματικοί" (*Ep. to the Philippians*, p. 153). That in the passage before us it does not mean perfect in the literal sense is clear from the words which occur in iii. 2 (assuming that the same writer wrote both passages), πολλὰ πταίομεν ἅπαντες. "The word τέλειος is often used by later writers of the baptised" (Mayor).—ὁλόκληροι: *Cf.* Wisd. xv. 3; in its root-meaning ὁλόκληρος implies the "entire lot or destiny," so that the underlying idea regarding a man who is ὁλόκληρος means one who fulfils his lot; here it would mean 'those who fully attain to their high calling'. —ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι: this is merely explanatory of ὁλόκληροι.

Ver. 5. There is no thought-connection between this verse and what has preceded, it is only by supplying something artificially that any connection can be made to exist, and for this there is no warrant in the text as it stands (see Introduction III.). In ver. 4 ὑπομονή has as its full result the making perfect of men, so that they are lacking in nothing; when, therefore, the next verse goes on to contemplate a lacking of wisdom, there is clearly the commencement of a new subject, not a continuation of the same one. The occurrence of λειπόμενοι and λείπεται, which is regarded by some as a proof of connection between the two verses, denotes nothing in view of the fact that the subject-matter is so different; moreover, there is a distinct difference in the sense in which this word is used in these two verses; coming behindhand in what one ought to attain to is quite different from not being in possession of the great gift of wisdom; this difference is well brought out by the Vulgate rendering: "... in nullo *deficientes*. Si quis autem vestrum *indiget* sapientia ..."—εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας: *Cf.* iii. 13-17; the position assigned to Wisdom by the Jews, and especially by Hellenistic Jews, was so exalted that a short consideration of the subject seems called for, the more so by reason of the prominence it assumes in this Epistle. It is probable that the more advanced ideas of Wisdom came originally from Babylon; for, according to the Babylonian cosmology, Wisdom existed in primeval ages before the creation of the world; it dwelt with Ea, the god of Wisdom, in the depths of the sea (*cf.* Prov. viii. 22-30); Ea the creator was therefore guided by Wisdom in his creative work (see Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, pp. 29, 80); in Biblical literature Wisdom became the all-discerning intelligence of God in His work of Creation; as it was needed by God Himself, how much more by men! Hence the constant insistence on its need which is so characteristic of the book of Proverbs. This laid the foundation for the extensive *Hokmah* (or Wisdom) literature of the Hellenistic Jews, which exercised also a great influence upon the Jews of later times. Under the influence of Greek philosophy Wisdom became not only a divine agency, but also assumed a personal character (Wisd. vii. 22-30). According to the Jerusalem Targum to Gen. i. 1 Wisdom was the principle whereby God created the world. Generally speaking, in the later Jewish literature Wisdom refers to worldly knowledge as distinct from religious knowledge which is all comprised under the term *Torah* ("Law"); and therefore Wisdom, unlike the *Torah*, was not regarded as the exclusive possession of the Jews, though these had it in more abundant measure, *e.g.*, it is said in *Kiddushin*, 49 *b*: "Ten measures of wisdom came down from heaven, and nine of them fell to the lot of the Holy Land". On the other hand, Wisdom and the *Torah* are often identified.—αἰτείτω: for the prayer for Wisdom, *cf.* Prov. ii. 3 *f.*; Wisd. vii. 7, ix. 4; Sir. i. 10, li. 13; in the Epistle of Barnabas xxi. 5, it says: ὁ Θεὸς δῴη ὑμῖν σοφίαν ... ὑπομονήν—παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς: there is an in

αὐτῷ. 6. [s] αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει, μηδὲν [t] διακρινόμενος· ὁ γὰρ [1] διακρινόμενος ἔοικεν [u] κλύδωνι [2] θαλάσσης [3] ἀνεμιζομένῳ καὶ ῥιπιζομένῳ [3]. 7. μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὅτι λήμψεταί [4] τι [5]

s Mark xi. 24; 1 Tim. ii. 8; *cf.* Heb. x. 22.
t *Cf.* ii. 4; Matt. xxi. 21.
u Luke viii. 24; Eph. iv. 14; *cf.* Matt. xi. 7; Isa. lvii. 20.

[1] Autem, *ff*, Vulg[F]. [2] Add et *s*. [3—3] Transp., Pesh.
[4] λήψεται KLP, curss. [5] Om. ℵ[a], 36, *s*.

teresting parallel to this thought in the opening treatise of the Talmud, *Berachoth*, 58 *b*: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Who hast imparted of Thy wisdom to flesh and blood"; the point of the words "flesh and blood" is that the reference is to Gentiles as well as Jews, corresponding thus to the πᾶσιν in the words before us. The force of ἁπλῶς lies in its sense of "singleness of aim," the aim being the imparting of benefit without requiring anything in return; the thought is the same as that which underlies Isa. lv. 1, *Ho, every one that thirsteth . . . come, buy wine and milk without money and without price*, *i.e.*, it is to be had for the asking.—**μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος**: the addition of this is very striking; it is intended to encourage boldness in making petition to God; many might be deterred, owing to a sense of unworthiness, from approaching God, fearing lest He should resent presumption. The three words which express the method of Divine giving—πᾶσιν, ἁπλῶς, μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος—must take away all scruple and fear; *cf.* Heb. iv. 16, *Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace. . . .*—**καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ**: *Cf.* Matt. vii. 7.

Ver. 6. **ἐν πίστει**: πίστις, as used in this Epistle, refers to the state of mind in which a man not only believes in the existence of God, but in which His ethical character is apprehended and the evidence of His good-will towards man is acknowledged; it is a belief in the beneficent activity, as well as in the personality, of God; it includes reliance on God and the expectation that what is asked for will be granted by Him. The word here does not connote faith in the sense of a body of doctrine. This idea of faith is not specifically Christian; it was, and is, precisely that of the Jews; with these אמונה (*Emûnah*) is just that perfect trust in God which is expressed in what is called the "Creed of Maimonides," or the "Thirteen principles of faith"; it is there said: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is the Author and Guide of everything that has been created, and that He alone has made, does make, and will make all things". In Talmudical literature, which, in this as in so much else, embodies much ancient material, the Rabbis constantly insist on the need of faith as being that which is "perfect trust in God"; the *mĕchûsarê 'amanah*, *i.e.*, "those who are lacking in faith," (*cf.* Matt. vi. 30, ὀλιγόπιστοι = קטני אמונה) are held up to rebuke; it is said in *Sotah*, ix. 12 that the disappearance of "men of faith" will bring about the downfall of the world. Faith therefore, in the sense in which it is used in this Epistle, was the characteristic mark of the Jew as well as of the Christian. In reference to αἰτείτω δὲ ἐν πίστει Knowling draws attention to Hermas, *Mand.*, ix. 6, 7; Sim., v. 4, 3.—**μηδὲν διακρινόμενος**: διακρίνεσθαι means to be in a critical state of mind, which is obviously the antithesis to that of him who has faith; it excludes faith *ipso facto*; *Cf.* Matt. xxi. 21, *If ye have faith and doubt not* (μὴ διακριθῆτε) . . .; Aphraates quotes as a saying of our Lord's: "Doubt not, that ye sink not into the world, as Simon, when he doubted, began to sink into the sea".—**ἔοικεν κλύδωνι θαλάσσης**: a very vivid picture; the instability of a billow, changing from moment to moment, is a wonderfully apt symbol of a mind that cannot fix itself in belief. ἔοικεν occurs only here and in ver. 23 in the N.T., κλύδων only elsewhere in Luke viii. 24.—**ἀνεμιζομένῳ**: a number of verbs are used in this Epistle ending in -ιζω, *viz.*, ὀνειδίζω, ῥιπίζω, παραλογίζομαι, φλογίζω, ἐγγίζω, καθαρίζω, ἁγνίζω, ἀφανίζω, θησαυρίζω, θερίζω, στηρίζω, μακαρίζω; the word before us is one of the sixteen used in the Epistle which do not occur elsewhere in the N.T., nor in the Septuagint.—**ῥιπιζομένῳ**: from ῥιπίς a "fan"; it occurs here only in the N.T., but *cf.* Dan. ii. 35 (Septuagint), καὶ ἐρρίπισεν αὐτὰ ὁ ἄνεμος; the word is not used in Theodotion's version. With the verse before us *cf.* Eph. iv. 14. . . . κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας.

Ver. 7. **μὴ γὰρ οἰέσθω**, etc.: γὰρ

παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου,[1] 8. ἀνὴρ[2] [v]δίψυχος, [w]ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. 9. [x]Καυχάσθω δὲ ὁ[3] ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ

v Cf. iv. 8; Sir. i. 28, v. 9, 10.; cf. 1 Kgs. xviii. 21; Ps. cxix. 113 (Heb.); Sir. ii. 12; Matt. vi. 24. w 2 Pet. ii. 14; cf. iii. 16. x Cf. ii. 13, iii. 14, iv. 6.

[1] With comma, Ti., Weiss; with stop, Treg.; without punctuation, WH.
[2] Add γαρ 33. [3] Om. B, 65, Arm, WH in brackets.

almost in the sense of διὰ τοῦτο. The verb occurs very rarely, see John xxi. 25; Phil. i. 17. There is a ring of contempt in the passage at the idea of a man with halting faith expecting his prayer to be answered. ἄνθρωπος is used here in reference to men in general; ἀνήρ in the next verse is more specific; in this Epistle ἀνήρ occurs usually with some qualifying word.—τοῦ Κυρίου: obviously in reference to God the Father on account of the τοῦ διδ. Θεοῦ above.

Ver. 8. δίψυχος: Although this word is not found in either the Septuagint or elsewhere in the N.T. (excepting in iv. 8) its occurrence is not rare otherwise; Clement of Rome, quoting what he calls ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, says: ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ . . . (Resch., *Agrapha*, p. 325 [2nd ed.]); the word occurs a number of times in Hermas, *e.g.*, *Mand.*, ix. 1, 5, 6, 7; xi. 13; so too in Barn., xix. 5, and in Did., iv. 4, as well as in other ancient Christian writings and in Philo. The frame of mind of the ἀνὴρ δίψυχος is equivalent to a "double heart," see Sir. i. 25, μὴ προσέλθῃς αὐτῷ (*i.e.*, the fear of the Lord) ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσῇ; this is precisely the equivalent of the Hebrew לֵב וָלֵב in Ps. xii. 3, which the Septuagint unfortunately translates literally, ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν καρδίᾳ. In Enoch xci. 4 we have: "Draw not nigh to uprightness with a double heart, and associate not with those of a double heart"; as the Greek version of this work is not extant it is impossible to say for certain how "double heart" was rendered. On the construction here see Mayor.—ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ: this is severe, and reads as if the writer had some particular person in mind. The double-hearted man is certainly one who is quite unreliable. Ἀκατάστατος, which occurs only here and in iii. 8 (but see critical note) in the N.T., is found in the Septuagint, though very rarely; in Isa. liv. 11 we have Ταπεινὴ καὶ ἀκατάστατος οὐ παρεκλήθης, where the Hebrew for ἀκατάστ. (סֹעֲרָה) means "storm-tossed". In the verse before us the word seems to mean unreliability, the man who does not trust God cannot be trusted by men; this probably is what must have been in the mind of the writer.—ἐν πάσαις, etc.: a Hebrew expression for the course of a man's life in the sense of his "manner of life" (ἀναστροφή, see iii. 13) see Prov. iii. 1, ἐν πάσαις ὁδοῖς σου γνώριζε αὐτήν (Hebrew αὐτόν), ἵνα ὀρθοτομῇ τὰς ὁδούς σου. The sense of the expression is certainly different from ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ in ver. 11 which refers to the days of a man's life.

Vv. 9-11. An entirely new subject is now started, which has no connection with what has preceded; such a connection can only be maintained by supplying mental links artificially, for which the text gives no warrant. Vv. 9-11 deal with the subject of rich and poor; they may be interpreted in two ways; on the one hand, one may paraphrase thus: Let the brother who is "humble," *i.e.*, belonging to the lower classes and therefore of necessity (in those days) poor, glory in the exaltation which as a Christian he partakes of; but let him who was rich glory in the fact that, owing to his having embraced Christianity, he is humiliated (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 10-13), "let the rich brother glory in his humiliation as a Christian" (Mayor)—taking ταπείνωσις, however, as having the sense of self-abasement which the rich man feels on becoming a Christian. This interpretation has its difficulties, for it is the rich man, not merely his riches, who "passes away"; so, too, in ver. 11; moreover, if it is a question of Christianity, ὕψει and ταπεινώσει cannot well *both* refer to it, since they are placed in contrast; this seems to have been felt by an ancient scribe who altered ταπεινώσει to πίστει in the cursive 137 (see critical note above), thinking, no doubt, of ii. 5, οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει . . . It seems wiser to take the words as they stand, and to

ὕψει αὐτοῦ, 10. ὁ δὲ [z] πλούσιος ἐν τῇ [a] ταπεινώσει [1] αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς [b] ἄνθος χόρτου [b] [c] παρελεύσεται. 11. ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος

y Matt. xxiii. 12.
z Jer. ix. 23.
a *Cf.* Heb. x. 34.

b—b Isa. xl. 6, 7; 1 Pet. i. 24; *cf.* Ps. cii. 4, 11; Job xiv. 2. c *Cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[1] πιστει 137.

seek to interpret them without reading in something that is not there, especially as the writer (or writers) of this Epistle is not as a rule ambiguous in what he says; in fact, one of the characteristics of the Epistle is the straightforward, transparent way in which things are put. Regarded from this point of view, these verses simply contain a wholesome piece of advice to men to do their duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call them; if the poor man becomes wealthy, there is nothing to be ashamed of, he is to be congratulated; if the rich man loses his wealth, he needs comfort,—after all, there is something to be thankful for in escaping the temptations and dangers to which the rich are subject; and, as the writer points out later on in ii. 1 ff., the rich *are* oppressors and cruel,—a fact which (it is well worth remembering) was far more true in those days than in these.

Ver. 9. **καυχάσθω**: it is noticeable that this word is only used in the Pauline Epistles, with the exception in this verse and in iii. 14, iv. 16; it is used, generally, in a good sense, as here and iii 14, though not in iv. 16.—**ὁ ἀδελφός**: see note on ver. 2.—**ταπεινός**: *cf.* Luke i. 52, refers to the outward condition of a man, and corresponds to the Hebrew דַּל and עָנִי, which like **ταπεινός**, can refer both to outward condition and character; the latter is the meaning attaching to **ταπ.** in iv. 6. In Sir. xi. 1 we read: **σοφία ταπεινοῦ ἀνύψωσεν κεφαλήν, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ μεγιστάνων καθίσει αὐτόν.** *Cf.* Sir. x. 31 (Hebrew).

Ver. 10. **ὁ πλούσιος**: equally a "brother"; *cf.* the whole section ii. 1-13 below.—**ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου . . .**: these words, together with **ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον**, etc., in the next verse, are adapted from the Sept. of Isa. xl. 5-8, . . . **καὶ εἶπα τί βοήσω; Πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου· ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ ὁ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν, τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,** which differs somewhat from the Hebrew. It is an interesting instance of the loose way in which scriptural texts were made use of without regard to their original meaning; the prophet refers to **πᾶσα σάρξ,** whereas in the verse before us the writer makes the words refer exclusively to the rich, *cf.* the words at the end of the next verse, **οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται.** To the precise Western mind this rather free use of Scripture (many examples of it occur in the Gospels) is sometimes apt to cause surprise; but it is well to remember that this inexactness is characteristic of the oriental, and does not strike him as inexact; what he wants in these cases is a verbal point of att chment which will illustrate the subject under discussion; what the words originally refer to is, to him, immaterial, as that does not come into consideration. **χόρτος** in its original sense means "an enclosure" in which cattle feed, then it came to mean the grass, etc., contained in the enclosure, *cf.* Matt. vi. 31.—**παρελεύσεται**: equally true of rich and poor, *cf.* Mark xiii. 31 for the transient character of all things, see also iv. 14 of this Epistle.

Ver. 11. **ἀνέτειλεν**: the "gnomic" aorist, *i.e.*, expressive of what always happens; it gives a "more vivid statement of general truths, by employing a distinct case or several distinct cases in the past to represent (as it were) all possible cases, and implying that what has occurred is likely to occur again under similar circumstances" (Moulton, p. 135, quoting Goodwin); he adds, "the gnomic aorist . . . need not have been denied by Winer for Jas. i. 11 and 1 Pet. i, 24". The R.V. gives the present, in accordance with the English idiom, but clearly the Greek way is the more exact; the same applies to Hebrew, though this particular verb does not occur in the corresponding passage in either the Septuagint or the Massoretic text; an example may, however, be seen in Nah. iii. 17. **ὁ ἥλιος ἀνέτειλεν, καὶ ἀφήλατο, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς** (see R.V.).—**σὺν τῷ καύσωνι**: the east wind which came from the Syrian desert, it was a hot wind which parched the vegetation and blighted the foliage of the trees; the Hebrew name רוּחַ הַקָּדִים "the wind of the east," or simply קָדִים, expresses the quarter whence it comes,

σὺν τῷ [d] καύσωνι [1] καὶ ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον, [2] καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ,[3] [e] ἐξέπεσεν[2] καὶ ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ [4] ἀπώλετο· [2] οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις [5] αὐτοῦ [6] μαρανθήσεται.[2] 12. [f] [g] Μακάριος ἀνὴρ [7] ὃς ὑπομένει [f] [8] πειρασμόν, ὅτι

d Matt. xx. 12; Luke xii. 55.
e Quoted from Isa. xl. 7
f—f Quoted from Dan. xii. 12.
g Cf. v. 11.; 1 Pet. iii. 14; Prov. iii. 11.

[1] Add Suo *ff*.

[2]—[2] Syr[lec] om. και το ανθος αυτου εξεπεσεν, and ουτως και . . . μαρανθησεται.

[3] Om. 69. [4] Om. B. [5]ποριαις ℵA, 40, 89, 97, Thl.; in actu *ff*.

[6] εαυτου C[1](vid). [7] ανθρωπος A, 70[a], 104.

[8] υπομενη 13, *m*, υπομεινη 13[a], sustinuerit, *ff*.

the Greek καύσων, "burner," describes its character, see Hos. xiii. 15; Ezek. xvii. 10; it became especially dangerous when it developed into a storm, on account of its great violence, see Isa. xxvii. 8; Jer. xviii. 17; Ezek. xxvii. 26.—ἐξέπεσεν: the equivalent Hebrew word is נָבֵל, which like the cognate root in other Semitic languages, contains the idea of dying, *cf.* Isa. xxiv. 4, xxvi. 19.—εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ: pleonastic; προσ. is used mostly in reference to persons, *e.g.*, in Sir. it occurs twenty-eight times, and only in two instances to things other than persons, *viz.*, xxxviii. 8, καὶ εἰρήνη παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς [Hebrew marg., however reads מִפְּנֵי אדם]. xl. 6 . . . ἀπὸ προσώπου πολέμου [Hebrew text, however, מִפְּנֵי רודף]. εὐπρέπεια does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.; see Sir. xlvii. 10, its only occurrence in that book.—ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ: see above ver. 8.—μαρανθήσεται: only here in N.T.

Vv. 12 ff. The section vv. 12-16 is wholly unconnected with what immediately precedes; it takes up the thread which was interrupted at i. 4. In i. 2-4 the brethren are bidden to rejoice when they fall into temptations because the purifying of their faith which this results in engenders ὑπομονήν, and if ὑπομονή holds sway unimpeded they will be lacking in nothing. But it is, of course, a prime condition here that those who are tempted should not succumb; the rejoicing is obviously only in place in so far as temptation, by being resisted, strengthens character; therefore the writer goes on to speak (ver. 12) of the blessedness of the man who fulfils this first condition, who endures (ὃς ὑπομένει) temptation, for he shall receive the crown of life, the reward of those in whom ὑπομονή has had its perfect work. It is this intimate connection between i. 2-4 and i. 12 ff. which induces one to hazard the conjecture that they were not originally separated by the intervening verses, which deal with entirely different subjects, and which therefore interrupt the thought-connection clearly existing between the two passages just mentioned.—In ver. 13 the occurrence of the words: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God," show that this view was actually held, indeed the belief was very widely prevalent and had been for long previously, *e.g.*, in Sir. xv. 11 ff. it is said: "Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away; for thou shalt not do the things that he hateth. Say not thou, It is he that caused me to err; for he hath no need of a sinful man. . . . He himself made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel . . ."; to say, with some commentators, that there is no reference here to any definite philosophical teaching, and that the words only express a natural human tendency to shift the blame for evil-doing in a man from himself to God, is an extraordinary position to take up; the tendency to shift blame is certainly natural and human, but it is not natural to shift it on to *God;* either on to fellowmen, or on to Satan, but not on to God! But besides this, nobody conversant with the teaching of Judaism during the centuries immediately preceding the commencement of the Christian era, and onwards, could for a moment fail to see what the writer of the Epistle is referring to; a writer who in a number of respects shows himself so thoroughly *au fait* with the thought-tendencies of his time (i. 5, iii. 13-18, ii. 14-26, ver. 19-20 besides the passage before us) was not likely to have been ignorant of the fact that among all the thoughtful men of his day the great question of the origin of evil was being

δόκιμος [h] γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς [i] ζωῆς, ὃν [k] ἐπηγγείλατο [1] τοῖς [l] ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

13. [m] Μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ [2] Θεοῦ πειράζομαι [3]· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα.[m]

h Rom. xvi. 10.
i Rev. ii. 10; cf. Wisd. iv. 2, v. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 25.
k See ii. 5; cf.; Matt. x. 22, xix. 28, 29.
l 1 Cor. ii. 9.
m—m Cf. Sir. xv. 11, 12, 20.

[1] Add **ο κυριος** KLP, Syr[hk]., Thl., Oec., etc., rec. + **κυριος** C, 4, 13(vid), 117, + **ο θεος** Syr[lec], Pesh., Vulg., Copt., Aeth.

[2] **υπο** ℵ 69. [3] Tentatur *ff*, Vulg.

constantly speculated upon. The words with which this section concludes—"Be not deceived, my beloved brethren"—show that there was a danger of those to whom the Epistle was addressed being led astray by a false teaching, which was as incompatible with the true Jewish doctrine of God as it was with the Christian; indeed, on this point, Jewish and Christian teaching were identical. The subject referred to in this section, vv. 12-16, is dealt with more fully in the Introduction IV., § 1, which see.

Ver. 12. **Μακάριος ἀνήρ**: this pleonastic use of **ἀνήρ** is Hebraic; *cf.* Ps. i. 1, where the expression אַשְׁרֵי הָאִישׁ ("O, the blessedness of the man . . .") is rendered **μακάριος ἀνήρ** by the Septuagint.—**ὑπομένει**: carries on the thought of **ὑπομονή** in ver. 4; the absence of all reference to divine grace entirely accords with the Jewish doctrine of works, and is one of the many indications in this Epistle that the writer (or writers) had as yet only imperfectly assimilated Christian doctrine, see further Introduction IV., § 2.—**πειρασμόν**: see note on i. 2.—**δόκιμος γενόμενος**: for **δοκ.** see note on i. 2; *cf.* Luther's rendering: "nachdem er bewähret ist," which contains the idea of something being preserved, *i.e.*, the *genuine* part, after the dross (as it were) has been purged away.—**τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς**: Wisdom and the Law (*Torah*) are said to be an ornament of grace to the head (Prov. i. 9), and Wisdom "shall deliver unto thee a crown of glory" (Prov. iv. 9); in *Pirqe Aboth* vi. 7 this is said of the *Torah*, of which it is also said in the same section, "She is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her" (Prov. iii. 18); in Sir. xv. 6 it is said that a wise man shall "inherit joy, and a crown of gladness (there is no mention of a crown in the Hebrew), and an everlasting name," *cf.* xxxii. (xxxv.) 2. In the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Lev. iv. 1, we read: "Be followers of his compassion, therefore, with a good mind, that ye also may wear crowns of glory"; *cf.* *Asc. of Isaiah*, vii. 22, viii. 26, ix. 10-13. The Hebrew עֲטָרָה is used both in a literal and figurative sense (for the latter see, *e.g.*, Job xix. 9) it is probably in a figurative sense that the word is here used.—**ὃν ἐπηγγ. τοῖς ἀγαπ. αὐτόν**: the insertion of **ὁ Θεός** or **ὁ Κύριος** is found only in authorities of secondary value. The words **λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὃν . . .**, introduced by **ὅτι** (*cf.* in next verse **ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ** . . . refer perhaps to a saying of our Lord's which has not been preserved elsewhere; the *thought* seems to be present in such passages as 2 Tim. ii. 5, iv. 8; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10, iii. 11, iv. 4, vi. 2; *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 25, which makes it all the more probable that the words were based ultimately on some actual "Logion" of Christ (*cf.* Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; *cf.* too, the following words which occur in the *Acta Philippi*: . . . **μακάριός ἐστιν ὁ ἔχων τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔνδυμα λαμπρόν· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ λαμβάνων τὸν στέφανον τῆς χαρᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ**, see Resch, *Agrapha*(2), p. 280). Against this it might be urged that mention would probably have been made of the fact if the words were actually those of our Lord, in the same way in which this is done in Acts xx. 35, where St. Paul directly specifies his authority in quoting a saying of Christ. There is an interesting passage in the *History of Barlaam and Josaphat*, quoted by James in "The Revelation of Peter," p. 59, which runs: "And as he was entering into the gate, others met him, all radiant with light, having crowns in their hands which shone with unspeakable beauty, and such as mortal eyes never beheld; and when Josaphat asked: 'Whose are the exceeding bright crowns of glory which I see?' 'One,' they said, 'is thine'".

Ver. 13. **Μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω**: In view of the specific doc-

n Matt. v. 28.
o 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18.
p—p *Cf.* Ps. vii. 14.
q *Cf.* Rom. v. 12.

14. ἕκαστος δὲ πειράζεται[1] ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας [n] ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ [o] δελεαζόμενος· 15. [p] εἶτα ἡ[2] ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία [p] ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει[3] [q] θάνατον.

[1] Om. *s*. [2] Om. C. [3] ἀποκυεῖ WH.

trine which is being combated in these verses, it is probable that the verb **πειράζω** is here used in the restricted sense of temptation to lust, and not in the more general sense (**πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις**) in which **πειρασμός** is used in i. 2. This view obtains support from the repeated mention of **ἐπιθυμία** in vv. 14, 15. The tendency to a sin which was so closely connected with the nature, the lower nature, of man (*cf.* Rom. vii. 23) would, on this very account, be regarded by many as in the last instance referable to the Creator of man; that this belief was held will be seen from the authorities cited in the Introduction IV., § 1. On this view **πειραζόμενος** refers to temptation of a special kind, **ἐπιθυμία**; *cf.* Matt. v. 28, **πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι** . . .; 1 Pet. ii. 11, **Ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ . . . ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς**; iv. 2-3 . . . **εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ**. . . .—**ὅτι**: *Cf.* the parallel use of כִּי in Hebrew.—**ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν**: "Untemptable of evil"; see Mayor's very interesting note on **ἀπείραστος**; the word does not occur elsewhere in N.T., nor in the Septuagint. If the interpretation of this passage given above be correct, the meaning here would seem to be that it is inconceivable that the idea should come into the mind of God to tempt men to lust; the "untemptableness" has perhaps a two-fold application: God cannot be tempted to do evil Himself, nor can He be tempted with the wish to tempt men. The word in its essence is really an insistence upon one of the fundamental beliefs concerning the Jewish doctrine of God, *viz.*, His attribute of Holiness and ethical purity; the teaching of many centuries is summed up in the third of the "Thirteen Principles" of Maimonides: "I believe with perfect faith that the Creator, blessed be His name, is not a body, and that He is free from all the accidents of matter, and that He has not any form whatsoever". The Peshittâ rendering of this clause, from which one might have looked for something suggestive, is very disappointing and entirely loses the force of the Greek.—**πειράζει**, etc., see Introduction IV., § 1.

Ver. 14. **ἕκαστος δὲ πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας**: according to this the evil originates in man himself, which would be the case more especially with the sin of lust; with regard to temptation to sin of another character see 1 Thess. iii. 5, . . . **μή πως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων**, who is doubtlessly to be identified with Satan. —**ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος**: describes the method of the working of **ἐπιθυμία**, the first effect of which is "to draw the man out of his original repose, the second to allure him to a definite bait" (Mayor). **ἐξελκ.** is in its original meaning used of fishing, **δελεαζ.** of hunting, and then of the wiles of the harlot; both the participles might be transferred, from their literal use in application to hunting or fishing, to a metaphorical use of alluring to sensual sin, and thus desire entices the man from his self-restraint as with the wiles of a harlot, a metaphor maintained by the words which follow, 'conceived,' 'beareth,' 'bringeth forth'; *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18, where the same verb is found, and Philo, *Quod omn. prob lib.*, 22, 'driven by passion or *enticed* by pleasure'" (Knowling).

Ver. 15. **εἶτα**: continuing the description of the method of the working of **ἐπιθυμία**.—**ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν**: With this idea of personification, *cf.* Zech. v. 5-11, where the woman "sitting in the midst of the ephah" is the personification of Wickedness; and for the metaphor see Ps. vii. 15 (Sept.), **ἰδοὺ ὠδίνησεν ἀνομίαν, συνέλαβεν πόνον καὶ ἔτεκεν ἀδικίαν**. Since **ἐπιθυμία** is represented as the parent of **ἁμαρτία** it can hardly be regarded as other than sinful itself; indeed, this seems to be taught in the Targum of Jonathan (a Targum which had received general recognition in Babylonia as early as the third century A.D., and whose elements therefore go back to a much earlier time) in the paraphrase of Isa. lxii. 10,

16. Μὴ[1] [r] πλανᾶσθε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. 17. [s] Πᾶσα [t] δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα [u] τέλειον [v] ἄνωθέν ἐστιν[2] καταβαῖνον[3] ἀπὸ[4]

r 1 Cor. vi. 9; *cf.* Eph. v. 6. s Ps. lxxxv. 12; Tobit iv. 19; John iii. 27; 1 Cor. iv. 7. t Matt. vii. 11; Phil. iv. 15. u Eccles. iii. 14. v *Cf.* iii. 15, 17; John iii. 3.

[1] μηδε 13. [2] Om. *ff*, εστιν, WH.
[3] καταβαινων A, 13; κατερχομενον 27ª. [4] παρα K, curss.

where it says that the *imagination* of sin is sinful, *cf.* Jer. Targ. i. to Deut. xxiii. 11; this is evidently the idea in the words before us.—ἀποτελεσθεῖσα: this word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint, *cf.* 1 Esdras, v. 7, ἀπεκώλυσαν τοῦ ἀποτελεσθῆναι (A reads ἐπιτελεσθ.) τὴν οἰκοδομήν; 2 Macc. xv. 39. . . . οἶνος ὕδατι συνκερασθεὶς ἤδη καὶ ἐπιτερπῆ τὴν χάριν ἀποτελεῖ . . .; it refers here to sin in its full completeness, Vulg., *cum consummatum fuerit.* The passage recalls Rom. vi. 28, τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος. Mayor quotes the appropriate passage from Hermas, *Mand.*, iv. 2. ἡ ἐνθύμησις αὕτη Θεοῦ δούλῳ ἁμαρτία μεγάλη· ἐὰν δέ τις ἐργάσηται τὸ ἔργον τὸ πονηρὸν τοῦτο, θάνατον ἑαυτῷ κατεργάζεται. Just as ἐπιθυμία and θάνατος belong together, and the latter testifies to the existence of the former, so πίστις and ἔργα belong together, and the latter proves the existence of the former; see ii. 22, ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη.—ἀποκύει: only here and in ver. 18 in the N.T., it only occurs once in the Septuagint, 4 Macc. xv. 17, ὦ μόνη γύναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν ὁλόκληρον ἀποκυήσασα.—θάνατον: in *Tanchuma*, *Bereshith*, 8, it is taught that Adam's sin was the means of death entering into the world, so that all generations to the end of time are subject to death; this teaching is, of course, found in both early and late Jewish literature; but it probably is not this to which reference is made in the passage before us. In seeking to realise what the writer meant by death here one recalls, in the first place, such passages as Rom. v. 21: *As sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord*; *cf.* vi. 21, vii. 24; John v. 24: *He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgement, but hath passed out of death into life*; *cf.* viii. 51, 52; 1 John iii. 14: *We know that we have passed from death unto life*: see also Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9, 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; and Jas. v. 20, . . . *shall save a soul from death* . . .; it seems clear that in passages like these death is not used in its literal sense, and probably what underlies the use of the word is that which is more explicitly expressed in Rev. ii. 11, *He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death*; xx. 6 . . . *Over these the second death hath no power*; xxi. 8, *But for the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators* . . . *their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death.* But there is another set of passages in which death is used in its literal sense; these should be noted, for it is possible that they may throw light on the use of θάνατος in the verse before us:—Matt. xvi. 28, *Verily I say unto you, there be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*, almost the identical words occur in Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; the belief in the near advent of Christ witnessed to by such passages as 1 Cor. xi. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 1, etc., shows that the possibility of not dying, in the literal sense of the word, was entertained; for those who were living would know that when Christ, who had overcome death, should be among them again, there could be no question of death. The belief in the abolition of death when the Messiah should come was held by Jews as well as by Christians, see *e.g.*, *Bereshith Rabba*, chap. 26, *Wajjiḳra Rabba*, chap. 30. The possibility may therefore be entertained that the writer of this Epistle is contemplating death in its literal sense, which those Christians will not escape in whom ἐπιθυμία holds sway, but which they are able to escape if they remain faithful until the return of Christ; that this is expected in the near future is clear from v. 7, *Be patient, therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord* . . . *stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord is at hand.*—μὴ πλανᾶσθε: *i.e.*, as regards the false teaching concerning the cause of sin in their hearts. The affectionate ending, "My beloved brethren" witnesses to the earnestness of the writer's feelings.

Ver. 17. The following saying of R. Chaninah (first century, A.D.) is preserved:

τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν [w] φώτων, παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἔνι [1] [x] παραλλαγὴ ἢ τροπῆς [2] [y] ἀποσκίασμα.[3] 18. [z] βουληθεὶς [4] [a] ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας,[a] εἰς τὸ εἶναι [b] ἡμᾶς [c] ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ [5] κτισμάτων.

w Job xxv. 3; cf. 1 John i. 5. x Mal. iii. 6; cf. Num. xiii. 19. y Wisd. vii. 18. z John iii. 3; cf. Phil. ii. 13. a—a John i. 13; 1 Pet. i. 23. b Cf. Eph. i. 12. c Jer. ii. 3; Rev. xiv. 4; Rom. viii. 19-23.

[1] εστιν ℵP, 36. [2] Modicum obumbrationis *ff*.
[3] αποσκιασματος ℵB. [4] Add enim, Vulg., pr. αυτος γαρ 40.
[5] εαυτου ℵ[3]ACP, 105; WH altern. reading.

א״ר חנינא אין דבר רע יורד מלמעלה: ("R. Chaninah said, 'No evil thing cometh down from above'".). On the possible connection between this verse and the preceding section, see Introduction IV., § 1.—**πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον**: Mayor remarks on this: "It will be observed that the words make a hexameter line, with a short syllable lengthened by the metrical stress. I think Ewald is right in considering it to be a quotation from some Hellenistic poem. . . . The authority of a familiar line would add persuasion to the writer's words, and account for the somewhat subtle distinction between **δοσ. ἀγ.** and **δω. τελ.**". In Theodotion's version of Daniel ii. 6, occur the words: . . . **δόματα καὶ δωρεὰς** . . ., which represent מתנן and נבזבה in the corresponding Aramaic (the Septuagint has another reading); the distinction between these two is perhaps that the former refers to gifts in the ordinary sense, while the latter is a gift given in return for something done, *i.e.*, a reward; but it cannot be said that the Greek reflects this distinction, though it is worthy of note that Philo makes a special distinction between them, "inasmuch as the latter noun is much stronger than the former, and contains the idea of greatness and perfection which is lacking in the former; Philo, *De Cherub.*, 25; and so *De Leg. Alleg.*, iii. 70, where he applies to the latter noun the same epithet 'perfect' as in the Greek of the verse before us" (Knowling).—**ἄνωθέν ἐστιν**: it is a question whether one should read: "Every good gift . . . from above comes down from . . .," so the Peshiṭtâ; or "Every good gift . . . is from above, coming down from . . ."; Mayor thinks that on the whole "the rhythm and balance of the sentence is better preserved by separating **ἐστι** from **καταβαῖνον**".—**ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων**: *Cf.* on the one hand, Sir. xliii. 9, **Κάλλος οὐρανοῦ, δόξα ἄστρων, κόσμος φωτίζων, ἐν ὑψίστοις Κύριος**; and, on the other 1 John i. 5, **ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστιν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστιν οὐδεμία.** There can be no doubt that in the passage before us this double meaning of light, literal and spiritual, is meant.—**παραλλαγή**: only here in the N.T., and in 4 Kings ix. 20 (Septuagint); it is rendered שוחלפא in the Peshiṭtâ, a word which is used variously of "change," "caprice," and even "apostasy" (see Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*, s.v.). In Greek, according to Mayor, the word may be taken "to express the contrast between the natural sun, which varies its position in the sky from hour to hour and month to month, and the eternal source of all light".—**τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα**: neither of these words is found elsewhere in the N.T., and the latter does not occur in the Septuagint either; the former is used in the Septuagint of the movements of the heavenly bodies, Deut. xxxiii. 14: **καὶ καθ' ὥραν γενημάτων ἡλίου τροπῶν** . . .; *cf.* Job xxxviii. 33. The meaning of the latter part of the verse before us is well brought out by Luther: "Bei welchem ist keine Veränderung noch Wechsel des Lichts und Finsterniss". If, as hinted above, there is a connection between this verse and the section i. 5-8, the meaning may perhaps be expressed thus: When, in answer to prayer, God promises the gift of wisdom, it is certain to be given, for He does not change; *cf.* for the thought, Rom. xi. 29, **ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ.**

Ver. 18. Again we have a verse without any connection between what precedes or follows; the words **ἴστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί** of ver. 19 seem to belong to ver. 18. As we have seen, ver. 17 most probably contains a quotation; the possibility of ver. 18 being also a loose quotation, from some other author, should not be lost sight of; it would ex-

19. [1]Ἴστε,[2] ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί.[1] Ἔστω δὲ[3] πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ [d]ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ [e]λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς [f]ὀργήν· 20. [g]ὀργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργάζεται.[g][4] 21. διὸ[5] [h]ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν [i]ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν[6] [k]κακίας ἐν[7]

d Sir. v. 11; Eccles. v. 1. e Cf. iii. 2; Prov. x. 19, xvii. 27; Eccles. v. 2; Sir. i. 29, iv. 29, v. 13. f Prov. xiv. 29; cf. Eccles. vii. 9; Eph. iv. 26. g—g Col. iii. 8. h Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 1; cf. Acts xv. 9; Heb. xii. 1. i Rev. xxii. 11. k Tit. iii. 3.

1—1 και νυν αδελφοι ημων Aeth^p; εστε αδελφοι ημων και Aeth^r.

2 ωστε KL^aP, Syr^hk, Thl., Oec., etc.; ιστω א[1] rec. ואנתון Pesh.; add δε A.

3 και εστω A, 13; om. δε KLP[2], Syr^hk, Pesh., Arm., Thl., Oec., etc , rec.

4 ου κατεργ. C*K^aLP, Thl., Oec., etc., rec.; *cf.* v. 3.

5 Pr. et *ff*. 6 περισσευμα A, 13, 68. 7 εμ א.

plain, as in the case of ver. 17, the abrupt way in which it is introduced; the ἴστε, taken as an indicative, might well imply that the writer is referring his readers to some well-known writing, much in the same way as St. Paul does in Acts xvii. 28, ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, ὡς καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν· "τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν". For the general thought of the verse *cf.* 1 John iii. 9.—**βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας**: this is strongly suggestive of an advanced belief in the doctrine of Grace, *cf.* John xv. 16. οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς. The rare word ἀπεκύησεν is, strictly speaking, only used of the mother. "It seems clear that the phrase has particular reference to the creation of man, κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. This was the truth about man which God's will realised in the creation by an act, a λόγος, which was the expression at once of God's will and man's nature" (Parry).—**ἀπαρχήν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων**: ἀπαρχή = תרומה used in reference to the *Torah* in *Shemoth Rabba*, chap. 33; see further below; the picture would be very familiar to Jews; just as the new fruits which ripen first herald the new season, so those men who are begotten λόγῳ ἀληθείας proclaim a new order of things in the world of spiritual growth; they are in advance of other men, in the same way that the first-fruits are in advance of the other fruits of the season. Rendel Harris illustrates this very pointedly from actual life of the present day in the East: "When one's soul desires the vintage or the fruitage of the returning summer, chronological advantage is everything. The trees that are a fortnight to the fore are the talk and delight of the town" (*Present Day Papers*, May, 1901, "The Elements of a Progressive Church").

Vv. 19-20. Another isolated saying, strongly reminiscent of the Wisdom literature; the frequent recurrence (see below) of words of this import suggests that here again the writer is recalling to the minds of his hearers familiar sayings.

Ver. 19. **ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι**: *Cf.* Sir. v. 11, γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου, καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν; see iv. 29, xx. 7. A similar precept is quoted in *Qoheleth Rabba*, v. 5 (Wünsche): "Speech for a shekel, silence for two; it it is like a precious stone"; *cf.* Taylor's ed. of *Pirqe Aboth*, p. 25.—**βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν**: *Cf.* Eccles. vii. 10 (R.V. 9), μὴ σπεύσῃς ἐν πνεύματί σου τοῦ θυμοῦσθαι, ὅτι θυμὸς ἐν κόλπῳ ἀφρόνων ἀναπαύσεται; see, too, Prov. xvi. 32. Margoliouth (*Expos. Times*, Dec. 1893) quotes a saying which, according to Mohammedan writers, was spoken by Christ: "Asked by some how to win Paradise, He said: 'Speak not at all'. They said: 'We cannot do this'. He said then: 'Only say what is good'." It must be remembered that the Arabs are the most foul-mouthed people on earth.

Ver. 20. **ὀργὴ γάρ**, etc.: Man's wrath is rarely, if ever, justifiable; even "just indignation" is too often intermixed with other elements; and frequently the premisses on which it is founded are at fault. Man, unlike God, never knows all the circumstances of the case. On the subject of anger, see Matt. v. 21, 22, and *cf.* the *Expositor*, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.

Vv. 21-25 form a self-contained section. By putting away all impurity the "implanted word" can influence the heart; but it is necessary not only to hear the word but also to act in accordance with it.

Ver. 21. **ἀποθέμενοι**: used in

l iii. 13; *cf.* Ps. xxv. 9. m Wisd. xii. 10. n—n Acts xiii. 26; Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 2; Eph. i. 13; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. ii. 3. o Matt. vii. 26; Rom. ii. 13.

πραΰτητι[1] [l]**δέξασθε τὸν** [m]**ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν** [n]**δυνάμενον**[2] **σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.**[n] [3] 22. **γίνεσθε δὲ** [o]**ποιηταὶ λόγου,**[4] **καὶ μὴ ἀκροαταὶ**

[1] Add **σοφιας** P, add **καρδιας** Thl., **πραυτητι** Weiss.
[2] Qui potestis *ff*. [3] **ημων** L[a].
[4] **νομου** C[2], 38[a], 73, 83, Aeth., Thl.

Heb. xii. 1 of putting off every weight preparatory to "running the race that is set before us"; the metaphor is taken from the divesting oneself of clothes.—**ῥυπαρία**: not elsewhere in the N.T. or Septuagint; the Syriac has טנפולא which is the same word used in Ezek. xliv. 6 for the Hebrew תועבה "abomination," meaning that which is abhorrent to God; usually it has reference to idolatrous practices, but it occurs a number of times in the later literature in reference to unchastity, this more especially in Proverbs. The adjective is used in Zech. iii. 4 of garments, and *cf.* Rev. xxii. 11, where the meaning is "filthy". The word before us, therefore, probably means "filthiness" in the sense of lustful impurity.—**περισσείαν κακίας**: not merely "excess" in the sense of the A.V. "superfluity" and the R.V. "overflowing," because **κακία** in the smallest measure is already excess. The phrase seems to mean simply "manifold wickedness"; this has to be got out of the way first before the "implanted word" can be received.—**ἐν πραΰτητι**: this must refer to the meekness which *is* the natural result of true repentance. *Cf.* Matt. iv. 17, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.*—**τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον**: **ἔμφυτος** occurs only here in the N.T.; in Wisd. xii. 10 we have, **οὐκ ἀγνοῶν ὅτι πονηρὰ ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν καὶ ἔμφυτος ἡ κακία αὐτῶν.** Mayor holds that the expression must be understood as "the rooted word," *i.e.*, a word whose property it is to root itself like a seed in the heart, *cf.* Matt. xiii. 21, **οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ**; and Matt. xv. 13, **πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται**; and *cf.* iv. Esdr. ix. 31, "Ecce enim semino in vobis legem meam, et faciet in vobis fructum et glorificabimini in eo per saeculum". The meaning "rooted word" agrees admirably with the rest of the verse, and seems to give the best sense, see further below.—**τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 9., **τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν.** The words before us leave the impression that those to whom they were addressed could not yet be called Christians; **πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν κακίας,** which they are enjoined to put off, implies a state far removed from even a moderate Christian ideal; and the "rooted word," which is able to save their souls, has evidently not been received yet. On the subject of the "rooted word" being able to save souls, see further under ver. 22.

Ver. 22. **γίνεσθε**: perhaps best expressed by the German "Werdet," though Luther does not render it so.—**ποιηταὶ λόγου, καὶ,** etc.: Taylor quotes an appropriate passage from the Babylonian Talmud: "On Exod. xxiv. 7 which ends (lit.), *We will do and we will hear*, it is written (*Shabbath*, 88*a*) that "when Israel put *we will do* before *we will hear*, there came sixty myriads of ministering angels, and attached to each Israelite two crowns, one corresponding to *we will do*, and the other to *we will hear;* and when they sinned there came down a hundred and twenty myriads of destroying angels and tore them off" (quoted by Mayor, p. 67). The duty of doing as well as hearing is frequently insisted upon in Jewish writings. See, further, Matt. vii. 24, etc. As to the precise meaning to be attached to **λόγος** opinions differ; but the mention twice made of *hearing* the word makes it fairly certain that in the first instance— whatever further meaning it connoted—reference is being made to the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogue; further, the mention, also twice made, of the *doing* of the word makes it a matter of practical certainty that the reference is to the *Torah*, the Law; the fact that Jews are being addressed only emphasises this. For the attitude of the Jews towards the *Torah* during the centuries immediately preceding Christianity and onwards, see Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, pp. 135-151; here it must suffice to say that it was regarded as the final revelation of God for all time, that it was the means of salvation, and that its practice was the

μόνον [1] [p] παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτούς [2]· 23. [q] ὅτι [3] εἴ τις [r] ἀκροατὴς λόγου [4] ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ [r] ποιητής, [q] οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι [5] τὸ

p Col. ii. 4. q—q *Cf.* ii. 14-20; Matt. vii. 24-27; Luke vi. 46-49. r Rom. ii. 13.

[1] **μονον ακροαται** ℵACKLP, Oec., Ti. [2] Aliter consiliantes *ff*.
[3] Om. A, 13. [4] **νομου** 83. [5] **κατανουντες** (sic) ℵ[1].

highest expression of loyalty towards God. Jews who had from childhood been taught to regard the *Torah* in this light would have found it very difficult to discard the time-honoured veneration accorded to it, and there was no need to do so, seeing the place that Christ Himself had given to it (Matt. v. 17-18, vii. 12, xii. 5, xix. 17, xxiii. 3; Luke x. 26, xvi. 17, 29), and provided that its teaching in general was regarded as preparatory to the embracing of Christianity. The intensely practical writer of this passage realised that those to whom he was writing must be drawn gently and gradually, without unduly severing them from their earlier belief, which, after all, contained so much which was identical with the new faith. The *Torah*, which had been rooted in their hearts and which was to them, in the most literal sense, the word of God, was the point of attachment between Judaism and Christianity; it was utilised by the writer in order to bring them to Christ, the "Word" of God in a newer, higher sense. All that he says here about the **λόγος** was actually the teaching of the Jews concerning the *Torah*, the revealed word of God; and all that he says was also equally true, only in a much higher sense, of the teaching of Christ, the "Word" of God,—this latter, higher conception of the "Word of God," the מימרא, was one with which Hellenistic Jews were quite familiar;—what has been said can be illustrated thus:—

In ver. 18 it is said, "Of his own will he brought us forth by the *word* of truth"; the Jews taught that they were the children of God by virtue of the *Torah*. In ver. 21 it is said, "Wherefore putting away all filthiness . . . receive the rooted word"; according to Jewish ideas, purity and the *Torah* were inseparable, it was an ancient Jewish belief that the *Torah* was the means whereby lust was annihilated in a man. In the same verse, the expression **ἔμφυτος λόγος** can have a two-fold meaning in reference to the *Torah;* either it contains an allusion to the belief that the *Torah* was implanted, like Wisdom, in God Himself from the very beginning, hence the expression ראשית ("beginning") used of the *Torah*; or else the writer is referring to the teaching of the *Torah* which was implanted, and therefore rooted, in every Jew from the earliest years. Once more, it is said that this word is able to save souls. Among the Jews it was an axiom that the *Torah* was the means of salvation; to give but one quotation illustrative of this ancient belief, in *Wajjikra Rabba*, 29 it is written: אין אורח חיים אלא תורה ("*Torah* is the only way that leadeth to life"). And finally, as already remarked, the necessity of being doers as well as hearers of the *Torah* is a commonplace in Jewish literature. For many illustrations showing the correctness of what has been said, see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie* (2nd Ed.), pp. 14-38, Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums* (1st Ed.), pp. 87-120, the various editions of *Midrashim* translated by Wünsche in "Bibliotheca Rabbinica," and the handy collection being issued under the editorship of Fiebig, entitled "Ausgewählte Mischnatractate". It will have been noticed that all that the writer of this passage says about **λόγος** as applicable to the Law, or *Torah*, is equally applicable, only in a much higher sense, to Christ; this will be obvious and need not be proved by quotations. But it is interesting to observe that apparently precisely the same thing was done by our Lord Himself, as recorded by St. John in the fourth Gospel; He adapted Jewish teaching on the *Torah* and applied it to Himself; for details of this, see Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, pp. 139 ff. It will be noticed that in our Epistle the writer presently goes on to substitute **νόμος** (*Torah*) for **λόγος**, ver. 25; this is very significant; the "perfect law of liberty," and the "royal law," both refer to the *Torah* as perfected by the "King of the Jews".—**παραλογιζόμενοι ἑαυτούς**: *i.e.*, deceiving the heart, as it is expressed in ver. 26; the rebuke shows the intimate knowledge on the part of the writer of the spiritual state of those to whom he is writing.

Ver. 23. **οὗτος ἔοικεν ἀνδρὶ . . . ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ**: With the thought here

πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως[1] αὐτοῦ ἐν [s] ἐσόπτρῳ· 24. κατενόησεν γὰρ[2] ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν, καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν. 25. ὁ δὲ [t] παρακύψας εἰς νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς [u] ἐλευθερίας καὶ παραμείνας,[3] οὐκ[4] [v] ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς [v] ἔργου, οὗτος [w] μακάριος[5] ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ[5] ἔσται. 26. Εἴ[6] τις [x] δοκεῖ θρησκὸς εἶναι,[7] μὴ [y] χαλιναγωγῶν[8] [z] γλῶσσαν ἑαυτοῦ[9] ἀλλὰ ἀπατῶν

s 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 8.
t 1 Pet. i. 12.
u *Cf.* ii. 12; John viii. 32; Rom. viii. 2; Gal. v. 1.
v—v Rom. ii. 13.
w Luke xi. 28; John xiii. 17.
x *Cf.* Heb. iv. 1.
y iii. 2, 3.
z iii. 6; Ps. xxxiv. 13 (14 in Heb.); Ps. cxli. 3.

[1] Om. **της γενεσεως** Pesh., et al. [2] Om. *ff*.
[3] Add **εν αυτω** Vulg. (om. Vulg[r]), Pesh., Syr[hk], Arm.
[4] Pr. **ουτος** KLP, Pesh., Arm., Thl., Oec., rec.
[5] – [5] In operibus suis *ff*. [6] Add **δε** CP, Pesh., latt., Copt., Treg.
[7] Add **εν υμιν** KL, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.
[8] **χαλινων** B. [9] **αυτου** ℵACKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).

contained, *cf.* Pseudo-Cyprian in *De duobus mont.*, chap. 13: "Ita me in vobis videte, quomodo quis vestrum se videt in aquam aut in speculum" (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 35), *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 18.—**τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ**: *Cf.* Jud. xii. 18, **πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γενέσεως**, "all the days of the natural life," **γεν.** being used of unenduring existence; if this is the meaning here, it is used "to contrast the reflexion in the mirror of the face which belongs to this transitory life, with the reflexion, as seen in the Word, of the character which is being here moulded for eternity" (Mayor). In ver. 24, "forgetteth what manner of man he was" makes it improbable that the reference is to the "natural face," because a man would probably have some idea as to what his features were like. If **πρόσωπον** is here used in the sense of "personality" (as in Sir. iv. 22, 27, vii. 6, x. 5, xlii. 1, etc.) then the reference would perhaps be to a man looking into his conscience, *i.e.*, "the personality at its birth," before he had become sin-stained; this being what he was originally meant to be. The Peshiṭtâ simplifies the matter by omitting **τῆς γενέσεως**, and is followed in this by some minor authorities.—**ἐσόπτρῳ**: *Cf.* Sir. xii. 11 . . . **καὶ ἔσῃ αὐτῷ ὡς ἐκμεμαχὼς ἔσοπτρον**; and Wisd. vii. 26.

Ver. 24. **κατενόησεν . . . ἀπελήλυθεν**: gnomic aorists, see note on **ἀνέτειλεν**, ver. 11.

Ver. 25. **παρακύψας**: in Sir. xiv. 20 ff. we read, **Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐν σοφίᾳ τελευτήσει . . . ὁ παρακύπτων διὰ τῶν θυρίδων αὐτῆς.** The word means literally to "peep into" with the idea of eagerness and concentration, see Gen. xxvi. 8; Mayor says that the **παρὰ** "seems to imply the bending of the upper part of the body horizontally"; if this is so the word would be used very appropriately of a man poring over a roll of the *Torah*.—**εἰς νόμον τέλειον . . .**: see above ver. 22.—**οὐκ ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς**, etc.: *Cf.* with this what is quoted as a saying of our Lord in the *Doctrina Addaei*: "Thus did the Lord command us, that that which we preach before the people by word we should practise in deed in the sight of all" (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 285). —**ἐπιλησμονῆς**: does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., and only very rarely in the Septuagint; see Sir. xi. 27, **κάκωσις ὥρας ἐπιλησμονὴν ποιεῖ τρυφῆς.**—**ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ**: only here in the N.T., *cf.* Sir. xix. 18 (20 in Greek), **πᾶσα σοφία φόβος Κυρίου, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ποίησις νόμου**; and li. 19, **καὶ ἐν ποιήσει μου** (Bℵ read **λιμοῦ**) **διηκριβασάμην** (this clause does not exist in the Hebrew, and is probably a doublet); *cf.* Sir. xvi. 26.

Vv. 26, 27. Although these verses are organically connected with the preceding section, they are self-contained, and deal with another aspect of religion. While the earlier verses, 19*b*-25, emphasise the need of doing as well as hearing, these speak of self-control in the matter of the tongue. At the same time it must be confessed that these verses would stand at least equally as well before iii. 1 ff.—**δοκεῖ**: the danger of regarding the *appearance* of religion as sufficient was the greater inasmuch as it was characteristic of a certain type of "religious" Jew, *cf.* Matt. vi. 1, 2, 5, 16; it must not, however, be supposed that this represented the normal type; the fact that the need of

καρδίαν ἑαυτοῦ,[1] τούτου[2] μάταιος ἡ [a] θρησκεία.[3] 27. θρησκεία[4] καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ[5] [b] Θεῷ καὶ[6] πατρὶ[7] αὕτη ἐστίν, [c] ἐπισκέπτεσθαι [d] ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας [d] ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, [e] ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν[8] [f] τηρεῖν ἀπὸ[9] τοῦ κόσμου.

II. 1. ᾿ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ μου, μὴ ἐν [a] προσωποληψίαις[10] ἔχετε τὴν [b] πί-

a Acts xxvi. 5. b iii. 9; Eph. v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. ii. 2. c Sir. vii. 35; Matt. xxv. 36. d—d Job xxxi. 17-18; Isa. i. 17; Sir. iv. 10; 2 Macc. iii. 10, viii. 28, 30. e Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 14. f 1 Tim v. 22; 1 John v. 18; Rom. xii. 2. a Deut. i. 17, x. 17; Prov. xxiv. 23; 2 Cor. v. 16; 1 Pet i. 17; Jude 16. b Mark xi. 22.

[1] αυτου ℵACKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).
[2] του ℵ[1].
[3] θρησκια ℵ Ti.
[4] θρησκια ℵ Ti., add γαρ A, 70, 83, 123, Pesh.; add δε Syr[hk], latt., Copt.; add autem *ff*.
[5] Om. τω ℵ[1]C[2]KL, curss., 40, 73, 99, Ti.
[6] Om. και 99, 126, *a*, *ff*, Pesh., Aeth.
[7] Pr. τω A; om. *ff*.
[8] σεαυτον A, Aeth.
[9] εκ CP.
[10] -ληψιαις KLP, curss.

reality in religion is so frequently insisted upon by the early Rabbis shows that their teaching in this respect was the same as that of this writer.—θρησκός: Hatch, as quoted by Mayor, describes θρησκεία as "religion in its external aspect, as worship or as one mode of worship contrasted with another"; this agrees exactly with what has just been said. θρησκός does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint.—χαλιναγωγῶν: (B reads χαλινων). Not found elsewhere in the N.T. or in the Septuagint; χαλινός is used in Ps. xxxi. (Heb. xxxii.) 9 in the Septuagint, as well as in the versions of Aquila and Quinta; for the thought *cf.* Ps. xxxviii. (Heb. xxxix.) 2, cxl. (Heb. cxli.) 3, though the word is not used in either of these last two passages. Mayor quotes the interesting passage from Hermas, *Mand.*, xii. 1. ἐνδεδυμένος τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τὴν ἀγαθὴν μισήσεις τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ χαλιναγωγήσεις αὐτήν.—γλῶσσαν ἑαυτοῦ; the reference is to the threefold misuse of the tongue, slander, swearing and impure speaking; see Eph. v. 3-6.

Ver. 27. θρησκεία καθαρὰ . . . αὕτη ἐστίν . . .: As illustrating this, Dr. Taylor (*Expos. Times*, xvi. 334) quotes the Ποίμανδρος of Hermes Trismegistos: καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ θεός, τὸ πᾶν . . . τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὦ τέκνον, προσκύνει καὶ θρήσκευε. θρησκεία δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ μία ἐστί, μὴ εἶναι κακόν. *Cf.* too, the following from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. iv. 6: "The Lord willeth not that those who reverence Him should be in uncleanness, nor doth He take pleasure in them that commit adultery, but in those that approach Him with a pure heart and undefiled lips".—ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς καὶ . . . αὐτῶν: this was reckoned among the גמילות חסדים "practice of kindnesses," which are constantly urged in Rabbinical writings, *e.g.*, *Nedarim*, 39*b*, 40*a*; *Ket.*, 50*a*; *Sanh.*, 19*b*. *Cf.* too, Sir. iv. 10, γίνου ὀρφανοῖς ὡς πατήρ, καὶ ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῶν. In the *Apoc. of Peter*, § 15, occur these words: οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλουτοῦντες καὶ τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῶν πεποιθότες καὶ μὴ ἐλεήσαντες ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας, ἀλλ' ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ. *Cf.* also the *Apoc. of Paul*, § 35.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-13 take up again the subject of the rich and poor which was commenced in i. 9-11.

Ver. 1. μὴ . . . ἔχετε: the imperative, which is also found in all the versions, seems more natural and more in accordance with the style of the Epistle than the interrogative form adopted by WH.—ἐν προσωποληψίαις: the plural form is due to Semitic usage, like ἐξ αἱμάτων in John i. 13; *cf.* Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25.—τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου . . .: the mention of the "faith of Christ" is brought in in a way which shows that this was a matter with which the readers were well acquainted. The phrase must evidently mean the new religion which Christ gave to the world, *i.e.*, the Christian faith.—τῆς δόξης: the intensely Jewish character of this Epistle makes it reasonably certain that the familiar Jewish conception of the *Shekinah* is what the writer is here referring to. The *Shekinah* (from the root שכן "to dwell")

c 1 Cor. ii. 8; *cf.* Acts vii. 2. d Acts vi. 9, etc.; Heb. x.25. e Luke xxiii. 11.

στιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] τῆς [c] δόξης.[2] 2. ἐὰν γὰρ[3] εἰσέλθῃ εἰς [d] συναγωγὴν[4] ὑμῶν ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν ἐσθῆτι [e] λαμ-

[1] Χριστου, WH (altern. reading).

[2] Pesh. places της δοξης after πιστιν, so too 69, 73, *a*, *c*; it is om. by 13, Sah.; and rendered "honeris" by *ff*, though the Vulg. reads "gloriae". WH read της δοξης;

[3] Autem *ff*. [4] Pr. την ℵ[3]AKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

denoted the visible presence of God dwelling among men. There are several references to it in the N.T. other than in this passage, Matt. ix. 7; Luke ii. 9; Acts vii. 2; Rom. ix. 4; *cf.* Heb. ix. 5; so, too, in the Targums, *e.g.*, in Targ. Onkelos to Num. vi. 25 ff. the "face (in the sense of appearance or presence) of the Lord" is spoken of as the *Shekinah*. A more materialistic conception is found in the Talmud, where the *Shekinah* appears in its relationship with men as one person dealing with another; *e.g.*, in *Sota*, 3*b*, it is said that before Israel sinned the *Shekinah* dwelt with every man severally, but that after they sinned it was taken away; *cf. Sota*, 17*a*, where it is said: "Man and wife, if they be deserving, have the *Shekinah* between them"; so, too, *Pirqe Aboth.*, iii. 3: "Rabbi Chananiah ben Teradyon [he lived in the second century, A.D.] said, Two that sit together and are occupied in words of *Torah* have the *Shekinah* among them" (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 20); see further Oesterley and Box, *Op. cit.*, pp. 191-194. The *Shekinah* was thus used by Jews as an indirect expression in place of God, the localised presence of the Deity. "In the identification of the *Shekinah* and cognate conceptions with the incarnate Christ, 'a use is made of these ideas,' as Dalman says, 'which is at variance with their primary application'. It marks a specifically Christian development, though the way had certainly been prepared by hypostatising tendencies" (Box, in Hastings' DCG., ii. 622*a*). That Christ was often identified with the Divine *Shekinah* may be seen from the examples given by Friedländer, *Patristische und Talmudische Studien*, pp. 62 ff. If our interpretation of δόξα here is correct, it will follow, in the first place, that the meaning of the phrase . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης is free from ambiguity, *viz.*, ". . . Have faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, the *Shekinah*" (literally "the glory"); this is precisely the same thought that is contained in the words, ". . . who being the effulgence of his glory . . . (Heb. i. 2-3). And, in the second place, this rendering shows that the words are an expression of the Divinity of our Lord; *cf.* Bengel's note: "τῆς δόξης: est appositio, ut ipse Christus dicatur ἡ δόξα". [Since writing the above the present writer finds that Mayor, p. 78, refers to Mr. Bassett's comment on this verse, where the same interpretation is given, together with a number of O.T. quotations; it seems scarcely possible to doubt that this interpretation is the correct one.]

Ver. 2. **εἰς συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν**: as the Epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes of the Dispersion no particular synagogue can be meant here; it is a general direction that is being given. In the N.T. the word is always used of a *Jewish* place of worship; but it is used of a *Christian* place of worship by Hermas, *Mand.*, xi. 9. . . . εἰς συναγωγὴν ἀνδρῶν δικαίων . . . καὶ ἔντευξις γένηται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων. Harnack (*Expansion* . . . i. 60) says: "I know one early Christian fragment, hitherto unpublished, which contains the expression: Χριστιανοί τε καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦντες". This latter may well refer to a place of worship in which converted Gentiles and Jewish-Christians met together. And this is probably the sense in which we must understand the use of the word in the verse before us. The Jewish name for the synagogue was בית הכנסת ("house of assembly"); according to *Shabbath*, 32*a*, the more popular designation was the Aramaic name בית עמא ("house of the people"); Hellenistic Jews used the term προσευχή = οἶκος προσευχῆς as well as συναγωγή.—**ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος**, etc.: *Cf.* Sir. xi. 2, μὴ αἰνέσῃς ἄνδρα ἐν κάλλει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ βδελύξῃ ἄνθρωπον ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ. For ἀνήρ see note on ver. 7. χρυσοδακτύλιος does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; *cf.* Luke

πρᾷ, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ καὶ[1] πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι, 3. [f]ἐπιβλέψητε δὲ[2] ἐπὶ τὸν φοροῦντα τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν [g]λαμπρὰν καὶ εἴπητε[3]· σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς, καὶ τῷ πτωχῷ εἴπητε· σὺ στῆθι ἐκεῖ[4] ἢ κάθου[5] ὑπὸ[6] τὸ ὑποπόδιόν[7] μου,[8] 4. οὐ[9] [h]διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐγένεσθε [i]κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν; 5. Ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί· οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς [k]ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ[10] πλουσίους ἐν [l]πίστει

f Luke i. 48. g Luke xxiii. 11. h iii. 17; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 1. i Matt. xv. 19. k Eph. i. 4; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; *cf.* Job xxxiv. 19. l Prov. iii. 7; Luke xii. 21; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rev. ii. 9.

[1] **δε και** is rendered "autem" by *ff*.

[2] **και επιβλ.** ℵAKL, Oec., Ti., Treg., rec.

[3] Add **αυτω** KLP, Vulg., Oec.

[4] *Pon post* **καθου** 2°B, *ff*, WH marg.

[5] Pr. **ωδε** ℵC²KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

[6] **επι** B³P, 13, 29, 69, *a*, *c*, *d*, Pesh., Arm., Sah.

[7] Add **των ποδων** A, 13, Vulg., Syrr., Aeth.

[8] Eorum *s*.

[9] Pr. **και** KLP, *a*, Thl., Oec., rec. B¹, *ff*, WH marg. do not make it interrogative.

[10] **του κοσμου** A?C²KLP, *a*, Pesh.; **του κοσμου τουτου** Aeth., Oec.; **εν τω κοσμω τουτω** 29, Vulg.; pr. **εν** 27, 43, 64, om. 113.

xv. 22. **λαμπρᾷ**, probably in reference to the fine white garment worn by wealthy Jews.—**πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι**: **ῥυπαρός** occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in Rev. xxii. 11 (*cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 21) and very rarely in the Septuagint, see Zech. iii. 3, 4; in the *Apoc. of Peter* we have, in § 15, . . . **γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες ῥάκη ῥυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένοι** . . .—There is nothing decisive to show whether the rich man or the poor man (presumably not regular worshippers), who are thus described as entering the Synagogue, were Christians or otherwise; on the assumption of an early date for the Epistle they might have been either; but if the Epistle be regarded as belonging to the first half of the second century non-Christians are probably those referred to; but it would be futile to attempt to speak definitely here, for a good case can be made out for any class of worshipper.

Ver. 3. **ἐπιβλέψητε**: "look upon with admiration," the exact force of the word is conditioned by the context; it quite expresses the Hebrew פנה אל, the meaning of which varies according to the context, *e.g.*, in Ps. xxv. 16 (Sept. xxiv. 16) it is "to look graciously," in Deut. ix. 27, "to look sternly".—**σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς**: the reference is to the kind of seat rather than to its position; chairs, or something corresponding to these, were provided for the elders and scribes (*cf.* Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xi. 43), and would no doubt have been offered to persons of rank who might enter, while the poorer men would sit on the floor, which is indeed clearly implied by the words **ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιόν μου**. The official who directed people to their seats was called the חזן (*Chazzan*) *i.e.*, the man who "had charge"; we read of the existence of this official in the Synagogue within the Temple precints in Jerusalem (*Yoma*, vii. 1).

Ver. 4. **οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς**: "Are ye not divided among yourselves"? The Peshiṭtâ uses the word אתפלג, the same as that used in Luke xi. 17. "Every Kingdom divided against itself." The reference in the verse before us might be to the class distinctions which were thus being made, and which would have the effect of engendering envy and strife, and thus divisions.—**κριταί**: the Peshiṭtâ has the interesting rendering מפרשנא (instead of the usual word for "judge" דינא), which comes from the root meaning "to divide".—**διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν**: *Cf.* Matt. xv. 19, **ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἔρχονται διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί**: genitive of quality, "judges with evil surmisings," *viz.*, of breaking up the unity of the worshippers by differentiating between their worldly status; the writer is very modern! **διαλογισμοί** is generally used in a bad sense, *cf.* Luke v. 21, 22; Rom. i. 21.

Ver. 5. **Ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί**: This expression, which one would expect to hear rather in a vigorous address, reveals the writer as one who was also an impassioned speaker;

καὶ [m] κληρονόμους τῆς [n] βασιλείας [1] ἧς [o] ἐπηγγείλατο [2] τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν [p] αὐτόν; 6. ὑμεῖς δὲ [q] ἠτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν. οὐχ [3] οἱ πλούσιοι

m Matt. xxv. 34. n Matt. v. 3; Luke vi. 20, xii. 32. o i. 12. p Exod. xx. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 9; *cf.* Prov. viii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 8. q v. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 22.

[1] επαγγελιας ℵ*A (*cf.* Heb. vi. 17).
[2] Pr. ο θεος Pesh. [3] ουχι AC[1], *a*, *c*, 69, 180.

cf. in the same spirit, the frequent ἀδελφοί, and especially, ἄγε νῦν, iv. 13, v. i.—ἐξελέξατο: a very significant term in the mouth of a Jew when addressing Jews; *cf.* Deut. xiv. 1-2, Υἱοί ἐστε Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν . . . ὅτι λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ σου, καὶ σὲ ἐξελέξατο Κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον . . . *cf.* Acts. xiii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 27. There is an interesting saying in *Chag.* 9*b* where it is said that poverty is the quality most befitting Israel as the chosen people.—πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ: *i.e.*, poor in the estimation of the world; the reading τοῦ κόσμου or ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ loses this point; *cf.* Matt. x. 9; Luke vi. 20.—πλουσίους ἐν πίστει: "Oblique predicate" (Mayor). In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Gad. vii. 6 we read: "For the poor man, if, free from envy, he pleaseth the Lord in all things, is blessed beyond all men" (the Greek text reads πλουτεῖ which Charles holds to be due to a corruption in the original Hebrew text which reads יְאֻשַּׁר = μακαριστός ἐστι). See, for the teaching of our Lord, Matt. vi. 19; Luke xii. 21. Πίστις is used here rather in the sense of trust than in the way in which it is used in ii. 1.—κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας: the Kingdom must refer to that of the Messiah, see v. 7-9, and Matt. xxv. 35, δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, but not Matt. v. 3 which treats of a different subject. It is of importance to remember that the Messianic Kingdom to which reference is made in this verse was originally, among the Jews, differentiated from the "future life" which is apparently referred to in i. 12, . . . λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς, ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. There was a distinction, fundamentally present, though later on confused, in Jewish theology, between the "Kingdom of Heaven" over which God reigns, and that of the Kingdom of Israel over which the Messiah should reign. An integral part of the Messianic hope was the doctrine of a resurrection (*cf.* Isa. xxiv. 10; Dan. xii. 2). This first assumed definite form, apparently, under the impulse of the idea that those who had suffered martyrdom for the Law (*Torah*) were worthy to share in the future glories of Israel. In the crudest form of the doctrine the resurrection was confined to the Holy Land—those buried elsewhere would have to burrow through the ground to Palestine—and to Israelites. And the trumpet-blast which was to be the signal for the ingathering of the exiles would also arouse the sleeping dead (*cf.* *Berachoth*, 15*b*, 4 Esdras iv. 23 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16). According to the older view, the Kingdom was to follow the resurrection and judgment; but the later and more widely held view was that a temporary Messianic Kingdom would be established on the earth, and that this would be followed by the Last Judgment and the Resurrection which would close the Messianic Era. This was to be followed by a new heaven and a new earth. In the eschatological development which took place during the first century B.C. Paradise came to be regarded as the abode of the righteous and elect in an intermediate state; from there they will pass to the Messianic Kingdom, and then, after the final judgment they enter heaven and eternal life. In our Epistle there are some reflections of these various conceptions and beliefs, but they have entered into a simpler and more spiritual phase. That the reference in the verse before us is to the Messianic Kingdom seems indubitable both on account of the mention of the "Lord Jesus Christ" (Messiah) with which the section opens, showing that the thought of our Lord was in the mind of the writer, and because of the mention of the "Kingdom," and also on account of the direct mention of the coming of the Messiah as Judge, later on in v. 7-9. And if this is so then we may perhaps see in the words ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο a reference to Christ.

Ver. 6. ἠτιμάσατε: *Cf.*, though in an entirely different connection, Sir. x. 23, οὐ δίκαιον ἀτιμάσαι πτωχὸν συνετόν (δίκαιον is absent in the Hebrew);

[r] καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν,[1] καὶ αὐτοὶ[2] [s] ἕλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς [t] κριτήρια; 7. οὐκ[3] αὐτοὶ [u] βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν [v] ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν[4] ἐφ'

r Wisd. ii. 10.
s Acts xvi. 19.
t Acts viii. 3, xiii. 50, xvii. 6, xviii. 11.
u 1 Tim. vi. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 14; *cf.* Acts xiii. 45.
v Acts xv. 17; *cf.* Jer. vii. 10; Mal. i. 11.

[1] υμας ℵ[1]A, 19, 20, 65, Ti.
[2] αυτοι και *s.*
[3] και A, *c*, 13, Syr[hk], Aeth.
[4] επικεκληθεν C[1].

the R.V. "dishonoured" accurately represents the Greek, but the equivalent Hebrew word would be better rendered "despised" which is what the A.V. has. "Dishonouring" would imply the withholding of a right, "despising" would be rather the contempt accorded to the man because he was poor. There can be little doubt that it is the former which is intended here, but the idea of the latter must also have been present.—**οὐχ οἱ πλούσιοι καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν**: the rich here probably refer to wealthy Jews, though it does not follow that "there could have been no question of *rich Jews* if the city and the temple had fallen" (Knowling), for the Epistle was addressed to Jews of the Dispersion, the bulk of whom were not affected, as far as their worldly belongings were concerned, by the Fall of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the possibility of the reference being to rich Jewish-Christians, or Gentile-Christians, cannot be dismissed off-hand, for on the assumption of a late date for the Epistle it is more likely that these would be meant. The writer is taxing his hearers both with bad treatment accorded to the poor, as well as pusillanimity with regard to the rich. The word **καταδυν.** only occurs once elsewhere in the N.T., Acts x. 38, . . . **πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου**; but fairly frequently in the Septuagint, *e.g.*, Am. viii, 4; Wisd. ii. 10, xv. 14. The accusative **ὑμᾶς**, which is the reading of ℵ[1]A, etc., is in accordance with the frequent usage of the Septuagint, where **καταδυν.** often takes an accusative instead of the genitive.—**αὐτοὶ**: "The pronoun **αὐτὸς** is used in the nominative, not only with the meaning 'self' when attached to a subject, as in classical Greek, but also when itself standing for the subject, with a less amount of emphasis, which we might render 'he for his part,' or 'it was he who,' as in the next clause; it is disputed whether it does not in some cases lose its emphatic force altogether, as in Luke xix. 2, xxiv. 31" (Mayor). **ἕλκουσιν**: See Matt. x. 7, 18. *Cf.* Acts xvi. 19, . . . **ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἵλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας.**—**κριτήρια**: *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 2, 4, either Jewish (*cf.* the Peshiṭtâ rendering בית דינא) tribunals or Gentile ones.

Ver. 7. **βλασφημοῦσιν**: for the force of the word *cf.* Sir. iii. 16, **ὡς βλάσφημος ὁ ἐγκαταλιπὼν** (the Greek is certainly wrong here, the Hebrew has בוזה, "he that despiseth") **πατέρα.** *Cf.* Rom. ii. 24, **τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** (Isa. lii. 5); the word in the N.T. is sometimes general in its application, of evil speaking with regard to men (in the *Apoc. of Peter* the phrase, **οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης** occurs twice, 7, 13); at other times, specifically with reference to God or our Lord.—**τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς**: the *name* here (especially in view of **καλόν**) must be "Jesus" (Saviour), for the Jews would not be likely to have blasphemed the name of "Christ" (Messiah); in Acts iv. 10-12 it is also the name of "Jesus," concerning which St. Peter says: *Neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.* **τὸ ἐπικλ. ἐφ. ὑμ.** is a Hebraism, in Am. ix. 12 we have: אשר נקרא שמי עליהם, which the R.V. renders (incorrectly): "which are called by my name," it should be: "Over whom my name was called," as rendered by the Septuagint, excepting that it repeats itself unnecessarily, **ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς.** The Peshiṭtá, too, has, שמא טבא דאתקרי so that the R.V. rendering here is incorrect, though the margin has "which was called upon you". The idea which the phrase expresses is very ancient; a possession was known by the name of the possessor (originally always a god), this was the name which was pronounced over, or concerning, the land; in the same way, a slave was known under the name of his master, it was the name under whose protection he stood. And

w Matt. xxii. 38; John xiii. 34; cf. Gal. vi. 2. x Cf. ii. 23. y—y Quoted from Lev. xix. 18; cf. Rom. xiii. 9. z Deut. i. 17.

ὑμᾶς; 8. εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε ʷ βασιλικὸν[1] κατὰ τὴν ˣ γραφήν· ʸ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν,[2] ʸ καλῶς ποιεῖτε. 9. εἰ δὲ ᶻ προσωποληπτεῖτε,[3] ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε, ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ

[1] βασιλικον τελειτε C, Syr^hk; τον βασ. P.

[2] ως σαυτον B; ως εαυτον 4, 25, 28, 31, 36, Thl.; ως εαυτους a.

[3] -λημπτειτε KLP.

so also different peoples were ranged under the names of special gods; this usage was the same among the Israelites, who stood under the protection of Jahwe—the name and the bearer were of course not differentiated. This, too, is the meaning here; it does not mean the name that they bore, or were called by, but the name under whose protection they stood, and to which they belonged. Parallel to it was the marking of cattle to denote ownership. (See, in reference to what has been said, Deut. xxviii. 10; 2 Sam. xii. 28; Jer. vii. 10). In the passage before us there is not *necessarily* any reference to Baptism, though it is extremely probable that this is so; Mayor quotes Hermas, *Sim.* ix. 16, πρὶν φορέσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ νεκρός ἐστιν· ὅταν δὲ λάβῃ τὴν σφραγῖδα (baptism) ἀποτίθεται τὴν νέκρωσιν καὶ ἀναλαμβάνει τὴν ζωήν. Resch (*op cit.* p. 193) quotes a very interesting passage from Agathangelus, chap. 73, in which these words occur: . . . καὶ εἰπὼν ὅτι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπικέκληται ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ναὸς τῆς θεότητός μου. In the passage before us, the omission of all mention of the name, which would have come in very naturally, betrays Jewish usage; as Taylor truly remarks (*Pirqe Aboth.*, p. 66): "A feeling of reverence leads the Jews to avoid, as far as possible, all mention of the Names of God. This feeling is manifested . . . in their post-canonical literature, even with regard to less sacred, and not incommunicable Divine names. In the Talmud and Midrash. and (with the exception of the Prayer Books) in the Rabbinic writings generally, it is the custom to abstain from using the Biblical names of God, *excepting in citations from the Bible;* and even when *Elohim* is necessarily brought in, it is often intentionally misspelt . . ." It should be noted that this phrase only occurs once elsewhere in the N.T., and there in a quotation from the O.T., quoted by St. James in Acts xv. 17.

Ver. 8. μέντοι: "nevertheless"; there is a duty due to all men, even the rich are to be regarded as "neighbours," for the precept of the Law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Lev. xix. 18), applies to all men.—νόμον βασιλικόν: "There is no difficulty in the anarthrous νόμος being used (as below, iv. 11) for the law of Christ or of Moses on the same principle that βασιλεύς could be used for the King of Persia, but the addition of an anarthrous epithet should not have been passed over without comment, as it has been by the editors generally" (Mayor). The reference is to the *Torah*, as is obvious from the quotation from Lev. xix. 18, and therefore βασιλικόν—if this was the original reading—must refer to God, not (in the first instance) to Christ; the Peshiṭtâ reads: "the law of God".—τελεῖτε: in Rom. ii. 27 we have the phrase νόμον τελεῖτε.—τὴν γραφήν: *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 3 κατὰ τὰς γραφάς. On a papyrus belonging to the beginning of the Christian era, the phrase κατὰ τὴν γραφήν is used in a legal sense in reference to a contract, *i.e.*, *something that is binding* (Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, p. 78). When used in reference to the *Torah*, as here, it was of particular significance to Jews who, as the "people of God" were bound by the Covenant.—καλῶς ποιεῖτε: *Cf.* Acts xv. 29; 2 Pet. i. 19.

Ver. 9. προσωποληπτεῖτε: see note on ii. 1; the word does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. nor in the Septuagint; *cf.* Lev. xix. 15; Deut. xvi. 19.—ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε: the strength of the expression is intended to remind his hearers that it is wilful, conscious sin of which they will be guilty, if they have this respect for persons on account of their wealth. It is well to bear in mind that the conception of sin among the Jews was not so deep as it became in the light of Christian teaching.—ἐλεγχόμενοι: *i.e.*, by the words in Lev. xix. 15., μὴ θαυμάσῃς πρόσωπον δυνάστου.—παραβάται: the verb παραβαίνω

τοῦ νόμου ὡς παραβάται. 10. ὅστις[1] γὰρ[2] ὅλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ,[3] [a] πταίσῃ[4] δὲ ἐν [b] ἑνί, γέγονεν πάντων [c] ἔνοχος. 11. ὁ γὰρ εἰπών[5]· [d] [6] μὴ μοιχεύσῃς,[7] εἶπεν καί· μὴ φονεύσῃς [d] [6]· εἰ δὲ οὐ [8] μοιχεύεις, φονεύεις[8] δέ, γέγονας[9] παραβάτης[10] νόμου. 12. οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε ὡς διὰ νόμου [e] ἐλευθερίας μέλλοντες κρίνε-

a iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 10; Jude 24.
b Matt. v. 19.
c Mark iii. 29; Gal. iii. 10.
d—d Quoted from Exod. xx. 13, 14; *cf.* Deut. v. 17, 18.
e i. 25.

[1] Qui *ff*. [2] Autem Vulg.

[3] τηρησει KLP; πληρωσει A, *a*, *c*, 63, 69, Syr^hk; πληρωσας τηρησει 13; τελεσει 66, 73.

[4] πταισει KLP. [5] ειπας A. [6—6] Transp. C, 69, Syr^hk, Arm., Thl.

[7] μοιχευσεις L. [8—8] Transp. 15, 70, Arm.; -σεις K, Thl.; -σῃς LP.

[9] εγενου AB. [10] αποστατης A.

precisely expresses the Hebrew עבר "to cross over"; *cf.* Rom. ii. 25, 27; Gal. ii. 18; Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15, and see Matt. xv. 2, 3. To cross over the line which marks the "way" is to become a transgressor.

Ver. 10. **τηρήσῃ**: τηρεῖν is used here with a force precisely corresponding to the Hebrew שמר when used in reference to the Law, or a statute, the Sabbath, etc.; the idea is that of guarding something against violation.—**πταίσῃ δὲ ἐν ἑνί**: πταίειν = the Hebrew כשל, "to stumble over" something; the picture is that of a παραβάτης stumbling over the border which marks the way; *cf.* the oft-used expression in Jewish writings of making a "hedge" or "fence" around the *Torah*, *e.g.*, *Pirqe Aboth.*, i. 1. With the verse before us *cf.* Sir. xxxvii. 12, . . . ὃν ἂν ἐπιγνῷς συντηροῦντα ἐντολάς . . . καὶ ἐὰν πταίσῃς συναλγήσει σοι, and ver. 15 καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις δεήθητι Ὑψίστου ἵνα εὐθύνῃ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὁδόν σου.—**ἐν ἑνί**: used in a pregnant sense, "in one matter" or "in any single point".—**γέγονεν πάντων ἔνοχος**: While there are a certain number of passages in Rabbinical writings which are in agreement with this teaching (*e.g.*, *Bemidbar Rabb.*, ix. on Num. v. 14; *Shabbath*, 70*b*; *Pesikta*, 50*a*; *Horaioth*, 8*b*; quoted by Mayor), there can be no doubt that the predominant teaching was in accordance with the passage quoted by Taylor (in Mayor, *op. cit.*, p. 89) from *Shemoth Rabb.* xxv. end: "The Sabbath weighs against all the precepts"; as Taylor goes on to say: "If they kept it, they were to be reckoned as having done all; if they profaned it, as having broken all". Rashi teaches the same principle. This is quite in accordance with the Jewish teaching regarding the accumulation of מצוות ("commandments," *i.e.*, observances of the Law); a man was regarded as "righteous" or "evil" according to the relative number of מצוות or evil deeds laid to his account; the good were balanced against the bad; according as to which of the two preponderated, so was the man reckoned as among the righteous or the wicked (see the writer's article in the *Expositor*, April, 1908, "The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard").—πάντων is equivalent to all the precepts of the *Torah*. For ἔνοχος *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 66; 1 Cor. xi. 27; Gal. iii. 10; see also Deut. xxvii. 26, and Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

Ver. 11. **μὴ μοιχεύσῃς**, etc.: for the order of the seventh commandment preceding the sixth, *cf.* the Septuagint (Exod. xx. 13, 14), and Luke xviii. 20; Rom. xiii. 9. With this mention of adultery and murder together should be compared §§ 9, 10 of the *Apoc of Peter*; in the former section the punishment of adulterers is described, in the latter that of murderers, while in § 11 mention is made of the children who were the victims of murder. Possibly it is nothing more than a coincidence, but the fact is worth drawing attention to that in the *Apoc.* of *Peter* (or, more strictly, in the extant remains of this) the punishment is described only of those who had been guilty of evil speaking (blasphemy), adultery, murder, and the wealthy who had not had pity upon widows and orphans. These are the sins upon which special stress is laid in our Epistle; other sins receive only incidental mention.

Ver. 12. **οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε**: When one thinks of

σθαι. 13. [f] ἡ γὰρ[1] κρίσις ἀνέλεος[2] τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος[3]· [g] κατακαυχᾶται[4] ἔλεος[5] κρίσεως.[f]

14. Τί τὸ[6] [h] ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις[7] ἔχειν

f—f Job xxii. 6-11; Prov. xxi. 13; Ezek. xxxv. 11; Matt. v. 7, vi. 15, xviii. 29, 34, 35, xxv. 45, 46; Mark xi. 26; Luke vi. 38, xvi. 35; cf. Rom. i. 31. g i. 9; iii. 14. h 1 Cor. xv. 32.

[1] Autem *ff*. [2] ανιλεως L, *a*, Chrys., Thl., rec., non miserebitur, *ff*. [3] ελεον K.
[4] κατακαυχασθω A, 13, 27, *a*, Copt.; κατακαυχατε B; κατακαυχασθε C[2]ras, Pesh., + δε ℵ[3]A, 13, + autem, Vulg., *a*, *ff*, Syrr., Oec.
[5] ελεον CKL, Oec. [6] Om. το BC[1], Arm., Treg^mg; WH.
[7] τις λεγη AC, Treg^mg.

the teaching of our Lord in such passages as Matt. v. 22, 28, where sinful feelings and thoughts are reckoned as equally wicked with sinful words and acts, it is a little difficult to get away from the impression that in the verse before us the teaching is somewhat inadequate from the Christian, though not from the Jewish, point of view.—διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας: See above i. 22, 25, and *cf.* John vii. 32-36.—μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι: *cf.* ver. 7, 8, and especially ver. 9, ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἕστηκεν.

Ver. 13. ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος, etc.: *Cf.* Matt. v. 7, vii. 1, xviii. 28 ff., xxv. 41 ff. For the form ἀνέλεος see Mayor, *in loc.* The teaching occurs often in Jewish writings, *e.g.*, Sir. xxviii. 1, 2, ὁ ἐκδικῶν παρὰ Κυρίου εὑρήσει ἐκδίκησιν, καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ διαστηριῶν διαστηρίσει. ἄφες ἀδίκημα τῷ πλησίον σου, καὶ τότε δεηθέντος σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου λυθήσονται. *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Zeb. viii. 1-3: "Have, therefore, yourselves also, my children, compassion towards every man with mercy, that the Lord also may have compassion and mercy upon you. Because also in the last days God will send His compassion on the earth, and wheresoever He findeth bowels of mercy He dwelleth in him. For in the degree in which a man hath compassion upon his neighbours, in the same degree hath the Lord also upon him" (Charles); *cf.* also vi. 4-6. *Shabbath*, 127*b*: "He who thus judges others will thus himself be judged". *Ibid.*, 151*b*: "He that hath mercy on his neighbours will receive mercy from heaven; and he that hath not mercy on his neighbours will not receive mercy from heaven". *Cf.* also the following from Ephraem Syrus, *Opp.*, I. 30B (quoted by Resch. *op. cit.*, p. 197): καὶ μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήσαντες, ὅτι ἐκεῖ ἐλεηθήσονται· καὶ οὐαὶ τοῖς μὴ ἐλεήσασιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐλεηθήσονται.—ποιήσαντι: this use of ποιεῖν is common in the Septuagint and corresponds to the Hebrew עָשָׂה; it is often used with חסד ("kindness").—κατακαυχᾶται: "triumphs over".

Vv. 14-26. On this section see Introduction IV., § 2. There are a few points worth drawing attention to, in connection with the subject treated of in these verses, before we come to deal with the passage in detail: (1) πίστις here means nothing more than belief in the unity of God, *cf.* ver. 20 τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν . . .; this is a very restricted use of the word, both according to Hebrew and Greek usage. The Hebrew אֱמוּנָה means primarily "faithfulness," "steadfastness," "reliability," and is used in reference to God quite as much as in reference to men. This is also the force of the verb אמן; it is only in the Hiph'al that the meaning "to believe in," in the sense of "to trust," arises. The use of πίστις in the Septuagint varies; mostly it corresponds to אֱמוּנָה, but not infrequently this latter is rendered ἀλήθεια, *e.g.*, Psa. lxxxviii. (lxxxix.) 34, 50, xcvii. (xcviii.) 3, though in each of these cases Aquila and Quinta render πίστις. In Sir. xli. 16, πίστις is the rendering of the Hebrew אמת ("truth"), while in xlv. 4, xlvi. 15 it corresponds to אֱמוּנָה in the sense of "reliability". In Sir. xxxvii. 26 the Greek is obviously corrupt, πίστις stands there for the Hebrew כבוד ("glory"), which is clearly more correct. But the most interesting passage on the subject in Sir. from our present point of view is xv. 15: ἐὰν θέλῃς, συντηρήσεις ἐντολάς, καὶ πίστιν ποίησαι εὐδοκίας; of which the Hebrew is: אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה ואמונה לעשות רצונו ("If it be thy will thou dost observe the

ἔργα δὲ μὴ [1] ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις [1] σῶσαι αὐτόν; 15. ἐὰν [2] i

i. 23; Matt. vii. 21; *cf.* xxi. 29.

[1] Add sola, *ff*; add sine operibus, Sah.
[2] Add δὲ ACDKL, curss., Vulg., rec.

commandment, and it is faithfulness to do His good pleasure"; the context shows that it is a question here of man's free-will). Here πίστις is used in a distinctly higher sense than in the passage of our Epistle under consideration. In so far, therefore, as πίστις is used in the restricted sense, as something which demons as well as men possess, it is clear that the subject is different from that treated by St. Paul in Romans; and therefore the comparison so often made between the two Epistles on this point is not *à propos*. (2) That which gave the occasion for this section seems to have been the fact that, in the mind of the writer, some of the Jewish converts had gone from one extreme to another on the subject of *works*. Too much stress had been laid upon the efficacy of works in their Jewish belief; when they became Christians they were in danger of losing some of the excellences of their earlier faith by a mistaken supposition that works, not being efficacious *per se* (which so far was right) were therefore altogether unnecessary, and that the mere fact of believing in the unity of God was sufficient. Regarded from this point of view, there can, again, be no question of a conflict with Pauline teaching as such. The point of controversy was one which must have agitated every centre in which Jews and Jewish-Christians were found. In this connection it is important to remember that the "faith of Abraham" was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion both in Rabbinical circles as well as in the Hellenistic School of Alexandria; regarding the former, see the interesting passage from the Midrashic work, *Mechilta*, quoted by Box in Hastings' *D.C.G.*, ii. 568*b*. The error of running from one extreme into another, in matters of doctrine, is one of those things too common to human nature for the similarity of language between this Epistle and St. Paul's writings in dealing with the subject of faith and works to denote antagonism between the two writers. (3) The passage as a whole betrays a very strong Jewish standpoint; while it would be too much to say that it could not have been written by a Christian, it is certainly difficult to understand how, *e.g.*, ver. 25 could have come from the pen of a Christian. (4) It is necessary to emphasise the fact that this passage cannot be properly understood without some idea of the subject of the Jewish doctrine of works which has always played a supremely important part in Judaism; for this, reference must be made to IV., § 2 of the Introduction, where various authorities are quoted.

Ver. 14. **τί τὸ ὄφελος**: B stands almost alone in omitting τό here; in 1 Cor. xv. 32, the only other place in the N.T. where the phrase occurs τό is inserted. A somewhat similar phrase occurs in Sir. xli. 14, . . . τίς ὠφελία ἐν ἀμφοτέροις; the abruptness of the words betrays the preacher.—**ἀδελφοί μου**: a characteristic mode of address in this Epistle. With ἀδελφός *cf.* חבר in Rabbinical literature. — **ἔργα**: = the Hebrew מצוות (literally "commandments," *i.e.*, fulfilling of commandments): see Introduction IV., § 2.—**πίστις**. *i.e.*, as expressed in the *Shema'* (Deut. vi, 4 ff.): "Hear O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One . . ."; this was the fundamental tenet of the Jewish faith, and that it is this to which reference is made, and not the Christian faith, is obvious from ver. 19 which contains the essence of the *Shema'*.—**σῶσαι**: the belief in the efficacy of works among the Jews has always been very strong; the following quotations express the traditional teaching of Judaism on the subject: "He that does a good work in this world, in the world to come his good work goes before him;" *Sota*, 3*b*, in *Kethuboth*, 67*b* we have the following: "When Mar Ukba lay a-dying, he asked for his account; it amounted to 7000 Zuzim (*i.e.*, this was the sum-total of his almsgiving). Then he cried out. 'The way is far, and the provision *is* small' (*i.e.*, he did not think that this sum would be sufficient to ensure his justification in the sight of God, and thus gain him salvation); so he gave away half of his fortune, in order to make himself quite secure." Again, concerning a righteous man who died in the odour of sanctity, it is said, in *Tanchuma*, *Wayyakel*, i.: "How much alms did he give, how much did he study the *Torah*, how many *Mitzvoth* (*i.e.*,

k Luke iii. 11; *cf.* Lev. xxv. 35; Job xxii. 6, xxxi. 19, 20.
l—l 1 John iii. 17, 18.

ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ [k] ὑπάρχωσιν καὶ λειπόμενοι [1] τῆς ἐφημέρου τροφῆς, 16. [l] εἴπῃ [2] δέ [3] τις [4] αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν· ὑπάγετε [5] ἐν

[1] Add ωσιν ALP, *m*, Thl., Oec., rec. [2] ειπει ℵ[1]. [3] και ειπη A, 13, *a*. [4] τι ℵ[1]. [5] υπαγε C[1] vid, 63.

'commandments,' see above) did he fulfil! He will rest among the righteous." It is also said in *Baba Bathra* 10*a*, that God placed the poor on earth in order to save rich men from Hell; the idea, of course, being that opportunities for doing *Mitzvoth* were thus provided. In a curious passage in the *Testament of Abraham*, chap. xvi., it is said that Thanatos met Abraham and told him that he welcomed the righteous with a pleasant look and with a salutation of peace, but the sinners he confronted with an angry and dark countenance; and he said that the good deeds of Abraham had become a crown upon his (Thanatos') head. In *Wisdom*, iv. 1 we have, . . . ἀθανασία γάρ ἐστιν ἐν μνήμῃ αὐτῆς (ἀρετῆς), ὅτι καὶ παρὰ Θεῷ γινώσκεται καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις. *Cf.* Enoch ciii. 1-4.

Ver. 15. In accordance with the very practical nature of the writer, he now proceeds to give an illustration of his thesis which is bound to appeal; he must have been a telling preacher.—**ἐάν**: the addition of δέ is fairly well attested, but the reading of Bℵ where it is omitted is to be preferred.—**ἀδελφή**: the specific mention of "sister" here is noteworthy; it is the one point in this passage which suggests distinctively Christian influence. This is apparently the only place in the Bible in which "sister" is mentioned in this special connection.—**γυμνοί**: *Cf. Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Zeb. vii. 1-3; "I saw a man in distress through nakedness in winter-time, and had compassion upon him, and stole away a garment secretly from my father's house (another reading is 'my house'), and gave it to him who was in distress. Do you, therefore, my children, from that which God bestoweth on you, show compassion and mercy without hesitation to all men, and give to every man with a good heart. And if you have not the wherewithal to give to him that needeth, have compassion for him in bowels of mercy" (Charles). Of course it is not literal nakedness that is meant in the passage before us; in the case of men the Hebrew עָרוֹם (= γυμνός), while often used in a literal sense, is also frequently used in reference to one who was not wearing a כתנת (= χιτών) and thus appeared only in סדינים, "under-garments," see Am. ii. 6; Isa. xx. 2 f.; Job xxii. 6, xxiv. 7-10. In the case of women, the reference is likewise to the כתנת, though in this case the garment was both longer and fuller than that of men; at the same time, it is improbable that the "sister" would have appeared without a veil, unless, indeed, we are dealing with a *venue* which is altogether more Western; this is a possibility which cannot be wholly excluded.—**λειπόμενοι**: must be taken with ὑπάρχωσιν as the addition of ὦσιν is poorly attested.—**ἐφημέρου τροφῆς**: "the food for the day"; the words express the dire necessity of those in want. *Cf.* Matt. vi. 11, Τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, and Nestle's note on ἐπιούσιος in Hastings' *D.C.G.*, ii. 58*a*. ἐφήμερος does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or the Septuagint.

Ver. 16. **ὑπάγετε, θερμαίνεσθε, χορτάζεσθε**: these words do not seem to be spoken in irony; this is clear from the τί τὸ ὄφελος. They are spoken in all seriousness, and it is quite possible that those whom the writer is addressing were acting upon a mistaken application of Christ's words in Matt. vi. 25 ff., *Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. . . . Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.* It was entirely in accordance with their idea of πίστις that these people should leave to their Heavenly Father what, according to both Jewish and Christian teaching, it was *their* duty to do.—**μὴ δῶτε δέ**: "The plural is often used after an indefinite singular" (Mayor).—**τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώματος**: only here in the N.T., but often found in classical writers; Mayor gives instances.—**τί τὸ ὄφελος**: in the earlier passage in which

εἰρήνῃ, θερμαίνεσθε καὶ χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δῶτε [1] δὲ αὐτοῖς [2] τὰ ἐπιτήδεια [3] τοῦ σώματος, τί τὸ [4] ὄφελος; [1] 17. οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις, ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃ ἔργα, [5] νεκρά ἐστιν καθ' ἑαυτήν. 18. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ [m] τις· [6] σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις, [7] κἀγὼ ἔργα ἔχω [6]· [8] δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου [9] [o] χωρὶς [10] τῶν ἔργων, [11] [12] κἀγώ σοι [n] δείξω [13] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου [14] τὴν [o] πίστιν. [15] [12] 19. [p] σὺ [16] πιστεύεις ὅτι [17] εἷς ἐστιν [18] ὁ Θεός. [17] καλῶς

l—l 1 John iii. 17, 18.
m Rom. ix. 19.
n iii. 13.
o Gal. v. 6; *cf.* Matt. vii. 16, 17.
p 1 Cor. viii. 6.

[1] Dederit *ff*.
[2] ei *s*.
[3] Alimentum *ff*.
[4] Om. το BC[1], Arm., Treg^{mg}, WH.
[5] εργα εχη L, Arm., Thl., Oec.
[6]—[6] Tu operam habes ego fidem habeo *ff*.
[7] εχεις; WH (altern. reading).
[8] εχω, Weiss; εχω. WH.
[9] Om. 68, *ff*.
[10] εκ KL, *m*., Thl., rec.
[11] Add σου CKL, *a*, Aeth., Thl., rec.
[12]—[12] Et ego tibi de operibus fidem *ff*.
[13] δειξω σοι ACKL, Syrr., Thl., Oec. Treg^{mg}.
[14] Om. Latt. (hab *s*), Syr^{hk}.
[15] Add μου AKLP, *m* Vulg., Syrr., Copt., Aeth., Thl., Oec., rec.
[16] Om. *s*.
[17]—[17] εις Θεος εστιν; B, 69, *a*, *c*, Thl., Treg^{mg}, WH; εις ο Θεος εστιν; C Syr^{hk}, Weiss, WH (altern. reading); ο Θεος εις εστιν K[2]L, Did., Oec.
[18] Om. *ff*.

this phrase occurs there is no question of irony, it is a direct fallacy which is being combated; in this verse, too, the writer is correcting a mistaken idea, this comes out clearly in the next verse.

Ver. 17. **οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις . . .**: just as faith without works is dead, so this spurious, quiescent charity, which is content to leave all to God without any attempt at individual effort, is worthless.—**καθ' ἑαυτήν**: the Vulgate *in semetipsa* brings out the force of this; such faith is, in its very essence, dead; *cf.* the Peshiṭtâ.

Ver. 18.—**ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις**: these words, together with the argumentative form of the verses that follow, imply that a well-known subject of controversy is being dealt with. **Ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις** is a regular argumentative phrase, used of an objection. "Instead of the future the optative with **ἄν** would be more common in classical Greek, but the latter form is rather avoided by the Hellenistic writers, occurring only eight times in the N.T.,—thrice in Luke, five times in Acts" (Mayor).—**ἔχεις**: the interrogative here suggested by WH does not commend itself, as the essence of the argument is the setting-up of two opposing and definite standpoints.—**κἀγώ**: In the N.T. **καί** "often coalesces with **ἐγώ** (and its oblique cases), **ἐκεῖ**, **ἐκεῖθεν**, **ἐκεῖνος**, and **ἄν**; but there are many exceptions, and especially where there is distinct coordination of **ἐγώ** with another pronoun or a substantive. There is much division of evidence" (WH, *The N.T. in Greek*, II. App., p. 145).—**δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου . . .**: **πίστις** is not used quite consistently by the writer; faith which requires works to prove its existence is not the same thing which is spoken of in the next verse as the possession of demons; the difference is graphically illustrated in the account of the Gadarene demoniac; in Luke viii. 28 the words, *What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God*, express a purely intellectual form of faith, which is a very different thing from the attitude of mind implied in the words which describe the whilom demoniac, as, *sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus* (ver. 35).—With the whole verse *cf.* Rom. iii. 28, iv. 6.

Ver. 19. **σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ Θεός**: *Cf.* Mark xii. 29, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 6. The reading varies, see critical note above; the interrogative is unsuitable, see note on **ἔχεις** in the preceding verse. Somewhat striking is the fact that the regular and universally accepted formula (whether Hebrew or Greek) among the Jews is not adhered to; the Septuagint of Deut. vi. 4, which corresponds strictly to the original, runs: **Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἷς ἐστιν**, and this is also the exact wording in Mark xii. 29. The stress laid on **Κύριος** (= יהוה) in the original is very pointed, the reason being the desire to emphasise the name of Jahwe as the God of *Israel* (note the omission of the article before **Κύριος**); it sounded a particularistic note. The elimination of **Κύριος** in the verse

ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ [q] δαιμόνια [r] πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν. 20. θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι, ὦ ἄνθρωπε [s] κενέ, ὅτι ἡ πίστις [t] χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή [1]

q 1 Cor. x. 20.
r Matt. viii. 28, 29; Mk. v. 2—7; Luke iv. 33, 34; Acts xvi. 16, 17, xix. 15.
s Judg. ix. 4 (Sept.); 1 Cor. xv. 36; *cf.* Matt. v. 22.
t Rom. iii. 28.

[1] νεκρα ℵAC²KLP, Vulg., Pesh., Syr^hk, Copt., Arm., Aeth., Oec., rec.; vacua *ff.*

before us, and the emphatic position of ὁ Θεός,, is most likely intentional, and points to a universalistic tendency, such as is known to have been a distinctive characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism. To Jews of all kinds belief in the unity of God formed the basis of faith; this unity is expressed in what is called the *Shema‘* (Deut. vi. 4 ff.), *i.e.*, "Hear," from the opening word of the passage referred to; strictly speaking, it includes Deut. vi. 4-9, xi. 13-21; Num. xv. 37-41, though originally it consisted of the one verse, Deut. vi. 4. From the time of the Exile, according to *Berachoth*, i. 1, the recitation of the *Shema‘* every morning and evening became the solemn duty of all true Jews. To the present day it is the confession of faith which every Jew breathes upon his death-bed. It is said of Rabbi Akiba, who suffered the martyr's death, that he breathed out at the last the word "One" in reference to the belief in the Unity of God as contained in the *Shema‘* (*Ber.*, 61*b*). A few instances may be given from Jewish literature in order to show the great importance of and honour attaching to the *Shema‘*: "They cool the flames of Gehinnom for him who reads the *Shema‘*" (*Ber.*, 15*b*); "Whoever reads the *Shema‘* upon his couch is as one that defends himself with a two-edged sword" (*Meg.*, 3*a*); it is said in *Ber.*, i. § 2, that to him who goes on reading the *Shema‘* after the prescribed time no harm will come; in *Suk.*, 42*a*, it is commanded that a father must teach his son to read the *Shema‘* as soon as he begins to speak. The very parchment on which the *Shema‘* is written is efficacious in keeping demons at a distance.—The single personality of God is frequently insisted upon in the O.T., Targums, and later Jewish literature; in the latter this fundamental article was sometimes believed to be impugned by Christian teaching concerning God, and we therefore find passages in which this latter is combated (see, on this, Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, p. 155); in the Targums all anthropomorphisms are avoided, since they were considered derogatory to the Divine Personality. We must suppose that it was owing to this intense jealousy wherewith the doctrine of the Unity of God was guarded that in the passage before us there are no qualifying words regarding the Godhead of Christ; when St. Paul (1 Cor. viii. 6) enunciates the same doctrine, ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, he is careful to add, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Such an addition might well have been expected in the verse before us; its omission must perhaps be accounted for owing to the very pronounced Judaistic character of the writer.—καλῶς ποιεῖς: it is impossible to believe that there is anything ironical about these words; as far as it went this belief was absolutely right; the context, which is sometimes interpreted as showing the irony of these words, only emphasises the inadequacy of the belief by itself.—τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν: one is, of course, reminded of the passage, Luke viii. 26 ff. (= Matt. viii. 28 ff.), already alluded to above: δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς, or, more graphically, in the parallel passage, ἔκραξαν λέγοντες, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς; *cf.* Acts xix. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 18. On demons see the writer's article in Hastings' *D.C.G.*. i. 438 ff.—Mayor gives some interesting reminiscences of these words in other early Christian writings, *e.g.*, Justin, *Trypho*, 49, etc.—φρίσσουσιν: ἅπ. λέγ. in the N.T.; literally "to bristle," *cf.* Job iv. 35; the very materialistic ideas concerning evil spirits which is so characteristic of Jewish Demonology would account for an expression which is not, strictly speaking, applicable to immaterial beings. One of the classes of demons comprised the שעירים ("hairy ones"), in reference to these the word φρίσσουσιν would be extremely appropriate (see further, on Jewish beliefs concerning demons, the writer's articles in the *Expositor*, April, June, August, 1907).

Ver. 20. The words of this and the following verses, to the end of ver. 23, belong to the argument commenced by a supposed speaker—ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις—; it is all represented as being conducted by

ἐστιν; 21. Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ᵘ θυσιαστήριον; 22. βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις ᵛ συνήργει [1] τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν

u Gen. xxii. 9-12.
v Heb. xi. 17.

[1] συνεργει ℵ¹A, Ti., Treg., communicat *ff*.

one man addressing another, the second person singular being used; with the ὁρᾶτε of ver. 24 the writer of the Epistle again speaks in his own name, and, as it were, sums up the previous argument. —Θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι: "Dost thou desire to know," *i.e.*, by an incontrovertible fact; the writer then, like a skilful disputant, altogether demolishes the position of his adversary by presenting something which was on all hands regarded as axiomatic. As remarked above, the question of Abraham's faith was a subject which was one of the commonplaces of theological discussion in the Rabbinical schools as well as among Hellenistic-Jews; this is represented as having been forgotten, or at all events, as not having been taken into account, so that the adversary, on being confronted with this fact, must confess that his argument is refuted by something that he himself accepts. It is this which gives the point to ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ. For κενέ the Peshiṭtâ has חלשא "feeble," in its primary sense, but also "ignorant," which admirably expresses what the writer evidently intends. Both Mayor and Knowling speak of κενός as being equivalent to *Raca* (Matt. v. 22), but the two words are derived from different roots, the former from a Grk. root meaning "to be empty," the latter from a Hebr. one meaning "to spit" [see the writer's article in the *Expositor*, July, 1905, pp. 28 ff.]; κενός has nothing to do with *Raca*.—ἀργή: the reading νεκρά is strongly attested; the Corbey MS. makes a pun by reading "vacua," after having written "o homo vacue". Ἀργή is not so strong as νεκρά; *cf.* Matt. xii. 36, πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργόν.

Ver. 21. Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν: A stereotyped phrase in Jewish literature.—οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη: the writer is referring to the well-known Jewish doctrine of זכות (*Zecûth*), on this subject see Introduction IV., § 2.—ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ . . .: on this subject an example of Jewish haggadic treatment may be of interest: "When Abraham finally held the knife over his beloved son, Isaac seemed doomed, and the angels of heaven shed tears which fell upon Isaac's eyes, causing him blindness in later life. But their prayer was heard. The Lord sent Michael the archangel to tell Abraham not to sacrifice his son, and the dew of life was poured on Isaac to revive him. The ram to be offered in his place had stood there ready, prepared from the beginning of Creation (*Aboth*, v. 6). Abraham had given proof that he served God not only from fear, but also out of love, and the promise was given that, whenever the *'Akedah* [= the "binding," *i.e.*, of Isaac] chapter was read on New Year's day, on which occasion the ram's horn is always blown, the descendants of Abraham should be redeemed from the power of Satan, of sin, and of oppression, owing to the merit of him whose ashes lay before God as though he had been sacrificed and consumed," *Pesiḳ. R.*, § 40 (quoted in *Jewish Encycl.*, i. 87*a*). It is interesting to notice that even in the Talmud (*e.g.*, *Ta'anit*, 4*a*) the attempted sacrifice of Isaac is regarded also from a very different point of view, such words as those of Jer. xix. 5; Mic. vi. 7, being explained as referring to this event (see further *Proceedings of the Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, xxiv. pp. 235 ff.).

Ver. 22. βλέπεις . . .: as these words are the deduction drawn from what precedes, it is better to take them in the form of a statement, and not as interrogative.—ἡ πίστις συνήργει: this implies a certain modification, with regard to πίστις, of the earlier position taken up by the writer, for in ver. 21 he says: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works?" no mention being made of faith; while here faith is accorded an equal place with works; *cf.* Gal. v. 6, πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, concerning which words Lightfoot says that they "bridge over the gulf which seems to separate the language of St. Paul and St. James. Both assert a principle of practical energy, as opposed to a barren, inactive theory". On συνήργει see *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Gad., iv. 7, "But the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God . . ." (Charles).—καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη: it is obvious that "faith" is used here in the highest sense, not merely as an attitude of mind,

ἔργων [w]ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη,[1] 23. καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ [x]γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα· [y]ἐπίστευσεν δὲ[2] Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ,[3] καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην,[y] καὶ [z]φίλος[4] Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη. 24.

w Cf. 1 Thess. i. 3; John vi. 28, 29
x iv. 5, Gal. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 6.
y—y Quoted from Gen. xv. 6; cf. 1 Macc. ii. 52; Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iii. 6.
z 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8; cf. Wisd. vii. 27.

[1] ετελειωθη; Treg.
[2] Om. δε L, latt. (hab s).
[3] Domino ff.
[4] δουλος 69.

but as a God-given possession. It must, however, be further remarked that if the Judaism of the Jewish-Christian writer of this part of the Epistle had been somewhat less strong, the words under consideration would probably have been put a little differently; for according to the purely Christian idea of faith, works, while being an indispensable proof of its existence, could not be said to perfect it, any more than the preaching of the faith could be said to perfect the preacher's belief; though works are the result and outcome of faith, they belong, nevertheless, to a different category.

Ver. 23. There is some little looseness in the way the O.T. is used in these verses; in ver. 21 mention is made of the *work* of offering up Isaac, whereby, it is said (ver. 22), faith is perfected; then it goes straight on (ver. 23) to say that the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, "Abraham believed . . ."; this reads as though the quotation were intended to refer to the offering up of Isaac,—the proof of perfected faith; but as a matter of fact the quotation refers to Abraham's belief in Jehovah's promise to the effect that the seed of Abraham was to be as numerous as the stars of heaven. In the O.T., that is to say, there is no connection between the quotation from Gen. xv. 6 and the offering-up of Isaac. This manipulation of Scripture is strongly characteristic of Jewish methods of exegesis.—**ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ . . .**: the N.T. = Septuagint, which differs from the Hebrew in reading τῷ Θεῷ instead of τῷ κυρίῳ, and the passive ἐλογίσθη for the active. Faith, according to Jewish teaching, was a good deed which was bound to bring its reward; it was one of those things which *demanded* a reward; the phrase זכות אמונה ("the merit of faith, *i.e.*, "trustfulness") occurs in *Beresh. Rabba*, chap. 74, where it is parallel to זכות תורה ("the merit of [keeping] the Law"); merit, that is to say, is *acquired* by trusting God, just as merit is *acquired* by observing the precepts of the *Torah;* the man who has acquired sufficient merit is in a state of *Zecûth*, *i.e.*, in that state of righteousness, attained by good works, wherein he is in a position to *claim* his reward from God. Very pointed, in this connection, are the reiterated words of Christ in Matt. vi. 5, 16, "Verily, I say unto you, they have received their reward".—**φίλος θεοῦ**: *Cf.* 2 Chron. xx. 7; Isa. xli. 8; Dan. iii. 35 (Septuagint); in Sir. vi. 17 the Septuagint reads: ὁ φοβούμενος Κύριον εὐθύνει φιλίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι κατ' αὐτὸν οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλησίον αὐτοῦ; the Hebrew has: "For as He Himself is, so is His friend, and as is His name, so are his works" ("works" must refer, most likely, to the "friend," not to God); the Syriac runs: "They that fear God show genuine friendship, for as He Himself is, so are His friends, and as is His name, so are His works". In the *Book of Jubilees*, xix. 9, it says in reference to Abraham: "For he was found faithful (believing), and was written down upon the heavenly tablets as the friend of God"; this is repeated in xxx. 20, but from what is said in the next verse it is clear that all those who keep the covenant can be inscribed as "friends" upon these tablets. Deissmann (*Bibelstudien*, pp. 159 f.) points out that at the court of the Ptolemies φίλος was the title of honour of the highest of the royal officials. In *Wisd.* vii. 27 the "friends of God" is an expression for the "righteous". The phrase φίλος Θεοῦ, therefore, while in the first instance probably general in its application, became restricted, so that finally, as among the Arabs, "the friend of God," *Khalîl Allah*, or simply *El Khalîl*, became synonymous with Abraham. Irenæus, iv. 16, iv. 34, 4, refers to Abraham as "the friend of God," but he does not mention our Epistle; if a reference to this was intended it is the earliest trace of an acquaintance with it. See, further, an interesting note of Nestle's in the *Expository Times*, xv. pp. 46 f.; *cf.* Gen. xviii. 17 where the Septuagint

ὁρᾶτε ὅτι[1] ἐξ ἔργων [a]δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.[2] [a] 25. ὁμοίως[3] δὲ[4] καὶ [b]Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων [c]ἐδικαιώθη, [d]ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους[5] καὶ ἑτέρᾳ[6] ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα[7] [b]; 26. ὥσπερ γὰρ[8] τὸ σῶμα [e]χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν, οὕτως καὶ[9] ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων[10] [f]νεκρά ἐστιν.

III. 1. Μὴ πολλοὶ [a]διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες

a—a Heb. xi. 33.
b—b Josh. ii. 4, xv. 6, 17.
c 2 Macc. i. 10; Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Heb. xi. 31.
d *Cf.* Luke x. 38, and see 1 Kgs. viii. 46.
e ii. 10.
f ii. 17.
a *Cf.* i. 19; Matt. xxiii. 8; Rom. ii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. xi. 31; 1 Tim. i. 7.

[1] **τοινυν** KL, Oec.
[2] **μονον;** Treg.
[3] **ουτως** C, Pesh., Copt., Arm., Aeth.
[4] Om. C, *ff*, Pesh., Copt., Arm.
[5] **κατασκοπους** CKmgL, Pesh., Arm., exploratores ex XII. tribus filiorum israhel *ff*.
[6] Pr. per *ff*, pr. ex *s*.
[7] Pr. eos *ff*.
[8] Om. B, Pesh., Arm., Aeth., WH (placed in mg.), autem *ff*, Orig.
[9] Om. *ff*.
[10] Pr. **των** ACKLP, Thl., Oec., Tregmg.

reads, **οὐ μὴ κρύψω ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ,** which is quoted by Philo with **τοῦ φίλου μου** instead of **τοῦ π. μου.** In the MS., 69 **φίλος** in the verse before us is rendered **δοῦλος** (see critical note above).

Ver. 24. **ὁρᾶτε**: The argument between the two supposed disputants having been brought to a close, the writer addresses his hearers again, and sums up in his own words.—**μόνον**: the writer, by using this word, allows more importance to faith than he has yet done; there is not necessarily any inconsistency in this, the exigencies of argument on controversial topics sometimes require special stress to be laid on one point of view to the partial exclusion of another in order to balance the one-sided view of an opponent.

Ver. 25. **Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη**: It must probably have been the position already accorded to Rahab in Jewish tradition that induced the writer to cite an example like this. In *Mechilta*, 64*b*, it is said that the harlot Rahab asked for forgiveness of her sins from God, pleading on her own behalf the good works she had done in releasing the messengers. The attempts which have been made to explain away the force of **πόρνη** are futile.

Ver. 26. **πνεύματος**: Spitta's suggested reading, **κινήματος,** is very ingenious, but quite unnecessary; רוח is often used of "breath," and the Greek equivalent, **πνεῦμα,** is also used in the same way in the Septuagint.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-18 form a self-contained section; the subject dealt with is the bridling of the tongue, see above i. 19, 26, 27.

Ver. 1. **Μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε**: the Peshittâ reads: "Let there not be many teachers among you"; both the Greek version, which implies that the "teachers" belonged to the congregation of the faithful, as well as the Syriac, which implies that "teachers" from outside were welcomed,—*cf.* Pseud-Clem., *De Virginitate*, i. 11 . . . quod dicit Scriptura, "Ne multi inter vos sint doctores, fratres, neque omnes sitis prophetae . . ." (Resch., *op. cit.*, p. 186),—bear witness to what we know from other sources to have been the actual facts of the case. It is the greatest mistake to suppose that **διδάσκαλοι** here is equivalent to Rabbis in the technical sense. In the Jewish "Houses of Learning" (*i.e.*, the Synagogues, for these were not exclusively places of worship) whether in Palestine or in the Dispersion (but more so in the latter), there was very little restriction in the matter of teachers; almost anyone would be listened to who desired to be heard. We have an example of this in the case of our Lord Himself, who found no difficulty in entering into Synagogues and teaching (Matt. xii. 9 ff., xiii. 54; Mark i. 39; Luke vi. 14 ff., etc., etc.), although His presence there must have been very distasteful to the Jewish authorities, and although on some occasions the ordinary hearers altogether dissented from what He taught (*e.g.*, John vi. 59-66); the same is true of St. Peter, St. John, and above all of St. Paul. In the case of St. Paul (or his d sciples) we have an extremely interesting instance (preserved in the Babylonian Talmud, *Meg.*, 26*a*) of an attempt, a successful attempt, made on one occasion to stop his teaching; it is said

b ii. 10.
c—c i. 19; Sir. xiv. 1, xix. 16, xxv. 8, xxxvi. 18.
d Matt. xii. 37.
e i. 4.
f i. 26.
g Ps. xxxii. 9; xxxix. 9.

ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα.[1] 2. πολλὰ γὰρ[2] πταίομεν [b] ἅπαντες· [c] εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει,[3] [d] οὗτος[4] [e] τέλειος ἀνήρ,[c] δυνατὸς[5] [f] χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. 3. εἰ δὲ[6] τῶν ἵππων τοὺς [g] χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα[7] βάλλομεν εἰς[8] τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν,[9] καὶ ὅλον

[1] λημψομεθα KLP, curss., sumitis Vulg. (accipiemus *ff*).
[2] Autem *ff*. [3] Non erat *ff*. [4] Add erit *ff*.
[5] δυναμενος ℵ, curss., Cyr., Thl.; add τε C^vid^.
[6] ειδε γαρ ℵ (om. γαρ ℵ[3]); ιδε CP, curss., Syr^hk^, Arm., Sah., Thl.; הוא גיר Pesh.
[7] το στομα A, curss., Pesh., Syr^hk^, Arm.
[8] προς AKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] ημιν αυτους AC, curss., Treg^mg^; om. ημιν *ff*.

that the Synagogue of the Alexandrians (mentioned in Acts vi. 9), which was called "the Synagogue of those of Tarsus," *i.e.*, the followers of St. Paul, was bought up by a Tannaite ("teacher") and used for private purposes (see Bergmann, *Jüdische Apologetik im neutestamentl. Zeitalter*, p. 9). Like the Athenians (Acts xvii. 21), many inquiring Jews were always ready to hear some new thing, and welcomed into their houses of learning teachers of all kinds (*cf.* Acts xv. 24; 1 Tim. i. 6, 7). The following would not have been said unless there had been great danger of Jews being influenced by the doctrines condemned: "All Israelites have their part in the world to come, . . . but the following (Israelites) have no part therein,—he who denies that the Resurrection is a doctrine the foundation of which is in the Bible, he who denies the divine origin of the *Torah*, and (he who is) an Epicurean" (*Sanh.*, xi. 1; quoted by Bergmann, *op. cit.*, p. 9). The custom of Jews, and especially of Hellenistic Jews, of permitting teachers of various kinds to enter their Synagogues and expound their views, was not likely to have been abrogated when they became Christians, which was in itself a sign of greater liberal-mindedness. The διδάσκαλοι, therefore, in the verse before us, must, it is held, be interpreted in the sense of what has been said. The whole passage is exceedingly interesting as throwing detailed light upon the methods of controversy in these Diaspora Synagogues; feeling seems to have run high, as was natural, mutual abuse was evidently poured forth without stint, judging from the stern words of rebuke which the writer has to use (ver. 6). On the διδάσκαλοι in the early Church see Harnack, *Expansion* . . . i. pp. 416-461.—εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα: *Cf. Pirqe Aboth*, i. 18. "Whoso multiplies words occasions sin"; i. 12. "Abtalion said, Ye wise, be guarded in your words; perchance ye may incur the debt of exile, and be exiled to the place of evil waters; and the disciples that come after you may drink and die, and the Name of Heaven be profaned"; Taylor comments thus on these words: "Scholars must take heed to their doctrine, lest they pass over into the realm of heresy, and inoculate their disciples with deadly error. The penalty of untruth is untruth, to imbibe which is death". λημψόμεθα: the writer does not often associate himself with his hearers as he does here; the first person plural is only rarely found in the Epistle (*cf.* πταίομεν in the next verse).

Ver. 2. πταίομεν: see note above on this word ii. 10.—εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει: *Cf.* Sir. xix. 16, τίς οὐχ ἥμαρτεν ἐν τῇ γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ;—τέλειος: see note on i. 4.—ἀνήρ: see note on i. 12.—χαλιναγωγῆσαι: see note on i. 26.—καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα: it is quite possible that these words are meant literally; the exaggerated gesticulation of an Oriental in the excitement of debate is proverbial; that the reference here is to even more than this is also quite within the bounds of possibility, *cf.* John xviii. 22; Acts xxiii. 2, 3.

Ver. 3. εἰ δὲ: this is the best attested reading, but see Mayor's admirable note in favour of the reading ἴδε γάρ.—τῶν ἵππων: "The genitive is here put in an emphatic place to mark the comparison. It belongs both to χαλινούς and to στόματα, probably more to the former as distinguishing it from the human bridle, so we have ἄχρι τῶν χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων, Apoc. xiv. 20, ἐπὶ

τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν μετάγομεν.[1] 4. ἰδοὺ[2] καὶ τὰ πλοῖα, τηλικαῦτα[3] ὄντα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν[4] ἐλαυνόμενα, μετάγεται ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου πηδαλίου [5]ὅπου[6] ἡ [7]ὁρμὴ[7] τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούλεται[8 5]. 5. οὕτως[9] καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν καὶ [10]μεγάλα αὐχεῖ.[10] ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον[11] πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει· 6. καὶ[12] ἡ γλῶσσα[13] πῦρ,[14] ὁ

h Acts xxvii. 40. i Acts xiv. 5. k Ps. xii. 3, 4; lxxiii. 8, 9; Sir. xxviii. 10. l Cf. i. 26; Prov. xvi. 27; Sir. viii. 8; cf. Prov. xii. 18, xv. 1, 2.

[1] μεταγομεν αυτων A, 13. [2] ειδε 24. [3] Pr. τα B.

[4] Pr. tam *ff*; σκληρων ανεμων AL, curss.

[5—5] Et ubicumque diriguntur volumptate eorum qui eas gubernant *ff*.

[6] Add αν ACKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., Treg^{mg}, rec.

[7] Om. η ορμη *s*. [8] βουληται ACKP; βουληθη 13.

[9] ωσαυτως A, 5. [10—10] μεγαλαυχει ℵC²KL, curss., Thl., Oec.

[11] ολιγον A¹C²KL, curss., Syrr., Sah., Copt., Arm., Aeth., pusillum *ff*.

[12] Om. ℵ¹. [13] Ti. punctuates thus: αναπτει η γλωσσα,.

[14] Weiss punctuates: πυρ.

τὸν χαλινὸν τοῦ ἵππου, Zech. xiv. 20. *Cf.* Ps. xxxii. 9" (Mayor). Knowling draws attention to Philo who "speaks of the easy way in which the horse, the most spirited of animals, is led when bridled, *De Mundi Opif.*, p. 19E".—καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα . . .: *Cf.* what was said in the preceding verse.

Ver. 4. τηλικαῦτα: *Cf.* 2 Cor. i. 10; Heb. ii. 3; Rev. xvi. 18, the only other N.T. passages in which the word occurs.—πηδαλίου: only elsewhere in N.T. in Acts xxvii. 40.—ὁρμή: only elsewhere in the N.T. in Acts xiv. 5, used there, however, in the sense of a rush of people. The graphic picture in this verse gives the impression that the writer gives the result of personal observation.

Ver. 5. ἡ γλῶσσα . . .: For this idea of the independent action of a member of the body taken as though personality were attached to it see Matt. v. 29, 30, xv. 19; it is quite in the Hebrew style, *cf.* in the O.T. the same thing in connection with anthropomorphic expressions. Moffatt (*Expository Times*, xiv. p. 568) draws attention to Plutarch's essay, *De Garrulitate*, 10, where the union of similar nautical and igneous metaphors (as in Jas. iii. 4-6) is found; "the moralist speaks first of speech as beyond control once it is uttered, like a ship which has broken loose from its anchorage. But in the following sentence, he comes nearer to the idea of James by quoting from a fragment of Euripides these lines :—

Μικροῦ γὰρ ἐκ λαμπτῆρος Ἰδαῖον λέπας
Πρήσειεν ἄν τις· καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρ' εἰπὼν ἕνα,
Πύθοιντ' ἂν ἀστοὶ πάντες."—

καὶ μεγάλα αὐχεῖ: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T.; the same would apply to the alternative reading (see critical note above) μεγαλαυχεῖ. In Sir. xlviii, 18 we have, καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Mayor most truly remarks: "There is no idea of vain boasting, the whole argument turns upon the reality of the power which the tongue possesses"; this fully bears out what has been implied above, that this section has for its object the attempt to pacify the bitterness which had arisen in certain Synagogues of the Diaspora owing to controversies aroused by the harangues of various "teachers".—ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει: at the risk of being charged with fancifulness the surmise may be permitted as to whether this picture was not suggested by the sight of an excited audience in some place of meeting; when an Eastern audience has been aroused to a high pitch, the noise of tongues, and gesticulation of the arms occasioned by the discussion following upon the oration which has been delivered, might most aptly be compared to a forest fire; the tongue of one speaker has set ablaze all the inflammable material which controversy brings into being. The possibility that the writer had something of this kind in his mind should not be altogether excluded.—ἀνάπτει occurs in the N.T. elsewhere only in Luke xii. 49; Taylor (quoted by Mayor) says: "On fires kindled by the tongue see Midr. Rabb. on Lev. (xiv. 2) xvi. where the words are almost the same as those in St. James, *quanta incendia lingua excitat!*"

Ver. 6. See critical note above for suggested differences in punctuation.—

κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας,[1] ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, ἡ[2] ᵐ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν ⁿ τροχὸν τῆς γενέ-

m Matt. xv. 11, 18, 19; cf. xii. 36, 37; Jude 23.
n Ps. lxxvii. 18 (Heb.); Eccles. xii. 6.

[1] Add ουτως P, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.; add ουτως και L, 106. [2] και ℵ[1], Ti.

καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ: this metaphor was familiar to Jews, see Prov. xvi. 27, . . . *And in his lips there is as a scorching fire;* the whole of the passage Sir. xxviii. 8-12 is very *à propos*, especially ver. 11, ἔρις κατασπευδομένη ἐκκαίει πῦρ, καὶ μάχη κατασπεύδουσα ἐκχέει αἷμα. Knowling refers to *Psalms of Sol.* xii. 2-4, where the same metaphor is graphically presented, but the reference is to slander, not to the fire engendered by public controversy; ver. 2 runs: "Very apt are the words of the tongue of a malicious man, like fire in a threshing-floor that burns up the straw" (the text in the second half of the verse is corrupt, but the general meaning is clear enough).—**καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας . . . τῆς γεέννης**: Carr has a very helpful note on this difficult verse, he says: "a consideration of the structure of the sentence, the poetical form in which the thoughts are cast, also throws light on the meaning. From this it appears that the first thought is resumed and expounded in the last two lines, while the centre doublet contains a parallelism in itself. The effect is that of an underground flame concealed for a while, then breaking out afresh. Thus φλογίζουσα and φλογιζομένη refer to πῦρ, and σπιλοῦσα to κόσμος, though grammatically these participles are in agreement with γλῶσσα."—**ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας**: This expression is an extremely difficult one, and a large variety of interpretations have been suggested; the real *crux* is, of course, the meaning of κόσμος. In this Epistle κόσμος is always used in a bad sense, i. 27, ii. 5, iv. 4. In the Septuagint ὁ κόσμος is several times the rendering of the Hebrew צבא, "host" (of heaven, *i.e.*, the stars, etc.), see Gen. ii. 1; Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3; there is no Hebrew word which corresponds to κόσμος, properly speaking; and it would therefore be no matter of surprise if a Jew with a knowledge of Hebrew should use κόσμος in a loose sense. In the N.T. αἰών is often used in the same sense as κόσμος, *e.g.*, Matt. xii. 32; Mark iv. 19; Eph. i. 21, of this world; here again it is mostly in an evil sense in which it is referred to, whether as αἰών or κόσμος. It is, therefore, possible that κόσμος might be used in the sense of αἰών, by a Jew, but as referring to a sphere not on this earth. Schegg (quoted by Mayor) interprets the phrase, "the sphere or domain of iniquity," and though this is not the natural meaning of κόσμος, this cannot be urged as an insuperable objection to his interpretation; we are dealing with the work of an Oriental, and a Jew, in an age long ago, and we must not therefore look for strict accuracy. If κόσμος may be regarded as being used in the sense of αἰών, which is applicable to this world or to the world to come, then Schegg's "domain of iniquity" might refer to a sphere in the next world. When it is further noticed that the tongue is called "fire," and that this fire has been kindled by ἡ γέεννα, the place of burning, it becomes possible to regard the words ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας as a symbolic expression of Gehenna (see further below, under τῆς γεέννης).—**καθίσταται**: "is set," *i.e.*, "is constituted". Mayor says: "It is opposed to ὑπάρχω, because it implies a sort of adaptation or development as contrasted with the natural or original state; to γίγνομαι, because it implies something of fixity".—**ἡ σπιλοῦσα**: σπίλος means a "stain," *cf.* Jude 23.—**φλογίζουσα**: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T., *cf.* Wisd. iii. 28.—**τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως**. "the wheel of nature," *i.e.*, the whole circle of innate passions; the meaning is that this wrong use of the tongue engenders jealousy, and faction, and every vile deed, *cf.* ver. 16. For the different interpretations of the phrase see Mayor.—**φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης**: In Jewish theology two ideas regarding the fate of the wicked hereafter existed, at one time, concurrently; according to the one, Hades (*Sheol*) was the place to which the spirits of all men, good as well as bad, went after death; at the resurrection, the good men arose and dwelt in glory, while the wicked remained in Sheol. According to a more developed belief, the place of the departed was not the same for the good and the bad; the former went to a place of rest, and awaited the final resurrection, while the latter went to a place of torment; after the

σεως[1] καὶ [o] φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς [p] γεέννης. 7. πᾶσα γὰρ[2] φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν ἑρπετῶν τε[3] καὶ ἐναλίων δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται[4] τῇ φύσει[5] τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, 8. τὴν δὲ[6] γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς[7] δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων[7]· ἀκατάστατον[8] κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ [q] θανατηφόρου. 9. ἐν αὐτῇ εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον[9] καὶ πατέρα, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς [r] καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ [r]

o Luke xvi 24.
p Matt. v. 22.
q Ps. cxl. 3; Eccles. x. 11; *cf.* Sir. xxviii. 17-23.
r—r Quoted from Gen. i. 27.

[1] Add ημων ℵ, 7, 25, 68, Vulg., Pesh., Aeth.; γεεννης Thl., Oec. [2] Autem *ff*.
[3] Om. A, curss., Arm. [4] Om. και δεδαμασται, Pesh.
[5] Add autem *ff*. [6] Om. *ff*.
[7] δυναται δαμ. ανθρ. ℵAKP, 69, 133, *a*, *c*, Treg^mg, Ti.; δυν. ανθρ. δαμ. L, curss., Arm., Copt., Thl., Oec.
[8] ακατασχετον CKL, curss., Pesh., Cyr., Dam., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] Θεον KL, curss., Vulg., Syr^hk, Epiph., Thl., Oec.

resurrection the good enter into eternal bliss, the wicked into eternal woe, but whether these latter continue in the same place in which they had hitherto been, or whether it is a different place of torment, is not clear. A realistic conception of the place of torment arose when the "Valley of Hinnom" (גֵי־הִנֹּם = ἡ γέεννα), was pointed out as the place in which the spirits of the wicked suffered; but very soon this conception became spiritualised, and there arose the belief that the Valley of Hinnom was only the *type* of what actually existed in the next world. The fire which burned in the Valley of Hinnom was likewise transferred to the next world; hence the phrases: γέεννα τοῦ πυρός, κάμινος τοῦ πυρός, etc. *Cf.* iv. Esdr. vii. 36; Rev. ix. 1, etc.

Vv. 7, 8. These verses, are, of course, not to be taken literally; their exaggerative character rather reminds one of the orator carried away by his subject. But it must be remembered that to the Oriental the language of exaggeration is quite normal. Moreover, this enumeration of various classes of animals was familiar from the O.T., and would be uttered as stereotyped phrases often are, it being well understood that the words are not to be taken *au pied de la lettre*; *e.g.*, a very familiar passage from the *Torah* runs: καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ φόβος ἔσται ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης (Gen. ix. 2); and one who shows so much familiarity with the Wisdom literature would be well acquainted with what tradition had imputed to Solomon: ἐλάλησε περὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἑρπετῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν ἰχθύων (1 Kings iv. 33), *cf.* Gen. i. 26 (i. 27 is quoted in the next verse); Deut. iv. 17, 18; Acts x. 12.

Ver. 9. ἐν αὐτῇ: this is Hebrew usage, *cf.* εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ, Luke xxii. 49; ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, Rev. vi. 8.—εὐλογοῦμεν: this use is Hellenistic. Both in speaking and writing the Jews always added the words ברוך הוא ("Blessed [be] He") after the name of God; *cf.* Mark xiv. 61, where ὁ εὐλογητός is used in reference to God.—τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα: the reading Κύριον can scarcely be right; Θεόν is not, it is true, well attested (see critical note), but it is required on account of the καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ; neither the combination τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα nor τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα is in accordance with ordinary Jewish usage; the exact phrase does not occur in the Bible elsewhere, the nearest approach being Tobit xiii. 4, . . . καὶ Θεὸς αὐτὸς πατὴρ ἡμῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας. *Cf.* Isa. lxiii. 16, σὺ Κύριε πατὴρ ἡμῶν, and 1 Chron. xxix. 10, εὐλογητὸς εἶ, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, ὁ Πατὴρ ἡμῶν. Although the Jews frequently speak of God as "Father," it is usually in a different combination, probably the most usual being "Our Father" alone, or "Our Father and King"; in the great prayer called the "Shemôneh 'Esreh" ("Eighteen" [Nineteen] Blessings), which was formulated in its final form about the year 110 A.D., each of the forty-four petitions which it contains begins with the words: *Abinu Malkênu* * ("Our Father, our King").

* To be distinguished from the "Abinu Malkênu" prayer used in the penitential portion of the Jewish Liturgy.

s—s Cf. Sir. xxviii. 12. γεγονότας· 10. ˢἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα.ˢ οὐ χρή, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γενέσθαι. 11. μήτι ἡ πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ᵗὀπῆς βρύει τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρόν; 12. μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα; [1]οὔτε ἁλυκὸν γλυκὺ [1] ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ.

t Heb. xi. 38.

u Gal. vi. 4. v ii. 18.

13. Τίς [2] ᵘσοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; ᵛδειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς

[1]—[1] ουτως ουτε αλυκον γλυκυ C[2], latt., Pesh.; ουτως ουδεμια πηγη αλυκον και γλυκυ KL, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

[2] Om. K, curss.; pr. ει 7, curss.

Πατήρ is always used in reference to God in order to emphasise the divine love; and in the passage before us a contrast is undoubtedly implied between the love of the Father towards all His children, and the mutual hatred among these latter.—**καταρώμεθα**: this word shows that the special sin of the tongue which is here referred to is not slander or backbiting or lying, but personal abuse, such as results from loss of temper in heated controversy. *Cf.* Rom. xii. 13, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε, and see the very appropriate passage in the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Benj. vi. 5, ἡ ἀγαθὴ διάνοια οὐκ ἔχει δύο γλώσσας εὐλογίας καὶ κατάρας.—**τοὺς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ γεγονότας**: quoted, apparently from memory, from Gen. i. 26, where the Septuagint reads, κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν; the Hebrew דמות (ὁμοίωσις) is synonymous with צלם (εἰκών). The belief that men are made in the material likeness of God is taught both in Biblical and post-Biblical Jewish literature; philosophers like Philo would naturally seek to modify this. An interesting passage which reminds one of this verse is quoted by Knowling from *Bereshith*, R. xxiv., Rabbi Akiba (born in the middle of the first century A.D.), in commenting on Gen. ix. 6, said: "Whoso sheddeth blood, it is reckoned to him as if he diminished *the likeness*"; then referring presently to Lev. xix. 18 (*Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*), he continues, "Do not say: 'after that I am despised, let my neighbour also be despised'. R. Tanchuma said, 'If you do so, understand that you despise him of whom it was written, *in the likeness of God made He him*'." The lesson is that he who curses him who was made in the image of God implicitly curses the prototype as well

Ver. 10. **ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος**: This incongruity is often rebuked in Jewish literature; it was the more needed because in earlier days it was not regarded as reprehensible, *cf.* Prov. xi. 26, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 2, xxx. 10, etc.—**εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα**: this does not imply a combination of blessing and cursing, as though such a combination were condemned, while either by itself were allowable (Mayor); it simply means that the mouth which blesses God when uttering prayer, curses men at some other times, *e.g.*, during embittered controversy.—**οὐ χρή**: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T.

Ver. 11. **μήτι ἡ πηγὴ . . . τὸ πικρόν**: these words show that the writer is thinking of the real source whence both good and evil words come; *cf.* Matt. xii. 34, 35: *Ye offspring of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh . . .*; *cf.* ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν below; βρύει does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or the Septuagint; and ὀπή is only found elsewhere in the N.T. in Heb. xi. 38, *cf.* Exod. xxxiii. 22; πικρόν is only used here and in ver. 14 in the N.T.; *cf.* Sir. iv. 6, . . . καταρωμένου γάρ σε ἐν πικρίᾳ ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 12. With the whole verse *cf.* Matt. vii. 16, 17; for the use of ποιεῖν see Matt. iii. 10, πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπόν . . .; ἁλυκόν does not occur elsewhere in the N.T. or Septuagint, though in Num. iii. 12, Deut. iii. 17, etc., we have the phrase ἡ θάλασσα ἡ ἁλυκή = the Dead Sea. "There is great harshness in the construction μὴ δύναται ποιῆσαι; οὔτε ποιῆσαι. If the government of δύναται is continued, we ought to have ἤ for οὔτε followed by a question; otherwise we should have expected an entirely independent clause, reading ποιήσει for ποιῆσαι" (Mayor).

Ver. 13. **Τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν**: The writer's appeal

[w] ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν [x] πραΰτητι σοφίας. 14. [y] εἰ δὲ [1] [z] ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ [a] ἐριθείαν [2] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ [3] ὑμῶν,[y] μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε [4] [5] καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας.[5] 15. οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία [b] ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ἀλλὰ [6] [c] ἐπίγειος, [d] ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης· 16. ὅπου γὰρ [7] [e] ζῆλος καὶ [f] ἐριθεία,[8] ἐκεῖ [9] [g] ἀκαταστασία

w Gal. i. 13 *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12.
x i. 21.
y—y iii. 16; Eph. iv. 31; Rom. xiii. 13; Acts v. 17.
z 1 Cor. iii. 3.
a Gal. v. 20. b i. 17, iii. 17. c *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. d 1 Cor. ii. 14. e Acts v. 13; Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Cor. iii. 3. f Gal. v. 20. g 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

[1] Add αρα AP, curss. [2] ερειθιαν B[1]; ερειθειαν A, εριθιαν 13, 101, WH.
[3] ταις καρδιαις ℵ, curss., Latt., Syrr., Copt., Arm. [4] κατακαυχασθε A, curss.
[5]—[5] της αληθ. και ψευδ. ℵ[1], Ti.; κατα της αληθ. και ψευδ. ℵ[3], Pesh.
[6] αλλ ACKLP. [7] Autem *ff*.
[8] εριθεια B[1]; ερειθεια B[2]; εριθια 13, 101, WH; ερεις C; ερις P.
[9] + και ℵA, curss., Weiss.

to the self-respect of his hearers. **σοφός** and **ἐπιστήμων** (the latter does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.) are connected in Deut. i. 13, where in reference to judges it is said, **δότε αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας σοφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστήμονας καὶ συνετούς**, *cf.* Deut. iv. 6; Isa. v. 21.—**ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 12. **ἀναστροφή** is literally a "turning back," but later connotes "manner of life". *Cf.* a quotation from an inscription from Pergamos (belonging to the second century B.C.) given by Deissmann, in which it is said concerning one of the royal officials: **ἐν πᾶσιν κα[ιροῖς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ἀδ]εῶς ἀναστρεφόμενος** (*op. cit.*, p. 83).—**ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας**: *cf.* with the whole of this verse Sir. iii. 17, 18, **Τέκνον, ἐν πρᾳΰτητι τὰ ἔργα σου διέξαγε, καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπου δεκτοῦ ἀγαπηθήσῃ. Ὅσῳ μέγας εἶ, τοσούτῳ ταπεινοῦ σεαυτόν, καὶ ἔναντι Κυρίου εὑρήσεις χάριν.** The pride of knowledge is always a subtle evil, *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1.

Ver. 14. **εἰ δὲ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν**: This makes it quite clear that what has been referred to all along is controversial strife; the bitter use of the tongue which the writer has been reprobating is the personal abuse which had been heaped upon one another by the partisans of rival schools of thought. **ζῆλον** is mostly used in a bad sense in the N.T., though the opposite is sometimes the case (*e.g.*, 2 Cor. xi. 2; Gal. i. 14); the intensity of feeling which had been aroused among those to whom the Epistle was addressed is seen by the words **ζῆλον πικρόν**, with the latter word in an emphatic position; they form a striking contrast to **πραΰτητι σοφίας**. The word **ἐριθείαν**, derived from **ἔριθος** "a hireling," means "party-spirit".—**μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε**: the malicious triumphing at the least point of vantage gained by one party was just the thing calculated to embitter the other side; this was a real "lying against the truth," because such petty triumphs are often gained at the expense of truth.

Ver. 15. **οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη**: The wisdom referred to,—acute argumentl subtle distinctions, clever controversia, methods which took small account of truth so long as a temporary point was gained, skilful dialectics, bitter sarcasms, the more enjoyed and triumphed in if the poisonous shaft came home and rankled in the breast of the opponent,—in short, all those tricks of the unscrupulous controversialist which are none the less contemptible for being clever,—this was wisdom of a certain kind; but, as expressed by the writer of the Epistle with such extraordinary accuracy, it was earthly (**ἐπίγειος**) as opposed to the wisdom which came down from above, it was human (**ψυχική**, *i.e.*, the domain wherein all that is essentially human holds sway) in that it pandered to self-esteem, and it was demoniacal (**δαιμονιώδης**) in that it raised up the "very devil" in the hearts of both opposer and opposed. Nowhere is the keen knowledge of human nature, which is so characteristic of the writer, more strikingly di-played than in these vv. 15, 16.

Ver. 16. **πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα**: this sums up the matter; *cf.* John iii. 20, **πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς**, and with this one might compare again the words in our Epistle, i. 17, **πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ . . . ἄνωθέν ἐστιν καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων.**

καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. 17. ἡ δὲ [h] ἄνωθεν [1] [i] σοφία πρῶτον μὲν [k] ἁγνή ἐστιν, ἔπειτα [l] εἰρηνική, [m] ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής,[2] μεστὴ [n] ἐλέους, καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, [o] ἀδιάκριτος, [p] ἀνυπόκριτος.[3] 18. [q] καρπὸς[4] δὲ δικαιοσύνης[5] ἐν [r] εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.

IV. 1. ΠΟΘΕΝ[6] [a] πόλεμοι καὶ πόθεν[7] μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν; οὐκ ἐντεῦ-

h i. 17. i 1 Cor. ii. 6, 7. k Cf. iv. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 11; Phil. v. 8; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 2; 1 Jn. iii. 3. l Heb. xii. 11. m Phil. iv. 5. n Gal. v. 22; cf. Luke vi. 36. o ii. 4; cf. 2 Cor. v. 16. p Rom. xii. 9. q Is. xxxii. 17; Am. vi. 12; Gal. vi. 8; Phil. i. 11; Heb. xii. 11. r Matt. v. 9. a 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9.

[1] Dei *ff*. [2] + Bonis consentiens Vulg. (om. Vulg^A^).
[3] Pr. και KL, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.; pr. inreprehensibilis *ff*.
[4] Pr. ο ℵ. [5] Pr. της K, Oec. [6] Pr. et *s*.
[7] Om. KL, curss., Vulg., rec.

Ver. 17. **ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία**: the divine character of wisdom is beautifully expressed in Wisd. vii. 25, ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως, καὶ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής.—**ἁγνή**: in Wisd. ix. 10, the prayer is uttered that God would send forth wisdom "out of the holy heavens . . ."; of that which is thus *holy* the first characteristic would be purity, the two ideas are inseparable; it is also possible that in the mind of the writer there was the thought of the contrast between purity and the sin which he knew some of his hearers to be guilty of (see above, the notes on i. 12 ff., iv. 3, 4).—**εἰρηνική**; only elsewhere in the N.T. in Heb. xii. 11; *cf.* Prov. iii. 17, where it is said of wisdom that "all her paths are peace". The word is evidently chosen to emphasise the *strife* referred to in an earlier verse.—**ἐπιεικής**: the word is meant as a contrast to unfair, unreasonable argument, *cf. Pss. of Sol.* v. 14.—**εὐπειθής**: this word, again, implies a contrast to the unbending attitude of self-centred controversialists; it does not occur elsewhere in the N.T.—**μεστὴ ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν**: the exact reverse of the cursing and bitterness of which some had already been convicted; in Wisd. vii. 22, 23, wisdom is spoken of as having a spirit which is: φιλάγαθον . . . φιλάνθρωπον.—**ἀδιάκριτος**: *Cf.* διακρίνομαι above (i. 6, ii. 4) which, as Mayor points out, makes it probable that we must understand the adjective here in the sense of "single-minded"; perhaps one might say that here it means almost "generous," in contrast to the unfair imputations which might be made in acrimonious discussion; the word occurs here only in the N.T.—**ἀνυπόκριτος**: *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 22; "genuine," as contrasted with the spurious "earthly" wisdom.

Ver. 18. The keynote of this verse is *peace*, as contrasted with the jealousy, faction and confusion mentioned above; peace and righteousness belong together, they are the result of true wisdom, the wisdom that is from above; on the other hand, strife and "every vile deed" belong together, and they are the result of the wisdom that is "earthly, ψυχική, demoniacal".

Chapter IV.—Vv. 1 ff. These verses reveal an appalling state of moral depravity in these *Diaspora* congregations; strife, self-indulgence, lust, murder, covetousness, adultery, envy, pride and slander are rife; the conception of the nature of prayer seems to have been altogether wrong among these people, and they appear to be given over wholly to a life of pleasure. It must have been terrible for the writer to contemplate such a sink of iniquity. On the assumption, therefore, of unity of authorship for this Epistle, it is absolutely incomprehensible how, in view of such an awful state of affairs, the writer could commence his Epistle with the words: "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold temptations". It is held by some that the writer is, in part, using figurative language; thus, Mayor and Knowling do not think that the adultery referred to is meant literally; but in view of the mention of the "pleasures that war in your members," and of the injunctions "Cleanse your hands," "Purify your hearts," it is difficult to believe that the writer is speaking figuratively. Is one to regard the words in ii. 11 ("For he that saith, Do not commit adultery, said also Do not kill . . .") as figurative also? And i. 14, 15? *Cf.* Acts xv. 20, 29. Moreover, it is one of

θεν, ἐκ τῶν [b] ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν [c] τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν [c]; 2. ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε[1]· [d] φονεύετε[2] καὶ [e] ζηλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν· μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε. οὐκ ἔχετε[3] διὰ τὸ μὴ

b iv. 3; Luke viii. 14; 2 Pet. ii. 13.
c—c Rom. vii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 11; cf. Rom. vi. 13.
d v. 6.
e 1 Cor. xii. 31.

[1] Habebitis *ff*. [2] φονευετε. και WH (altern. reading); φθονειτε και Erasmus. [3] και ουκ εχ. ℵP, curss., Latt., Syrr., Arm., Aeth., Thl., Oec., Ti.; add δε rec. [From here to end of Ep. C is wanting.]

the characteristics of the writer that he speaks straight to the point. It is true that in the O.T. adultery is sometimes used in a figurative sense, meaning unfaithfulness to Jahwe; but it is well to remember that such a use is quite exceptional; out of the thirty-one passages in which adultery is spoken of, in only five is a figurative sense found. In the N.T. there are only two possible cases of a figurative use apart from the verse before us (Matt. xii. 39 = xvi. 4, Mark viii. 38). The word "to commit fornication" (זנה) occurs oftener, in the O.T., in a figurative sense; but in comparison with the vastly larger instances of a literal sense, the former must be regarded as exceptional. But even granting that this particular word is figuratively used, there is still a terrible list of other sins, the meaning of which cannot be explained away; these are more than sufficient to bear witness to the truly awful moral condition of those to whom the Epistle is addressed. On the assumption of an early date for our Epistle, the low state of morals here depicted is extremely difficult to account for. In a community which had recently received and accepted the new faith, with its very high ideals, one would naturally look for some signs of new-born zeal, some conception of the meaning of Christianity, some reflex of the example of the Founder; religious strife, owing to a mistaken zeal, one can understand; isolated cases of moral delinquency are almost to be expected; but the collective wickedness of a new-born Christian community,—this would be quite incomprehensible; and it is clear from the verses before us that the writer is not singling out exceptions. In a second or third generation the community living among heathen surroundings might conceivably become so contaminated as to have lost its genuinely Christian character; with the lapse of years there is an inevitable tendency to deteriorate, until a new spirit of discipline is infused. It seems more in accordance with known facts, and with common-sense, to regard the people to whom this Epistle (or part of it) was addressed as those who had deteriorated from the high ideal set by their fathers and grandfathers, and to see in the writer one who sought to inspire a new sense of discipline and morals into the hearts of his Jewish-Christian brethren. — Vv. 1-10 form a self-contained whole, dealing with the general state of moral depravity in the community (presumably the writer has more particularly one community in view), and ending with a call to repentance. Vv. 11, 12 form another independent section, belonging in substance to ii. 1-13. Vv. 13-17 form again a separate section without any reference to what precedes or follows.

Ver. 1. **πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι**: the former refers to the permanent state of enmity, which every now and then breaks out into the latter; like war and battles. — **ἐν ὑμῖν**: comprehensive.— **ἐντεῦθεν**: lays special stress on the place of origin, which is seen in the following words: **ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν**: ἡδοναί is sometimes used of the lusts of the flesh, *e.g.*, in the *Letter of Aristeas* (Swete, *Intro. to O.T. in Greek*, p. 567), in answer to the question: "Why do not the majority of men take possession of virtue"? it is said: "Ὅτι φυσικῶς ἅπαντες ἀκρατεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς τρεπόμενοι γεγόνασιν. *Cf.* 4 Macc. vi. 35; Luke viii. 14; Tit. iii. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 13.—**τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν**: the same thought is found in 1 Pet. ii. 11, παρακαλῶ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, *cf.* Rom. vii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 7.

Vv. 2, 3. **ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε . . .**: It must be confessed that these verses are very difficult to understand; we have, on the one hand, lusting and coveting, murdering and fighting; and, on the other hand, praying. Murdering and fighting are the means used in order to obtain that which is coveted; yet in the same breath it is said that the reason why the coveted things are not

f Prov. i. 28.
g Rom. viii. 26; *cf.* 1 Jn. v. 14.
h Matt. vii. 7.
i Matt. xii. 39.
k Matt. vi. 24; Luke vi. 26; 1 Jn. ii. 15.
l Rom. viii. 7; Eph. ii. 15.
m—m Jn. xv. 19: xvii. 14; Gal. i. 10.
n ii. 23.

αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς· 3. [f] αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς [g] αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς [h] ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.[1] 4. [i] μοιχαλίδες,[2] οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ [k] κόσμου [3] [l] ἔχθρα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν[4]; [m] ὃς ἐὰν[5] οὖν[6] βουληθῇ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς[7] τοῦ Θεοῦ καθίσταται.[m] 5. ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ [n] γραφὴ λέγει· πρὸς φθόνον[8] ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ

[1] καταδαπανησητε ℵ[1]; δαπανησετε B, Weiss.
[2] Pr. μοιχοι και ℵ[3]KLP, curss.; μοιχοι Latt. (exc. *ff*), Pesh., Copt., Aeth., Arm.
[3] του κοσμου τουτου ℵ, 68, Vulg., Pesh., Arm., Aeth.
[4] εστιν τω Θεω ℵ, Copt., Ti.
[5] Om. ος ℵ; ος αν ℵ[3]AKL, curss., Thl., Oec., Treg.
[6] Om. L, curss.
[7] εχθρα ℵ[1], 7.
[8] λεγει προς φθ. A, curss., Arm.

obtained is because they are not asked for! Is it intended to be understood that this lust (in the sense, of course, of desiring) and covetousness are not gratified only because they had not been prayed for, or not properly prayed for? This is what the words mean as they stand; but can it ever be justifiable to pray for what is evil? There is something extraordinarily incongruous in the whole passage, which defies explanation if the words are to be taken in their obvious meaning. Only one thing seems clear, and that is a moral condition which is hopelessly chaotic.—Carr says that "these two verses are among the examples of poetical form in this Epistle"; perhaps this gives the key to the solution of the problem. It may be that we have in the whole of these verses 1-10 a string of quotations, not very skilfully strung together—a kind of "Stromateis"—taken from a variety of authorities, in order to make this protest against a disgraceful state of affairs more emphatic and authoritative.—**φονεύετε**: the reading φθονεῖτε cannot be entertained if any regard is to be paid to MS. authority; even if accepted it would not really simplify matters much.—**ζηλοῦτε**: refers rather to persons, ἐπιθυμεῖτε to things.

Ver. 3. **αἰτεῖτε . . . αἰτεῖσθε**: There does not seem to be any difference in meaning between the active and middle here: "If the middle is really the stronger word, we can understand its being brought in just where an effect of contrast can be secured, while in ordinary passages the active would carry as much weight as was needed" (Moulton, *op. cit.*, p. 160); *cf.* Mark vi. 22-25, x. 35-38; 1 John v. 15.—**δαπανήσητε**: *Cf.* Luke xv. 14, 30; Acts xxi. 24.

Ver. 4. **μοιχαλίδες**: the weight of evidence is strongly in favour of this reading as against μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες. The depraved state of morals to which the whole section bears witness must in part at least have been due to the wickedness and co-operation of the women, so that there is nothing strange in their being specifically mentioned in connection with that form of sin with which they would be more particularly associated.—**οὐκ οἴδατε . . . καθίσταται**: what seems to be in the mind of the writer is John xv. 18 ff. . . . εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμος ἂν οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος . . .—**καθίσταται**: "is constituted"; *cf.* the Vulgate *constituitur*.

Ver. 5. **ἡ γραφὴ λέγει πρὸς φθόνον . . .**: this attributing of personality to Scripture is paralleled, as Lightfoot points out (*Gal.* iii. 8), by the not uncommon Jewish formula of reference מה ראה "Quid vidit". According to Lightfoot the singular γραφὴ in the N.T. "always means a *particular passage* of Scripture; where the reference is clearly to the sacred writings as a whole, as in the expressions, 'searching the Scriptures,' 'learned in the Scriptures,' etc., the plural γραφαί is universally found, *e.g.*, Acts xvii. 11, xviii. 24, 28. . . . Ἡ γραφὴ is most frequently used in introducing a particular quotation, and in the very few instances where the quotation is not actually given, it is for the most part easy to fix the passage referred to. The biblical usage is followed also by the earliest fathers. The transition from the 'Scriptures' to the

[o]πνεῦμα ὃ [p]κατῴκισεν[1] ἐν ἡμῖν[2]; 6. μείζονα δὲ [q]δίδωσιν χάριν[q]· [3]διὸ λέγει· [q]ὁ Θεὸς[4] ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται,[5] ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.[q 3] 7. ὑποτάγητε οὖν[6] τῷ Θεῷ· ἀντίστητε δὲ[7]

o Gal. v. 17.
p *Cf.* Gen. vi. 5, viii. 21; Num. xi. 29.
q—q Quoted from Prov. iii. 34 (Sept.); *cf.* Matt. xiii. 12; Job xxii. 29; Ps. cxxxviii. 6; Prov. xxix. 23; Matt. xxiii. 12. Luke i. 52; 1 Pet. v. 5.

[1] κατωκησεν KLP, curss., Latt., Syrr., Copt., Thl., Oec., rec.
[2] ημιν, Ti., vobis *ff*. [3—3] Om. LP, curss. [4] Add κυριος 5, 16.
[5] αντιτασσετε B. [6] Om. ουν *ff*.
[7] Om. δε KLP, curss., Thl., Oec., rec.

'Scripture' is analogous to the transition from τὰ βιβλία to the 'Bible'" (*ibid.*, pp. 147 f.). In the present instance the "Scripture" is nowhere to be found in the O.T.; it is, however, reflected in some Pauline passages, Gal. v. 17, 21, and *cf.* Rom. viii. 6, 8; 1 Cor. iii. 16: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός (Gal. v. 17); τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν (1 Cor, iii. 16). It is difficult not to see a Pauline influence in our passage; and what is certainly noteworthy is the fact that the two *Agrapha* which the Epistle contains (i. 12 and the one before us) are both closely connected with St. Paul, i. 12 = 2 Tim. iv. 8; iv. 5 = Gal. v. 17. But that which is conclusive against the "Scripture" here referring to the O.T. is the fact that the doctrine of the Spirit is not found there in the developed form in which it is represented here; the pronounced personality of the Spirit as here used is never found in the O.T. The reference here must be to the N.T., and this is one of the many indications which point to the late date of our Epistle, or parts of it. As early a document as the Epistle of Polycarp (110 A.D.) refers once to the N.T. quotations as "Scripture"; and in the Epistle of Barnabas (about 98 A.D. according to Lightfoot, but regarded as later by most scholars) a N.T. quotation is prefaced by the formula "It is written".—πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ . . .: on this very difficult text see, for a variety of interpretations, Mayor's elaborate note; the best rendering seems to be that of the R.V. margin: "That Spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth for us even unto jealous envy". The words witness to the truth that the third Person of the Holy Trinity abides in our hearts striving to acquire the same love for Him on our part which He bears for us. It is a most striking passage which tells of the love of the Holy Spirit, as (in one sense) distinct from that of the Father or that of the Son; in connection with it should be read Rom. viii. 26-28; Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19.

Ver. 6. μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν: these words further emphasise the developed doctrine of the Spirit referred to above; they point to the nature of divine grace, which is almost illimitable. These verses, 5, 6, witness in a striking way to the Christian doctrine of grace, and herein breathe a different spirit from that found in most of the Epistle.—ὁ Θεὸς . . . χάριν: *Cf.* Sir. x. 7, 12, 18; *Pss. of Sol.* ii. 25, iv. 28; the quotation is also found in 1 Pet. v. 5; taken with the preceding it teaches the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Ephrem Syrus quotes this as a saying of Christ's (*Opp.* iii. 93 E., ed. Assemani; quoted by Resch, *op. cit.*, p. 199).

Ver. 7. ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ Θεῷ: *Cf.* Heb. xii. 9, οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν. It is not a question of subjection either to God or the devil, but rather one of the choice between self-will and God's will; it is the proud spirit that has to be curbed.—ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν: the two ideas contained in these words are very Jewish; in the first place, the withstanding of the devil is represented as being within the competence of *man;* the more specifically Christian way of putting the matter is best seen by comparing the words before us with the two following passages: Luke x. 17, Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ . . . λέγοντες· κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου. And the passage in 1 Pet. v. 6 ff. which is parallel to the one before us, is prefaced by the words, "Casting all your anxiety upon Him, because He careth for you," and followed by the words, "And the God of all grace . . . shall Himself perfect, stablish, strengthen you". The

r Eph. vi. 11, 12; 1 Pet. v. 8, 9.
s 2 Chron. xv. 2; Zech. i. 3; Luke xv. 30; cf. Lam. iii. 57.
t Isa. i. 16.
u Jer. iv. 14; 1 Pet. i. 22; 1 Jn. iii. 8.

τῷ [r] διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται [1] ἀφ' ὑμῶν· 8. [s] ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ,[2] καὶ ἐγγίσει [3] ὑμῖν. [t] καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ [u] ἁγνίσατε

[1] φευξετε B[1] (-ται B[2]).
[2] D(omi)no s Vulg[r]; ad dominum *ff*; add et ipse *ff*.
[3] εγγιει Treg., Ti.

difference between the Jewish and Christian doctrines of grace and free-will here cannot fail to be observed. It is useless to cite the words, "Be subject unto God," as indicating divine assistance in withstanding the devil, because the subject of thought in either passage is quite independent; the meaning is not that ability to withstand the devil is the result of being subject to God; but two courses of action are enjoined, in each of which man is represented as able to take the initiative.—In the second place, the representation of Satan (the devil) here is altogether Jewish; the Hebrew root from which "Satan" comes (שׂטן) means "to oppose," or "to act as an adversary"; the idea is very clearly brought out in Num. xxii. 22, where the noun is used: ***And the Angel of Jahwe placed himself in the way for an adversary*** (literally "for a Satan"). This is precisely the picture represented in the words before us; the ancient Hebrew idea of something in the way is to some extent present in the Greek **ὁ διάβολος,** from **διαβάλλω** "to throw across," *i.e.*, the pathway is impeded (*cf.* Eph. iv. 27, vi. 11). Jewish demonology was full of intensely materialistic conceptions; the presence of demons in various guise, or else invisible, was always feared; primarily it was bodily harm that they did; the idea of spiritual evil, as in the passage before us, was later, though both conceptions existed side by side. The words under consideration are possibly an inexact quotation from *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Naphth. viii. 4, "If ye work that which is good my children . . . and the devil shall flee from you". Knowling quotes an interesting parallel in Hermas, *Mand.*, xii. 5, 2, where in connection with the devil it is said, "If ye resist him he will be vanquished, and will flee from you disgraced".

Ver. 8. **ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν**: here, again, we have what to Christian ears sounds rather like a reversal of the order of things; we should expect the order to be that expressed in such words as, "Ye did not choose me, but I chose you" (John xv. 16). The words before us seem to be a quotation (inexact) from Hos. xii. 6 (Sept.), . . . **ἔγγιζε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου διὰ παντός.** The Hebrew phrase נִגַּשׁ אֶל־ is a technical term for approaching God for the purpose of worship, *e.g.*, Exod. xix. 22; Jer. xxx. 21; Ezek. xliv. 13. There is an extraordinary passage in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Dan. vi. 1, 2 which runs, "And now, fear the Lord, my children, and beware of Satan and his spirits. Draw near unto God and to the angel that intercedeth for you, for he is a mediator between God and man" (the latter part here is not a Christian interpolation). — **καθαρίσατε χεῖρας**: *Cf.* Ps. xxiv. 4, **ἀθῷος χερσὶ καὶ καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ** . . .; in Hos. i. 16 we have, **λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε,** and in Sir. xxxviii. 10, **ἀπόστησον πλημμελίαν καὶ εὔθυνον χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν.** In each case it is a metaphorical use of language which otherwise expressed the literal ritual washing; the former, taken from the latter, was in use at least as early as exilic times.—**ἁμαρτωλοί**: the close connection with this word and the **δίψυχοι** which follows almost immediately recalls the language in Sir. v. 9, . . . **οὕτως ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς ὁ δίγλωσσος.** —**ἁγνίσατε καρδίας**: the thought of these, as well as of the preceding words, is an adaptation of Ps. lxxii. (lxxiii.) 13, **Ἄρα ματαίως ἐδικαίωσα τὴν καρδίαν μου, καὶ ἐνιψάμην ἐν ἀθῴοις τὰς χεῖράς μου.** The verb **ἁγνίζω** (הִתְקַדֵּשׁ) means originally to sanctify oneself preparatory to appearing before the Lord by separating oneself from everything that might cause uncleanness; the idea of separating oneself is still present in the passage before us, because mourning implied temporary withdrawal from the world and its doings. Mayor quotes in connection with this verse, Hermas, *Mand.*, ix. 7, **καθάρισον τὴν καρδίαν σου ἀπὸ τῆς διψυχίας.**—**δίψυχοι**: *Cf.* Hos. x. 2,

καρδίας,[1] [v]δίψυχοι. 9. ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ [2] [w]πενθήσατε [3] καὶ [4] κλαύσατε [5]· ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω [6] καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς [x]κατήφειαν. 10. [y]ταπεινώθητε [7] ἐνώπιον Κυρίου [8] καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

11. Μὴ [z]καταλαλεῖτε [9] ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί· [9] [10] ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ [11] [a]κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον·

v i. 18.
w Matt. v. 4.
x Wisd. xvii. 4.
y 1 Pet. v. 6.
z 1 Pet. ii. 1; Eph. iv. 31.
a Matt. vii. 1.

[1] Add vestra *ff*. [2] Om. *ff*. [3] Miseri *ff*.
[4] Om. Ti. [5] Om. και κλαυσατε 15, curss., Pesh.
[6] μεταστραφητω ℵAKL, curss., Oec., Ti., Treg., WH (altern. reading).
[7] Add ουν ℵ, 56. [8] Pr. του D, curss., Weiss.
[9]—[9] αδελφοι μου αλληλων A, curss. [10] Frater. *ff*. [11] και KL, curss., rec. et *ff*.

and in addition to the passages referred to above, i. 8, *cf*. Barnabas xix. 5, οὐ μὴ διψυχήσῃς, πότερον ἔσται ἢ οὔ, and the identical words in Did. iv. 4.

Ver. 9. **ταλαιπωρήσατε**: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T. *cf*. Mic. ii. 4; Jer. iv. 13; "undergo hardship"; it was a recognised tenet in Jewish theology that self-inflicted punishment of any kind was a means of reconciliation, *e.g.*, in *Mechilta*, 76*a*, the words of Ps. lxxxix. 32 (33 in Heb.), *I will visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes*, are interpreted to mean that the pain suffered under liberal chastisement is one of the means of reconciliation with God; for instances of how chastisement has reconciled men to God, see *Baba mesia*, 84 *a b*.—**πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε**: these words are found together in 2 Esdras xviii. 9 (= Neh. viii. 9); and in Luke vi. 25 we have, οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε. Repentance (תשובה) was, according to Jewish teaching, also in itself another of the means of reconciliation.—**ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω**: μετατραπ. ἅπ. λεγ. in. N.T.; *cf*. Am. viii. 10, καὶ μεταστρέψω τὰς ἑορτὰς ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος.—**καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν**: *Cf*. Jer. xvi. 9; Prov. xiv. 13; the words express the contrast between the loud unseemly gaiety of the pleasure-seeker, and the subdued mien and downcast look of the penitent. κατήφειαν occurs only here in the N.T.; it is often found in Philo.

Ver 10. **ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον Κυρίου καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς**: *Cf*. Sir. ii. 17, οἱ φοβούμενοι Κύριον ἑτοιμάσουσι καρδίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ταπεινώσουσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν, and *cf*. iii. 18; in the *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jos. xviii. 1, we read, "If ye also, therefore, walk in the commandments of the Lord, my children, He will exalt you there (*i.e.*, on high), and will bless you with good things for ever and ever". Although the actual word is not mentioned in these vv. 7-10, it is obvious that they constitute a call to repentance. Both as establishing a proper relationship towards God, and as a means of bringing about that relationship, the need of repentance had always been greatly insisted on by Jewish teachers; in *Pirqe Aboth*, *e.g.*, iv. 15, it is said, "Repentance and good works are as a shield against punishment"; and Taylor quotes *Berachoth*, 17*a*, "It was a commonplace in the mouth of Raba that, The perfection of wisdom is repentance," *cf*. *Bereshith Rabba*, lxv.; *Nedarim*, 32*b*, etc., etc.

Vv. 11, 12. The subject of these verses, speaking against and judging others, is the same as that of the section ii. 1-13; they follow on quite naturally after vv. 12, 13 of that chapter, while they have nothing to do with the context in which they now stand. They constitute a weaving together of several quotations, much after the style of the section which precedes.

Ver. 11. **Μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί**, etc.: this speaking against one another must be taken together with the judging of one another; it is a question of deciding who is and who is not observing the *Torah*; some of the brethren were evidently arrogating to themselves the right of settling what did and what did not constitute obedience to the *Torah*, and those who, according to the idea of the former, were not keeping the *Torah*, were denounced and spoken against. Difficulties of this kind were bound to be constantly arising in a community of Jewish-Christians; if unnumbered differences of opinion with regard to legal observances was characteristic,

εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ[1] [b]ποιητὴς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτής. 12. εἷς ἐστιν [c]νομοθέτης[2] καὶ [d]κριτής,[3] ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ [e]ἀπολέσαι· σὺ δὲ[4] τίς εἶ, ὁ κρίνων[5] τὸν [f]πλησίον[6]; 13. [g]Ἄγε[7] νῦν οἱ λέγοντες· [h]σήμερον ἢ[8] αὔριον πορευσόμεθα[9] εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν καὶ [i]ποιήσομεν[10] ἐκεῖ[11] ἐνιαυτὸν[12] καὶ [k]ἐμπορευ-

b 1 Macc. ii. 67; Rom. ii. 13. c Is. xxxiii. 22. d Matt. vii. 1. e Matt. x. 28. f Rom. ii. 1, xiv. 4. g v. i. h Prov. xxvii. 1; Luke xii. 18-20. i Matt. xx. 12. k 2 Pet. ii. 3.

[1] ουκετι KP, curss. [2] Pr. ο ℵAKL, curss., Ti., Treg., WH mg.
[3] Om. και κριτης KL, curss., rec. [4] Om. δε Sah., Arm., Oec., rec.
[5] ος κρινεις KL, curss., rec.
[6] ετερον KL, curss., rec.; add οτι ουκ εν ανθρωπω αλλ εν Θεω τα διαβηματα ανθρωπου κατευθυνεται K, curss.
[7] Jam *ff*. [8] και AKLP, curss., Cyr., Thl., Oec., rec.
[9] πορευσωμεθα AKL, curss., Thl. [10] ποιησωμεν ℵAKL, curss., Treg.
[11] Om. A, 13, Cyr. [12] Add ενα AKL, curss., Syrr., Arm., Cyr., Thl., Oec., rec.

as we know it to have been, of Rabbinism, it was the most natural thing in the world for Jewish-Christians to differ upon the extent to which they held the *Torah* to be binding. The writer of the Epistle is finding fault on two counts; firstly, the fact of the brethren speaking against one another at all, and secondly, their presuming to decide what was and what was not *Torah*-observance.—**καταλαλεῖ νόμον καὶ κρίνει νόμον**: the reason why speaking against and judging a brother is equivalent to doing the same to the Law is because the Law has been misinterpreted and misapplied; the Law had, in fact, been maligned; it had been made out to be something that it was not. It is not a general principle, therefore, which is being laid down here, *viz.*: that speaking against a brother or judging a brother is always necessarily speaking against and judging the Law; these things are breaches of the Law, but not necessarily for that reason denunciation of it; the point here, as already remarked, is a maligning of the Law by making it out to be something that it was not. It is not a general principle, but a specific case, which is referred to here.—**εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς . . . κριτής**: here again it is a specific case which is referred to; as a general principle the statement would be contrary to fact, for it is possible to give a judgment upon the Law, in the sense of criticising it, or even to denounce it, and yet obey it; the Rabbis were constantly discussing and giving their judgments on points of the Law, and were nevertheless earnest observers of its precepts. When a man misinterpreted the Law, and then acted upon that misinterpretation, and denounced others who did not do likewise, then he was truly not a doer of the Law, but a judge,—and a very bad one too.

Ver. 12. **εἷς ἐστιν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής**: the words are intended to show the arrogant impertinence of those who were judging their neighbours on a misinterpretation of the Law. The word **νομοθέτης** does not occur elsewhere in the N.T., though **νομοθετέω** and **νομοθεσία** do; *cf.* Ps. xxvii. 11.—**ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι**: *Cf.* Matt. x. 28, **τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ**, and Luke vi. 9.—**σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον**: we find very similar words in Rom. xiv. 4, **σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην;** In *Pirqe Aboth*, i. 7, we read, "Judge every man in the scale of merit," *i.e.*, Give every man the benefit of the doubt (Taylor); *cf. Shabbath*, 127*b*, "He who thus judges others will thus himself be judged".

Vv. 13-17 form an independent section entirely unconnected with what precedes or follows. The section is very interesting as giving a picture of the commercial *Diaspora*-Jew. The Jews of the Dispersion had, from the outset, to give up agricultural pursuits; since for the most part they congregated in the cities it was commerce in which they engaged chiefly. A good instance of the *Diaspora*-Jew going from city to city occurs in Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii. 2-5 (160-185), though the period dealt with is far anterior to that of our Epistle. Egypt was, of course, the greatest centre of attraction, and many wealthy Jews were to be numbered among the large Jewish population of

σόμεθα[1] καὶ κερδήσομεν[2]· 14. οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε[3] τῆς [l]αὔριον[4]· ποία[5] ἡ[6] ζωὴ ὑμῶν[7]; ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε[8] ἡ[9] πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ[10] ἀφανιζομένη.[1] 15. ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς·

l—l i. 10; Job vii. 7; Ps. xxxix. 6, 12; cii. 3; Luke xii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 31.

[1] εμπορευσωμεθα KL, curss. [2] κερδησωμεν KL, curss. [3] επιστανται P, 68.

[4] το της αυρ. ℵKL, curss., Latt., Pesh., Sah., Copt., Thl., Oec., Treg., Ti.; τα της αυρ. AP, 7, 13, 69, 106, *a*, *c*, Syrhk, Tregmg, WH (altern. reading).

[5] Add γαρ ℵ³AKLP, curss., Tregmg (WH altern. reading); add autem *ff*.

[6] Om. B. [7] ημων 13, 69, Syrhk, Thl; *ff* runs on without the interrogative.

[8] Om. ατμις γαρ εστε ℵ; om. γαρ A, Vulg., Copt.; momentum enim est *ff*. Vulg., Copt., Thl. read εστιν; AKP, curss. read εσται.

[9] Om. η BP, WH.

[10] Pr. δε LP𝔐, curss.; δε Sah., Thl., Oec.; om. 36, 38, 69, Syrhk, Copt.

Alexandria; Philo speaks of Jewish ship-owners and merchants in this city (*In Flaccum*, viii.). When such Jews embraced Christianity there would be, obviously, no reason for them to give up their calling. It must, however, be confessed that both this section and the following read far more naturally as addressed to Jews than to Jewish-Christians.

Ver. 13.—**Ἄγε**: this expression of disapproval occurs only here and in v. 1 in the N.T.; although it is used here and there in the Septuagint, it is the rendering of different Hebrew words; one may compare, though it is not the equivalent of ἄγε, the Aramaic expression of disapproval וויא לכון ("Ah you!" literally "Woe unto you"). Ἄγε is used with either a singular or a plural subject, *cf.* Jud. xix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 24.—**σήμερον ἢ αὔριον πορευσόμεθα**: *Cf.* Prov. xxvii. 1, μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον, οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα. There is a Rabbinical saying, in *Sanhed.*, 100*b*, which runs: "Care not for the morrow, for ye know not what a day may bring forth. Perhaps he may not be [alive] on the morrow, and so have cared for a world that does not exist for him" (quoted by Edersheim, *Life and Times*, ii. 539); *cf.* Luke xii. 16 ff.; xiii. 32, 33.—**ἐμπορευσόμεθα**: 2 Pet. ii. 3 is the only other passage in the N.T. in which this word occurs; it means primarily "to travel," then to travel for the purpose of trading, and finally "to trade" simply.—**κερδήσομεν**: a rare form; "the Attic is κερδανῶ, with aorist ἐκέρδανα, Ion. and late Attic κερδήσομαι, aorist ἐκέρδησα; the latter occurs often in the N.T." (Mayor).

Ver. 14. **οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τὸ τῆς αὔριον**: "Ye are they that know not . . ."; it is the contrast between the ignorance of men, with the consequent incertitude of all that the morrow may bring forth, and the knowledge of God in accordance with Whose will (*cf.* ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ in the next verse) all things come to pass.—**ποία ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν**; "Of what kind is your life"? The reference here is not to the life of the wicked, but to the uncertainty of human life in general; the thought of the ungodly being cut off is, it is true, often expressed in the Bible, but that is not what is here referred to; it is evidently not conscious sin, but thoughtlessness which the writer is rebuking here.—**ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε**: the reading ἐστε, in preference to ἐστι or ἔσται, makes the address more personal; ἀτμὶς is often used for "smoke," *e.g.*, Acts ii. 17; *cf.* Ps. cii. 3 (4), ἐξέλιπον ὡσεὶ καπνὸς αἱ ἡμέραι μου; the word only occurs here in the N.T., in Acts ii. 19 it is a quotation from Joel ii. 30 (Sept.) iii. 3 (Heb.). In Job vii. 7 we have μνήσθητι ὅτι πνεῦμά μου ἡ ζωή, *cf.* Wisd. ii. 4; the rendering "breath" instead of "vapour" does not commend itself on account of the former being invisible, and the point of the words is that man does *appear* for a little time (πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη) and then disappears, *cf.* Wisd. xvi. 6.—**ἀφανιζομένη**: the word occurs, though in a different connection, in Sir. xlv. 26.

Ver. 15. **ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς**: "A classical writer would rather have said δέον λέγειν or οἵτινες βέλτιον ἂν εἶπον" (Mayor).—**ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ**: *Cf. Berachoth*, 17*a*, "It is revealed and known before Thee that our will is to do Thy will" (quoted by Taylor,

m Acts xviii. 21; cf. Dan. v 23. n Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2; 1 Jn. ii. 16.

ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος [m] θελήσῃ,[1] καὶ ζήσομεν[2] καὶ[3] ποιήσομεν[4] τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο.[5] 16. νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε[6] ἐν ταῖς [n] ἀλαζονίαις[7] ὑμῶν· πᾶσα[8] [o] καύχησις τοιαύτη πονηρά ἐστιν. 17. [p] εἰδότι οὖν[9] καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι,[10] ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ[11] ἐστιν.[p]

o 1 Cor. v. 6; cf. 2 Cor. vii. 4. p—p Luke xii. 47, 48; Jn. ix. 41, xv. 22; Rom. xiv. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 21; cf. Rom. i. 20, 21, 32, ii. 17, 18, 23; 1 Tim. i. 13.

[1] θελη BP, 69, *a*, *d*, Tregmg, WH.

[2] ζησωμεν KLב, curss., Cyr., Thl., Oec.; pr. si Vulg. (om. *s* VulgA).

[3] Om. Vulg., Pesh., Sah., Copt., Arm., Aeth, Cyr.

[4] ποιησωμεν KLב, curss., Thl., Oec.

[5] Totum comma deest *s*.

[6] κατακαυχασθε א, 7.

[7] αλαζονειαις B[3]K, Treg., Weiss; superbia *ff*.

[8] απασα א.

[9] Scientibus autem *ff*.

[10] Facientibus *ff*.

[11] Illis *ff*.

op. cit., p. 29); *cf.* John vii. 17, ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται . . . In the Hebrew commentary on a curious little work called *The Book of the Alphabet of Ben Sira* there occur the words אם בוחר שם, *i.e.*, "If the Name (= God) wills"; and it is said that this formula should never be omitted when a man is about to undertake anything. This passage occurs in the comment on the eleventh proverb of the "Alphabet," which runs: "The bride enters the bridal chamber and, nevertheless, knows not what will befall her". The formula, "If the Name wills," is, according to Ginsberg, of Mohammedan origin, "for the use of formulas was introduced to the Jews by the Mohammedans". The formula is, of course, not Ben Sira's, as it forms no part of the work ascribed to him; the commentary in which it occurs belongs to about the year 1000 probably (see *Jewish Encycl.*, ii. 678 f.). *Cf.*, further, Acts xviii. 21, τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος, 1 Cor. iv. 19, ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ; and in *Pirqe Aboth*, ii. 4 occur the words of Rabban Gamliel (middle of third century A.D.), "Do His will as if it were thy will, that He may do thy will as if it were His will. Annul thy will before His will, that He may annul the will of others before thy will" (Taylor).—καὶ ζήσομεν καὶ . . . both life and action depend upon God's will.

Ver. 16. νῦν δέ: "but now," *i.e.*, as things are; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 6, νῦν δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν ἔλθω . . .—καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονίαις ὑμῶν: those vauntings were, of course, not on account of following out their own will in despite of the divine will, but because of the thoughtlessness which did not take God's will into account, and therefore boasted of the ability of following one's own bent. Both are bad, but conscious opposition to the will of God would, of the two, be worse. Ἀλαζονίαις comes from ἀλαζών which is literally a "wanderer," then it comes to mean one who makes pretensions. *Cf.* Prov. xxvii. 1, μὴ καυχῶ τὰ εἰς αὔριον, οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα: the word occurs only here and in 1 John ii. 16 (ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου) in the N.T.—πᾶσα καύχησις τοιαύτη . . .: boasting of this kind must be evil because it forgets God, and unduly exalts self.

Ver. 17. Although this verse may be regarded as standing independent of what has preceded, and as being in the form of a more or less inexact quotation, it is quite permissible to take it with what has gone before. Those to whom the words have been addressed had, to some extent, erred through thoughtlessness; now that things have been made quite plain to them, they are in a position to know how to act; if, therefore, in spite of knowing now how to act aright, the proper course is neglected, then it is sinful. This seems to be the point of the words of this verse.—The words are perhaps an echo of Luke xii. 47, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ δαρήσεται πολλάς. With καλὸν ποιεῖν *cf.* Gal. vi. 9, τὸ δὲ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐνκακῶμεν.—ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστιν: for the converse of this, namely, doing what is wrong in ignorance—in which case it is excusable—see Acts iii. 17, "And now, brethren, I wot that in ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers"; 1 Tim. i 13, ". . . howbeit, I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief".—It is, however, quite possible that we have in these words the enunciation of the principle that sins of omission

V. 1. [a] ἌΓΕ νῦν οἱ [b] πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε [1] ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς

a iv. 13.
b Am. vi. 1; Prov. xi. 28; Luke vi. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 9.

[1] κλαυσονται 13.

are as sinful as those of commission; when our Lord says, "... these things ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone" (Matt. xxiii. 23), it is clear that the sins of omission are regarded as wilful sin equally with those of commission, *cf.* Matt. xxv. 41-45. There is always a tendency to reckon the things which are left undone as less serious than actually committed sin; this was certainly, though not wholly so, in Judaism. It is exceptional when we read, for example, in 1 Sam. xii. 23, "God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you"; as a rule sins of omission are regarded as venial, according to the Jewish doctrine, and are not punishable. The conception of sin according to Rabbinical ideas is well seen in what is called the *'Al Chêt* (*i.e.*, "For the sin," from the opening words of each sentence in the great *Widdui* ["Confession"] said on *Yom Kippur* ["the Day of Atonement"]); in the long list of sins here, mention is made only of committed sins. In the Jerusalem Talmud (*Yoma*, viii. 6) it is said that the Day of Atonement brings atonement, even without repentance, for sins of omission; in *Pesikta*, 7*b* the words in Zeph. i. 12. "I will search Jerusalem with candles, and I will punish the men ...," are commented on by saying, "not by daylight, nor with the torch, but with candles, so as not to detect venial sins," among these being, of course, included sins of omission. Although this is, in the main, the traditional teaching, there are some exceptions to be found, *e.g.*, *Shabbath*, 54*b*; "'Whosoever is in a position to prevent sins being committed by the members of his household, but refrains from doing so, becomes liable for their sins.' The same rule applies to the govenour of a town, or even of a whole country" (see *Jewish Encycl.*, xi. 378).

Having regard to the very Jewish character of our Epistle, it is quite possible that in the verse before us the reference is to this subject of sins of omission.

Chapter V.—Chap. V. contains five distinct sections; of great interest is the fact that the first two—1-6, 7-11—deal respectively with Jewish and Christian Eschatology; this subject will be dealt with presently; ver. 12 is a short section containing an adaptation of some words from the "Sermon on the Mount"; 13-18 deals with the subject of the visitation of the sick in the early Church; while vv. 19, 20 bring the Epistle to an abrupt termination with a very pronounced utterance upon the Jewish doctrine of works. Each of these sections is self-contained, and it would be impossible to have a clearer or more pointed illustration than this chapter offers of the "patchwork" character of our Epistle.

It will not be necessary, in dealing with the very large subject of Jewish Eschatology, to do more than indicate very briefly its connection with the section vv. 1-6 of this chapter; at the same time, a slight reference to its leading ideas is essential, as some of these are referred in this passage; one of these is the punishment about to overtake the wicked —who are often identified with the *rich* —in the "last days". Jewish Eschatology, or the "Doctrine of the last things," is based on the teaching of the O.T. prophets regarding the "Day of the Lord," or, as the phrase runs, "the last day," or "last time"; another formula which occurs frequently is "in those days". "By the time of the New Testament period Judaism was in possession of most, if not all, of its eschatological ideas. These had been developed during the two eventful centuries that immediately preceded the rise of Christianity. It was these centuries which saw the rise of the *Apocalyptic Movement* with its vast eschatological developments that were essentially bound up with the doctrine of a future life, and a belief in a judgment after death, with rewards and punishments" (Oesterley and Box, *op. cit.*, p. 211). The four outstanding subjects that the doctrine of the last things comprises are: (1) The signs of the approach of the "Messianic Era"—this latter took the place of the "Day of the Lord" in the development of eschatological thought, (2) the actual advent of the Messiah, together with the great events that should then come to pass, *viz.*, the ingathering of Israel and the resurrection of the dead; (3) The judgment upon the wicked; (4) The blessedness of the righteous (*Cf.* the writer's *The Doctrine of the Last Things*). In

c Rom. iii. 16.
d Matt. vi. 19, 20.

ᶜταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις.[1] 2. ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν ᵈσέ-

[1] Add υμιν ℵ, 5, 8, 25, Vulg., Pesh., Copt., Arm., Aeth.

the passage before us (vv. 1-6) three of the above are referred to, *viz.*, the Messianic Era; the punishment of the wicked, and (implicitly) the blessedness of the righteous. In ver. 3 the phrase **ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις** points indubitably to the times of the Messiah; the language is that of *Jewish* Eschatology based on prophetic teaching (*cf.* Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1; Hos. iii. 5; Joel iii. 1; Am. viii. 11, ix. 11; Zech. viii. 23). In vv. 1, 3 the punishment of the wicked is referred in the words, **κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις: . . . καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν . . . φάγεται τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ**; as illustrating this *cf. Book of Enoch* xcvi. 8, "Woe unto you mighty who violently oppress the righteous, for the day of your destruction will come; in that time many happy days will come for the righteous, then shall ye be condemned"; xciv. 7, 8, 9, "Woe to those that build their houses with sin . . .; and those who acquire gold and silver will perish in judgment suddenly. Woe to you, ye rich, for ye have trusted in your riches. . . . Ye have committed blasphemy and unrighteousness, and have become ready for the day of slaughter and the day of darkness and the day of the great judgment"; xcv. 7, "Woe to you sinners, for ye persecute the righteous . . .; xcvi, 4, "Woe unto you, ye sinners, for your riches make you appear like the righteous . . . and this word shall be a testimony against you"; many other similar quotations could be given, the striking resemblance in thought and language with our passage cannot fail to be observed; see further below, ver. 1. And lastly, in ver. 6, there is an implicit reference to the happiness of the righteous, in the words, **κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον· οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν**; that is to say, the righteous can afford to suffer such ill-treatment because he knows that the time of blessedness is coming for him; this is also frequently referred to in the Book of Enoch, *e.g.*, xcvi. 1, "Be hopeful, ye righteous; for suddenly will the sinners perish before you, and ye will have lordship over them according to your desires; 3, Wherefore, fear not, ye that suffer; for healing will be your portion". The non-mention in our passage of the actual advent of the Messiah by name was characteristic of Jewish usage at certain periods, and is significant here. On the other hand, the section comprising vv. 7-11 is wholly Christian; the utterly different tone and language of this, as compared with the section vv. 1-6, cannot be accounted for by saying that the one is addressed to the wicked, the other to the righteous; because in the latter there is a distinct reference to those who are in danger of being judged on account of murmuring against one another (ver. 9). But there are one or two points whereby the respectively Jewish and Christian form of Eschatology may be clearly discerned. (1) The language on which Jewish eschatological ideas are based is that of the prophets; the section vv. 1-6 is steeped in O.T. phraseology; on the other hand, the actual references to the Advent in vv. 7-11 are in N.T. language; the O.T. references in this section have nothing to do with the Advent. (2) It is characteristic of Jewish Eschatology that, generally speaking, there is indefiniteness as to when the Messianic Era will be inaugurated; it differs herein somewhat from the prophetical teaching, owing, as a matter of fact, to the rise of apocalyptic conceptions: on the other hand, the Christian, like the prophetical, view of the Advent is that it will take place in the very near future (". . . behold the judge standeth at the door"). (3) In Jewish pre-Christian eschatological literature the Messianic Era is frequently depicted without any reference to the personality of the Messiah; on the other hand, in the N.T., it is the rule that when the second Advent is referred to Christ is mentioned under the titles of the "Son of Man" or the "Lord" (*cf.* Matt. x. 23, xiii. 41, 42, xvi. 27, 28, xix. 28, xxv. 31-33, etc., Phil. iv. 5, **ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς**, 1 Cor. xvi. 22, **μαρὰν ἀθά**, and see *Didache*, x. 6, **εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἐστί, μετανοείτω· μαρὰν ἀθά. ἀμήν**). (4) Besides there being no reference to the personality of the Messiah in the Jewish eschatological section there is the further contrast between it and the Christian section that in the latter the distinctively Christian expression **ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου** twice occurs; against this the Jewish section

σηπεν, καὶ τὰ [e] ἱμάτια ὑμῶν [f] σητόβρωτα γέγονεν· 3. ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν [1] καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος [g] κατίωται,[1] καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν

e *Cf.* ii. 2.
f Bar. vi. 12; Job xiii. 28.
g Sir. xii. 11.

[1]—[1] κατιωται και ο αργυρος Aב, 13.

makes use of the distinctively Jewish title for God, the "Lord of Sabaoth".

It is thus difficult to resist the conclusion that we have here, in the section vv. 1-6, a passage which did not originally belong to the Epistle at all, but was taken or adapted from some Jewish eschatological work; it will be generally acknowledged that this section has absolutely nothing specifically Christian about it. That the writer (compiler?) should have incorporated this in his Epistle is quite natural, seeing that he was writing to Jews; equally as natural is it that he should, as a Christian writing to (Jewish-) Christians, add the developed Christian form of the same subject, interspersing it with O.T. references for the sake of his hearers [see further, *Bk. of Jubilees*, i. 29, v. 12, xxiii. 26-30; *Enoch*, x. 13, xvi. 1; *Ass. of Moses*, i. 18, x. 13; *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Reuben, vi. 8; *Apoc. Bar.* xxvii. 15, xxix. 8, lvi. 2; 4 *Esdr.* ix. 5].

Ver. 1. **Ἄγε νῦν**: See above iv. 13.—**κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις**: according to the original prophetic conception these "miseries" which were to overtake the wicked, were to come to pass in the "Day of the Lord," *i.e.*, during the Messianic Era; this belief became extended during the development of ideas which took place during the two centuries preceding the Christian Era. Whatever the reasons were which brought about the belief, it is certain that the expression "those days" came to be applied to a certain period which was immediately to *precede* the coming of the Messiah; without doubt a number of prophetical passages were regarded as suggesting this (see below). The descriptions given of these "days," which are to foretell the advent of the Messiah, belong to apocalyptic conceptions; in their general outline the "signs" of these times are identical. Prophetical passages such as the following laid the foundation: "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is laid up in store. The sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him . . ."; then, on the other hand, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death . . ." (Hos. xiii. 12-14); again, ". . . The day of thy watchmen, even thy visitation, is come; now shall be their perplexity. Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a guide . . . for the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother . . . a man's enemies are the men of his own house" (Mic. vii. 4-6); another characteristic which played a great part in the later apocalypse is contained in Joel ii. 10 ff., "the earth quaketh before them; the heavens tremble; the sun and the moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining. . . . *Cf.* Zech. xiv. 6 ff.; Dan. xii. 1, etc., etc. Throughout the immense domain of apocalyptic literature these themes are developed to an enormous extent; they are familiar to us from the Gospels, Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mark xiii. 14-27; Luke xxi. 9-19. In Jewish literature references to them also occur with frequency; this period is called the time of "travail," and more specifically, the "birth-pangs," or "sufferings" of the Messiah—*Cheble ha-Meshiach*, or *Cheblo shel Mashiach*, see *Pesikta rab.*, xxi. 34; *Shabbath*, 118*a*; *Sanhedrin*, 96*b*, 97*a*, etc., etc. See further Oesterley, *The Doctrine of the Last Things*, chap. vii. The great diffusion and immense popularity which the apocalyptic literature enjoyed makes it certain that the writer of our Epistle was familiar with the subject; the "miseries," therefore, referred to in the passage before us may quite possibly have reference to the sufferings which were to take place in the time of travail preceding the actual coming of the Messiah.—**ὀλολύζοντες**: only here in the N.T., but fairly frequent in the Septuagint, Isa. xiii. 6; Joel i. 5, 13; Jer. iv. 8, etc.; in the first of these passages the connection is the same as here, . . . ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου, and see Luke vi. 24, "Woe unto you rich . . .," which is strongly reminiscent of the verse before us.

Ver. 2. The use of the Hebraic prophetic perfects in this passage is another mark of Jewish authorship. **ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν**: this cannot refer to wealth in the abstract because this would be out of harmony with the rest of the verse which

ἔσται [1] καὶ φάγεται [2] τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς [3] [h] πῦρ.[4] [i] ἐθησαυρίσατε [5] ἐν [k] ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.[6] 4. ἰδοὺ [7] ὁ [l] μισθὸς [8] τῶν ἐργατῶν τῶν ἀμησάντων τὰς [m] χώρας ὑμῶν ὁ ἀφυστερημένος [9] ἀφ' ὑμῶν [10]

h Cf. Prov. xvi. 27.
i Rom. ii. 5; cf. Mic. vi. 10; Matt. vi. 19.
k Cf. v. 8, 9.
l Lev. xix. 13; Job xxiv. 10, 11; Jer. xxii. 13; Sir. iv. 1, xxxiv. 22.
m Cf. Luke xxi. 21.

[1] Om. *s*. [2] φαινετε ℵ[1]. [3] Pr. ο ιος APב, curss.
[4] Add ο Aeth., Thl. [5] Add vobis iram Vulg. (om. *s*, om. iram Vulg[F]).
[6] ημεραις εσχαταις A. [7] Pr. et *ff*. [8] Mercedes *ff*.
[9] απεστερημενος AB[3]P, curss.; αποστερημενος KL; quod abnegastis *ff*.
[10] Om. αφ υμων *ff*.

speaks of literal destruction; we have here precisely the same idea, as to actual destruction, as that which occurs in the eschatological passage *Enoch*, xcviii. 1 ff., where in reference to foolish men "in royalty, and in grandeur, and in power, and in silver and in gold, and in purple . . .," it says that "they will perish thereby together with their possessions and with all their glory and their splendour".—σέσηπεν: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T., *cf.* Sir. xiv. 19, πᾶν ἔργον σηπόμενον ἐκλείπει.—σητόβρωτα: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T., *cf.* Job xiii. 28, παλαιοῦται ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον σητόβρωτον; Sir. xlii. 13, ἀπὸ γὰρ ἱματίων ἐκπορεύεται σής. For the form of the word *cf.* σκωληκόβρωτος in Acts xii. 23.

Ver. 3. κατίωται: in Sir. xii. 11 we have καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τέλος κατίωσεν in reference to a mirror; the Hebrew, which is followed by the Syriac, is corrupt, but evidently read חלאה, which is the same word used in the preceding verse (ἰοῦται); the Hebrew word may perhaps be used in the sense of "filth" (see Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, s.v.), and possibly this more general term is what was originally intended in the verse before us, since gold cannot strictly be said to rust. The word occurs in one other passage *viz.*, in Sir., xxix. 10, but unfortunately the Hebrew for this is wanting. The force of the κατα is intensive.—ὁ ἰὸς: used in iii. 8 of the poison of the tongue, in a figurative sense; the meaning "rust" is secondary.—εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται: this metaphor is quite in the Hebrew style; עד (= μαρτύριον), though generally used of persons, is in a fair number of instances used of inanimate things in the O.T.; *cf.* in the N.T. Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5.—φάγεται: a Hellenistic form, unclassical, *cf.* Sir. xxxiii, 23 (Sept.) πᾶν βρῶμα φάγεται κοιλία, *cf.* xi. 19, xlv. 21 (Sept.).

—τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν: "The plural σάρκες is used for the fleshy parts of the body both in classical and later writers . . . while the singular σάρξ is used for the whole body" (Mayor); in the Septuagint we meet with a similar phrase in a number of cases, *e.g.*, Mic. iii. 3. . . . κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου; 2 Kings ix. 36; in these and other instances the Hebrew בשר (= σάρξ) is always in the singular (unlike "blood," which is often used in the plural).—ὡς πῦρ: this comparison must probably have been suggested by the fact that fire, in a literal sense, often figures in apocalyptic pictures, *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Enoch*, cii. 1, "And in those days when He brings a grievous fire upon you, whither will ye flee, and where will ye find deliverance?" xcviii. 3, where mention is made of "the furnace of fire," x. 13, "the abyss of fire"; this idea arose originally because "Gehenna" was conceived of as the place of torment, and a fire in the literal sense was constantly burning in the valley of Hinnom; the fire in the place of torment is referred to in Matt. xxv. 41 τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, Mark ix. 44 ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται, Jude 7 πυρὸς αἰωνίου . . . See Carr's interesting note on ὡς πῦρ. ἐθησαυρίσατε.—ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις: see prefatory note to this chapter.

Ver. 4. ἰδοὺ: this interjection, though good Attic, is used by some N.T. writers with a frequency which is unclassical, (Mayor) *e.g.*, in this short Epistle it occurs six times, while on the other hand St. Paul uses it only nine times (once in a quotation) in the whole of his writings; its frequent occurrence is a mark of Jewish authorship, as Jews were accustomed to the constant use of an equivalent interjection (הנה) in their own tongue.—ὁ μισθὸς τῶν ἐργατῶν: μισθὸς occurs several times in Sir. in the sense

κράζει,[1] καὶ αἱ [n] βοαὶ τῶν θερισάντων εἰς τὰ ὦτα Κυρίου [o] σαβαὼθ εἰσελήλυθαν.[2] 5. [p] ἐτρυφήσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ[3] [q] ἐσπαταλήσατε, [r] ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἐν[4] ἡμέρᾳ[5] [s] σφαγῆς.

n Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Is. v. 9; Job xxxi. 38-40; *cf.* Exod. ii. 23.
o Rom. ix. 29; Rev. xviii. 5.
p *Cf.* Job xxi. 13; Luke xvi. 19, 25; 2 Pet. ii. 13.
q Am. vi. 4 (Sept.); *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 6.
r Luke xxi. 34.
s Quoted from Jer. xii. 3; *cf.* 1 Sam. ix. 12, 13; Ezek. xxxiv. 3.

[1] Clamabunt *ff*.

[2] εισεληλυθασιν ℵKL, curss.; εισεληλυθεν A; εισεληλυθεισαν ב.

[3] Om. και A, 73, Copt. [4] ως εν ℵ[2]AKLב, curss. [5] ημεραις A.

of reward, but not in that of wages due; in the same book **ἐργάτης** occurs twice (xix. 1, xl. 18), but in neither case with the meaning "agricultural labourer," which is its usual meaning in the N.T., *cf.* Matt. ix. 37, but on the other hand Luke. x 7, **ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.**—**τῶν ἀμησάντων**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; whatever difference of meaning there may have been originally between **ἀμᾶν** and **θερίζειν** they are used as synonyms in the Septuagint, and the same is true, according to Mayor, of classical Greek.—**τὰς χώρας ὑμῶν**: often, as here, used in the restricted sense of "fields," *cf.* for the variety of meaning which it can bear the three instances of its occurrence in Sir. x. 16, xliii. 3, xlvii. 17; for its meaning of "fields," both in singular and plural, see Luke xii. 16, xxi. 21; John iv. 35.—**ὁ ἀφυστερημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν**: "which is kept back by you," "on your part," or as Mayor renders as an alternative, "comes too late *from* you"; the **ἀφ' ὑμῶν** is not really required, it is omitted by *ff*. The withholding of wages due was evidently a sin of frequent occurrence, see Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Job xxiv. 10; Mic. iii. 10; Jer. xxii. 13; Prov. iii. 27, 28; Mal. iii. 5; Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 22; Tob. iv. 14.—**ἀφυστ.** only here in N.T.—**κράζει**: a thoroughly Hebraic idea which occurs several times in the O.T., *cf.* for the "crying out" of inanimate things, Gen. iv. 10; Job xxiv. 12; Ps. lxxxiv. 2; Prov. viii. 1; Lam. ii. 18; Hab. ii. 11.—**αἱ βοαί**: only here in N.T., *cf.* Exod. xi. 23.—**εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαώθ**: quoted from Isa. v. 9; one of the many marks in this section, vv. 1-6, which suggest that it did not originally belong to the N.T.; it is certainly extraordinary that the usual Septuagint rendering, **Κύριος παντοκράτωρ** or **ὁ Κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων**, is not used here; though it is true **σαβαώθ** is sometimes transliterated, it is nevertheless exceptional. "Jahwe Sabaoth" was the ancient Israelite name of Jehovah as war-god.

Ver. 5. **ἐτρυφήσατε**: **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; it occurs in Sir. xiv. 4 for the Hebrew בָּרַע,* which means "to revel," followed by ב. Luther translates: Ihr habt wohlgelebet, "Ye have lived well"; but the German word "schwelgen" so exactly describes the Greek that one wonders why he did not adopt it; the English "to revel" comes nearest to it, and this is the R.V. rendering of the word in the Sir. passage referred to. **τρυφᾶν** with its compounds is used in a good as well as in a bad sense; for the former see Ps. xxxvii. 4, 11; Isa. lv. 2, lxvi. 11; Neh. ix. 25.—**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: the contrast is between their enjoyment of the good things of the earth and what their lot is to be hereafter; *cf.* Luke xvi. 25, "Remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art in anguish".—**ἐσπαταλήσατε**: only elsewhere in N.T. in 1 Tim. v. 6; it occurs in Ezek. xvi. 49 of the women of Jerusalem who are compared to those of Sodom; see also Sir. xxi. 15; the compound **κατασπ.** occurs in Am. vi. 4; Prov. xxix. 21; neither the word itself nor its compound is used in a good sense, expressing as it does the living of a life of wanton self-indulgence.—**ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν**: this use of **καρδία** is thoroughly Hebraic, לב being used in a very wide sense in Hebrew, *cf.* Ps. civ. 15, ". . . and bread

* This is not *biblical* Hebrew, which would be התענג (Isa. lxvi. 11), or התעדן (Neh. ix. 25); בָּרַע occurs in the Targums, but means there "to shout for joy".

6. καταδικάσατε,[1] ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον[2]· οὐκ [t] ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν.[3]

7. [u] Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν,[4] ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς [v] παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου. ἰδοὺ ὁ [w] γεωργὸς [x] ἐκδέχεται τὸν τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς

t Hos. i. 6 (Sept.).
u Luke xxi. 19; Heb. x. 36.
v 1 Thess. ii. 19.
w Matt. xxi. 33.
x Sir. vi. 19.

[1] Add et *ff*. [2] δικαιον. WH. [3] υμιν; WHmg. [4] Om. ουν *s*.

that strengtheneth man's heart" (לבב which does not differ from לב in meaning), *cf.* Jud. xix. 5.—ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς: there is something extremely significant in this quotation from Jer. xii. 3, because Jeremiah uses this expression (יום הרגה) as the day of judgment; and not only so, but this prophet had also coined a new word for Gehenna, *viz.*, "Geharĕgah" = "the valley of slaughter" (Jer. vii. 32. xix. 6). These expressions—"day of slaughter" and "valley of slaughter"—belong to Jeremiah (*Enoch*, xvi. 1 quotes the expression καὶ ἀπὸ ἡμέρας καιροῦ σφαγῆς), and in using the words "day of slaughter" the writer of our Epistle is undoubtedly giving them the meaning that they had originally; the passage before us probably means that these luxurious livers will be revelling in self-indulgence on the very day of judgment, *cf.* our Lord's words in Luke xvii. 27 ff., "They ate, they drank . . . and the flood came and destroyed them all . . . after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed". The tense ἐθρέψατε is in accordance with Hebrew usage of regarding a thing in the future as having already taken place; it is wholly in the prophetic style.

Ver. 6. κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον: this expresses what must often have taken place; the prophetical books often refer to like things; there is no reason for regarding this as some specific case of judicial murder. *Cf.* Am. ii. 6, 7, v. 12; Wisd. ii. 10 ff. The antithesis between the צדיק ("righteous") and רשע ("wicked") is a commonplace in Jewish theology.—οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν: the statement of fact here, instead of the interrogative as read by some authorities, is more natural, and more in accordance with the prophetical style which is so characteristic of this whole passage. This picture of patient acquiescence in ill-treatment is really a very vivid touch, for it shows, on the one hand, that the down-trodden realised the futility of resistance; on the other, that their hopes were centred on the time to come.

With the whole of this section *cf.* the words in *The first book of Clement, which is called The Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 12: "The harvest is come, that the guilty may be reaped and the Judge appear suddenly and confront them with their works".

Vv. 7-11. The section 7-11 is a Christian adaptation of the earlier Jewish conception of the Messianic Era; in place of αἱ ἔσχαται ἡμέραι there is ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου, the one a specifically Jewish, the other a specifically Christian expression; the two expressions, which represent, as it were, the titles of Jewish and Christian Eschatology respectively, are sufficient to show the difference of *venue* regarding these two sections. It is characteristic of one type of apocalyptic literature that the central figure of the Messiah is not mentioned, while another type lays great emphasis on the Messianic Personality; vv. 1-6 represents the former of these; that it contains no trace of Christian interpolation is the more remarkable in that it is utilised by a Jewish-Christian writer and is incorporated in Christian literature. The fact is additional evidence in favour of its being a quotation,—one of several which our Epistle contains. It is christianised by the addition to it of vv. 7-11, which, though interspersed with O.T. reminiscences, is specifically Christian. A similar christianising of Jewish material by adding to it is found, though on a much smaller scale, in Rev. xxii. 20, Ἀμήν ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ, which forms a response to the preceding ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ. Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (in *Encycl. Brit.*, art. "Midrash") discovered that the Hebrew equivalent of the words Ἀμὴν ἔρχου (= אמן בא) indicated acrostically a primitive hymn, which still appears in all the Jewish prayer books, and is known from its opening words as *'En Kelohenu* ("There is none like our God"; see Singer's *The Authorised Daily Prayer*

[y] μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ[1] ἕως[2] λάβῃ[3] [z] πρόϊμον[4] καὶ ὄψιμον.[5] 8. μακροθυμήσατε[6] καὶ ὑμεῖς, [a] στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ [b] παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικεν. 9. μὴ στενάζετε, ἀδελφοί,[7] κατ'

y Sir. xviii. 11; Luke viii. 15, xviii. 17.
z Deut. xi. 14; Job xxix. 23; Jer. v. 24; Joel ii. 23; Zech. x. 1.
a 1 Thess. ii. 16, iii. 13.
b Heb. x. 25; 1 Pet. iv. 7; *cf.* Rom. xiii. 11.

[1] αυτον KL, curss., Thl.; om. Vulg., Arm.

[2] Add αν ℵPב, 13, rec.; add ου curss.

[3] Add υετον AKLP, curss., Pesh., rec.; add καρπον ℵ[3] (καρπον τον ℵ[1]), Copt.

[4] πρωιμον B[3]KL, curss. [5] Add fructum *ff*. [6] Add ουν ℵL, 9.

[7] Add μου Aב, 13, pon post; αλληλων ℵL, Syrr., Thl., Oec., Ti.; om. K, 15, 16.

Book, p. 167). This hymn consists of five verses of four lines each; the first word of each line in the first verse begins with א, of the second verse with מ, of the third with נ, of the fourth with ב, and of the fifth with א, thus making a four-fold repetition of the formula אמן בא (= "Amen, Come"). This formula is the short title of the hymn referred to and "is actually written instead of the hymn in the place where it is to be used after the Additional Service for the New Year, and again towards the conclusion of the additional service for the eighth day of Solemn Assembly . . ., at the end of the Feast of Tabernacles" (Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 78 ff., and see Box in *Church and Synagogue*, iii., pp. 41 ff.). The formula "Amen Bo" belonged to Jewish Eschatology, and possibly took its origin from the phrase עולם הבא (= "The age to come," a common expression for the Messianic Era); it is christianised by the Jewish-Christian writer in the Apocalypse by the addition of κύριε Ἰησοῦ, just as in the passage before us the second, obviously Christian, section vv. 7-11, is added on to the former, quite as obviously Jewish, in order to make the whole Christian.

Ver. 7. **Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν**: the verb, as well as the adjective, is used both of God and man, *e.g.*, Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 6; it expresses the attitude of mind which is content to wait; when used of God it refers to His long-suffering towards men (*e.g.*, Sir. xviii. 11); it is possible that in the present connection this is also implied in view of ver. 9.—Perhaps οὖν was added in order to join it on to the preceding section; it is omitted by the OL MS. *s*.—**ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου**: see above, introductory words to this section. Παρουσία does not occur in the Septuagint, being (with τοῦ Κυρίου) specifically Christian; but with τοῦ Θεοῦ, instead of τοῦ Κυρίου, it occurs in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Jud. xxii. 2, ἕως παρουσίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς δικαιοσύνης (the words are omitted in the Armenian Version).—**ὁ γεωργός**: *Cf.* Sir. vi. 18; *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Issach. v. 3 ff.—**καρπόν**: used in the sense of "produce of the soil".—**ἕως λάβῃ**: the context shows that the subject must be "the earth," not "the fruit," for the simple reason that the fruit is not in existence when the "former" rains descend; the great importance of the "former" rains (called both יורה and מורה) was that they moistened the earth (commencing about the month of October) after it had been hardened by the blazing summer sun, and thus enabled it to receive the seed; without the "former" rains to moisten the earth one might as well sow seed on rocks. The subject might possibly be "the husbandman" as he may be said in a certain sense to receive the rain, but the most obvious subject, and that upon which the meaning of the verse most naturally depends, is the earth.—**πρόϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον**: *Cf.* Deut. xi. 14, and often, יורה ומלקוש.

Ver. 8. **στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας**: a Hebrew idiom, סעד לב; in the O.T. mostly of strengthening the body with food.—**ἡ παρουσία τοῦ Κυρίου ἤγγικεν**: see above; *cf.* Matt. iii. 2; Luke xxi. 28; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 John i. 18.

Ver. 9. **μὴ στενάζετε**: "A strengthened expression for μὴ καταλαλεῖτε iv. 11" (Carr); it refers to the inward feeling of grudge against another. The word shows that it is not only the righteous who are addressed in this section.—

ἀλλήλων ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε[1] · ἰδοὺ ὁ [c] κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν [d] θυρῶν[2] ἕστηκεν.[3] 10. [e] ὑπόδειγμα[4] λάβετε,[5] ἀδελφοί,[6] τῆς κακοπαθείας[7] καὶ τῆς [f] μακροθυμίας[8] τοὺς [g] προφήτας, οἳ [h] ἐλάλησαν ἐν[9] τῷ[10] ὀνόματι Κυρίου.[11] 11. ἰδοὺ [i] μακαρίζομεν τοὺς [k] [i] ὑπομείναντας[i] [12] · τὴν ὑπομονὴν [l] Ἰὼβ ἠκούσατε, καὶ τὸ τέλος[13] Κυρίου εἴδετε,[14] ὅτι [m] πολύσπλαγχνός[15] ἐστιν ὁ Κύριος[16] καὶ [n] οἰκτίρμων.[m] 12. Πρὸ πάντων δέ,[17] ἀδελφοί [o] μου,[18] μὴ ὀμνύετε, μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον · ἤτω δὲ[19] ὑμῶν τὸ

c 2 (4) Esdr. viii. 18; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 5; Rev. xxii. 12.
d Matt. xxiv. 33; Mark xiii. 29; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 5.
e John xiii. 15; Heb. iv. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 6.
f Col. i. 11.
g Matt. v. 12.
h 2 Pet. i. 21.
i—i Cf. Dan. xii. 12. See Matt. v. 10.
k Matt. x. 22; Col. i. 11.
l Job i. 21, 22, ii. 10.
m—m Ps. ciii. 8, cxi. 4; cf. Num. xiv. 18.
n Luke vi. 36.
o—o Matt. v. 34-37; cf. Mal. iii. 5; Heb. vi. 16.

[1] κατακριθητε ב. [2] Januam ff. [3] Stat ff. [4] Add δε ב.

[5] λαβετε . . . και της μακροθυμιας εχετε (lectio ex duabus confusa) ב; om. λαβετε A, 13, Aeth.

[6] Add μου ℵKL, 13, rec. [7] κακοπαθιας B¹P, WH; καλοκαγαθιας ℵ.

[8] Add εχετε ℵ³A, 13, Aeth. [9] Om. εν AKLב, curss.

[10] Om. τω ℵ, Chrys. [11] Pr. του ב.

[12] υπομενοντας KL ב, curss., Copt., Arm., Aeth., Thl., Oec., rec.

[13] ελεος 27, 29. [14] ιδετε AB³LP, curss. [15] πολυευσπλαγχνος curss., Thl.

[16] Om. ο Κυριος KL, curss.; om. ο B, WHmg, Weiss.

[17] ουν ℵ¹; om. K, curss. [18] Om. μου ב.

[19] Add ο λογος ℵ*, 8, Copt., Aeth.

ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἕστηκεν: *Cf.* Rev. iii. 20. For the idea of the Judge standing at the door see Matt. xxiv. 33, . . . γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις, xxv. 10 ff. (the parable of the Ten Virgins). In its origin the idea is antique; *cf.* the following from the Mishna (*Ab.* iv. 16): "This world is as if it were a vestibule to the future world; prepare thyself in the vestibule, that thou mayest enter the reception-room"; this saying is one of Jacob of Korsha's who lived in the second century A.D.—ἕστηκεν: for the tense see above.

Ver. 10. ὑπόδειγμα: *Cf.* Sir. xliv. 16 and especially John xiii. 15, ὑπόδ. ἔδωκα ὑμῖν . . . of our Lord.—τῆς κακοπαθείας: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T. *cf.* 4 Macc. ix. 8. It means "endurance" rather than the R.V. "suffering"; this goes better with μακροθυμίας, "patience". The rendering "endurance" has support from the papyri, see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelst.*, pp. 91 f.—ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι: although this use of the phrase is paralleled by its use in the papyri (see Deissmann, *Bibelst.*, pp. 143-5: *Neue Bibelst.*, pp. 25, 26), it is more probable that in this case it comes through the Septuagint from the Hebrew בשם; *cf.* above ii. 7.

Ver. 11. μακαρίζομεν: *Cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 13, used in reference to Daniel.—Ἰώβ: Job occupies a high place of honour in post-biblical Jewish literature, *cf.* the pseudepigraphic work "The Testament of Job".—τὸ τέλος Κυρίου: the final purpose of Jehovah with regard to Job; it could not refer to Christ, for the whole passage is dealing with O.T. examples.—πολύσπλαγχνος: ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T.—οἰκτίρμων: only elsewhere in N.T. in Luke vi. 36; *cf.* Sir. ii. 11 and often in the Septuagint.

Ver. 12. Πρὸ πάντων . . .: The most natural way of understanding these words would be to take them in connection with something that immediately preceded, but as there is not the remotest connection between this verse and the section that has gone just before, this is impossible here; the verse must be regarded as the fragment of some larger piece; it is not the only instance in this Epistle of a quotation which has been incorporated, only in this case the fragmentary character is more than usually evident. That it is not a quotation from the Gospel, as we now have it (Matt. v. 33-37), must be obvious, for if it were this, it would unquestionably approximate more closely

ᵒ ναὶ ναί, καὶ τὸ οὔ οὔ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν[1] πέσητε.ᵒ 13. ᵖ Κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν[2] ὑμῖν; προσευχέσθω· εὐθυμεῖ τις; ʳ ψαλλέτω. 14. ἀσθενεῖ[3] ᵍ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς ˢ πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας,[4] καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν[5] ᵗ ἀλείψαντες[6] ἐλαίῳ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ

p 2 Cor. i. 17, 18.
q Ps. l. 15.
r Rom. xv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.
s Acts xi. 30.
t Mark vi. 13; *cf.* xvi. 18.

[1] εις υποκρισιν KLPב, curss., rec. (ed. Steph.). [2] Ex *ff.*
[3] Pr. et *ff.* [4] Om. της εκκλησιας *ff.* [5] αυτους א[1].
[6] Add αυτον אAKL, curss., Treg.

to the original; on the other hand, its general similarity to the Gospel passage proves that there must be a relationship of some kind between the two. Probably both trace their origin to a saying of our Lord's which became modified in transmission, assuming various forms while retaining the essential point. An example of a similar kind can be seen by comparing together Matt. x. 26; Luke viii. 17 and the fourth of the New Oxyrhynchus Sayings: Λέγει Ἰησοῦς Πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἐγερθήσεται (Grenfell and Hunt's restoration). In any case the verse before us must originally have been preceded by a context which contained various precepts of which this was regarded as the most important, on account of the words πρὸ πάντων.—μὴ ὀμνύετε . . .: this was a precept enjoined by many of the more devout Jews; Pharisees avoided oaths as much as possible, the Essenes never swore; a very good pre-Christian example of the same precept is contained in Sir. xxiii. 9-11, Ὅρκῳ μὴ ἐθίσῃς τὸ στόμα σου, καὶ ὀνομασίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ συνεθισθῇς . . . ἀνὴρ πολύορκος πλησθήσεται ἀνομίας . . .—ἤτω: *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 22, the only other occurrence of this form in the N.T.

Ver. 13. κακοπαθεῖ: See note on v. 10; it refers perhaps rather to mental worry or distress, while ἀσθενεῖ refers to some specific bodily ailment.—εὐθυμεῖ; only found elsewhere in Acts xxvii. 22, 25 in the N.T.—ψαλλέτω: refers both to playing on a stringed instrument (Sir. ix. 4) and to singing (Eph. v. 19), and is also used of singing with the spirit (1 Cor. xiv. 15).

Ver. 14. ἀσθενεῖ . . . προσκαλεσάσθω, etc.: *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 14, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ Κυρίου δεηθήσονται, ἵνα εὐοδώσῃ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ ἴασιν χάριν ἐμβιώσεως. In regard to the practice of primitive Christianity in the matter of caring for the sick Harnack says: "Even from the fragments of our extant literature, although that literature was not written with any such intention, we can still recognise the careful attention paid to works of mercy. At the outset we meet with directions everywhere to care for sick people, 1 Thess. v. 14. . . . In the prayer of the Church, preserved in the first epistle of Clement, supplications are expressly offered for those who are sick in soul and body (1 Clem. lix., τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς ἴασαι . . . ἐξανάστησον τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, παρακάλεσον τοὺς ὀλιγοψυχοῦντας). . . . Epistle of Polycarp, vi. 1; Justin Martyr, lxvii. . . ."; he also quotes Lactantius, *Div. Inst.*, vi. 12: "Aegros quoque quibus defuerit qui adsistat, curandos fovendosque suscipere summae humanitatis et magnae operationis est" (*Expansion* . . . i. 147 f. first English ed.). A like care was characteristic of the Rabbis, who declared it to be a duty incumbent upon every Jew to visit and relieve the sick whether they were Jews or Gentiles (*Git.*, 61 *a*, *Soṭah*, 14 *a*); "the *Ḥaberim*, or *Ḥasidic* associations, made the performance of this duty a special obligation" (*Jewish Encycl.*, xi. 327).—τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας: both the words "presbyters" (= "priest") and "ecclesia" were taken over from the Jews, being the Greek equivalents for זקנים and קהל. While, however, the word πρεσβύτερος was, without question, in the Christian Church taken over from the זקן in the Jewish Church, it is well to recall the extended use which attached to it according to the evidence of the papyri. The phrase ὁ πρεσβύτερος τῆς κώμης occurs on a papyrus belonging to the time of the Ptolemies, and is evidently an official title of some kind; οἱ πρεσβύτεροι is found together with ἱερεῖς of an idola-

u *Cf.* Acts ix. 40, xxviii. 8, and see Matt. ix. 2.

Κυρίου.[1] 15. καὶ ἡ εὐχὴ[2] τῆς [u] πίστεως [v] σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος· κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ[3] [w] πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται[4]

v Matt. ix. 21, 22. w Is. xxxiii. 24; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20; *cf.* 1 Jn. v. 16.

[1] Om. του Κυριου BA, Orig., Treg^mg; ιυ χυ ℭ. WH place it in brackets.

[2] προσευχη P, curss. [3] ην ב. [4] αφεθησονται P, 7.

trous worship (c. 40 B.C.); and in the second century A.D. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι occurs in reference to "elders" of villages in Egypt. The Septuagint translators were therefore probably using in this case a word which had a well-known technical sense. Deissmann believes it possible, therefore, that the Christian congregations of Asia Minor got the title of πρεσβύτερος from the minor officials who were so called, and not necessarily from the Jewish prototype (*Op. cit.*, pp. 153 f.). This might well be the case in various centres, though not all (as for example, Babylonia), of the Diaspora, but not in Palestine. It is, of course, an open question as to whether our Epistle was written from Palestine or not; see, further, Deissmann (*Neue Bibelst.* pp. 60 ff.). As regards ἐκκλησία, Harnack remarks that "originally it was beyond question a collective term (*i.e.*, קהל); it was the most solemn expression of the Jews for their worship as a collective body, and as such it was taken over by the Christians. But ere long it was applied to the individual communities, and then again to the general meeting for worship. . . . Its acquisition rendered the capture of the term 'synagogue' a superfluity, and once the inner cleavage had taken place, the very neglect of the latter title served to distinguish Christians sharply from Judaism and its religious gatherings even in terminology. . . . Most important of all, however, was the fact that ἐκκλησία was conceived of, in the first instance, not simply as an earthly but as a heavenly and transcendental entity" (*op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff.); "קהל (usually rendered ἐκκλησία in LXX) denotes the community in relation to God, and consequently is more sacred than the profaner עדה (regularly translated by συναγωγή in the LXX). . . . Among the Jews ἐκκλησία lagged far behind συναγωγή in practical use, and this was all in favour of the Christians and their adoption of the term" (*ibid.*). In the verse before us it is the combination of these two terms, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας which points to a developed organisation among the communities of the Diaspora, and therefore to a late date for this part of the Epistle. —ἀλείψαντες ἐλαίῳ: a common Jewish usage, see Isa. i. 6; Mark vi. 13; Luke x. 34. As oil was believed to have the effect of curing bodily sickness, so it became customary to use it preparatory to Baptism, possibly with the idea of its healing, sacramentally, the disease of sin; that it was joined to Baptism as an integral part of the sacrament is certain. Prayer was, of course, an indispensable accompaniment.—ἐν ὀνόματι . . .: *Cf.* Mark xvi. 17; Luke x. 17; Acts iii. 6, 16, iv. 10, xvi. 18; and on the formula, the note above, ii. 17.

Ver. 15. ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως: *Cf.* Matt. xxi. 22.—σώσει: for this sense *cf.* Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 23; John xi. 12.—κάμνοντα: in this sense only here in the N.T., though it is used in a somewhat similar sense in Hebrew xii. 3. —ἐγερεῖ: it seems most natural to take this as referring to the sick man being raised up from his bed of sickness, though the use of κάμνειν in Heb. xii. 3 suggests the possibility of spiritual comfort being also included.—ὁ Κύριος: this must probably refer to Christ, though the O.T. reference in the context would justify the contention that Jahwe is meant.—κἂν: *Cf.* Mark xvi. 18; Luke xiii. 9, as showing that this does not necessarily mean "even if".—ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκὼς ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ: *Cf.* Sir. xxxviii. 9, 10, Τέκνον, ἐν ἀρρωστήματί σου μὴ παράβλεπε, ἀλλ' εὖξαι Κυρίῳ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἰάσεταί σε· ἀπόστησον πλημμελίαν καὶ εὔθυνον χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας καθάρισον καρδίαν; The Jewish belief on this subject may be illustrated by the following: in *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Simeon, ii. 11 ff., because Simeon continued wrathful against Reuben, he says, "But the Lord restrained me, and withheld from me the power of my hands; for my right hand was half withered for seven days"; in Gad. v. 9 ff. the patriarch confesses that owing to his hatred against Joseph God brought upon

αὐτῷ. 16. [x] ἐξομολογεῖσθε οὖν [1] ἀλλήλοις τὰς ἁμαρτίας,[2] καὶ προσεύχεσθε [3] ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων, ὅπως [y] ἰαθῆτε.[4] πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου [z] ἐνεργουμένη. 17. [a] Ἠλείας [5] ἄνθρωπος ἦν ὁμοιοπαθὴς ἡμῖν, καὶ προσευχῇ [b] προσηύξατο τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [c] ἐνιαυτοὺς τρεῖς καὶ μῆνας ἕξ· 18. καὶ [6] πάλιν [d] προσηύξατο, καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ὑετὸν ἔδωκεν [7] καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐβλάστησεν τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῆς.

x Sir. iv. 26. y Matt. xiii. 15; Luke iv. 18; Heb. xii. 13. z 2 Cor. i. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *cf.* Gen. xviii. 23-32; Jn. ix. 31; Acts viii. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 12. a 1 Kgs. xvii. 1, xviii. 1; Acts xiv. 15. b *Cf.* Sir. xlviii. 2, 3; Luke xxii. 15; Rev. xi. 6. c Luke iv. 25. d 1 Kgs. xviii. 42, 45; 2 (4) Esdr. vii. 39.

[1] Om. L, curss., *ff*, Arm., Aeth.; δε 107, Pesh.

[2] τα παραπτωματα KL, curss., Pesh., Orig., Thl., Oec.; add υμων L, 69, *a*, *c*, *ff*, Vulg., Syrr., Copt., Aeth.

[3] ευχεσθε ℵKLP, curss., Thl., Oec., Treg., Ti., WH (altern. reading).

[4] Ut remittatur vobis *ff*. [5] Ηλιας ℵAB³KLP, curss.

[6] Sed *ff*. [7] εδωκεν υετον A, 13, 73, Latt., Treg., Ti., WHmg.; εδ. τον υετ. ℵ.

him a disease of the liver, "and had not the prayers of Jacob my father succoured me, it had hardly failed but my spirit had departed". That sin brings disease was, likewise in the later Jewish literature, an article of faith, indeed here one finds specified what are the particular sicknesses that particular sins bring in their train. According to Rabbinical teaching there are four signs by means of which it is possible to recognise the sin of which a man has been guilty: dropsy is the sign that the sin of fornication has been committed, jaundice that of unquenchable hatred, poverty and humiliation that of pride, liver complaint (?) (אסכרה) that of back-biting. In *Shabbath*, 55 *a*, it says: "No death without sin, no chastisement without evil-doing," and in *Nedarim*, 41 *a* it says; "No recovery without forgiveness". Leprosy may be due to one of eleven sins, but most probably to that of an evil tongue (see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 245 f.).

Ver. 16. ἐξομολογεῖσθε . . . ἁμαρτίας: see critical note above. Confession of sins has always played an important part in Judaism; the O.T. word for confession of sins is תודה,* the later term, which denotes more particularly the liturgical form of confession, is וידוי. Private as well as public confession was enjoined, and many forms of confession, both general and particular, exist, among others one for the sick; it was the duty of the Rabbis to urge the sick person to confess his sins. Confession is regarded as a meritorious act: according to *Sanhedrin*, 103 *a*, it has the effect of enabling the worst sinners to inherit everlasting life (see, among other authorities, Hamburger's *Realencycl. des Judent*, article "Sündenbekenntniss".). For the custom of the early Church *cf.* *Didache*, iv. 14, xiv. 1.—προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων: the need of intercessory prayer is strongly emphasised in O.T., N.T. and the later Jewish literature, see above and the next note.—πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη: one is reminded of the well-known instance of Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai (end of first century, A.D.) who, when in need of the prayers of a righteous man on behalf of his sick child, said, "Although I am greater in learning than Chaninah, he is more efficacious in prayer; I am, indeed, the Prince, but he is the steward who has constant access to the King" (*Berachoth*, 34 *b*). A curious saying of Rabbi Isaac is contained in *Jebamoth*, 64 *a*: "The prayer of the righteous is comparable to a pitchfork; as the pitchfork changes the position of the wheat so the prayer changes the disposition of God from wrath to mercy" (quoted in *Jewish Encycl.*, x. 169). With δικαίου *cf.* δίκαιον in ver. 6. On ἐνεργουμένη see Mayor's elaborate note.

Ver. 17. Ἠλείας: Elijah plays an immense part in the later Jewish literature, see Hamburger, *op. cit.*, article "Elias". With his mention here *cf.* Sir. xlviii. 1 ff.—προσευχῇ προσηύξατο: Hebraism *cf.* Luke xxii. 15; John iii. 29, etc., etc.

Ver. 18. With this and the preceding

* This word is sometimes used as meaning *praise* given to God by the act of confession of sins, *cf.* Ryle, *Ezra* . . ., p. 132.

e—e Cf. Gal. vi. 1. f Matt. xviii. 15. g Ps. li. 13 (15 in Heb.); Mal. ii. 6; cf. Prov. xi. 30. h Rom. xi. 14; cf. xiii. 9. i Acts xxvii. 37. k Cf. Prov. x. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 8, and see Ps. xxxii. 1, lxxxv. 2; Rom. iv. 7.

19. [e] Ἀδελφοί μου,[1] ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς[2] ἀληθείας καὶ [f] ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτόν,[e] 20. γινώσκετε ὅτι[3] ὁ [g] ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ[4] [h] σώσει[5] [i6] ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου[6] καὶ [k] καλύψει[7] πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.[8]

[1] Om. L, curss., Did., Oec., rec. [2] Add οδου της ℵ, 5, Pesh., Copt.

[3] γινωσκετω οτι ℵAKLP, Treg., Ti., WHmg; om. ff, Sah.

[4] Om. ff. [5] Salvat ff, Orig.; salvavit Vulg[r].

[6—6] την ψυχην A, 73, Arm.; om. αυτου KL, curss., Sah., Orig., Thl., Oec., Treg.; pon αυτου post θαν. B, ff, Aeth., Weiss, WHmg.

[7] καλυπτει Vulg., Orig., Dam. [8] Peccati ff; add αμην 40.

Subscr. ιακωβου B; επιστολη ιακωβου ℵ; ιακωβου επιστολη A, 40, 67, 177; ιακωβου αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη P, 63; τελος του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου επιστολη καθολικη L; τελος της επιστολης του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου του αδελφοθεου 38; explicit epistola Jacobi filii Zaebedei ff; most MSS. have no subscr.

verse cf. *Ta'anith*, 24 *b*, where we are told of how Rabbi Chaninah, on being caught in a shower of rain, prayed: "Master of the Universe, the whole world is pleased, while Chaninah alone is annoyed"; then the rain immediately ceased. On arriving home he prayed: "Master of the Universe, shall all the world be grieved while Chaninah enjoys his comfort?" Whereupon the rain came down again (see *Jewish Encycl.*, vi. 215).

Ver. 19. **πλανηθῇ**: "The passive aorist is used with a middle force in classical writers, as well as in the LXX, Deut. xxxii. 1; Ps. cxix. 176; Ezek. xxxiv. 4" (Mayor).—**ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας**: *Cf.* Mark xii. 14, . . . ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις, this seems to be the way in which ἀλήθεια is here used, *cf.* John iii. 21, v. 33; viii. 32.—**ἐπιστρέψῃ**: excepting here (and in the next verse) and Luke i. 16, 17 this word is always used intransitively in the N.T. (*cf.* however Acts xxvi. 18).

Ver. 20. **γινώσκετε**: taking this as an indicative one may regard the words that follow as a quotation, a course which commends itself owing to the comparatively large number of quotations with which the Epistle abounds; at the same time it must be remembered that the weight of MS. evidence is in favour of γινωσκέτω.—**καλύψει . . .** (Hebrew כִּפֶּר) *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 8, one of the strongest of the many marks of Jewish authorship which the Epistle contains; according to Jewish doctrine good works balance evil ones; the good work of converting a sinner is reckoned here as one of the most efficacious in obliterating evil deeds; on the whole subject see Introduction IV., § 2.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE EXPOSITOR'S
GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC.

VOLUME V.

NEW YORK

DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY,

FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH STREET

1910

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER

BY THE REV.

J. H. A. HART, M.A.

II

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER

BY THE REV.

R. D. STRACHAN, M.A.

III

THE EPISTLES OF JOHN

BY THE REV.

DAVID SMITH, M.A., D.D.

IV

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE

BY THE REV.

J. B. MAYOR, LITT.D.

V

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE

BY THE REV.

JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.

NEW YORK

DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY,

FOURTH AVENUE AND 30TH STREET

1910

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL

OF

PETER

INTRODUCTION

In the case of this document a question preliminary to the ordinary heads of Introduction arises; the question of *the Unity of the Epistle.* For it contains *two* formal and solemn conclusions. The first[1] is "*That in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ to Whom belongs the glory and the victory to the ages of the ages. Amen;*" and the second,[2] "*Now the God of all grace, he who called you to his eternal glory in Christ, himself shall refit you after brief suffering, shall confirm you, shall strengthen you, shall establish you. His is the victory to the ages of the ages. Amen.*" The latter conclusion is followed by a postscript which ends with yet another formula of conclusion[3] "*Peace to you all who are in Christ*".

The address[4] at the head of the document stamps it as a circular letter or an encyclical epistle. The three conclusions divide it into three parts. Of these the last and shortest part may fairly be taken as a true postscript. The writer (we may suppose) takes the pen from the secretary, to whom he has been dictating, and appends a greeting in his own handwriting. St. Paul did the same thing in the Epistle to the Galatians.[5] In such a case the value of the postscript would be greater than in the case of a circular letter addressed to widely separated churches in different provinces or countries. The Galatian letter would naturally be preserved in the chest of the chief church of the province; and St. Paul's autograph would be prized as proof of the authenticity of the exemplar, copies of which were doubtless made and supplied as need and demand arose. But in this case also the autograph has a value of its own, inasmuch as it gives the credentials of the bearer, who presumably went from place to place and read it out to the assembled Christians, letting them see the postscript before he travelled on. So the third part of the letter may well be an integral portion of this encyclical.

But this postscript is preceded not by one conclusion but by two; and in this the document bears witness *against* its own unity. And

[1] iv. 11. [2] v. 10 f. [3] v. 14. [4] i. 1. [5] Gal. vi. 11-17.

further it is to be noted that the first conclusion is followed by a general form of address—"*Beloved*"—which has occurred at an earlier point.[1] In fact, apart from the formal superscription—X to Y greeting—the second part[2] of the Epistle is a complete epistle in itself. And it is natural enough that a circular letter, addressed to different communities, should contain alternative or additional letters, if the writer was aware that the conditions or circumstances were not identical in every case. The formal severance of the second part may, therefore, be taken as indicating that *all* the communities addressed were *not* necessarily in the condition, which that part implies.

1. *The Recipients.*—Eusebius of Cæsarea, whose Ecclesiastical History belongs to the beginning of the fourth century, is the earliest (extant) writer, who inquired systematically into the origins of the Christian literature. For him there is no question about the nationality of the first recipients of this document: they are *Hebrews* or Jewish Christians. He insists that the compact made between St. Peter and St. Paul at Jerusalem[3] was faithfully observed, as their respective writings and the evidence of St. Luke agree to testify: "That Paul, on the one hand, preached to those of Gentile origin and so laid the foundations of the churches from Jerusalem and round about as far as Illyricum is plain from his own statements and from the narratives, which Luke gives in the Acts. And, on the other hand, from the phrases of Peter it is clear in what provinces he for his part preached the Gospel of Christ to those of the Circumcision and delivered to them the message of the New Covenant—I mean, from his acknowledged epistle in which he writes *to those of Hebrew origin* in the dispersion of Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia and Asia and Bithynia.[4]

Just before this[5] plain statement Eusebius quotes verbally from Origen's exegetical commentary upon Genesis: "Peter seems to have preached in Pontus and Galatia and Bithynia, in Cappadocia and Asia *to the Jews in dispersion*". Origen's assertion rests presumably on the authority of the address of our document, although the order of the provinces differs in respect of Bithynia from the generally accepted text. When Eusebius speaks for himself he restores the conventional order of the provinces and explicitly quotes the authority of "the acknowledged Epistle". It does not seem at all probable that either Eusebius or Origen had any other evidence for their belief than such as is preserved for modern investigation. Both knew of

[1] ii. 11. [2] iv. 12-v. 11. [3] Gal. ii. 7-9.
[4] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 4. [5] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 1.

the compact, in virtue of which Peter was to continue his work among the Jews: both construed the direction of the Epistle as proof that the writer had preached the Gospel to his readers: therefore in virtue of the compact his readers were *Jews*—Jews of the Dispersion, but still Jews.

The evidence upon which both Eusebius and Origen seem to rely is extant; the deduction drawn—characteristic as it is of patristic exegesis—is not necessarily valid, and it is not supported by any pretence of independent tradition.

The compact to which James and Cephas and John, on the one side, and Paul and Barnabas, on the other, were consenting parties, cannot be held to prove these Christians to be Jewish Christians—even if it could be made out that St. Peter "the Apostle of the Circumcision," who writes to them, converted them to Christianity.

The appellation *of the Dispersion* is on the face of it a weightier argument, because *Dispersion* is a technical term and comprises in itself all the Jews who lived outside Palestine. Whatever its *provenance*, the term is Jewish through and through, for it insists upon the First Cause of all such scattering and upon the central shrine from which the exiles are removed. The mere Greek spoke and thought of exiles as fugitives and had a collective term φυγή to correspond with the Jewish διασπορά. But the Jewish word recognises that those dispersed are placed here and there—as exiles, traders, and what not?—by God. Jewish as it is, this appellation is capable of extension to the new Israel and does not necessarily imply that the persons addressed were born Jews. Ultimately and fundamentally it does not denote privilege like the term *Israel* but rather penalty—removal from the place which was traditionally associated with the visible presence of Jehovah. The writer may, perhaps, be taken to use it without a precise definition of a centre corresponding to the Holy Land of the Jew; but there is no valid ground for doubting that he could apply it to Gentiles, who were in the world and not of it by virtue of their faith in Christ. Situated as they were among unfriendly friends these *Gentile* churches are collectively the new Dispersion.

These *Gentile* Churches—for there is more than one passage in our document which seems to settle the point, apart from general probabilities to be derived from the traditions of St. Paul's missionary activity. In the first place, St. Peter [1] applies to his readers the words of Hosea [2]; ye who were once no People but now are God's People, who were not in a state of experiencing His mercy, but now have

[1] ii. 10. [2] See Hosea ii. 23.

come under its influence." At a definite time God had shown mercy to these Christians, who before—according to the strict Jewish point of view—had been outside the pale of His mercy. And, if we may argue from silence as from the tenses employed, they were formerly *not a people at all*, to say nothing of their being no people of God. In fact they were just *tribes* and *Gentiles*—not a λαός but just ἔθνη. It is true that Hosea was speaking of the children of Israel, who had apostatized, and of the final restoration, when all the dispersed should be gathered together. It is true, again, that St. Paul[1] uses the prophecy conformably with the apparent intention of the prophet; but he cites it more fully than St. Peter in connexion with the calling of the Gentiles.[2] The Christian Church is God's, Israel the heir of His promises; and—who knows?—the writer may have added the title *of the Dispersion* partly because it is written in the book of Hosea,[3] "and I will sow her unto myself upon the earth, and I will love her who was not beloved, and I will say to Not-my-people, Thou art my people and he shall say, Thou art the Lord my God". It is a great prophecy and a Jewish Christian would be slow to forget its first intention. No line of argument can exclude the possibility that *some* of the Christians, to whom his letter is addressed, were born Jews. And if he thought less of them and most of the aliens, who, perhaps, outnumbered them, at anyrate his own mind was Jewish and he spoke to his Jewish self, before he wrote or dictated his letter. It must have been a strange experience for a Jew to preach a Messiah, whom his Nation had rejected, to a motley collection of Gentile believers and to use such prophecies as this.

But whatever emotions the words stirred up within his heart they remained there. The thought of his countrymen does not shake him visibly as it shook St. Paul;[4] and from this self-repression one might conclude that the Jewish element in these churches was insignificant, or that the decree which severed him and them from the unbelieving Jews was already made absolute.

The probable significance of this use of Hosea's phrase is supported by the words, "*For ye were once wanderers like sheep but now ye have returned to the shepherd and overseer of your souls*".[5] It is, of course, possible to exaggerate the force of ἐπεστράφητε, *ye have returned*, as if it implied a previous association with God. But the word means no more than obedience to the invitation *Repent*, which Christian missionaries addressed to all the world; in the Septuagint it is used of Jewish *apostasy* without implying previous

[1] Rom. xi. 28-32. [2] Rom. ix. 24-26. [3] Hosea ii. 23 (LXX).
[4] Rom. ix. 1 ff. [5] ii. 25.

apostasy, and here it is fitly applied to the adherence of Gentiles, who previously had no faith in God. In fact its proper force is represented by *turn* rather than *return*.

Another capital passage would seem to be sufficient in itself to show that the writer regarded the churches to whom he speaks, as composed of Gentile Christians: "*Sufficient is the time that is past for the accomplishment of the ideal of the Gentiles, when you walked in . . . unlawful idolatry*".[1] If they were Jews by birth, who are so reproached for their pre-Christian life, it is clear that they must have been renegades, who had forfeited their title to be reckoned as Jews. For so great an apostasy there is no evidence whatever. That individuals in the Dispersion did succumb to the attractions of the life outside the ghetto is probable enough. Philo, for example, warns his fellow countrymen against the seductions of pagan mysteries; and his own nephew gave up his faith in order to become a soldier of fortune. But the interpretation, which makes Jews of the readers, involves an impossible assumption of wholesale perversion. The persons in question are, surely, Gentiles; before their conversion they lived as their neighbours lived, and, after their conversion, they excited the surprise of their neighbours by their change of life.[2]

The internal evidence of the Epistle is borne out by what is known of the evangelisation of the provinces named. With the exception of Cilicia all Asia Minor is included and Asia Minor was the great field of the labours of St. Paul and his companions. There is nothing to suggest that St. Peter was addressing converts of his own as Origen and Eusebius[3] seem to assume.

The Author.—The beginning and the final conclusion of this document certify it to be the letter or epistle of *Peter the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, who speaks of Silvanus and Mark as his companions and writes from "Babylon". The certificate was accepted and remained unquestioned until quite modern times. Irenæus, whose connexion with Polycarp is certain, quotes the document as written by *the* Peter of the Church—Simon, son of John, to whom Jesus gave the name of *Cephas* or (in Greek) *Peter*. When F. C. Baur (for example) speaks of the "alleged apostolic authorship of writings which bear the marks of pseudonymity so plainly on their face,"[4] he illustrates the reaction which ran riot, when once the doctrine of the inspiration and authority of canonical books was called in question. The authorship of this document does not

[1] iv. 3. [2] iv. 4. [3] See above page 4.

[4] *Church History* (English translation: London, 1878), p. 131 (note) in reference to the Epistle of James and the First Epistle of Peter.

necessarily decide the question of its authority—all or none—as it did in the time of uncritical devotion to the letter of Scripture. But Baur's brave words do no more to solve the problem than the stolid reiteration of traditional dogmas. And it is to be remembered that Catholic traditions have often been rehabilitated by critical researches.

To the question, "Do you at this time of day venture to attribute this document to Simon Peter?" the answer is, "Why not?"

Such a conservative attitude excites the pity—if not the contempt—of the "advanced" critics. They find no difficulty in treating the Canonical Epistles as most men have treated the Epistles of Phalaris—ever since Bentley wrote his dissertation. Bentley said[1] out of Galen, "*That in the age of the* Ptolemies *the trade of coining false Authors was in greatest Practice and Perfection. . . . When the* Attali *and the* Ptolemies *were in Emulation about their Libraries, the knavery of forging Books and Titles began. For there were those that to enhance the price of their Books put the Names of great Authors before them, and so sold them to those Princes.*" But Bentley proceeded to demonstrate that the Epistles of Phalaris contained blunders incompatible with their authenticity; and—for all their exquisite reasons—the critics, who treat the First Epistle of Peter as falsely so-called, have not yet found their Bentley. Indeed, their reasons are chiefly interesting as symptoms of presuppositions inherited from past controversies. They reveal (for example) a tendency to resent the attribution of divine authority to the Apostles, and a tendency—which others share—to ignore the relatively mature theology to which, as a matter of fact, the first Christian missionaries were bred, before ever they became missionaries or Christians at all. For those who believe that the Church has been directed by the Holy Spirit it is not easy to suppose that others than James and Peter, Jude and John were as destitute as they were full of divine inspiration. And it is not difficult to acquiesce in the excommunication of Marcion and all others who regard Christianity as a new thing descended from heaven with no affinity to any earthly antecedents.

In a natural and simple phrase this document professes to be written by Peter. But Harnack[2] has put forward the hypothesis that the opening and closing sentences[3] are an interpolation by another hand and argues against the assumption that the whole is a forgery. "If," he says, "the hypothesis here brought forward should prove erroneous, I should more readily prevail upon myself to regard the improbable as possible and to claim the Epistle for Peter him-

[1] Wagner's edition (London, 1883), pp. 80, 81.

[2] *Chronologie*, p. 457 ff.

[3] i. 1, 2 and v. 12-14.

self than to suppose that a *Pseudo-Petrus* wrote our fragment as it now stands from the first verse to the last, soon after A.D. 90, or even from ten to thirty years earlier. Such an assumption is, in my opinion, weighed down by insuperable difficulties.[1]

So far as extant evidence goes Harnack's hypothesis of interpolation has nothing on which to rest. It remains to consider the chief objections which have been urged to prove that the traditional view is improbable. Peter cannot have written the Epistle (it is said) because (1) it is clearly indebted to Paulinism, (2) it contains no vivid reminiscences of the life and doctrine of Jesus, (3) it is written in better Greek than a Galilean peasant could compass, and (4) it reflects conditions which Peter did not live to see.

The first reason is regarded as decisive by Harnack:[2] "Were it not for the dependence [of 1 Peter] on the Pauline Epistles, I might perhaps allow myself to maintain its genuineness: that dependence however, is not accidental, but is of the essence of the Epistle". Dr. Chase has examined the affinities between 1 Peter and the Epistles of the N.T., and it is sufficient to state the results at which he arrives. "The coincidences with St. James can hardly be accounted for on the ground of personal intercourse between the two writers. . . . The coincidences with the Pauline Epistles other than Romans and Ephesians are not very close and are to be accounted for as the outcome of a common evolution of Christian phrases and conceptions rather than as instances of direct borrowing. . . . There is no doubt that the author of 1 Peter was acquainted with the Epistle to the Romans. Nor is this surprising if the writer is St. Peter. . . . The connexion of Ephesians with 1 Peter (here he adopts the words of Hort) is shown more by the identities of thought and similarity in the structure of the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase. . . ." In his summing-up he says: "All that we learn of St. Peter from the New Testament gives us the picture of a man prompt and enthusiastic in action rather than fertile in ideas. His borrowing from St. James' Epistle shows that his mind was receptive and retentive of the thoughts of others. The Epistle undoubtedly owes much to St. Paul. But it is only when the Pauline element is isolated and exaggerated that it becomes a serious argument against the Petrine authorship of the Epistle."[3]

It is to be remembered, also, that St. Paul did not invent Paulinism and that St. Peter manifests (according to the narrative of

[1] *Die Chronologie*, 464 f. (quoted by Chase, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 786 b).

[2] *Chron*. p. 364 (quoted by Chase).

[3] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. pp. 788 f.

Acts) a disinclination to associate with the Gentile which suggests that he also was a strict Pharisee. There can be no doubt that of the Apostles of Christianity, who are known to us, St. Paul's was the master-mind. And there can be no doubt that St. Paul brought to the service of the Church a body of doctrine which he had inherited from Gamaliel and the masters of Gamaliel. The common notion that Christianity was something absolutely new planted by St. Paul and watered—watered *down*—by St. Peter and finally by St. John is inconsistent with known facts and with general probability. It is, indeed, the vicious product of the artificial isolation of the New Testament literature from the literature and the life of Judaism.

Others than St. Paul modified their inherited theology in the light of their belief, that Jesus, having been raised from the dead, was the promised and anointed deliverer—the Messiah, who by revealing God's will more fully than the prophets or the scribes, but not independently of either, introduced to men more fully the Sovereignty of Heaven, under whose yoke he lived and died. Inevitably and insensibly the first Christian teachers learned from each other and profited by their own and each other's experience. But they all inherited and already possessed the presuppositions and categories of the Scribes, whose teaching their Master had endorsed and extended. Into this body of theology they fitted the new fact of a crucified Messiah—into the framework of Pharisaism—as Pharisees fitted all new facts which threw fresh light upon the will of God. If St. Paul was the first (as our fragmentary evidence suggests) to find a deep significance in it, it is not derogatory to St. Peter to suggest that he may have been indebted to St. Paul both here and elsewhere, and such indebtedness is not necessarily an argument against the authenticity of this Epistle of Peter.

The second objection is that our document contains no vivid reminiscences of the life and doctrine of Jesus such as we should expect from a personal disciple.

The alleged expectation is not altogether a reasonable one. If the document is, as an unbroken chain of tradition affirms, a pastoral letter addressed to Christian Churches already in being, there is no reason to expect reminiscences of the life and teaching of Jesus. The Church was built upon the belief that Jesus was raised from the dead and so declared to be the promised deliverer. His submission to death—and the death of the cross—was the crown and the summary of His life as it was the fulfilment of His teaching. So far as other facts and traditions were relatively necessary to the faith of the converts they were naturally communicated—formally or informally—by those who founded or confirmed the Churches. But in an epistle

like this they would have been irrelevant and inconclusive. The occasion called for the emphatic isolation of the glorious resurrection, which followed the culmination of the sufferings of Jesus and in which His past miracles were swallowed up like stars in the sunshine. As for the teaching of Jesus our records are plainly incomplete, and, whether the Fourth Gospel be permitted to give evidence or not it is quite clear that the arguments used by Jesus and the topics He treated were determined for Him by the character of those to whom He addressed Himself. When the Christian missionaries addressed themselves to men of different nationalities, they could not presume in them knowledge of Jewish presuppositions and therefore, quite apart from its relative insignificance they postponed indefinitely much of the teaching of Jesus. For in any case this teaching was relatively insignificant in their view; the essence of their message was Jesus and the Resurrection. Particular incidents and particular sayings may have their value as links in the chain of proof that—witness here and witness there—Jesus was He of whom Moses and the Prophets had spoken. But such proof belongs properly to the controversy with the Jews and, in many cases, not to the original phase of it. Historical or biographical sermons upon which the Gospel according to St. Mark is by tradition asserted to be based, were a sequel to the summons, "Repent and believe". It may well be that St. Peter did so preach, and that he dwelt rather upon the record of Jesus' life in Galilee of the Gentiles, because his own audience had little in common with the Jews of Jerusalem; but his reminiscences of the ministry prior to the Passion were *not*, as has been said,[1] "the best, the most inspiring message that he could deliver at such a critical time". He himself had seen and heard these things; yet, when the crisis came, he himself denied and repudiated Jesus. The impressiveness of these things, which failed to convince an eye-witness, was not likely to be heightened, when he repeated them to strangers. And there can be little doubt that, if he had inserted a reference to the Transfiguration (for example), it would be said nowadays that this was the mark of a sedulous forger, anxious to keep up the part he was playing. In his intercourse with Jesus St. Peter had learned and unlearned here a little and there a little. But at the last his faith was not

[1] Von Soden, *Early Christian Literature* (English Translation), London, 1906, pp. 278 f.: "It is evident that St. Peter cannot have written this epistle. The oldest personal disciple of our Lord would never have omitted the slightest reference to that which must above all things have distinguished him in the eyes of his readers. And how, especially at such a critical time, could he have refrained from speaking of reminiscences which formed the best, the most inspiring, message that he could deliver?"

proof against the appearance of failure. When, therefore, he converted and began to establish his brethren, he imparted to them the convictions he had acquired, and did not parade the diverse and devious steps by which he had painfully reached that height.

A third objection is that the Greek of this Epistle is better than a Galilean peasant could compass and that a Palestinian Jew would not possess such a familiar knowledge of the Old Testament in Greek.

Such an objection seems to take no account at all of certain known facts and of general probability. Even a Galilean peasant, who stayed in his native place, needed and presumably acquired some knowledge of the Greek language in his intercourse with the non-Jewish inhabitants of the land, whom Josephus calls indifferently *Greeks* and *Syrians*. If he went up to Jerusalem for the feasts he there came into contact with Jews of the Dispersion, most of whom lived in the Greek-speaking world. The part played by these assemblies in cementing the solidarity of the whole nation is commonly overlooked; and therefore it is worth while to quote Philo's explicit statement on the subject.[1] "The Temple made with hands," he says, "is necessary for men in general. They must have a place where they can give thanks for benefits and pray for pardon when they sin. So there is the temple at Jerusalem and no other. They must rise up from the ends of the earth and resort thither, if they would offer sacrifice. They must leave their fatherland, their friends and their kinsfolk, and so prove the sincerity of their religion. And this they do. At every feast myriads from East and West, from North and South repair to the Temple to be free for a little space from the business and the confusion of their lives. They draw breath for a little while, as they have leisure for holiness and the honouring of God. *And so they make friends with strangers hitherto unknown to them; and over sacrifices and libations they form a community of interests which is the surest pledge of unanimity.*" In the face of this, it seems impossible to accept the modern distinction between Alexandrian and Palestinian Judaism as corresponding to an absolute severance in life, language and religion in the first century of the present era. Apart from this normal intercourse of all classes of religiously minded Jews, those who aspired to direct their fellows as Sages or Scribes seem to have travelled in foreign countries as a part of their training. And further, it is known that the delivery of the Temple dues at Jerusalem was regarded as a pious duty which the foremost members of each

[1] *De specialibus legibus*, i. (*de templo*), §§ 67-70 (Cohn and Wendland, vol. v. pp. 17 f.; ii. p. 223, Mangey).

community were selected to perform. In these and other ways the Jews of Palestine became acquainted with the Greek language and, so far as they engaged in religious discussion with their visitors or hosts of the Dispersion, with the Old Testament in Greek also. The translation known as the Septuagint was still a triumphant achievement, through which the Jews of the Greek world were retained within the fold of Judaism and the Greeks outside were offered knowledge of the Law. And even when the Christian missionaries began to utilise in the interests of their own creed the laxities of the Septuagint, the non-Christian Jews produced the Greek versions of Aquila Symmachus and Theodotion. In fact, so far as and as long as any sect of Judaism engaged in missionary enterprise knowledge of the Greek language and the Greek Bible was indispensable to its agents.

It is therefore entirely in keeping with the tradition that this document is the Epistle General of St. Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, that it should be written in passable Greek and bear evident traces of familiarity with the Septuagint. In order to prove that Jesus was the deliverer for whom the prophets had looked, he was bound to appeal to the Scriptures, and to the Scriptures in that version which was established as the Bible of the Greek Dispersion.

If in spite of these and other considerations it is felt that the general style of the Epistle is too literary for one who had lived the life and done the work of St. Peter, there is still another line of defence for the traditional view. In other words, it is still possible to believe that the document as it stands gives a just and true account of its own origin. In the postscript[1] the author says, "*I write* (or *I have written*) *to you, briefly by means of Silvanus the faithful brother, as I reckon him*".

If the phrase *I write by means of Silvanus* may be taken to imply that Silvanus was not only the bearer of the Epistle but also the trusted secretary who wrote out in his own way St. Peter's message, then all the difficulties derived from the style of the document and its use of Pauline ideas vanish at once. And in any case this mention of Silvanus proves that St. Peter was closely associated with the sometime colleague of St. Paul, who had actually helped to preach the Gospel in Syria, Cilicia and Galatia.[2] For there seems to be no reason for questioning the identification of the Silas of the *Acts* with the Silvanus of the Pauline Epistles and this Epistle.

The interpretation of the phrase διὰ Cιλουανοῦ is still in dispute. Professor Zahn[3] maintains the view that "Silvanus' part in the

[1] v. 12. [2] See Acts xv. 23, 40 f.; xvi. 1-8.
[3] *Introduction to the New Testament* (English Translation, 1909), vol. ii. p. 150

composition was so important and so large that its performance required a considerable degree of trustworthiness. . . . It purports to be a letter of Peter's; and such it is, except that Peter left its composition to Silvanus because he regarded him as better fitted than himself . . . to express in an intelligible and effective manner the thoughts and feelings which Peter entertained toward the Gentile Christians of Asia Minor".

Dr. Chase[1] quotes Professor Zahn as arguing that Silvanus "must have been *either* a messenger who conveyed the letter *or* a friend who put St. Peter's thoughts into the form of a letter". Against this interpretation, he says, four "considerations seem together decisive"; and he concludes that Silvanus carried the Epistle and did *not* write it. It is of course possible that the phrase may bear this meaning, but the other is not to be excluded. The parallels quoted are, with two exceptions, ambiguous, and of the exceptions each supports one of the rival views. In Acts xv. 22, for example, it is said that the Apostles chose Judas and Silas and *wrote by their hand*.[2] Clearly they were the bearers of the letter, as it is said that they delivered it at Antioch;[3] and "being prophets they exhorted and confirmed the brethren".[4] But it is certainly possible if not definitely probable that they actually wrote each a copy of the letter for himself at the dictation of St. James. The case on which Dr. Chase chiefly relies is the postscript of Ignatius' letter to the Romans: "I write these things to you by the worthy Ephesians: Crocus whom I love is by my side with many others".[5] But even here the other interpretation is not impossible. They certainly were the bearers, but for safety's sake each may have written his own copy of the letter. The journey from Smyrna to Rome was long and dangerous, and apart from considerations of safe delivery each of them may well have desired to have his own copy. And there is one clear case in which this ambiguity disappears: Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writes to Soter, Bishop of Rome, in acknowledgment of a letter received from the Roman Church, which (he says) "we shall always have to read for our admonition like the former

[1] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1900), vol. iii. p. 790.

[2] γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

[3] Acts xv. 30, οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες κατῆλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ συναγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν.

[4] Acts xv. 32.

[5] *Ad Romanos*, xiv. 1, γράφω δὲ ὑμῖν ταῦτα ἀπὸ Σμύρνης δι' Ἐφεσίων τῶν ἀξιομακαρίστων. ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἅμα ἐμοὶ σὺν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς καὶ Κρόκος τὸ ποθητόν μοι ὄνομα.

Epistle written to us *through* Clement".[1] Here the preposition clearly denotes the interpreter who writes in the name of the Church and cannot cover the messenger also, because the bearers of the Epistle—Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Bito, and Fortunatus—are named at the end.[2]

Since, therefore, διά can in such contexts designate the *writer* as well as the *bearer* of an Epistle, it is hardly safe to say that Silvanus cannot have been *both* in this case. If St. Peter had not so far profited by his general experience and in particular by his association with Silvanus and other missionaries as to write moderately good Greek and to employ "Pauline" ideas, then we may suppose that he permitted Silvanus to write the Epistle for him. He was none the less the real author if he employed a letter-writer whose position and experience enabled him to supplement the author's alleged deficiencies in respect of the language and modes of thought familiar to the persons addressed. The postscript indicates St. Peter's approval of the draft thus made and submitted to him. The tone of authority which is used in the addresses to separate classes is naturally reproduced by the secretary from his recollection of what St. Peter had said. The secretary's intervention affects only the manner of the Epistle at most. If Silvanus had really contributed to the matter he would have been joined with St. Peter in the salutation. On the other hand, there is every reason to suppose that Silvanus was also St. Peter's messenger plenipotentiary and would, as when he was sent by the Apostles of Jerusalem, "proclaim the same things by word of mouth".[3]

The fourth objection to the traditional view is that the Epistle reflects conditions which were definitely later than the date of St. Peter's death. No other book of the New Testament offers any plain information about St. Peter at any time after the hypocrisy he practised at Antioch.[4] But Christian tradition connects him not only with Antioch [5] and Asia Minor [6]—statements which are probably simple inferences from the statements of St. Paul's Epistle to the

[1] Τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἅγιαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ἣν ἕξομεν ἀεί ποτε ἀναγινώσκοντες νουθετεῖσθαι ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμεῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν (Eusebius, *Historiae Ecclesiae*, iv. 23. 8).

[2] Clement, *ad Corinthios*, lxv. [3] Acts xv. 27. [4] Gal. ii.

[5] So Origen (*in Lucam Homilia*, vi.): "Eleganter in cuiusdam martyris epistola scriptum repperi, Ignatium dico, *episcopum Antiochiae post Petrum secundum*, qui in persecutione Romae pugnavit ad bestias, 'principem saeculi huius latuit virginitas Mariae'."

[6] So Origen (fragment in Eusebius, *Historiae Ecclesiae*, iii. 1): Πέτρος δὲ ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ Καππαδοκίᾳ τε καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐκ διασπορᾶς Ἰουδαίοις ἔοικεν.

Galatians and the First Epistle of St. Peter respectively—but also with Rome. For this part of the tradition there is no obvious hint in the New Testament which can be used to explain away its origin, unless it be supposed that the bare mention of Babylon in the First Epistle of St. Peter is sufficient of itself to have given birth to so complete a legend. It is not surprising that Babylon should have been interpreted as meaning Rome from the first; but the tradition, that St. Peter died at Rome under Nero, has nothing on which to rest in the Epistles or elsewhere.

Tertullian is the first to state this tradition explicitly. We read, in the *Lives of the Cæsars*, "Nero first laid bloody hands upon the rising faith at Rome. Then was Peter girded by another when he was bound to the cross."[1] But apart from the definite date, the tradition is as old as Clement of Rome, who cites St. Peter and St. Paul as "noble examples of our own generation" in his Epistle to the Corinthians: "By reason of envy and jealousy the great and righteous Pillars were persecuted and struggled on till they died. Let us put before our eyes the good Apostles—Peter, who by reason of unrighteous envy endured not one or two but many labours and so became a martyr and departed to the place of glory which was his due".[2] A brief account of St. Paul's sufferings, based largely on New Testament evidence, follows; and the conclusion that St. Peter suffered before St. Paul and both at Rome is commonly drawn. After this Clement goes on to say: "To these men of holy life was gathered a great multitude of elect persons who by reason of envy suffered many outrages and torments and so became a noble example among us".[3] This further illustration of the terrible effects of envy and jealousy—the theme to which all these references are incidental—is most naturally interpreted as describing the victims of the Neronian persecution of A.D. 64, of whom Tacitus[4] speaks as "a huge multitude". If, then, Clement has put his illustrations in

[1] *Vitas Caesarum legimus: Orientem fidem Romae primus Nero cruentavit. Nunc Petrus ab altero cingitur, cum cruci adstringitur* (*Scorpiace*, 15). The fact is so stated as to indicate the fulfilment of the word of Jesus reported in John xxi. 18:

[2] διὰ ζῆλον καὶ φθόνον οἱ μέγιστοι καὶ δικαιότατοι στύλοι (cf. Gal. ii. 9) ἐδιώχθησαν καὶ ἕως θανάτου ἤθλησαν. λάβωμεν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους Πέτρον ὃς διὰ ζῆλον ἄδικον οὐχ ἕνα οὐδὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης (1 *Clementis ad Corinthios*, v. 2-4).

[3] τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὁσίως πολιτευσαμένοις συνηθροίσθη πολὺ πλῆθος ἐκλεκτῶν οἵτινες πολλὰς αἰκίας καὶ βασάνους διὰ ζῆλος παθόντες ὑπόδειγμα κάλλιστον ἐγένοντο ἐν ἡμῖν (1 *Clementis ad Corinthios*, vi. 1).

[4] *Annals*, xv. 44.

chronological order, he agrees with Tertullian in asserting that St. Peter died as a martyr under Nero and, being a conspicuous pillar of the Church, before the mass of the Christians. To this assertion Origen, quoted by Eusebius,[1] adds the statement that "at the end Peter being at Rome was crucified head-downwards having himself requested that he might so suffer".

Eusebius in his account of the Neronian persecution endorses this tradition of St. Peter's martyrdom and cites evidence to prove its truth: "So then at this time this man who was proclaimed one of the foremost fighters against God was led on to slaughter the Apostles. It is related that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself and that Peter was likewise crucified in his reign. And the history is confirmed by the inscription upon the tombs there which is still in existence. It is also confirmed by an ecclesiastic named Gaius, who lived at the time when Zephyrinus was Bishop of Rome, who writing to Proclus, the leader of the Phrygian heresy, says these very words about the places where the sacred tabernacles of the aforesaid Apostles are deposited, 'But I can shew the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian Way you will find the trophies of those who founded this Church. And that they both became martyrs at the same time Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, writing to the Romans proves in this way. You also by such admonition have compounded the plant of Romans and Corinthians which came from Peter and Paul. For they both of them came to our Corinth and planted us, teaching like doctrine, and in like manner they taught together in Italy and became martyrs at the same time." [2]

All the other extant evidence[3] agrees with this, and we may fairly conclude that from the end of the first century it has been the unchallenged belief of the Christian Church that St. Peter was put to death at Rome in A.D. 64. The question therefore arises, Is this tradition compatible with the traditional ascription of this document to St. Peter?

Date, Circumstances, and Purpose.

If St. Peter was the author of this document and if St. Peter perished in the persecution under Nero, it follows that the document

[1] *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, iii. 1: ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν.

[2] *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, ii. 25.

[3] See Dr. Chase's article on Peter (Simon) in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii.

must have been written before A.D. 64. The conclusion is challenged on the ground of the circumstances implied by the document and consequently one or other of the premises is invalidated. The circumstances implied and indicated are suppposed to belong to a date definitely later than the time of Nero; and from this supposition it follows *either* that St. Peter did not write the Epistle *or* that he did not perish under Nero. In either case the Epistle is now commonly assigned to the reign either of Domitian (A.D. 81-96) or of Trajan (A.D. 98-117). Professor Gunkel (for example) in a popular commentary recently published[1] ends his introduction with the words: "The more precise dating of the Epistle must be determined in accordance with the persecutions above mentioned, with which, it must be confessed, we are not perfectly acquainted. Now the Neronian persecution affected only Rome and not the provinces. On the other hand more general persecutions seem to have taken place under Domitian. The time of Trajan, under whom a persecution (A.D. 112) to which the letters of Pliny to the emperor testify, certainly took place in Asia Minor, is open to the objection that then the Christians were compelled to offer sacrifice—to which the Epistle has no reference. Our Epistle is therefore best assigned to the early period of Domitian's reign. A still later dating (*sc.* than the reign of Trajan ?) is excluded by the lack of references to *Gnosis* and the Episcopate."

Professor Ramsay similarly suggests, on the basis of the contents of the Epistle: "The First Epistle of Peter then must have been written soon after Vespasian's resumption of the Neronian policy in a more precise and definite form. It implies relations between Church and State which are later than the Neronian period, but which have only just begun."[2]

Professor Cone[3] urges that the conditions implied by the Epistle fit the time of Trajan, and argues, as against Professor Ramsay, that "since they also fit the later date, they furnish no ground for excluding it in favour of the earlier". His conclusion is: "The data supplied in the Epistle and in known and precisely determinable historical circumstances do not warrant us in placing its composition more definitely than in the last quarter of the first, or the first quarter of the second, century". For this he relies partly on Professor Ramsay's opinion that "the history of the spread of Chris-

[1] *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments neu übersetzt und für die Gegenwart erklärt*. . . Gottingen, 1908.

[2] *The Church in the Roman Empire* (sixth edition: London, 1893), p. 282. He assigns it, therefore, to *c.* A.D. 80 at the end of Vespasian's reign.

[3] *Encyclopedia Biblica III.*, "Peter, the Epistles of".

tianity imperatively demands for 1 Peter a later date than A.D. 64"; and from it he deduces the corollary: "The later date renders it very probable that Babylon is employed figuratively for Rome, according to Rev. xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii. 5, xviii. 2, 10, 21".

Professor Cone's corollary deserves attention. He seems to assume that the Christians started afresh—*de novo* or *ex nihilo*—to evolve modes and idioms of thought for themselves. Such an assumption is demonstrably untenable. In the particular case of such cipher-language as this, it is certain that the Christians appropriated the inventions of the Jews, who in their own oppressions and their own persecutions had learned to veil their hopes from all but the initiated. Babylon was the great and typical oppressor, and her successors in the part naturally received her proper name. Rome was not the declared and inflexible enemy of the Jewish nation as a whole before the time of Caligula; but Rome stood behind Herod the Great, and Pompey had desecrated the Temple at Jerusalem. Philo might forgive and forget the outrages which Pompey and Herod had perpetrated in order to heighten the enormity of Caligula's offences, but the Psalms of Solomon and the evidence of Josephus suffice to prove that for some Rome was already the enemy in the last century B.C. Formal proof that the Jews actually spoke of Rome by the name of Babylon before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 is, indeed, wanting. But the identification of Rome with Babylon and the consequent transference of the paraphernalia of Babylon to Rome is part and parcel of the apocalyptic vocabulary and passed over into the language of the Rabbis. The author of the Epistle had no more need to explain his use of Babylon than had the Jewish poet who wrote in the name of the Sibyl and said in reference to Nero:—

> "Poets shall mourn for thee, thrice-hapless Greece,
> What time the mighty king of mighty Rome,
> Coming from Italy, shall pierce thine Isthmus—
> A God-like mortal, born (they say) of Zeus
> By lady Hera, who with dulcet songs
> Shall slay his hapless mother and many more.
> A shameless prince and terrible! He shall fly
> From *Babylon* . . ."[1]

And again he prophesied that after a time and times and half a time[2]

[1] Oracula, *Sibyllina*, v. 137-143 (Geffcken: Leipzig, 1902).
[2] *Ibid.* 154: "ἐκ τετράτου ἔτεος"; compare Daniel vii. 25.

"From heav'n into the sea a star shall fall
That shall consume with fire the ocean wide,
And *Babylon* herself, and Italy . . ."[1]

Nero's achievements added matricide to the specification of Antichrist; but the book of Daniel and other apocalypses, which were directly or indirectly inspired by the experience of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes, had long ago established the code of language by which each particular persecutor was identified with the vanished type. In the time of Antiochus such disguise was a necessary precaution; and it was so again in the time of Nero or Vespasian, of Domitian or Trajan. In fact, Professor Cone's corollary has nothing to do with his conclusion. Whenever any Christian community became exposed for whatever reason to attack by any representative of the State, the State became for them the enemy, and therefore Babylon.

For Trajan's attitude towards the Christians of Bithynia we have ample testimony—thanks to the lack of independence displayed by his legate, the younger Pliny. In A.D. 112 Bithynia was in a bad state. There were many abuses which called for remedies, and the province was distracted by factions.[2] The law which forbade the formation of clubs or associations for different purposes had fallen into abeyance, and Pliny began by re-enacting it in accordance with Trajan's mandate.[3] On this policy Trajan insisted so strongly that he refused to authorise a fire brigade in Nicomedia, in spite of Pliny's protestations that only 150 men would be enrolled, only carpenters, and for the sole purpose of dealing with such a conflagration as had recently devastated the city.[4] From experience he held that all corporations, whatever name they bore, quickly became political associations.[5] This rigid interpretation of the law made the ordinary meetings of the Christians at once illegal; and there were so many Christians in Bithynia that the temples were almost deserted and the customary sacrifices were omitted. When the edict was

[1] Or. *Sib.* v. 158-160.

[2] Trajan to Pliny, xxxii. (xli.): "Meminerimus idcirco te in istam provinciam missum, quoniam multa in ea emendanda apparuerint; xxxiv. (xliii.) meminerimus provinciam istam . . . factionibus esse vexatam".

[3] Pliny to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.): "Edictum meum quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram".

[4] Pliny to Trajan, xxxiii. (xlii.): "Tu, domine, dispice an instituendum putes Collegium fabrorum dumtaxat hominum Cl. Ego attendam ne quis nisi faber recipiatur neve iure concesso in aliud utatur; necerit difficile custodire tam paucos".

[5] Trajan to Pliny, xxxiv. (xliii.): "Quodcumque nomen ex quacumque causa dederimus eis qui in idem contracti fuerit. . . . hetaeriae que brevi fient".

published, some Christians — apparently renegades, who abjured Christianity when challenged by Pliny—asserted that either they or the Christians generally gave up either the practice of meeting for a common meal or their religious meetings also. It is improbable that those who persisted in their wicked and immoderate superstition should have abandoned their weekly assemblies at which they recited a hymn to Christ as God, but it is unnatural to distinguish between these assemblies and the subsequent meetings for the common meal, and the statement of the renegades may reasonably be confined to their own obedience to the edict.

Professor Ramsay, however, infers from Pliny's language that the statement refers to the Christians as a whole: "They had, indeed, been in the habit of holding social meetings, and feasting in common; but this illegal practice they had abandoned as soon as the governor had issued an edict in accordance with the Emperor's instructions, forbidding the formation or existence of *sodalitates* ".[1] And he asserts that Pliny's language implies a distinction between the illegal meetings of the evening and the legal meetings of the morning: "The regular morning meetings which Pliny speaks about and which, as we know, must have been weekly meetings, were not abandoned, and Pliny obviously accepts them as strictly legal. Amid the strict regulations about societies the Roman government expressly allowed to all people the right of meeting for purely religious purposes. The morning meeting of the Christians was religious; but the evening meeting was social, including a common meal, and therefore constituted the Christian community a *sodalitas*. The Christians abandoned the illegal meeting, but continued the legal one. This fact is one of the utmost consequence. It shows that the Christian communities were quite alive to the necessity of acting according to the law, and of using the forms of the law to screen themselves as far as was consistent with their principles."[2]

Against this view it must be urged, in the first place, that the common meal of the Christian community had a definitely religious character and could not be abandoned without a breach of their principles; and, in the second place, that Pliny's language is by no means so explicit and clear as is suggested. The authors of the statement are a large number of persons accused of Christianity, either by an anonymous letter or by an informer: all of them convinced Pliny that they had never been Christians, or had ceased to be Christians, by offering sacrifice to idols and blas-

[1] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 206.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 219 f.

pheming Christ.[1] As regards their past Christianity—if ever they had practised Christianity—they affirmed that this was the sum and substance of their crime, that they had been accustomed to assemble on a fixed day before sunrise and to repeat alternately a hymn to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by an oath—not to commit any crime, but—to abstain from theft, brigandage, adultery, breach of faith, and refusal of any deposit; which done they usually departed and assembled again to take food, which food was taken by all together, and involved no crime. And even this, they said, they had ceased to do after the edict.[2]

Here, surely, Pliny is concerned only with renegades who proved to him that the Christian faith which they had abandoned had led them into no crimes of which he must take cognisance. Their oath was not proof of conspiracy and their meal was not a cannibal feast. To satisfy himself that their denial of the charges brought against them was well founded, Pliny examined two slaves, who were called deaconesses, under torture. Finding nothing in them but a foul immoderate superstition, he submitted the case to the Emperor.[3]

The fact is that the large number of persons involved and the doubt whether those who had repented of their Christianity had thereby deserved free pardon, gave Pliny food for reflexion. Christianity had been rampant in his province, but his experience of these apostates gave him good hope that it might be checked. Apostates would naturally be more zealous heathens, and therefore good

[1] Pliny to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.): "Propositus est libellus sine auctore multorum nomina continens. Qui negabant esse se Christianos aut fuisse cum praeeunte me deos appellarent et imagini tuae, quam propter hoc iusseram cum simulacris numinum adferri, ture ac vino supplicarent, praeterea male dicerent Christo, quorum nihil posse cogi dicuntur qui sunt se vera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi. Alii ab indice nominati esse se Christianos dixerunt et mox negaverunt; fuisse quidem, sed desisse, quidam ante plures annos non nemo etiam ante viginti quoque. Omnes et imaginem tuam deorumque simulacra venerati sunt et Christo maledixerunt."

[2] Pliny to Trajan, xcvi. (xcvii.): "Adfirmabant autem hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae vel erroris quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent; quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium; quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram".

[3] Pliny, *ibid.*: "Quo magis necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis quae ministrae dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quaerere. Nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam immodicam. Ideo dilata cognitione ad consulendum te decucurri".

citizens, in future. To execute them all would have been to diminish seriously the population of his province.[1] As a conscientious governor, he was anxious to bring this section of his subjects to their senses, and he believed that the extension of clemency to those who repented of their Christianity would be the means most likely to secure that end.[2] If room for repentance was given, all the Christians might be induced to recant. He does not contemplate a policy of religious toleration at all. Though there might be no crimes inherent in the profession of Christianity, Christians were still guilty of *sacrilegium* when they refused to worship the gods of the Empire, even if they satisfied Pliny that their meetings were purely religious in character and, therefore, did not constitute them a *sodalitas* within the meaning of the law. Obstinate Christians had three opportunities of recantation: if they did not take advantage of their opportunities, they were executed summarily—or, if they were Roman citizens, they were transported to Rome. It was an accepted and a familiar fact that a Christian was, as such, a criminal[3]—so familiar, indeed, that Pliny leaves their crime of sacrilege to be inferred from the sacrifice required of those who would prove their apostasy. He confesses that he never occupied such an official position as to be called on to decide or advise in the case of Christians, and was therefore ignorant of the precise nature of the proceedings.[4] But he did not hesitate to condemn the obdurate,[5] although he might doubt whether the name itself, if it involved no crime, or the crimes attaching to the name were thereby punished.[6]

[1] *Ibid.*: "Visa est enim mihi res digna consultatione maxime propter periclitantium munerum. Multi enim omnis aetatis, omnis ordinis utriusque sexus etiam, vocantur in periculum et vocabuntur. Neque civitates tantum sed vicos etiam atque agros superstitionis istius contagio pervagata est; *quae videtur sisti et corrigi posse.* Certe satis constat prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra sollemnia diuintermissa repeti pastumque venire victinarum cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor."

[2] *Ibid.*: "Ex quo facile est opinari quae turba hominum emendari possit si sit paenitentiae locus".

[3] *Ibid.*: "Interrogari ipsos an essent Christiani. Confitentes iterum ac tertio interrogari, supplicium miratus: perseverantes duci iussi. *Neque enim dubitatum, qualecumque esset quod faterentur, pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri.* Fuerunt alii similis amentiae quos, quia cives Romani erant, adnotari in urbem remittendos."

[4] Professor Ramsay's paraphrase of Pliny's words (*ibid.*): "Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam; ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri".

[5] See note (1) *supra.*

[6] *Ibid.*: "Nec mediocriter haesitavi sitne aliquod discrimen aetatum an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant, detur paenitentiae venia an eï qui omnino Christianus fuit desisse non prosit, nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini puniantur".

Such doubts as this arose from his examination of the renegades and the slaves who were called deaconesses, in which he learned that there were no crimes other than *sacrilegium* involved in the name, and, therefore, was emboldened to suggest that renegades should be pardoned.

Trajan's answer authorises the policy suggested: "Any one who denies that he is a Christian and gives plain proof of his truthfulness, that is, by worshipping our gods, though his past may not be above suspicion, shall obtain pardon by his repentance".[1] No anonymous accusations are to be entertained,[2] and Christians are not to be sought out. If they are brought before the governor and convicted of being Christians they must, of course, be punished. Pliny did well to investigate the cases of the so-called Christians, who had been brought before him.[3] No general policy can be laid down. Trajan is content to endorse the existing practice of punishing obdurate Christians as Christians, and to sanction the pardon of such Christians as were prepared to renounce their Christianity and to ratify their renunciation by performance of heathen rites.

Trajan's endorsement of the action which Pliny took without hesitation against the Christians *as such*, proves that "persecution for the name" was already an established and familiar part of Roman policy. If Pliny had been present at trials of Christians before becoming governor of Bithynia, he might have learned that the vulgar were wrong in ascribing foul crimes to the Christians, as such. But there is no question that Christians, as such, were liable to capital punishment. In the first instance, when he had only to do with those Christians who refused to apostatize, Pliny condemned them to death almost instinctively as a matter of routine and immemorial tradition.

Under Domitian (according to Dio Cassius) Flavius Clemens was put to death on the charge of atheism, and many others who embraced the customs of the Jews were condemned to death or

[1] Trajan to Pliny, xcvii. (xcviii.). . . . puniendi sunt ita tamen ut qui negaverit se Christianum esse idque re ipsa manifestum fecerit, id est supplicando dis nostris, quamvis suspectus in praeteritum, veniam ex paenitentia impetret".

[2] *Ibid.*: "Sine auctore vero propositi libelli in nullo crimine locum habere debent. Nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est."

[3] *Ibid.*: "Actum quem debuisti, mi Secunde, in excutiendis causis eorum qui Christiani ad te delati fuerunt secutus es. Neque enim in universum aliquid quod quasi certam forman habeat constitui potest. Conquirendi non sunt: si deferantur et arguantur, puniendi sunt". . . .

deprived of their goods. His wife Domitilla, a relative of the Emperor, was merely banished to Pandateria.[1]

Suetonius[2] describes Flavius Clemens as a man of contemptible inactivity—a conventional description of Christians[3]—and says that he was put to death on the barest suspicion. Eusebius[4] asserts explicitly that Domitilla was banished with many others, because she bore witness to Christ. Probably the Christians were regarded as a Jewish sect who could not claim the privileges of Jews proper. Evidently the sect was proscribed. A Christian as such was liable to death, banishment, or confiscation of his goods. Domitian (as Eusebius[5] says) was the second persecutor of the Christian Church and made himself the heir of Nero's battle with God. But according to Hegesippus,[6] as reported by Eusebius,[7] Domitian stopped the persecution after examining the grandsons of Judas, the brother of Jesus.[8]

[1] lxvii. 14 (epitome of Xiphilinus): Κἀν τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει (A.D. 95) ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς καὶ τὸν Φλάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα, καίπερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα, καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαουίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα, κατέσφαξεν ὁ Δομετιανός· ἐπηνέχθη δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος, ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι εἰς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ τῶν γοῦν οὐσιῶν ἐστερήθησαν· ἡ δὲ Δομιτίλλα ὑπερωρίσθη μόνον εἰς Πανδατερίαν.

[2] *Domitian* xv. Denique Flavium Clementem patruelum suum contemptissimae inertiae . . . repente ex tenuissima suspicione tantum non ipso eius consulatu interemit: quo maxime facto maturavit sibi exilium.

[3] Compare Tertullian's *Apology*, xlii.: "Sed alio quoque iniuriarum titulo postulamur et infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. . . . Quomodo infructuosi videmur negotiis vestris, cum quibus et de quibus vivimus, non scio. Sed si carimonias tuas non frequento, attamen et illa die homo sum."

[4] *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, iii. 18: "εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ ἄρα . . . ἡ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως διέλαμπε διδασκαλία, ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἄποθεν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς λόγου συγγραφεῖς μὴ ἀποκνῆσαι ταῖς αὐτῶν Ἱστορίαις τόν τε διωγμὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτύρια παραδοῦναι. οἵγε καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς ἐπεσημήναντο, ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ Δομετιανοῦ μετὰ πλείστων ἑτέρων καὶ Φλαυίαν Δομετίλλαν ἱστορήσαντες, ἐξ ἀδελφῆς γεγονυῖαν Φλαυίου Κλήμεντος, ἑνὸς τῶν τηνικάδε ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ὑπάτων, τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν μαρτυρίας ἕνεκεν, εἰς νῆσον Ποντίαν κατὰ τιμωρίαν δεδόσθαι."

[5] *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, iii. 17: "Τῆς Νέρωνος θεοεχθρίας τε καὶ θεομαχίας διάδοχον ἑαυτὸν κατεστήσατο. δεύτερος δῆτα τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν ἀνεκίνει διωγμόν, καίπερ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ μηδὲν καθ' ἡμῶν ἄτοπον ἐπινοήσαντος."

[6] Hegesippus was an Eastern—probably a native of Palestine. He visited Rome in the episcopate of Anicetus (? A.D. 155-156) and published his five books of *Memoranda* or *Memoirs* (ὑπομνήματα) in A.D. 180. See Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, i. pp. 483-490.

[7] *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, iii. 20: "ἐφ' οἷς μηδὲν αὐτῶν κατεγνωκότα τὸν Δομετιανόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς εὐτελῶν καταφρονήσαντα, ἐλευθέρους μὲν αὐτοὺς ἀνεῖναι, καταπαῦσαι δὲ διὰ προστάγματος τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διωγμόν

Eusebius[1] quotes Tertullian[2] to the same general effect: "Domitian, a semi-Nero in cruelty, attempted to condemn the Christians; but, being also a man, he readily stopped the course of action he had begun, and even recalled those whom he had banished".

But Nero was the first to persecute the Christians[3] and something is known of his procedure from Tacitus,[4] who represents his persecution as a final effort to divert from himself the suspicion of having given orders for the fire of Rome. Human assistance, public largesses, services of expiation, all failed to banish the calumny. So to put an end to the rumour, Nero made the Christians, as they were commonly called by the vulgar who hated them for their crimes, scape-goats in his place and visited them with the most elaborate penalties. Christ from whom their name was derived was executed by the procurator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius. For a time this fatal superstition was suppressed, but it broke out afterwards not only in Judaea, the birthplace of the mischief, but also in Rome . . . Accordingly, in the first instance those who confessed were arrested; and afterwards on their information a huge multitude were sent to join them not so much on the charge of arson as on that of hatred of the human race.

Tacitus emphasises the fact that the Christians were guilty and deserved to suffer the last penalty of the law.[5] Public feeling condemned them as enemies of civilised society; but the outrageous mockery with which Nero had them executed, and the common suspicion that the alleged arson was a mere pretence produced a revul-

[1] *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, iii. 20.

[2] *Apology* v.: "Temptaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate; sed qua et homo (ἀλλ' οἶμαι ἅτε ἔχων τι συνέσεως, Eusebius) facile coeptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat.

[3] Tertullian, *Apology*, v.: "Consulite commentarios vestros; illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romae orientem Caesariano gladio ferocisse. Sed tali dedicatore damnationis nostrae etiam gloriamur. Qui enim scit illum, intelligere potest non nisi grande aliquod bonum a Nerone damnatum."

[4] *Annals*, xv. 44: "Sed non ope humana, non largitionibus principis aut deum placamentis decedebat infamia, quin iussum incendium crederetur. Ergo abolendo rumori Nero subdidit reos, et quaesitissimis poenis affecit, quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Chrestianos (*sic*) appellabat. Auctor nominis eius Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat. Repressaque in praesens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judaeam originem eius mali sed per urbem etiam. . . . Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis coniuncti sunt."

[5] *Ibid.*: "sontes et novissima exempla meritos".

sion in their favour.[1] The bare punishments—crucifixion, burning at the stake, and death by wild beasts—were right and proper. But the people to whom Nero threw open his gardens, in order that they might witness such sights, found Nero himself among them dressed in the garb of a charioteer[2]—the ancient equivalent of a jockey. If the Christians were really magicians, as their punishments implied,[3] and their stories of healings may have suggested, the situation was too serious for such buffoonery. Nero's conduct was enough to discredit his plea of reasons of state.

It is clear, then, that Christians, who confessed their Christianity or were denounced as Christians by such confessors, were put to death by Nero after the great fire of Rome in A.D. 64. It was alleged that they were incendiaries or magicians, but these allegations were not proven. The reference to the execution of the founder of the sect suggests that they were, in accordance with that precedent, liable to capital punishment in Rome or in the provinces.

Suetonius records that under Nero many practices were severely punished and prohibited and many others set up. No food was henceforth to be sold in the cook-shops (for example) except vegetables; and punishments were inflicted upon the Christians—a kind of men who embraced a new and maleficent superstition.[4]

The natural inference that Nero's action in the matter of the Christians formed a precedent which was followed generally and in the provinces unless further regulations were introduced by himself or his successors, is probable in the nature of the case, and it is expressly asserted by Sulpicius Severus, who follows Tacitus, and may have known parts of his *Annals* which are no longer extant. This, he says, was the beginning of the savage treatment of the Christians.

[1] *Annals*: "pereuntibus addita ludibria, ut ferarum tergis contecti, laniatu canum interirent, aut crucibus affixi, aut flammandi, atque ubi defecisset dies in usum nocturni luminis urerentur . . . Unde . . . miseratio oriebatur, tamquam non utilitate publica sed in saevitiam unius absumerentur."

[2] *Ibid.*: "Hortos suos ei spectaculo Nero obtulerat et Circense ludicrum edebat, habitu aurigae permixtus plebi vel circulo insistens".

[3] So Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 236: "*Odium humani generis* was, as Arnold aptly points out, the crime of poisoners and magicians. . . . The punishments inflicted on the Christians under Nero are those ordered for magicians. Paulls, Sentent. v. 23 M.: "Magicae artis conscios summo supplicio affici placuit, id est, bestiis obici aut cruci suffigi. Ipsi autem magi vivi exuruntur."

[4] *Vita Neronis*, xvi.: "Multa sub eo et animadversa severe et coercita nec minus instituta . . . interdictum, ne quid in popinis cocti praeter legumina aut holera veniret cum antea nullum non obsonii genus proponeretur; adflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae."

Afterwards also laws were laid down by which the religion was proscribed and edicts were issued by which it was publicly declared illegal to be a Christian. Then Paul and Peter were condemned to death.[1]

To the three first persecutors of the Church—Nero, Domitian, and Trajan—Sulpicius Severus suggests that Titus should be added. If he is following good authority—say, Tacitus, here as elsewhere—Titus held a council to decide the fate of the Temple, when Jerusalem was taken in A.D. 70. Of his councillors some urged that a consecrated house famous beyond all mortal things ought not to be destroyed. Its preservation would bear witness to Roman moderation; its ruin would be an eternal mark of their cruelty. Others, and among them Titus himself, held the Temple should be destroyed at once, in order that the religion of the Jews and Christians might be more completely undone; inasmuch as these religions, though opposed to one another, nevertheless came from the same parent stock. The Christians sprang from the Jews. If the root were taken away the branch would naturally perish.[2]

From this survey of the evidence it appears that the non-Christian authorities bear out the assertion of Tertullian that from the year 64 A.D. Christianity was distinguished from Judaism and, therefore, proscribed. It had lost the protection of the ancient and famous lawful religion, which sheltered it at the first.[3] Nero set the law in motion against it for his own purposes and attempted to justify his action to the people. But such action once taken, persecution of the Church was part of the law of the Empire, as Suetonius, Sulpicius Severus, and Tertullian aver.[4] There is nothing in the evidence to

[1] *Chronicon*, ii. 29: "Hoc initio in Christianos saeviri coeptum. Post etiam datis legibus religio vetebatur, palamque edictis propositis Christianum esse non licebat. Tum Paulus et Petrus capitis damnati."

[2] *Chronicorum*, ii. 30: "Fertur Titus adhibito consilio prius deliberasse an templum tanti operis everteret. Etenim nonnullis videbatur aedem sacratam ultra omnia mortalia illustrem non oportere deleri, quae servata modestiae Romanae testimonium, diruta perennem crudelitatis notam praeberet. At contra alii et Titus ipse evertendum imprimis templum censebant, quo plenius Judaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur: quippe has religiones, licet contrarias sibi, isdem tamen ab auctoribus profectas: Christianos ex Judaeis extitisse: radice sublata stirpem facile perituram."

[3] Tertullian, *Apology*, xxi.: "Antiquissimis Judaecorum instrumentis sectam . . . suffultam . . . sub umbraculo insignissimae religionis certe licitae".

[4] In addition to passages quoted above, see Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, i. 7: "Principe Augusto nomen hoc ortum est: Tiberio disciplina eius inluxit: sub Nerone damnatio invaluit ut iam hinc de persona persecutoris ponderetis, si pius ille princeps, impii Christiani . . . si non hostis publicus, nos publici hostes: quales simus damnator ipse demonstravit, utique aemula sibi puniens: et tamen permansit erasis

suggest that the Neronian persecution slackened, because the citizens of Rome saw through the pretexts of arson and witchcraft. On the contrary the evidence suggests that the name was condemned by Nero.

It was still possible for Titus and for Dio Cassius to recall the fact that Christianity was a sect—a schismatic sect of Judaism. Perhaps the condemnation of the sect carried with it a partial proscription and prohibition of its name. But there is no trace of any real change of attitude between the policy, on which Nero embarked in sudden desperation, and the action taken by Pliny, when he began to put the affairs of Bithynia in order. Pliny assumed that the name of Christian was proof of guilt and only inquired why, when he found himself dealing with special and extenuating circumstances. Nero in special circumstances had sought to save himself from popular suspicion by making the name of Christian proof, first of special and then of general guilt.

It remains to examine the relations of the Christian Church and the Roman State, as they are reflected in the First Epistle of St. Peter, and to inquire which of the first three persecutions known to us they best fit.

In the first part of the Epistle, which ends at iv. 11, the writer speaks generally of manifold temptations.[1] "He exhorteth them—to quote the summary of the revisers of 1611—from the breach of charity . . . he beseecheth them also to abstain from fleshly lusts, to be obedient to magistrates, and teacheth servants how to obey their masters, patiently suffering for well-doing after the example of Christ. He teacheth the duty of wives and husbands to each other, exhorting all men to unity and love, and to suffer persecution. . . . He exhorteth them to cease from sin by the example of Christ, and the consideration of the general end that now approacheth. . . .

In the second part of the Epistle the writer "comforteth them against persecution. He exhorteth the elders to feed their flocks, the younger to obey, and all to be sober, watchful, and constant in the faith : to resist the cruel adversary the devil." Here only it is suggested that Christians may be put to death for the Name. For certain churches, to whom the bearer would read this part of the letter and whose special circumstances the writer had in mind, a trial[2] was imminent: their adversary the devil was walking about, as a roaring lion,

omnibus hoc solum institutum Neronianum: iustum denique, ut dissimile sui auctoris".

[1] i. 6. [2] iv. 12.

seeking whom he might devour.[1] In the earlier and general part the references to persecution and persecutors are vaguer, and stress is laid upon the railing or reviling[2] to which the Christians are exposed, but must not retaliate in kind. In both parts the example of Christ is put before them as their model—He suffered and they must suffer *as* He suffered—but only in the second part is it added that they must commit the keeping of their souls to God, as He did.[3] The first part, in fact, does not seem to contemplate state-persecution so much as the discredit and discomfort inevitably incurred by those who dissent from an established religion.

But such a distinction between the two parts of the Epistle, even if it be accepted as valid, does not relegate the second part to a later period. In some of the Churches of Asia Minor, at any rate—and there is no evidence to show which—the conditions described in the second part existed already. And so the evidence of the Epistle as a whole must be taken.

The faith of the Christians addressed is undergoing a trial : for a season (if need be) they are in heaviness through manifold temptations.[4] In different ways their faith is being tested. The tests—whatever they are—cause a temporary grief in the midst of their permanent joy, but will only refine their faith and purge it of dross. Half-hearted Christians will fall away. They have already purified their souls by obedience to the truth revealed to them,[5] and must lay aside all malice and all guile and hypocrisies and envies and all evil speakings.[6] They must abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul, and, by their good conduct, refute the common rumour which speaks of them as evildoers.[7] Pending the visitation of God, they are exhorted to be obedient to the Emperor and his officers, and as loyal citizens stop the mouths of ignorant fools.[8] There is no room, here, for the later test of their loyalty : the writer could not exhort them to offer sacrifice to Cæsar. No one can really harm them, if they obey these commands; but they may have to suffer for righteousness' sake.[9] They must not be afraid. They must be ready to defend themselves and to reply to every one who inquires about their hope. Good behaviour and gentle answers may put their calumniators to shame ; in any case it is essential.[10]

In certain places Christians are already sharing in the sufferings of Christ, and therefore must rejoice therein. Their suffering may be misrepresented as the just punishment of murderers, thieves,

[1] v. 8. [2] iii. 9 with ii. 21-23. [3] iv. 19 with ii. 23. [4] i. 6 f.
[5] i. 22. [6] ii. 1. [7] ii. 11 f.. [8] ii. 13. [9] iii. 13 f. [10] iii. 15 f.

criminals or busybodies: they must correct by word or deed all such misrepresentations and make it clear that they are reproached—or what not?—simply because they are Christians.[1] Their adversary the devil—in the persons of all his agents—goes about seeking whose faith he may destroy; they must resist him and survive the ordeal.[2] Throughout the world the Christian brotherhood is exposed to the same temptations and varied persecutions.

From this evidence Professor Ramsay[3] concludes that the Epistle belongs to the time when Vespasian revived the policy of Nero. "The Christian communities of Asia Minor north of the Taurus are regarded as exposed to persecution (i. 6), not merely in the form of dislike and malevolence on the part of neighbours, . . . but persecution to the death (iv. 15, 16), after trial and question (iii. 15). The persecution is general, and extends over the whole Church (v. 9). The Christians are not merely tried when a private accuser comes forward against them, but are sought out for trial by the Roman officials (v. 8, iii. 15). They suffer for the Name (iv. 14-16) pure and simple; the trial takes the form of inquiry into their religion, giving them the opportunity of 'glorifying God in this name'."

Of this persecution by Vespasian there is no evidence except an inference from the statement of Sulpicius Severus, that Titus his son and successor wished to exterminate both Judaism and Christianity, and the general deduction from the letter of Pliny, that persecution for the Name was an established practice. Apart from this objection, it may fairly he said that even the rigorous interpretation which Professor Ramsay puts upon different passages is not necessarily inconsistent with the conditions of the reign of Nero when persecution of the Church did, as a fact, begin. If the vague terms, in which the various sufferings of Christians are described, are to be pressed and limited to mean State persecution and persecution to the death, there still remain indubitable references to unofficial persecution which did not go to such lengths. The author, as Professor Ramsay himself says, looks *forward* to a period of persecution as the condition in which Christians have to live. Further he exhorts Christians to be loyal subjects and therein proves that the obvious test of loyalty had not yet been applied to them. And he definitely excludes the narrow interpretation of the roaring lion, when he urges the Christians to resist it.

For these and other reasons, Professor Ramsay's theory is re-

[1] iv 13-16. [2] v. 8 f.:
[3] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 279 ff.

jected by Dr. Chase on the one hand and Professor Schmiedel[1] on the other. But many of his arguments hold good against the date under Trajan, to which Professor Schmiedel adheres. Pliny's correspondence with Trajan, however, is not easily made to fit the state of things reflected in the First Epistle of St. Peter. For one thing, in Pliny's time Bithynia was so far infected by real or nominal Christianity that the temples were deserted. The unlawful superstition was so far predominant that many of its adherents conformed without any conviction. Pliny's anticipation that clemency shown to such penitents would result in the annihilation of Christianity suggests an altogether different state of things.

On the whole—whether St. Peter perished under Nero or, as Professor Ramsay urges, at a later date—the Epistle may not unreasonably be referred to the time when Nero inaugurated the attack upon the provincial Roman Christians and gave the cue to all provincial governors who wished to earn his favour by endorsing the rightfulness of his action under whatever pretext. Already they were distinguished from the Jews, and, therefore, stood under the ban of the law as an unlicensed corporation. They were magicians who prophesied the destruction of the world, and the fire of Rome was proof of their power. They might plead innocence of crimes associated with the name by vulgar suspicion; but even when they cleared their name it was in itself sufficient to condemn them. That is the pagan view. The Christian view is that Christ suffered and they must follow in His steps. No colour must be given to the misrepresentations of their enemies. They must take every opportunity of removing them. This done, though death be their penalty, they will die to the glory of God, resisting the slanderer and remaining firm in their faith.

CANONICITY.

There are two different ways of treating the fact that any given book of the New Testament Canon is first quoted as authoritative Scripture and as the work of its commonly reputed author by a later writer of known date and recognised authority. You may say that the said book is thereby recognised as canonical and as authentic either *not before* or *as early as* such and such a date. In the former case the endorsement of tradition is regarded as an innovation, in the latter as an explicit regularisation of previous, but inarticulate, practice.

[1] *Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol. i.: "Christian, name of".

The former interpretation of such facts has the advantage of appearing to appeal to what is apparent and to nothing else. But it involves axioms which require to be proved. We must suppose that the Canon was definitely fixed by authority and was not a thing of gradual growth. And, if we are to argue from the silence of ecclesiastical writers, we must ignore the fact that many of them are no longer extant and postulate for them an interest in such matters as canonicity equal to our own. In fact it seems more reasonable to allow ourselves the exercise of a sober imagination in dealing with the evidence. In the case of 1 Peter at all events there is no sign of any attempt to force a new forgery upon the acceptance of the Church. It contains no innovation of doctrine such as might need the support of Apostolic authority.

The Epistle, then (we may say), is used by Irenæus *as early as* the third quarter of the second century. Behind Irenæus in all probability there lies a period, in which the idea of the New Testament Canon grew up and in which its contents were gradually reduced for reasons which appeared to those in authority to be adequate. Of that period we certainly do not know everything. All the Gnostics whom Irenæus has pilloried are represented only by fragments and summaries of their doctrines contemptuously preserved by their opponents at a later time. But, even so, it appears that the Gnostics in their efforts to elucidate the philosophy of the Christian religion and to advance to something higher than the somewhat pedestrian and commonplace theology of the ordinary ecclesiastic laid stress upon Scripture. And in so far as they tended to relegate the Old Testament to a definitely inferior place in the development of true religion they necessarily devoted themselves to the writings of the Apostles—the Scriptures of the New Testament. Inevitably the Gospels, which contained the sayings of Jesus, and the works of St. Paul occupied the first place in their estimation. The Lord and *the* Apostle exercised an authority to which the Church must bow. So the Gnostics applied themselves to New Testament exegesis—not always for the purposes of theological controversy. The controversies, which ensued upon the deductions they drew from such exegesis, led to the delimitation of the Canon and there is a strong presumption in favour of the traditional view of the books which survived the ordeal. 1 Peter is not a book which was likely to be much to the mind of daring thinkers who could discriminate between the different degrees of inspiration latent in different sayings of the Lord and who were determined to be done with Judaism. The Gnostics professed to be wiser than the Apostles—Irenæus their posthumous conqueror

asserts. 1 Peter is a book more congenial to such a man as Polycarp, who was more fitted to be a simple recipient of the general tradition. And it is to be remembered that Polycarp takes us back to a time when the idea of a Canon of New Testament Scripture was in its infancy.

Our document is first quoted with the formula *Peter* or *Peter in his Epistle says* in the latter part of the second century.

Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, whose book *Against Heresies* was written while Bleutherus was Bishop of Rome (A.D. 175-189),[1] is the earliest witness to its reception as such. He appealed to it (for example) along with Paul and Isaiah : " et Petrus ait in epistula : [2] *Quem non videntes diligitis,* inquit, *in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili* ".[3] In another place it is quoted after Moses and the Lord: "et propter hoc Petrus, ait, *non velamentum malitiae habere nos libertatem* [4] sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei ".

Tertullian, a little later, puts Peter on a level with Paul in respect of his inspiration, and explains their agreement as due to the fact that they were inspired by the same spirit: "de modestia quidem cultus et ornatus aperba praescriptio est etiam Petri cohibentis eodem ore quia eodem et spiritu quo Paulus, et vestium gloriam et auri superbiam et crinium lenoniam operositatem ".[5] In his *Antidote* to the poison of the Gnostics, which may perhaps be dated A.D. 213, he cites 1 Peter as addressed to the natives of Pontus: "Petrus quidem ad Ponticos, *Quanta enim,* inquit, *gloria si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis. Haec enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis, quoniam et Christus passus est pro nobis, relinquens vobis exemplum semetipsum, uti adsequamini vestigia ipsius.* Et rursus *Dilecti ne expavescatis ultionem quae agitur in vobis in temptationem, quasi novum accidat vobis; etenim secundum quod communicatis passionibus Christi, gaudete, uti et in revelatione gloriae eius gaudeatis exultantes : si dedecoramini nomine Christi, beati estis, quoniam gloria et dei spiritus requiescat in vobis, dum ne quis vestrum patiatur, ut homicida aut fur aut maleficus aut alieni speculator. Si autem ut Christianus, ne erubescat, glorificet autem dominum in nomine isto.*[6]

[1] " νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν 'Αποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον 'Ελεύθερος." Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 3. 3 (Harvey's edition).

[2] *Adv. Haer.* iv. 19, 2 = 1 Peter i. 8. [3] *Adv. Haer.* iv. 28. [4] 1 Peter ii. 16.

[5] *De Oratione*, xv. referring to 1 Peter iii. 3 and Tim. ii. 9; compare Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, III., xi. 66, quoted above.

[6] Scorpiace xii. = 1 Peter ii. 20, 21 and iv. 12-15.

Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 150-(?) 210) commented on 1 Peter in his Hypotyposes, but the commentary is only preserved in a Latin abridgment.[1] In his extant works he quotes freely from the Epistle and uses it as if it were familiar to to his readers. In the *Paedagogus*[2] (for example), which is addressed to catechumens, he says: ἐγνωκότες οὖν τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ἀναστράφητε, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθημεν ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατριπαραδότου, ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ. ἀρκετὸς οὖν ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος—ὁ Πέτρος φησί—τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι, πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις, οἰνοφλυγίαις, κώμοις, πότοις, καὶ ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις.[3] And in the *Stromateis*,[4] which were intended for more advanced Christians he has, after quotations from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: διὸ καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος Πέτρος φησίν· ἀγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν καλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. ὅτι οὕτως ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀγαθοποιοῦντας φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἐργασίαν, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς δοῦλοι θεοῦ. On one occasion[5] he fuses together the sumptuary laws for women laid down by St. Paul and St. Peter: προσιέναι δὲ αὐτὰς ὁ παιδάγωγος κελεύει ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ, μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς,[6] ὑποτασσομένας τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ὡς καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῖεν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, ἐποπτεύσαντες, φησί, τὴν ἐν λόγῳ ἁγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν· ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσίων ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος, ὅ ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελές.[7] This fusion is characteristic: both St. Paul and St. Peter wrote Scripture, and Clement follows popular usage, which never has insisted upon a nice discrimination between the authors of "texts". Indeed in another place[8] he refers part of the first Epistle to Timothy[9] to St. Peter:

[1] Potter's edition, pp. 1006 f. [2] III., xii. 85. [3] 1 Peter i. 17-19, iv. 3.
[4] III., xi. 75. [5] *Paedagogus*, III., xi. 66. [6] 1 Tim. ii. 9.
[7] 1 Peter iii. 1-4. [8] *Paedagogus*, II., xii. 127. [9] Tim. ii. 9 f.

πάνυ γοῦν θαυμασίως ὁ Πέτρος ὁ μακάριος γυναῖκας, φησίν, ὡσαύτως μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν ἢ χρυσῷ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν σφᾶς αὐτὰς κοσμούσων.

The fact of the matter is that even Clement used, at any rate in his *Paedagogus*, manuals of extracts from Scripture classified according to their subjects. His *Paedagogus* or instructor is the distinguished successor of a line of humbler books of the same kind. The Christian catechist had his armoury of appropriate texts just as the missionary to the Jews had his. The extracts were arranged under headings: sayings of Moses, the Prophet, the Psalmist, the Sage, the Lord and the Apostle followed each other in various orders and with different degrees of precision in attribution. The inevitable results were that the extracts were affected by their new neighbours in respect of their text, and that their proper ascription was lost sight of. As the learning and the security of the Church increased, these results were corrected. Complete Bibles in the Church chests superseded the manuals, and Origen (for example) laboured to restore the purity of the text. The new state of things is reflected in the *Stromateis* of Clement: there Jesus Son of Sirach receives credit for his wisdom, which in the *Paedagogus* is ascribed to wisdom, the Paedagogue, or Solomon; and the text of the extracts conforms to the standard of the uncial manuscripts. But the literature which preceded Clement was popular rather than scholarly, and the phenomena presented by his use of Scripture in the *Paedagogus* contribute to confirm the conclusion that the argument based upon the silence of his predecessors is fallacious, and that their silence can fairly be construed as a denial of the Petrine origin or authorship of 1 Peter.

These examples of the use of 1 Peter made by Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria have been given in full to show what the raw material of the evidence really is. Samples only as they are, they suffice to show that 1 Peter was recognised as St. Peter's Epistle about A.D. 200 in Gaul, Africa, and Alexandria. By a stretch of the imagination it might be supposed that Tertullian was dependent upon Clement for this knowledge; but Irenæus and Clement represent a tradition which they inherited independently from a distant past. Now Clement was the earliest Christian *scholar*, whose works have come down to us, and Irenæus is linked to the apostolic age by his connexion with Polycarp.

In his Epistle to the Philippians, Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna,

who died a martyr on 23rd February, A.D. 155 at the age of 86 years,[1] has left, as Eusebius noted, a valuable witness to the earlier history of the New Testament Canon.

So far as the Canonicity of 1 Peter is concerned the evidence of the Epistle is overwhelming. It is true that Polycarp does not give the name of the authority, which he uses so often. It would be unreasonable to expect that he should. "Paul" and "the Lord" are the only authors named. The words of the Lord have naturally a higher authority than those of His Apostles—at any rate at this stage in the development of the Canon. And St. Paul as the founder of the Church at Philippi had a special claim upon their obedience: "Neither I (Polycarp says) nor anyone like me can attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who, when he came among you, before the face of the men of that time taught accurately and surely the word of truth, who also when he was absent wrote letters to you into which if you look you will be able to be built up in the faith given unto you."[2] Other Scriptures, even the first Epistle of St. John, Polycarp's teacher, are used just as 1 Peter is used—anonymously and not always with a clear formula to stamp the quotations as quotations.

The following passages contain clear cases of Polycarp's use of 1 Peter:—

(I. 1-3) συνεχάρην . . . ὅτι ἡ βεβαία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν ῥίζα . . . μεχρὶ νῦν διαμένει καὶ καρποφορεῖ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν . . . εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ[3] εἰς ἣν πολλοὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν.[4]

II. διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας ὑμῶν[5] δουλεύσατε τῷ θεῷ . . . πιστεύσαντες εἰς τὸν ἐγείραντα τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόντα αὐτῷ δόξαν[6] καὶ θρόνον ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ . . . μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἢ λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας[7] ἢ γρόνθον ἀντὶ γρόνθου ἢ κατάραν ἀντὶ κατάρας.[8]

V. καλὸν γὰρ τὸ ἀνακόπτεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ὅτι πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται.[9]

VII. ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν παραδοθέντα λόγον ἐπιστρέψωμεν νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχὰς[10] καὶ προσκαρτεροῦντες νηστείαις.

[1] So Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der Altkirchlichen Litteratur*, i. p. 149.
[2] iii. 2. [3] 1 Peter i. 8. [4] Compare 1 Peter i. 12. [5] 1 Peter i. 3.
[6] 1 Peter i. 21. [7] 1 Peter iii. 9. [8] Compare 1 Peter iii. 9.
[9] 1 Peter ii. 11 conflated with Galatians v. 17. [10] Peter iv. 7.

VIII. προσκαρτερῶμεν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἡμῶν καὶ τῷ ἀρραβῶνι τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὃς ἀνήνεγκεν ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ἰδίῳ σώματι ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον,[1] ὃς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ.[2] ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμᾶς, ἵνα ζήσωμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, πάντα ὑπέμεινεν. μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐὰν πάσχωμεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, δοξάζωμεν αὐτόν.[3] τοῦτον γὰρ ἡμῖν τὸν ὑπογραμμὸν ἔθηκε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦτο ἐπιστεύσαμεν.[4]

X. In his ergo state et domini exemplar sequimini *firmi in fide et inmutabiles, fraternitatis amatores diligentes invicem. . . .*[5] *Omnes vobis invicem subiecti estote,*[6] *conversationem vestram inreprehensibilem habentes in gentibus, ut ex bonis operibus vestris* et vos laudem accipiatis *et dominus in vobis non blasphemetur.*[7]

[1] 1 Peter ii. 24.
[2] 1 Peter ii. 22.
[3] 1 Peter iv. 16.
[4] 1 Peter ii. 21.
[5] Compare 1 Peter iii. 8 (ii. 17).
[6] Compare 1 Peter v. 5.
[7] 1 Peter ii. 12: the paraphrase of the latter part of the verse (ἐποπτεύοντες δοξάσωσι τὸν θεόν) is due to the next quotation (Isaiah lii. 5), vae autem, per quem nomen domini blasphematur.

NOTE.

This edition is based on a course of lectures delivered, in the first instance, to a class of honours men who were expected to use the late Professor Bigg's commentary as a text-book. The lectures were, therefore, made independently of that commentary and with a view to the exhibition of new material and processes rather than results. In particular, an attempt was made to illustrate the reference of the Septuagint and Jewish literature generally to the exegesis of the New Testament. In the reduction of these notes to their present form the commentaries of Alford, Bigg, Hort, Kühl-Meyer, and Von Soden were consulted.

The text is taken from the facsimile of the great Vatican Codex (B), the lines of which are indicated by spaces.

The editor gratefully acknowledges the kindness of the Rev. George Milligan, D.D., and the Rev. R. St. John Parry, B.D., who read the commentary in proof.

‾πέτρου Α‾.

ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ἀπόστολος ΙΥ ΧΥ[1] ἐκλεκτοῖς παρε πιδήμοις δια- I. 1
σπορᾶς Πόντου Γαλατίας Καπ παδοκίας Ἀσίας κατὰ 2

[1] ΙΥ ΧΥ is the normal contraction of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: so ΚΥ = κυρίου, ΘΥ = Θεοῦ. After Ἀσίας all other manuscripts and all the versions add καὶ βιθυνίας: the original scribe of Codex Vaticanus (B*) stands alone in the omission.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1, 2. Peter the High Commissioner of Jesus, who is Messiah of Greeks as of Jews, sends greeting after the Christian fashion, in which the Greek and Jewish formulæ have been combined and transformed, to the Churches of Northern Asia Minor. They are the dispersion of the New Israel, chosen out of the whole world in accordance with God's foreknowledge of their fitness, to undergo the hallowing of His Spirit, and with a view to their reception into His Church. For the result, and therefore the purpose, of their election is that they may profess obedience and receive the outward sign of sprinkling, being baptised into the death of Jesus Christ. For them may grace (and not mere greeting) and peace (God's peace not man's) be multiplied! For discussion of writer and readers see Introduction.

Ver. 1. **ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς**, *elect sojourners of dispersion*, a combination of titles of Israel appropriated to Christians in accordance with the universal principle of the early Church. (i.) The Jews were the *chosen race* (ii. 9 from Isa. xliii. 20) as Moses said, *Because He loved thy fathers therefore He chose their seed after them* (Deut. iv. 37; *cf.* Rom. xi. 28). So Jesus said to His disciples, *I have chosen you* (John xv. 16, 19, etc.), and refers to them in the eschatological discourse as *the elect* (Mark xiii. 20). (ii.) Being *chosen out of the world—in the world*, indeed, *but not of it*, John xv. 16 ff.—Christians are *alien sojourners* during their life on earth. Their fatherland is *the city that hath foundations* (i. 7, ii. 11; Heb. xiii. 14; Phil. iii. 20). In Heb. xi. 9-13 the Patriarchs are credited with the same idea and Philo says that the sages of Moses' school are all introduced as *sojourners* (p. 416 M). So Abraham said to the Sons of Heth, "I am a stranger and sojourner (**πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος** = גר ותושב) with you" (Gen. xxiii. 4); Jacob speaks of *the days of the years of my pilgrimage* (מגורי **ἃς παροικῶ**); and the Psalmist anticipates Peter and Heb. in the generalisation *I am a stranger and sojourner* (**πάροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος**) *in the earth as all my fathers were* (Ps. xxxix. 13). Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 149) quotes two examples of **παρεπίδημος** from wills of the third century B.C., one of a Jew resident in the Fayyûm (**Ἀπολλώνιον [παρεπ]ίδημον ὃς καὶ συριστὶ Ἰωνάθας**). In P. Tor. 8 (B.C. 118) **παρεπιδημοῦντες** and **κατοικοῦντες** are contrasted. (iii.) Moses said to Israel *thou shalt be scattered among the kingdoms of the earth* (Deut. xxviii. 25); and the rendering of the LXX **διασπορά** is probably the earliest example of the technical designation (*cf.* John vii. 35) of the Jews, who—for whatever reason—lived outside the Holy Land. The collective term (Rabbinic גולה) implies the real unity of these scattered communities, whose scattering is no longer regarded as God's punishment for sin. It thus serves well the purpose of one, who, like St. Paul, insists on the unity of the whole brotherhood of Christians (*e.g.*, v. 9); but this application of the principle that the Church is the Israel of God is subordinate to others which imply that there is

προγνωσιν ΘΫ[1] πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύμα τος εἰς ὑπακοὴν
καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος ΙΫ ΧΫ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη

[1] ΘΫ is the normal contraction of Θεοῦ.

no earthly correlative to it. When St. James addresses *the twelve tribes which are in Dispersion*, he may on the other hand be contrasting the saints of Jerusalem with those abroad (as St. Paul did in the matter of the Collection) if indeed he is not speaking simply to his fellow-countrymen as a Jew to Jews. But St. Peter writes from "Babylon" and the capital of Christendom is no longer Jerusalem. The collocation of **παρεπιδήμοις** and **διασπορᾶς** implies that this scattering, which in the case of the type was God's punishment for sin, will not be permanent for the antitype. For the Christian Church the Jewish hope of the ingathering will be fulfilled, as is indicated by the emphatic **ἐκλεκτοῖς**—for Jesus said, "*The Son of Man . . . shall gather together his elect . . . from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven*" (Mark xiii. 26, 27; *cf.* Deut. xxx. 4). Compare Didache ix. 4, "For as this was broken [bread] scattered over the hills and being gathered together became one, so may thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth *into thy kingdom*," and Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 113, "As Moses . . . so also Jesus the Christ (corresponding to J., the Son of Nun) shall turn again the Dispersion of the People . . . shall give us the possession eternally".

Πόντου . . . Ἀσίας. The order indicates the route of the messenger, who landed presumably at Sinope or Amastris and, if the omission of **καὶ Βιθυνίας** be accepted, left the country at Ephesus or Smyrna. The (Armenian) Acta of Phocas (Martyr of Sinope under Trajan) are addressed to the brethren dwelling in Pontus and Bithynia in Paphlagonia and in Mysia in Galatia and in Cappadocia and in Armenia (Conybeare, *Monuments of Early Christianity*, p. 103). See Introduction.

Ver. 2. The three clauses **κατὰ . . .**, **ἐν . . .**, and **εἰς . . .** qualify **ἐκλεκτοῖς** and perhaps also **ἀπόστολος** (as Oecumenius) Peter himself is *elect* and shares their privileges but had no need to magnify his office, as had St. Paul. Yet see Acts xv. 7 ff.

κατὰ πρόγνωσιν. . . . The noun occurs only in Acts ii. 23 (speech of St. Peter) in reference to the slaying of Christ **τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ**, *cf.* i. 20. The use of nouns instead of verbs is characteristic of this Epistle. The same idea is expressed more elaborately by St. Paul in Rom. viii. 29 (*q.v.*). *Cf.* Origen, *Philocalia*, xxv. Oecumenius infers that the Apostle is thus the equal of the prophets, especially Jeremiah (*v.* Jer. i. 5).—**ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος**, subjective genitive like **θεοῦ**, being elect they are within the sphere of the proper work of the Holy Spirit. The context excludes the rendering *hallowing of the (human) spirit*. Peter uses the stereotyped phrase; *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 13 (which corresponds exactly to the whole context) **εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (κατὰ πρ. θ. π.) . . . ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας (εἰς ὑπ.)**.—**εἰς ὑπακοὴν . . . Ἰ. Χριστοῦ**, the goal or purpose of their election. *Obedience* is a technical term: sc. *to* God; *cf.* i. 14, where it is contrasted with the ignorant disobedience of their past lives (i. 22). As Christians, they obeyed God and not men (Acts iv. 19, v. 29); God gives His Holy Spirit to them that obey Him (Acts v. 32). Compare the Pauline *obedience of faith*. This obedience implies a change of mind in Jew and in Gentile, which is effected by the *sprinkling of blood of Jesus Christ*. They are now cleansed from sin, which is disobedience in Jew or Gentile. Jesus Christ, the mediator of the new covenant, sprinkles those whom God selected with His own blood, as Moses sprinkled the children of Israel who had promised obedience with the blood of oxen (Exod. xxiv. 7 f.; *cf.* Heb. ix. 19). But references to other sprinklings of the O.T., unconnected with obedience, must not be excluded. The word **ῥαντισμός** is appropriated, for example, to the water in which the ashes of the heifer were dissolved (Num. xix.); and a less obvious explanation is supported by Barnabas, "that by the remission of sins we might be purified, that is in the sprinkling of His blood for it stands written . . . *by His bruise we were healed* (Isa. liii. 5)". Indeed the best commentary is supplied by the Epistle to the Hebrews in which evidence of the O.T. is reviewed and the conclusion drawn that according to the

πληθυνθείη. εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θς̄[1] καὶ πα τὴρ τοῦ Κῡ ἡμῶν Ιῡ 3
Χῡ ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς[2] εἰς

[1] Θς̄ is the normal contraction of Θεός: so Χ̄ς̄ = Χριστός, κ̄ς̄ = κύριος, Ις̄ = Ἰησοῦς.

[2] For ἡμᾶς a few cursives read ὑμᾶς: the words are practically interchangeable in manuscripts.

law everything is cleansed by blood. All the types were summed up in the fulfilment (see especially Heb. ix.) whether they related to the Covenant or to the Worship. So in Heb. xii. 24 the blood of Abel the first martyr is drawn into the composite picture of typical blood sheddings. It would be possible to take ὑπακοὴν with Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and to render either that ye might obey Jesus Christ (*cf.* i. 22; 2 Cor. x. 5) being sprinkled with His blood or that ye might obey as He obeyed even unto death (*cf.* Heb. v. 8; Phil. ii. 8). χάρις . . . πληθυνθείη. This full formula is found also in 2 Peter and Jude. For precedent see Dan. iii. 31. Its use here is not merely a convention peculiar to the Petrine school; grace and peace are multiplied to match the growth of hostility with which the Christians addressed are confronted, lest the word of Jesus be fulfilled διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν (Matt. xxiv. 12); *cf.* Rom. v. 20 f. In the Pastoral Epistles ἔλεος (*cf.* ver. 3) is inserted between χ. and εἰρ., so 2 John 3. From Gal. vi. 16 it appears that ἔλεος stood originally in the place which χάρις usurped (as distinctively Christian and reminiscent of the familar χαίρειν); so that the source will be Num. vi. 24-26. κύριος . . . ἐλεῆσαι σε . . . καὶ δῴη σοι εἰρήνην.

Vv. 3-12. *Benediction of the Name.* The mention of God is followed by the Benediction of the Name as Jewish piety prescribed; the formula *the Holy One, blessed be He*, being] amplified by the Christian appreciation of their fuller knowledge. The Apostle surpasses the fervour of the Psalmist, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel inasmuch as the last mighty work surpasses all previous deliverances. It falls naturally into three divisions. Vv. 3-5 have as their central figure the Father, vv. 6-9 the Son, and vv. 10-12 the Spirit who is at last given, who inspired the prophets of old and now inspires the Christian missionaries. From the past which preceded their acceptance of God's choice of them and its outward sign St. Peter turns to consider their present condition and to illuminate it with the light of the future glory.

Vv. 3-5. Blessed be God whom we have come to know as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ! For He has granted to us the crowning manifestation of His great mercy. He has raised Jesus Christ from the dead and us thereby to newness of life. So you may hope for and in part enjoy the inheritance which was prefigured by the Promised Land. This heavenly treasure God has kept for those whom He guards with His power. So your faith respond, He is guarding you for the salvation which will be revealed at the last.

Ver. 3. εὐλογητός. The verbal adjective is recognised, perhaps coined by the LXX as proper to the Benediction of the Name. This usage is reflected in N.T., Rom. i. 25, ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; note Mark xiv. 61. ὁ θεὸς . . . ἡμῶν, part ot the formula (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3)—based on the saying "I ascend to your father and my father, unto your God and my God" (John xx. 17). κατὰ τὸ πολὺ ἔλεος, the more elaborate κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ of Eph. i. 7 (*cf.* ii. 4). ἀναγεννήσας (*cf.* i. 23). Else the verb only occurs in N.T. as variant to γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν in Old Latin (and Irenæus) text of John iii. 5, which prompted St. Peter's Christian use of the word, see especially i. 23. Later it is used to describe the outward sign of baptism (*e.g.*, Justin Apol. i. 51) for the benefit of pagans as to the limitation of worshippers of Isis (Apuleius, *Met.* xi. 26, ut renatus quodammodo staatim sacrorum obsequio desponderetur). And of Mithras (in aeternum renati). Here the regeneration of the Christian corresponds to the resurrection of Christ (Chrysostom on John) and implies a previous mystical or figurative death to sin—see ii. 24; iii. 17 f.; iv. 1—which is repeated in the practice of their unnatural virtue (iv. 1-4). The simple idea of regeneration underlies St. Paul's elaborations of the doctrine of the καινὴ κτίσις. Hort refers to Philo, *de incorruptibilitate mundi* (ii. 489 M.) where ἀναγέννησις is used for the more usual παλιγγενεσία—rebirth of the world—of the Stoics. ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν. The omission of the definite article is characteristic of St. Peter. The *Hope*

4 ἐλπίδα ζῶσα⁻[1] δι' ἀναστάσεως ΙΥ ΧΥ ἐκ νεκρῶν εἰς κληρο
νομίαν ἄφθαρτον κ͵[2] ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάρα⁻ τον τετηρημένην ἐ⁻
5 οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει ΘΥ φρου ρουμένους διὰ

[1] ζωσα⁻ = ζῶσαν: the sign ⁻ for *ν* is apt to be absorbed in the preceding line and so disregarded: it is used at the end of the line or *sichu*, whether or not the word in which it occurs has come to its end.

[2] κ͵ is the common abbreviation for καί: it is probably derived from cursive writing in which letters were joined together and so varied in shape according to their companions.

is a recognised technical term (Acts xxiii. 6, etc.) of the Pharisees, corresponding to בטחון. ζῶσαν stamps the Christian hope as Divine since life is God's prerogative (*cf.* i. 23 and the *living* bread, water of John) and effective (*cf.* the corresponding use of dead faith, Jas. ii. 17, 26). *Cf.* Sap. iii. 4, ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης. δι' ἀ. with ἀναγεννήσας rather than ζῶσαν: three prepositional clauses are thus attached to ἀ. as to ἐκλεκτοῖς (and ἀπόστολος) in ver. 2. The resurrection of Jesus is the means and guarantee of the spiritual resurrection of the Christian (1 Cor. xv. 14, 17) from the death of the sinful and fleshly life.

Ver. 4. εἰς κληρ. . . . ἀμάραντον, as God's sons in virtue of their regeneration they are God's heirs (Gal. iv. 7) and have an heavenly inheritance. The accumulated adjectives recall various images employed to describe it—and emphasise the fact that it is eternal (Heb. ix. 15) and spiritual. It is ἄφθαρτον, *incorruptible* (*cf.* i. 23, iii. 4) because it belongs to the future life which the risen dead (1 Cor. xv. 52) share with God Himself (Rom. i. 23; 1 Tim. i. 17). It is set where "moth doth not corrupt (διαφθείρει, Luke xii. 33: Matt. vi. 19 ff. has ἀφανίζει)," apart from this corruptible world (*cf.* Isa. xxiv. 3). It is the incorruptible crown (1 Cor. ix. 25). The second epithet ἀμίαντον is applied to the great High Priest, Heb. vii. 26 (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 4; Jas. i. 27) and implies again separation from this sinful world of which it is written ἐμιάνατε τὴν γῆν μου καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν μου ἔθεσθε εἰς βδέλυγμα (Jer. ii. 7). Compare the description of virtue in Sap. iv. 2, στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα. ἀμάραντον is peculiar to 1 Peter in N.T., *cf.* ἀμαράντινον (v. 4): it is perhaps derived from Sap. vi. 12, ἀμάραντός ἐστιν ἡ σοφία, and thus presupposes the identification of eternal life with knowledge of God (John xvii. 3). Compare the application of Isa. xl. 6 f. (cited *infra* 24) in Jas. i. 11. All three suit or are associated with the wreath presented to the victor in the games—a metaphor which the Lord Himself used according to the Apocalypse (ii. 10, *cf.* 1 Peter v. 4; Jas. i. 12). Origen (?) in Cramer's *Catena* notes that the words contradict Chiliasm. τετηρημένην εἰς ὑμᾶς, *reserved* (1) *with a view to you*, *cf.* John xii. 7, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν . . . τηρήσῃ, 2 Peter ii. 4, εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους; for same use of εἰς in similar context see Rom. viii. 18. (2) . . . *until you came*—a sense which would suit the other examples of τηρεῖν εἰς. (3) . . . *for you*, εἰς = ל = dative (so Syriac), the writer or translator being influenced by εἰς above and below. The inheritance is still, as it has always been, kept back, but the Christians are sure to succeed to it. So Enoch refers to the secrets of the righteous which shall be revealed (xxxviii. 3); the lot of the righteous which the Son of Man preserves (xlviii. 7); and says Blessed are ye ye righteous and elect for glorious will be your lot . . . it will be said to the holy that they should seek in heaven the secrets of righteousness the heritage of faith (lviii. 5).

Ver. 5. The Christians addressed are—to complete the metaphor from other passages in the Epistle—a spiritual house (ii. v.), which is besieged by the devil (v. 8) but guarded and garrisoned by God's Power. So long as they have faith (v. 9) they are safe: "our faith lays hold upon this power and this power strengthens faith and so we are preserved" (Leighton)., Without responsive faith God's power is powerless to heal or to guard (*cf.* Mark vi. 5 f. and accounts of Jesus' miracles generally, Jas. i. 6 f.). The language seems to echo Rom. i. 16, δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, combined with Gal. iii. 23 (*cf.* Phil. iv. 7) where also the distinctive φρουρεῖν occurs in similar context. The *Power*

πίστε ως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοί μην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ· ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ὀλίγον ἄρ τι εἰ δέον [1] λυπηθέντες [2] 6

[1] Codex Alexandrinus with others adds ἐστι after δέον.

[2] λυπηθέντες is probably right, εἰ δέον being parenthetical: the variants λυπηθέντας (first hand of Codex Sinaiticus and many cursives) and λυπηθῆναι (one cursive and the Vulgate) are due to the connexion of δέον with its context, the parenthetical character of the phrase being disregarded.

(גבורתא) *of God* is put for *Jehovah* in the Targum of Isa. xxxiii. 21; and the corresponding use of ἡ δύναμις is found in Mark xiv. 62 (see Dalman, 200 f.; and add ἡ μεγαλωσύνη, a more exact rendering, of Heb. i. 3, viii. 1). In Philo God's powers are personified self-manifestations. εἰς σωτηρίαν, κ.τ.λ., is probably the third clause qualification of φρουρ. (*cf.* 2, 3). Below, the salvation of souls is described as the goal of faith (9) in a passage where the ἑτοίμην, κ.τ.λ., qualify σωτηρίαν rather than κληρονομίαν which is explained by σωτ. . . . ἐσχάτῳ. Salvation is to St. Peter that salvation which is to be revealed in the future (*cf.* i. 9, ii. 2; so Rom. xiii. 11, νῦν ἐγγύτερον . . . ἡ σωτηρία). Partial anticipations he neglects; for them as for Christ the glory follows the present suffering. The idea of the revelation of salvation comes from Ps. xcviii. 2 (*cf.* Isa. lvi. 1) which has influenced St. Paul also (Rom. i. 16 f.). ἑτοίμην seems to be simply the equivalent of עתיד *prepared*, which St. Paul renders with more attention to current usage than etymology by μέλλουσαν (Rom. viii. 18; Gal. iii. 23; so 1 Peter v. 1). This weaker sense begins with Deut. xxxii. 35 (LXX, πάρεστιν ἕτοιμα, as Peter here) and prevails in new Hebrew (Tarphon said . . . the recompense of the reward of the righteous is for *the time to come*. העתיד לבא, Aboth, ii. 19). But the proper significance of the word is recognised and utilised in the Parables of Jesus, Matt. xxiv. 4, 8.

καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, still anarthrous as being technical term—indefinite as the time is unknown as well as in accordance with authors' custom (*cf.* δύναμις, πιστέως, σωτηρίαν above); *cf.* John ii. 18.

Vv. 6-9. Exult then. These various temptations to which you are exposed cause present grief. But they are part of God's plan for you. Even material perishable gold is tried in the fire. So is your faith tested that it may be purged of its dross and the good metal be discovered when Jesus Christ is revealed. You love Him whom you never saw; though you see Him not you believe on Him. Exult then with joy that anticipates your future glory. You are winning the prize of your faith, the ultimate salvation of souls. St. Peter returns to the present and regards it from the point of view of those whom God is guarding—but only to advance again to the glorious future (7 fin, 9) when Jesus Christ the present object of their love and faith shall be revealed. He is the central figure of this section which is based upon two of His sayings which are appropriate to the circumstances of these His persecuted followers (so iv. 13) *v.* Matt. v. 12 = Apoc. xix. 7 from Ps. xxi. 1, cxviii. 24. Compare Jas. i. 2-4 and John cited below.

Ver. 6. ἐν ᾧ. There are four possible antecedents. (1) καιρῷ, (2) Jesus Christ, (3) God, (4) the state of things described in 3-5. (1) would imply that they must live in the future and is least probably right. (2) is supported by 8 but is unlikely at this point. The choice lies between (3), God being hitherto the dominating figure; and (4): *cf.* Luke i. 47 = 1 Sam. ii. 1 α—ἀ. with ἐν in LXX as well as ἐπί. ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. Indicative (with or without quasi future meaning) rather than Imperative. Bye form of ἀγάλλομαι (Homer downwards) first found in LXX especially as assonant rendering of גיל: used later in bad sense (λοιδορεῖται, Hesych): here borrowed from Matt. v. 11 f. χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. ὀλίγον, (1) *for a little time*, or (2) *to a small extent* (contrast John xvi. 6, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν). εἰ δέον, they cannot but feel grief at their trials (John xvi. 20, ὑμεῖς λυπηθήσεσθε ἡ δὲ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται), but they must not indulge their natural weakness. To take the "necessity" as referring to their trials (for not all the Saints are oppressed, Oec.) limits λυπ. to the external sense of vexation without reference to the feelings of the grieved corresponding to the feelings implied in ἀγ. The contrast is thus destroyed, but this sense *harass* would suit the other military metaphor, τοὺς φρουρουμένους.—ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, the adjective rules out the

7 ἐν ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον[1] ὑμῶ̄ τῆς πίστεως πολυτει[2] μότερον χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυ ρὸς δὲ

[1] For δοκίμιον three cursives read δόκιμον, a more familiar form of the adjective.

[2] The ει in πολυτειμότερον is used in place of the conventional ι to show that the syllable is long: so τειμήν, etc. The secondary uncials have πολὺ τιμίωτερον.

limitation of π. to external trials which St. James who has the entire phrase seems to put upon it.

Ver. 7. τὸ δοκίμιον. The evidence of the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 259 ff.) shows that δοκίμιος is a bye form of the adjective δόκιμος *approved*; so Ps. xii. 7, ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον δοκίμιον (*cf.* 1 Chron. xxxix. 4; Zech. xi. 3, where it occurs as *v.l.* for δόκιμον). Hence the phrase (here and in Jas. i. 3?) corresponds exactly to St. Paul's τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης γνήσιον—"the genuineness of your faith or "the approvedness"). So Arethas on Apoc. ix. 4, οἱ δὲ τὸ δοκίμιον ἑαυτῶν διὰ πυρὸς παρεχόμενοι. The substantive δ. = "means of trial, testing" which does not suit this context, or a specimen of metal to be tested.—πολυτιμότερον, to justify the common rendering (A.V., R.V.) according to which π. κ.τ.λ. are taken as in apposition to τὸ δοκ., ὂν must be supplied as if omitted by haplography after πολ. But there is no need for emendation, if πολ. be taken as predicate thrown forward for the sake of emphasis.—χρυσοῦ κ.τ.λ. St. Peter adapts the familiar comparison of man's suffering to the fining-pot of precious metal, insisting on the superiority of the spiritual to the material gold. The stress lies on διὰ πυρός. True faith is tested by trials, just as gold is proved by fire. It is more valuable than gold which is perishable. If men test gold thus, much more will God test faith which outlives the present age, *cf.* Hebrew ix. 23. *Cf.* use of πύρωσις, iv. 12. For the image, Zech. xiii. 9, δοκιμῶ αὐτοὺς ὡς δοκιμάζεται τὸ χρυσίον; Ps. lxvi. 10; Prov. xvii. 3; Sir. ii. 5, etc.—Τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, *cf.* John vi. 27, τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπ. (contrasted with imperishable food; here gold generally is contrasted with faith) and φθαρτοῖς ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ below.—εὑρεθῇ, *cf.* 2 Peter iii. 14, σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ; Ps. xvii. 3, ἐδοκίμασας τὴν καρδίαν μου . . . καὶ οὐχ εὑρέθη ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀδικία.—εἰς ἔπαινον . . . must be taken with the whole sentence, unless ὂν be supplied. So εἰς might introduce the predicate (better ∵ stronger) of εὑρ., *cf.* Rom. vii. 10. εἰς taken as = ל expressing transition into a new state or condition (as Rom. vii. 10).—ἔπαινον is the verdict. "Well done good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The Christian is the true Jew and receives at last the *praise* which the name Judah signifies. In Rom. ii. 29, ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος . . . οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, Paul follows the alteration of the original ἐξομολόγησις (Gen. xxix. 35, LXX, and Philo) consequent upon the transference of the praise (תודה) from God to men (*cf.* Gen. xlix. 8, Ἰούδα σε αἰνέσαισαν οἱ ἀδελφοί σου). The old Israel set their hope on praise from the congregation (Sir. xxxix. 10) or glory from men, John v. 44; xii. 42 f. The new Israel looked for praise from God to balance the dispraise of men (Matt. v. 11 f.); so St. Peter adds ἐπ. to the usual formula δόξαν καὶ τιμήν, Rom. ii. 7, 10 (Ps. viii. 6) δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφάνωσας ἄνθρωπον, *cf.* σκεῦος εἰς τιμήν, Rom. ix. 21, for the less obvious word. Hort compares Marcus Aurelius xii. 11, μὴ ποιεῖν ἄλλο ἢ ὅπερ μέλλει ὁ θεὸς ἐπαινεῖν.—ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰυ. Χυ., *when Jesus Christ is revealed*. The expression is derived from the saying κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔσται ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται (Luke xvii. 30). As Judge He will pronounce the verdict of approval and bestow glory and honour. The reference to present *glorified joy* in the midst of trial suggests that the writer has advanced beyond the simple belief in a final theophany and contemplates a spiritual revelation of Jesus Christ as each Christian (*cf.* Gal. i. 16) realises the meaning of His Resurrection; but *cf.* μὴ ὁρῶντες below.

Ver. 7. The Christians addressed were not personal disciples of Jesus but converts of the Apostles (12). As such they could claim Beatitude μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες (John xx. 29). Their love began and continues without sight of Him; even now when they expect His coming they must still believe without seeing Him and exult. The Latin version of Augustine, gives

δοκιμαζομένου εὑρεθῇ εἰς ἔπαινον ϗ δόξαν καὶ τειμὴν ἐν
ἀποκαλύψει ΙΥ ΧΥ ὃν οὐχ[1] ἰδόντες[2] ἀγαπᾶτε εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ 8
ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλ λιᾶτε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλή τῳ καὶ
δεδοξασμένῃ κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως σωτηρί αν 9
ψυχῶν. περὶ ἧς σω τηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν ϗ ἐξηραύνησαν προ- 10
φῆ ται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαν τες

[1] The first hand of Codex Vaticanus is alone in reading οὐχ, which could only be justified if followed by an aspirate.

[2] For ἰδόντες many manuscripts, headed by Codex Alexandrinus, read εἰδότες: this confusion between ἰδεῖν and εἰδέναι is common.

three distinct clauses referring to the past, the present and the future climax *whom you knew not; in whom now—not seeing ye believe; whom when you see you will exult*. But for lack of support it must be set aside in favour of the Greek text (which regards present as leading up to future culmination without a break) as being a redaction of the passage for separate use. **εἰς ὅν**, with πιστεύοντες, μὴ ὁρῶντες being parenthesis added to explain force of πιστ. (Heb. xi. 1; Rom. viii. 24).—**χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ**. Their faith enables them to pass beyond their present sufferings to the joy which belongs to the subsequent glories. Thus their joy being heavenly is *unspeakable* and *glorified*. Language cannot express the communion with God which the Christian like St. Paul may enjoy (2 Cor. xii. 3 f.); compare Rom. viii. 26, αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. And this joy is *glorified* because it is an earnest of the glory which shall be revealed; *cf.* iv. 14.

Ver. 9. The connexion with mention of persecution suggests that the writer is here thinking of the saying, *in your patience ye shall win your souls* and perhaps also of the contrast between the persecutoı who has only power over the body. Whatever happen to the body the conclusion—the consummation of their faith—is assured them.—**κομιζόμενοι** implies that already they are receiving what is due to them (*cf.* v. 4) and therefore they rejoice with Hannah in God the Saviour. In the Attic Orators who use a refined form of colloquial Greek the verb is common in the sense of *recovering* debts, as in Matt. xxv. 27, ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμόν. St. Paul applies it to future recompense (2 Cor. v. 10, ἵνα κομίσηται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 25; *cf.* 2 Macc. viii. 33, τὸν ἄξιον τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκομίσατο μισθόν); in Heb. iii. 4, it is used of receiving promises.—**τὸ τέλος**. The common meaning *fulfilment* or *consummation* gives a fair sense but the connection with κομιζόμενοι is thus somewhat strange. The parallel of v. 4, taken with Pindar, Ol. x(xi.) 81, Δόρυκλος δ' ἔφερε πυγμᾶς **τέλος**, suggests as a possible rendering *because ye receive the reward*. The Septuagint, again (Num. xxxi. 28, etc.), uses τ. to translate מכס = *proportion to be paid, tax*. And this use is well established in Greek literature for **τὰ τέλη**, *cf.* λυσιτελεῖν, etc. Accordingly Suidas defines τέλος as τὸ διδόμενον τοῖς βασιλεῦσι. The particular connotations can hardly be pressed here but these uses give some colour of support to the Syriac rendering *recompense* and the *mercedem* of Augustine; *cf.* Rom. vi. 22.—**σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν** = σωτηρίαν above. ψυχῶν is added to console the readers for their sufferings in accordance with Mark viii. 35, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν = John xii. 25; *cf.* Luke xxi. 19; Jas. i. 21. The soul for St. Peter is the self or personality as for Jesus Himself.

Vv. 10-12.—The ancient prophets prophesied concerning the grace which was destined for you and enquired diligently about this salvation. They were the unconscious instruments of the revelation of God and their first duty done continued to pore over the inspired descriptions of the sufferings and subsequent glories of the Messiah. They asked themselves to whom does this refer and when shall these things be. And to them the revelation was made that they were only the administrators of an estate which others—you in fact should enjoy. The subjects of their prophecies have now been proclaimed to you by your Christian teachers who, like the prophets, were inspired by

11 ἐραυνῶντες εἰς τίνα ἢ ποῖον καιρὸν ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα[1] προμαρτυρό μενον[2] τὰ εἰς Χρειστὸ παθήματα καὶ τὰς

[1] Codex Vaticanus is alone in omitting Χριστοῦ after πνεῦμα.

[2] Codex Alexandrinus with others has προμαρτυρουμενον.

the Holy Spirit—with this difference that now the Spirit has been sent from heaven whereas of old He dwelt only in minds of a few. And these are the mysteries into which angels long to peep.

St. Peter has utilised a saying of Jesus to explain the great problem of unfulfilled prophecy and expounded it. Among the prophets he includes the so-called apocalyptic writers like Daniel and his successors. Gradually the coming of the Messiah and the dawn of the new age had been pushed further and further back until the inspired prophets realised that —as the Christians held—the Messiah would only come just before the end of all. The Messiah was not Hezekiah despite the Rabbis, nor yet the best of the Hasmonean house as Enoch hoped. **ἀπεκαλύφθη**. Such was the revelation or Apocalypse from which the latest of the prophets derive their common name; and St. Peter credits all the line with the curiosity which characterised the last of them and his own contemporaries; *cf.* Acts ii. and Heb. xi. 13 ff. The saying in question on which St. Peter builds is reported differently: According to Matt. xiii. 17, Jesus said, **πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν** . . . according to Luke x. 24, **προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν** . . . according to St. Peter **προφῆται** (10) **καὶ ἄγγελοι**. The mention of the *righteous* derives support from Heb. xi. 13-16, and John viii. 56, and an original ישרים "the righteous" would easily be altered in the course of transmission into שרים = *princes* earthly or heavenly (*cf.* Dan. x. 21; LXX, **Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἄγγελος**). The motive which prompted the interpretation **ἄγγελοι** is due to the influence of the Book of Enoch (see note below) which explains the writer's conception of the prophets.

Ver. 10. The prophets were concerned with the Messianic salvation and searched their own writings and those of their predecessors for definite information about it. They are honoured by the Christians who realise that as a matter of fact they prophesied concerning the grace which was destined for the Christian Church.—**τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος**, *the grace which belongs to you*, *cf.* **τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθ.** (11).

Ver. 11. The construction of **εἰς τ.κ.π. καιρόν** and of **προμαρτ.** is doubtful. **ἐραυνῶντες** takes up **ἐξεζήτησαν κ.τ.λ.** (10); the run of the sentence seems to naturally connect **τὰ . . . δόξας** with **προμαρτ.** and **εἰς . . . καιρόν** with **ἐδήλου**. So Vulgate *in quod vel quale tempus significaret . . . spiritus . . . praenuntians . . . passiones*. But if **εἰς . . . καιρὸν** be unfit to be a direct object and **προμαρτ.**, perhaps, to have one of this kind, **τὰ . . . δόξας** must be governed by **ἐδήλου**. It is possible also to dissociate **τίνα** from **καιρὸν** and to render *in reference to whom and what time the Spirit signified* . . . ; *cf.* Eph. v. 22, **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν**, Acts ii. 25. If **τίνα** be taken with **καιρόν**, the two words correspond to the two questions of the disciples, *When?* . . . and *what shall be the sign?* (Mark xiii. 4). Failing to discover *at what time*, the prophets asked *at what kind of time*; their answer received a certain endorsement in the eschatological discourse of Jesus (Mark xiii. 5 ff. and parallels).—**ἐδήλου**, *cf.* Heb. ix. 8, **τοῦτο δηλοῦντος τοῦ Πνεύματος**. The word implies discernment on the part of the student (Heb. xii. 27, **τὸ δὲ ἔτι ἅπαξ δηλοῖ** . . .). *What time . . . did point unto* of R.V. is unjustifiable; a simple accusative is required, *i.e.*, either (i.) **ποῖον κ.** or (ii.) **τίνα ἢ π. κ.** (**εἰς** being deleted as dittography of **-ες**) or (iii.) **τὰ . . . δόξας**.—**τὸ πνεῦμα** [**Χριστοῦ**], the full phrase is a natural one for a Christian to employ—Christ being here the proper name = Jesus Christ and not the title. **κύριος** in the O.T. was commonly interpreted as referring to Our Lord; and XC. is a frequent *v.l.* for KC. Hence Barnabas (*v.q.*), **οἱ προφῆται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἔχον τὴν χάριν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπροφήτευσαν**.—**προμαρτυρόμενον** only occurs here. If **μαρτύρομαι** (the proper sense) determine the meaning of the compound render "*protesting* (*calling God to witness*) *beforehand*". If usage justify confusion with **μαρτυρεῖν**, *be witness* [*of*] render *testifying beforehand* or (*publicly*.)—**τὰ εἰς Χν παθήματα**, the doctrine that the Messiah must suffer and so enter into His glory was stated by the prophets (*e.g.* Isa. iii.) but neglected by the Jews of the first century (John xii. 34). Believers were reminded of it by the risen Lord Himself (Luke xxiv. 26, 46) and put it in the forefront of their *demonstratio*

με τὰ ταῦτα δόξας οἷς ἀ πεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑ αυτοῖς 12
ὑμῖν δὲ διηκό νουν[1] αὐτὰ ἃ νῦν ἀνηγ γέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐ

[1] For διηκόνουν Dr. Rendel Harris (*Side-Lights on New Testament Research*, p. 207) conjectures that διενοοῦντο should be read in accordance with the statement of the Book of Enoch, "I contemplated them (the things heard in the vision) not for the present generation but for one that was far distant". See Henoch, i. 2, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τοῦ νῦν γενεὰν διενοούμην ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ πόρρω ἧνσαν ἐγὼ λαλῶ. διανοίας of verse 13 is cited in confirmation of the conjecture.

evangelica (Acts iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 23). The phrase corresponds exactly to the original חבלי שׁלי : εἰς standing for the ל (periphrasis for construct. state).—**τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας**, the plural *glories* implies some comprehension of the later doctrine, *e.g.*, John, which recognised that the glory of Jesus was partially manifested during His earthly life; although the definition *subsequent* reflects the primitive simplicity and if it be pressed the glories must be explained as referring to the resurrection ascension triumph over angels as well as the glorious session (viii. 21 f.).—**οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη**, so St. Peter argues that Joel prophesied the last things (*cf.* Sir. xlviii. 24) and that David foresaw and spoke concerning the resurrection (Acts ii. 17, 31, *cf.* iii. 24). Compare Dan. ix. 2, xii. 4, etc., for examples of partial revelations of this kind proper to apocalyptic writers. Heb. l.c. *supr.* credits the Patriarchs with the same insight.—**οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν δέ**, negative and positive presentation of the past for emphasis is common in this Epistle.—**διηκόνουν αὐτά**, "they were supplying, conveying the revelations granted to them—primary the prophecy and the revealed solution of it alike," *cf.* iv. 10, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες. The context shows, if the word διακονεῖν does not itself connote it, that herein they were stewards of God's manifold grace—channels of communication. For Acc. with διακον. *cf*, 2 Cor. iii. 3, ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, viii. 19, τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ' ἡμῶν, from which it may be inferred that δ. connotes what the context here suggests, *cf.* **ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη**, *have been at the present dispensation declared*; ἀ. is taken from the great proof text relating to the calling of the Gentiles, οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη ἀκούουσιν, Isa. lii. 15 cited Rom. xv. 21. "But St. Peter probably meant more by the word . . . the phrase includes not only the announcement of the historical facts of the Gospel, but, yet more, their implicit teachings as to the counsels of God and the hopes revealed for men" (Hort).—**διὰ τῶν εὐαγγ. ὑμας**, God spake *through* the evangelists (*cf.* Isa. lxi. 1, apud Rom. x. 15) as *through* the prophets, Matt. i. 22, ii. 15, etc. Both are simply God's messengers. For accusative after εὐαγγ. *cf.* use of בשׂר = *gladden with good tidings* (Isa. lxi. 1). So πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22) is substituted for the original πτωχοῖς εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Luke iv. 18 = Isa. lxi. 1) if the prophecy which Jesus appropriated and which forms the basis of the Christian use of the word.—**πνεύματι κ.τ.λ.** The evangelists preached *by the Spirit*, as Stephen spoke (Acts vi. 10), τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει. In Sir. xlviii. 24, if the Greek and Hebrew texts are trustworthy, πνεύματι the simple Dative (πνεύματι μεγάλῳ εἶδεν τὰ ἔσχατα *i.e.* Isaiah) corresponds to ברוח : *cf.* insertion of ἐν here in *v.l.* The visible descent of the Holy Spirit is contrasted with the indwelling Spirit which inspired the prophets. The Holy Spirit was given, when Jesus was glorified, as never before, οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου (John iii. 34). Vulgate renders by ablative absolute.—**εἰς ἃ . . . παρακύψαι**, after expanding the first part of Jesus' saying (and its context *ye see*) St. Peter at last reaches the second in its secondary form. He combines with it as its proper Scripture, the prophecy of Enoch (ix. 1) καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ τέσσαρες μεγάλοι ἀρχάγγελοι . . . παρέκυψαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. St. Paul spiritualises the idea "to me . . . this grace was given to preach to the Gentiles . . . in order that now might be made known to the principalities and the authorities in heavenly places by means of the Church the very-varied wisdom of God" (Eph. iii. 8 ff.). St. Peter reproduces faithfully the simplicity of the original and represents this longing as still unsatisfied since the Church is not yet perfect or complete. It thus becomes part of the sympathetic groaning and travailing of the whole creation (Rom. viii. 22 f.). In iii. 21 St. Peter states on the same authority that

αγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς πνεύματι[1] ἁγίῳ ἀπο σταλέντι ἀπ᾽ οὐρανοῦ 13 εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγ γελοι παρακύψαι. διὸ ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν νέφοντες[2] τε λείως ἐλπίσατε 14 ἐπὶ τὴ̄ φερομένην ὑμῖν χάρῑ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ΙΘ ΧΘ. ὡς

[1] To πνεύματι Codex Sinaiticus, with other manuscripts of less weight, prefixes ἐν.

[2] νέφοντες for νήφοντες.

Christ preached to the spirits in prison; adding that when he ascended all angels were subjected to Him. The apparent contradiction is due to the discrepancy between the ideal and its gradual realisation and not to an imperfect coordination of these conceptions of the universal sovereignty of God. See 1 Cor. xv. 25 f., Heb. ii. 7 f., *not yet do we see* . . .—**παρακύψαι** has lost its suggestion of peeping through its use in the LXX for שקף *look forth* though it is not employed by them in the places where God is said to *look down from* heaven (Ps. xiv. 2, etc.). The patristic commentators seem to hold by the Evangelist rather than the Apostle in respect to the saying, as they refer exclusively for illustration to the O.T. figures, Moses (Heb xi. 26), Isaiah (John xii. 41). Oecumenius notes that Daniel is called by the angel *a man of longings* (Dan. ix. 25). That the angels of Peter are due to Enoch and secondary seems to be borne out by the Targum of Eccles. i. 8, "In all the words that are prepared (about) to come to pass in the world the ancient prophets wearied themselves and could not find their ends".

Vv. 13-21. *Practical admonitions.* In this section St. Peter is engrossed with the conception of the Church as the new Israel which has been delivered from idolatry—the spiritual Egypt—by a *far more excellent sacrifice.* Jesus Himself endorsed such adaptation of the directions given for the typical deliverance (Luke xii. 35) and the principle that the worshippers of Jehovah must be like Him (John iv. 23 f.; Matt. v. 48, etc.).

Ver. 13. **διό** introduces the practical inference. —**ἀναζωσάμενοι, κ.τ.λ.**, the reference to the directions for celebration of the Passover (Exod. xii. 11, οὕτως δὲ φάγεσθε αὐτό· αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν περιεζωσμέναι . . . μετὰ σπουδῆς) is unmistakable. The actual deliverance of the Christians is still in the future; they must be always ready against the coming of the Lord. Oec. refers to Job xxxviii, 3. The particular compound occurs only twice in LXX—once in this phrase of the manly woman in Prov. xxxi. 17, ἀναζωσαμένη ἰσχυρῶς τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτῆς, where it implies preparation for serious work. In 2 Kings iv. 29 ff. (Elisha's mission of Gehazi which is in some ways a type fulfilled by Jesus' mission of the Seventy, *cf.* Luke x. 4), ζῶσαι τὴν ὀσφύν σου is the preparation for an urgent errand. The addition of τῆς διανοίας implies that the readiness required is spiritual. St. Paul uses καρδία in the same way (Eph. i. 18, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν) and from Mark xii. 30 = Deut. vi. 4 f. it appears that διάνοια is a recognised equivalent of לבב *heart.* —**νήφοντες τελείως.** In cases like this it is natural to take the adverb with the preceding verb. **τελείως** (only here in N.T.) has much the same force as τῆς διανοίας; so the adjective is applied to the antitype as contrasted with the type in Heb. ix. 11, τῆς . . . τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς and Jas. i. 25, νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας. For νήφοντες *cf.* iv. 7 and v. 8, νήψατε γρηγορήσατε, 1 Thess. v. 8, γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν. Sobriety is necessary to watchfulness. The origin of this use of the word (not in the LXX) is to be found in the parable of Luke xii. 45 f.; it has special point in view of the κώμοις and πότοις, in which they were prone to indulge.—**τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν** is an adaption of the common Greek idiom (Homer downwards) φέρειν χ., *to confer a favour* (*cf.* Sir. viii. 19, μὴ ἀναφερέτω σοι χάριν) and is thus analogous to St. Paul's use of χαρίζεσθαι (see Rom. viii. 32). The present participle has its natural force. Peter does not distinguish between the present and the climax; already the new age which is the last has begun. The χάρις is the final deliverance and its use here is another link with the type: ἔδωκεν ὁ Κύριος τὴν χάριν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ (Exod. xii. 36).—**ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**, Jesus Christ is being revealed *or* is revealing the salvation. The revelation began with the resurrection *cf.* φανερωθέντος and continues to the culmination (7).

Ver. 14. **ὡς**, *inasmuch as you are*, *cf.*

τέκνα ὑπακοῆς· μὴ συσχηματιζόμε ναι[1] ταῖς πρότερον ἐν
τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπι θυμίαις· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ̄ καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς 15
ἅγιο̄ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πά σῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενή θητε·
διότι γέγραπται ὅτι ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐ γὼ ἅγιος· καὶ εἰ 16, 17
πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπρο σωπολήμπτως κρί νοντα κατὰ
τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον

[1] The termination συσχηματιζόμεναι is probably due to the following ταῖς.

ii. 2, 5, iii. 7, etc.—τέκνα ὑπακοῆς, *obedient* corresponds to St. Paul's υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας (Col. iii. 6; Eph. ii. 2, v. 6). Both phrases reflect the Hebrew use of בן, "followed by word of quality characteristic, etc." (B.D.B., *s.v.*, 8). For τέκνα in place of usual υἱοί in this idiom, *cf.* Hos. 9, τέκνα ἀδικίας and Eph. ii. 3, τέκνα ὀργῆς. Here it suits better with βρέφη (ii. 1).—συσχηματιζόμεναι, from Rom. xii. 2, μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ. The feminine is peculiar to B whose scribe was perhaps influenced by the Alexandrian identification of woman with the flesh (John i. 13) or regarded such conformity as womanish. The participle has the force of an imperative. The Christians needed to be warned against conformity to the manners and morals of their countrymen, which were incompatible with their new faith (see v. 2-4). The use of σχῆμα in Isa. iii. 17, perhaps assists the use of συσχ. in connection with lusts.—ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν. It was a Jewish axiom that the Gentiles were *ignorant* (Acts xvii. 30; Eph. iv. 17 f.). Christian teachers demonstrated the equal ignorance of the Jews (Peter, Acts iii. 17; Paul, in Rom.). So Jesus had pronounced even the teachers of Israel to be blind and promised them knowledge of the truth (John viii. 32 ff., *cf.* interview with Nicodemus); whereas speaking to the Samaritan woman He adopted the Jewish standpoint (John iv. 22)—*cf.* 2 Kings xvii. 29-41 with Isa. ii. 3; Baruch. iv. 4, μακάριοί ἐσμεν Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι τὰ ἀρεστὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῖν γνωστά ἐστιν.

Vv. 15 f. The command *Ye shall be holy for I am holy* is connected originally with the deliverance from Egypt and the distinction between clean and unclean, which lays down the principle of separation involved in the Exodus (Lev. xi. 44-46, etc.; *cf.* Isa. lii. 11). St. Peter combines the Scripture with the Word of Jesus for κατὰ τὸν . . . corresponds to ὡς of Matt. v. 48. Gentiles needed God's summons before they could regard Him as their heavenly Father; hence *Him that called you*. Compare Deut. xviii. 13 (whence τέλειος of Matt. *l.c.*) where also contrast with abominations of the the heathen.—ἅγιον is better taken as predicate than as substantive, since ὁ καλέσας (καλῶν) is well-established as a title of God in His relation to Gentile Christians (*cf.* ii. 9, etc.).—ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ, *cf.* i. 18, ii. 12, iii. 1, 2, 16; Tobit iv. 19, ἴσθι πεπαιδευμένος ἐν πάσῃ ἀ. σου. The corresponding verb, ἀναστρέφεσθαι is found as rendering of הלך in the same sense (Prov. xx. 7, ἀναστρέφεται ἄμωμος); both verb and noun are so used in late Greek authors (especially Epictetus).—γενήθητε *become as you were not* OR *show yourselves as you are*; the latter sense suits ἀ. which is distinctively outward behaviour.

Ver. 17, *cf.* Rom. ii. 10 f., εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε, *if ye invoke as Father*:—reminiscence of Jer. iii. 19, εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθέ με (so Q. perhaps after 1 Peter, for εἶπα πατέρα καλέσετέ με) *cf.* Ps. lxxxix. 27, αὐτὸς ἐπικαλέσεταί με Πατήρ μου εἶ σύ. There may be a reference to the use of the Lord's Prayer (*surname the Judge Father*); but the context of Jer. *l.c.* corresponds closely to the thought here: "All the nations shall be gathered . . . to Jerusalem, neither shall they walk any more after the stubbornness of their evil heart. In those days . . . Judah and Israel shall come together out of the land of captivity . . . and I said 'My father ye shall call me'."—ἀπροσωπολήμπτως summarises St. Peter's inference from experience at Caesarea (Acts x. 34) καταλαμβάνομαι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ θεός. Adjective and adverb are formed from λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον of LXX = נשא פני *receive* (*lift up*) *the face of*, *i.e.*, *be favourable* and later *partial*, *to*. The degeneration of the phrase was due to the natural contrast

18 ἀναστράφη τε· εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ φθαρ τοῖς ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ
ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστρο φῆς πατροπαρα-
19 δότου· ἀλλὰ τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀ σπίλου

between the face and the heart of a man, which was stamped on the Greek equivalent by the use of **πρόσωπον** for *mask* of the actor or *hypocrite*.—**κρίνοντα**. If the tense be pressed, compare the saying of Jesus recorded in John xii. 31, **νῦν κρίσις ἐστιν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**. Rom. ii. 16 is referred to the last Judgment by **διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ**. But the present participle may be timeless as in **ὁ καλῶν, ὁ βαπτίζων**, etc.—**κατὰ τὸ ἑκάστου ἔργον**, a commonplace Jewish and Christian, *cf.* Ps. xii. 12 (cited Rom. ii. 6), **σὺ ἀποδώσεις ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ** (Hebrew has *the work*). R. Aqiba used to say . . . The world is judged by grace and everything is according to the work (*Pirqe Aboth*., iii. 24). For collective singular *lifework*, *cf.* also 1 Cor. iii. 13-15, etc.—**ἐν φόβῳ**, *Fear* is not entirely a technical term in N.T. Christians needed the warning to fear God (so Luke xii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 10), although love might be proper to the perfect—Gnostic or Pharisee—1 John iv. 18. The natural and acquired senses exist side by side, as appears in the use of **ἄφοβος**. Compare **ἄφοβος οὐ δύναται δικαιωθῆναι** (Sir. i. (22 with **ἐν τούτῳ ἄφοβός εἰμι** (Ps. xxvii. 2, Symmachus) = *in Him I am confident*.—**τὸν τῆς παροικίας χρόνον**, *during your earthly pilgrimage*, which corresponds to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt (Acts xiii. 17). If God is their Father, heaven must be their home (i. 4); their life on earth is therefore a sojourn (see on i. 1). St. Paul has his own use of the metaphor (Eph. ii. 19). Gentile Christians are no longer strangers and sojourners, but fellow-citizens of the saints.

Ver. 18. Amplification of Isa. lii. 3 f., **Δωρεὰν ἐπράθητε καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε** (*cf.* xlv. 13) . . . **εἰς Αἴγυπτον κατέβη ὁ λαός μου τὸ πρότερον παροικῆσαι ἐκεῖ**. The deliverance from Babylon corresponds to the deliverance from Egypt. To these the Christians added a third and appropriated to it the descriptions of its predecessors.—**οὐ φθαρτοῖς, κ.τ.λ.** The preceding negative relief to positive statement is characteristic of St. Peter, who here found it in his original (Isa. *l.c.*). **φθαρτοῖς** echoes **ἀπολλυμένου** and is probably an allusion to the Golden Calf of which it was said *These be thy gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt* (Exod. xxxii. 14). According to Sap. xiv. 8, it is the proper name for an idol: **τὸ δὲ φθαρτὸν θεὸς ὠνομάσθη**. So the dative represents the agent and not only the instrument of the deliverance.—**ματαίας** supports the view taken of **φθ.**, for *the gods of the nations are vanity*, **μάταια** הבל (Jer. x. 3, etc.).—**πατροπαραδότου**, *ancestral*, *hereditary*. The adjective indicates the source of the influence, which their old way of life—*patrius mos*, *patrii ritus*—still exercised over them. The ancient religion had a strength—not merely *vis inertiae*—which often baffled both Jewish and Christian missionaries: "to subvert a custom delivered to us from ancestors the heathen say is not reasonable" (Clem. *Ac. Protr.* x.). This power of the dead hand is exemplified in the pains taken by the Stoics and New Pythagoreans to conserve the popular religion and its myths by allegorical interpretation. Among the Jews this natural conservatism was highly developed; St. Paul was a *zealot for the ancestral laws*. But the combination of patriarch and tradition does not prove that the persons addressed were Jewish Christians. The law, according to which the Jews regulated their life, was Divine, its mediator Moses; and there is a note of depreciation in the words *not that it is derived from Moses only from the Fathers* (John vii. 22). **πατρο** is contrasted with **πατέρα** (17) as **παραδότου** with the direct calling.

Ver. 19. The blood of Christ, the true paschal lamb, was the (means or) agent of your redemption. The type contemplated is composite; the *lamb* is the *yearling sheep* (שה **πρόβατον**, but Targum-Onkelos has אמר *lamb* and שה is rendered **ἀμνός** in Lev. xii. 8; Num. xv. 11; Deut. xiv. 4) prescribed for the Passover (Exod. xii. 5). But the description *perfect* (**τέλειον** תמים) is glossed by **ἀμώμου** (*cf.* Heb. xii. 14), which is the common translation of תמים in this connection, and **ἀσπίλου** which summarises the description of sacrificial victims generally (*v.* Lev. xxii. 22, etc.). **ἄμωμος** would be unintelligible to the Gentile, because it has acquired a peculiar meaning from the

Χ͞ῦ προεγνωσ μένου μὲν πρὸ κατα βολῆς κόσμου φανε 20, 21
ρωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχά του τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ

Hebrew מום *blemish*. **ἄσπιλος** is used by Symmachus in Job xv. 15, for זכך. Hesychius treats **ἄσπιλος. ἄμωμος** and **καθαρός** as synonyms.—**τιμίῳ** is set over against **φθαρτοῖς** as **πολυτιμ.** against **ἀπολλυμένου**; *cf.* Ps. cxvi. 15, **τίμιος ἐναντίον Κυρίου ὁ θάνατος τῶν ὁσίων** and **λίθον . . . ἔντιμον** (ii. 4).

Ver. 20. As the paschal lamb was taken on the tenth day of the month (Exod. xiii. 3) so Christ was foreknown before the creation and existed before His manifestation. The preexistence of Moses is stated in similar terms in *Assumption of Moses*, i. 12-14, "God created the world on behalf of His people. But He was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the foundation of the world in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted. . . . Accordingly He designed and devised me and He prepared me before the foundation of the world that I should be the mediator of His Covenant." So of the Messiah, Enoch (xlviii. 3, 6) says: "His name was called before the Lord of spirits before the sun and the signs of the zodiac were created. . . . He was chosen and hidden with God before the world was created. At the end of time God will reveal him to the world." Alexandrian Judaism took over from Greek philosophy (Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle) the doctrine of the preexistence of all souls. So in the *Secrets of Enoch* (xxiii. 5) it is said "Every soul was created eternally before the foundation of the world". The author of Wisdom *was a goodly child and obtained a good soul or rather being good came into a body undefiled* (Sap. viii. 19 f.); and Philo found Scriptural warrant in the first of the two accounts of Creation (Gen. i. 26 f.). Outside Alexandria, apart from the Essenes (Joseph, B. J., ii. 154-157) the general doctrine does not appear to have been accepted. But the belief in the preexistence of the Name of the Messiah if not the Messiah Himself was not unknown in Palestine and was latent in many of the current ideals. The doctrine of Trypho was probably part of the general reaction from the position reached by the Jewish thinkers (A.D.) and appropriated by the Christians. There are many hints in the O.T. which Christians exploited without violence and the development of angelology offered great assistance. Current conceptions of Angels and Wisdom as well as of the Messiah all led up to this belief. Apart from the express declarations of Jesus recorded by St. John, it is clear that St. Peter held to the real and not merely ideal pre-existence of Christ, not deriving it from St. Paul or St. John and Heb. It is no mere corollary of God's omniscience that the spirit of Christ was in the prophets.—**προεγνωσμένου**, *cf.* **κατὰ πρόγνωσιν**, ver. 2; only here of Messiah, perhaps as a greater Jeremiah (*cf.* Jer. i. 5)—but see the description of Moses cited above.—**πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.** The phrase does not occur in LXX but Matt. xiii. 35 = Ps. lxxviii. 2 renders מני קדם by **ἀπὸ καταβολῆς** (LXX **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**) Philo has **καταβολὴ γενέσεως** and **αἱ καταβολαὶ σπερμάτων** and uses **ἐκ κ.** = afresh. In 2 Macc. ii. 29, **καταβολή** is used of the foundation of a house; *cf.* **κατασκευάζειν** in Heb.—**φανερωθέντος**, of the past manifestation of Christ. In v. 1 of the future implies previous hidden existence, *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 16 (quotation of current quasi-creed) **ἐφανερώθη ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.** The manifestation consists in the resurrection and glorification evidenced by descent of spirit (21): *cf.* Peter's sermon in Acts ii., *risen, exalted, Jesus has sent the spirit: therefore let all the house of Israel know surely that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ.* St. Paul speaks in the same way of the *revelation of the secret, which is Christ in you*; see especially Col. i. 25-27. Compare John i. 14.—**ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων**, *at the end of the times*, *cf.* **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν** (Heb. i. 1 and LXX). The deliverance effected *certo tempore* by Christ's blood is eternally efficacious, *cf.* **αἰώνιον λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος** Heb., ix. 12 and the more popular statement of the same idea in Apoc. xiii. 8, the lamb slain from the *foundation of the world.*

Ver. 21. **δι' ὑμᾶς**, *for the sake of you Gentiles*, *i.e.*, **ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ**, iii. 18. The resurrection of Jesus and His glorification are the basis of their faith in God and inspire not merely faith but hope.—**δι' αὐτοῦ.** Compare for form Acts iii. 16, **ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ** and for thought Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18—**πιστοὺς εἰς θεόν.** This construction occurs not infrequently in the Bezan text and is simply equivalent to **π.** with

πιστοὺς[1] εἰς Θν̄ τὸν ἐ γείραντα αὐτὸν ἐκ νε κρῶν καὶ δόξαν
αὐτῶ δόντα· ὥστε τὴν πί στιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς
22 Θν̄· τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθεί
ας[2] εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον· ἐκ καρ δίας ἀλληλους

[1] For **πιστοὺς** Codex Sinaiticus and others substitute the participle **πιστεύοντας** in order to avoid the unfamiliar construction with the adjective.

[2] Manuscripts of secondary importance add **διὰ πνεύματος** after **τῆς ἀληθείας** and (with the original hand of Codex Sinaiticus) **καθαρᾶς** before **καρδίας**. The latter addition might be regarded as a mistaken emendation of an accidental repetition of **καρδίας**; but in the course of transmission such safeguards are commonly added to Scriptural texts. The third hand of Codex Sinaiticus substitutes **ἀληθινῆς** after **καρδίας**.

the Dative (Acts xvi. 15) corresponding to נאמן ל'. But **π.** keeping construction has changed its meaning. Already it is semi-technical = *believing*, *sc.* in Jesus and here **πίστιν . . . εἰς θεόν** follows immediately. So the verb **πιστεύοντας** is a true gloss; the addition of **εἰς θεόν** corrects the common conception of faith, which ultimately gave rise to a distinction between belief in Christ and belief in God.—**δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα**, so *e.g.*, the prophecy (Isa. lii. 13) **ὁ παῖς μου . . . δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα** was fulfilled when the lame man was healed by St. Peter and St. John; **ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν** (Acts iii. 13). But the glory is primarily and generally the glorious resurrection and ascension, in which state Jesus sent the Holy Spirit (**ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα ὅτι οὔπω ἐδοξάσθη**, John).—**ὥστε . . . θεόν. καὶ ἐλπίδα** may be part of the subject of **εἶναι εἰς θεόν**, *so that your faith and hope are in God*, *or* predicate *so that your faith is also hope in God*. In either case **ἐλπίς** is rather *confidence* than *hope*, in accordance with LXX usage (= בטחה), and supplies an adequate climax—patient faith leads up to the appropriation of the Hope of Israel.

Vv. 22-25. The combination of purification of souls with love of the brotherhood suggests that the temptations to relapses were due to former intimacies and relationships which were not overcome by the spiritual brotherhood which they entered. Different grades of society were doubtless represented in all Christian churches and those who were marked out for leaders by their wealth and position were naturally slow to love the slaves and outcasts. As at Corinth old intimacies and congenial society led the better classes (iv. 3 f.) to fall back on the clubs to which they had belonged and in the company of their equals to sneer at their new brothers—"the brethren" (ii. 1). St. Peter reminds them that they must purify their souls from the taint—with a side-glance perhaps at the rites proper to the associations in question. They must love the brotherhood and its members as such. Earthly relationships are done away by their regeneration; they have exchanged the flesh for the spirit. The section is full of echoes; compare **ἡγνικότες** with **ἅγιοι** (15), **ἐν ἁγιασμῷ** (2), **τῇ ὑπακοῇ** with **τέκνα ὑ.** (14), **ἀναγεγεννημένοι** with **ἀναγεννήσας** (3), **φθαρτῆς** with **φθαρτοῖς** (18), **εὐαγγελισθέν** with **τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων** (12). It should be compared throughout with Eph. iv. 18-24.—**τὰς . . . ἡγνικότες** from Jer. vi. 16, "*see what is the good way and walk in it and you shall find purification* (**ἁγνισμόν** LXX) *to your souls*. **ἁ.** usually of ceremonial purification in LXX. Compare Jas. iv. 8, **ἁγνίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι** (*cf.* **ἀνυπόκριτον**). The perfect participle is used as indicating the ground of the admonition, so **ἀναγεγεννημένοι** (23). Pagan rites professed to purify the worshipper but cannot affect the soul, the self or the heart any more than the Jewish ceremonies can (Heb. ix. 9 f.). Scripture declares **ὁ φόβος Κυρίου ἁγνός** (Ps. xix. 10). They must realise that they have cleansed themselves ideally at baptism, *cf.* 1 John iii. 3 and 15 f. above with context.—**ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας**, in your obedience to the truth, *cf.* Jer. *l.c.* above. They are no longer ignorant (14) but have learned the truth (*cf.* John xvii. 17-19, and **γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀ.**, John viii. 32) from the missionaries. They must persist in the obedience to it which they then professed, in contrast with those who *are disobedient to the truth* (Rom. ii. 8; *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 12). Hort says: "St. Peter rather means the dependence of Christian obedience on the possession

ἀγαπή σατε ἐκτενῶς ἀναγε γεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς[1] 23
φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θῦ καὶ μένο
τος.[2] διότι πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς 24
ἄνθος χόρτου ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσεν
τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα Κῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶ να· τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ 25

[1] The three great uncials (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus) put **φθορᾶς** for **σπορᾶς** keeping **φθαρτῆς**: the variant was probably a paraphrase of the whole phrase and possibly implied the identification of **ἀφθάρτου** with **ζῶντος Θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος**.

[2] The addition of **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** to **μένοντος** is due to verse 25.

of the truth," relying on Eph. iv. 24, and the probability that "St. Peter would have distinctly used some such language as **ἐν τῷ ὑπακούειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ**". In regard to the latter point it should be observed that St. Peter is curiously fond of using nouns instead of verbs (*e.g.*, 2).—**εἰς φιλαδελφίαν**, *love of the brethren*, Vulgate, *in fraternitalis amore*, mutual love which exists between brothers. It is the primary Christian duty, Matt. xxiii. 8, the first fruits of their profession of which St. Paul has no need to remind the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. iv. 9.—**ἀνυπόκριτον**, *unfeigned*, contrasted with the love which they professed towards their fellow Christians (*cf.* ii. 1) which was neither hearty nor eager. There was pretence among them whether due to imperfect sympathy of Jew for Gentile or of wealthy and honourable Gentiles for those who were neither the one nor the other. For a vivid illustration of this feigning see Jas. ii. 15 f. and ii. 1-5, etc., for the friction between rich and poor.—**ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε**. St. John's summary of the teaching of Jesus (John xiii. 34 f., xv. 12, 17) which he repeated in extreme old age at Ephesus, till the disciples were weary of it: "Magister quare semper hoc loqueris.". His answer was worthy of him: "Quia praeceptum Domini est et si solum fiat sufficit (Hieron. in Gal. vi. 10).—**ἐκτενῶς**, *intentius* (Vulg.), in LXX of "*strong* crying to God" (Jonah iii. 8 = בחזקה *violently*, *cf.* Jud. iv. 12; Joel i. 14; 3 Macc. v. 9: in Polybius of a warm commendation (xxxi. 22, 12) a warm and friendly welcome (viii. 21, 1), a warm and magnificent reception (xxxiii. 16 4).

Ver. 23. **ἀναγεγεννημένοι**. So St. John **ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους ὅτι . . . πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται**; *cf.* Eph. iv. 17, v. 2.—**ἐκ σπορᾶς ἀφθάρτου**, *i.e.*, of God regarded as Father and perhaps also as Sower (*cf.* ver. 24); the two conceptions are combined in 1 John iii. 9, **πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ μένει**. Compare Philo, *Leg. All.*, p. 123 M. **Λείαν . . . ἐξ οὐδενὸς γεννητοῦ λαμβάνουσαν τὴν σπορὰν . . . ἀλλ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.—διὰ λόγου . . . μένοντος**, the connection of **ζῶντος κ. μέν.** is doubtful; the following quotation might justify *the abiding word* and Heb. iv. 22, the living *word* in accordance with Deut. xxxii. 47—*cf.* 3, **ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν**. On the other hand the rendering of the Vulgate, *per verbum dei vivi et permanentis*, is supported by Dan. vi. 26 (**αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν**) and supports St. Peter's argument: earthly relationships must perish with all flesh and its glory; spiritual kinship abides, because it is based on the relation of the kinsfolk to *God living and abiding*. For *the word of God* as the means of regeneration, *cf.* Jas. i. 18, **βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας**. For its identification with **ῥῆμα** of the quotation, *cf.* Acts x. 36 f.

Ver. 24 f. = Isa. xl. 6-8, adduced as endorsement of the comparison instituted between natural generation and divine regeneration, with gloss explaining the saying of Jehovah (*cf.* Heb. i. 1 f.). The only divergences from the LXX (which omits—as Jerome notes, perhaps through homœdeuton—quia spiritus dei flavit in eo: vere foenum est populus; asuit foenum cecidit flos) are that **ὡς** is inserted before **χ.** (so Targum), and that **αὐτῆς** is put for **ἀνθρώπου** (so Heb., etc.) and **Κυρίου** for **τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν** (in accordance with the proper reading of *Jehovah* in the omitted verse).

Ver. 25. **τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν** comes from **ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος Σειὼν** of Isa. xl. 9 which the Targum explains as referring to the prophets.

II. 1 ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲ̄ εἰς ὑμᾶς. ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑπό κρισιν καὶ φόνους[1] κ̔ πάσας 2 καταλαλιὰς ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον

[1] φόνους is an error (peculiar to Codex Vaticanus) for φθόνους.

Chapter II.—Vv. 1-10. Continuation of practical admonition with appeal to additional ground-principles illustrating the thesis of i. 10.

Ver. 1. *Put away then all malice—all guile and hypocrisy and envy—all backbiting*. **οὖν** resumes **διό** (i. 13). The faults to be put away fall into three groups, divided by the prefix *all*, and correspond to the virtues of i. 22 (**ὑπόκρισιν ἀνυπόκριτον**). The special connection of the command with the preceding Scripture would require the expression of the latent idea, that such faults as these are inspired by the prejudices of the natural man and belong to *the fashion of the world*, which *is passing away* (i. John ii. 17).—**ἀποθέμενοι**, *putting off*. Again participle with imperative force. St. Peter regards the metaphor of removal as based on the idea of washing off filth, *cf.* **σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου** (iii. 21). St. James (i. 21, **διὸ ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσείαν κακίας**) which seems to combine these two phrases and to deduce the familiarity of the spiritual sense of *filth* (*cf.* Apoc. xxii. 11, **ῥυπαρὸς κἄγιος**). St. Paul has the same word but associates it with the putting off of clothing (Col. iii. 5 ff.; Eph. iv. 22; Rom. xiii. 12—all followed by **ἐνδύσασθαι**).—**κακίαν**, probably *malice* rather than *wickedness*. Peter is occupied with their mutual relations and considering what hinders brotherly love, not their vices, if any, as vice is commonly reckoned. So James associates the removal of **κακία** with *courtesy;* and St. Paul says *let all bitterness and anger and wrath and shouting and ill-speaking be removed from you with all malice* (Eph. iv. 31; *cf.* Col. iii. 8). **κ.** is generally eagerness to hurt one's neighbour (Suidas)—the feeling which prompts *backbitings* and may be subdivided into *guile, hypocrisy, and envy*.—**δόλον**, *Guile* was characteristic of Jacob, the eponymous hero of the Jews, but not part of the true Israelite (**ἴδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστιν** John i. 47). It was also rife among the Greeks (**μεστοὺς . . . δόλου**, Rom. i. 29) as the Western world has judged from experience (Greek and grec = cardsharper; compare characters of Odysseus and Hermes). **δ.** is here contrasted with *obedience to the truth* (i. 22), vii. 22, iii. 10.—**ὑπόκρισιν** is best explained by the saying *Isaiah prophesied about you hypocrites. . . . This people honours me with their lips but their heart is far away from me* (Mark vii. 6 f. = Isa. xxix. 13). It stands for חנף *profane, impure* in Symmachus' version of Ps. xxxv. 16; so **ὑποκριτής** in LXX of Job (xxxiv. 30, xxxvi. 13), and Aquila (Prov. xi. 9), etc. In 2 Macc. vi. 25, **ὑ** is used of (unreal ?—not secret) *apostasy* perhaps in accordance with the earlier sense of ח, which only in post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic = *hypocrisy*. In His repeated denunciations of the hypocrites Jesus repeated the Pharisees description of the Sadducees *that live in hypocrisy with the saints* (Ps. Sol. iv. 7). Polybius has **ὑ.** in the classical sense of oratorical delivery, and once contrasted with the purpose of speakers (xxxv. 2, 13).—**καταλαλιάς**, *detractiones* (Vulgate), of external slanders in ii. 12, iii. 11. For internal calumnies, *cf.* Jas. iv. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 20 illustrates one special case, for **φυσιώσεις καταλαλιαί** correspond to **εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου** of 1 Cor. iv. 6 (*cf.* i. 12).

Ver. 2. **ὡς**, *inasmuch as you are new-born babes; cf.* **ἀναγεγεννημένοι** (i. 23). The development of the metaphor rests upon the saying, *unless ye be turned and become as the children* (**ὡς τὰ παιδία**) *ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. xviii. 3).—**βρέφη** (only here in metaphorical sense) is substituted for **παιδία** (preserved by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 20) as = *babes at the breast*. A **παιδίον** might have lost its traditional innocence but not a **βρέφος** (= either *child unborn* as Luke i. 41, or *suckling* in classical Greek). For the origin of the metaphor, which appears also in the saying of R. Jose, "the proselyte is a child just born," compare Isa. xxviii. 9, *Whom will he teach knowledge ? . . . Them that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts*, which the Targum renders, *To whom was the law given ? . . . Was it not to the house of Israel which is beloved beyond all peoples ?*—**τὸ . . . γάλα**. The quotation of ver. 3 suggests that the *milk* is Christ;

γά λα ἐπιποθήσατε ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε[1] εἰς σωτηρίαν 3, 4
εἰ ἐγεύσα σθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ Κς̄ πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμε νοι
λίθον ζῶντα ὑπ' ἀ̄ θρώπων μὲν ἀποδε δοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ
Θῶ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντει μον· καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδο- 5
μεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικὸς εἰς ἱεράτευμα ἅγιον ἀνενέγκαι

[1] The variant ἀξιωθῆτε for αὐξηθῆτε illustrates the possibilities of variation and consequently of emendation: at the same time it directs attention to the omnipotence of God and the relative impotence of man.

compare St. Paul's explanation of the tradition of the Rock which followed the Israelites in the desert (1 Cor. x. 4) and the *living water* of John iv. 14. Milk is the proper food for babes; compare Isa. lv. 1, *buy . . . milk* (LXX, στέαρ) *without money* (*cf.* i. 18). This milk is *guileless* (*cf.* δόλον of ver. 1) *pure* or *unadulterated* (*cf.* μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 2). The interpretation of λογικόν (pertaining to λόγος) is doubtful. But the use of λόγος just above (i. 23) probably indicates the sense which St. Peter put upon the adjective he borrowed (?) from Rom. xii. 1, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν. There and elsewhere λ. = *rationabilis, spiritual*; here belonging to contained in the Word of God, delivered by prophet or by evangelist. St. Paul in his use of λ. and of the metaphor of *milk* (solid food, 1 Cor. iii. 1 ff.) follows Philo and the Stoics.—ἵνα . . . σωτηρίαν, *that fed thereon ye may grow up* (*cf.* Eph. iv. 14 f.) *unto salvation*; *cf.* Jas. i. 21, "receive the ingrafted word which is able to save your souls".

Ver. 3. St. Peter adopts the language of Ps. xxxiv. 9, omitting καὶ ἴδετε as inappropriate to γάλα. χρηστός (identical in sound with χριστός) = *dulcis* (Vulg.) or *kind* (*cf.* χρηστότης θεοῦ, Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22). Compare Heb. vi. 4 f. γευσαμένους τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου . . . καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεοῦ ῥῆμα.

Vv. 4-10. Passages of scripture proving that Christ is called stone are first utilised, then quoted, and finally expounded. The transition from *milk* to the *stone* may be explained by the prophecy *the hills shall flow with milk* (Joel iii. 18), as the stone becomes a mountain according to Dan. iii. 21 f.; or by the legend to which St. Paul refers (1 Cor. x. 4); compare also ποτίσαι of Isa. xliii. 20, which is used in ver. 9. This collection of texts can be traced back through Rom. ix. 32 f. to its origin in the saying of Mark xii. 10 f.; Cyprian (Test. ii. 16 f.) gives a still richer form.

Ver. 4. πρὸς ὃν προσερχ. from Ps. xxxiv. 6, προσελθόντες πρὸς αὐτὸν (Heb. and Targum, *they looked unto Him*; Syriac, *look ye* . . .). Cyprian uses Isa. ii. 2 f.; Ps. xxiii. 3 f. to prove that the stone becomes a mountain to which the Gentiles *come* and the just ascend. — λίθον ζῶντα, a paradox which has no obvious precedent in O.T. Gen. xlix. 24 speaks of the Shepherd the stone of Israel, but Onkelos and LXX substitute אביך *thy father* for אבן *stone*. The Targum of Isa. viii. 14, however, has אבן מחי *a striking stone*, for אנגף which might be taken as meaning *reviving* or *living stone*, if connected with the foregoing instead of the following words. The LXX supports this connection and secures a *good* sense by inserting a negative; the Targum gives a *bad* sense throughout. ὑπ' . . . ἔντιμον, *though by men rejected, yet in God's sight elect precious.* ἀποδεδοκ. comes from Ps. cxviii. 22 (see ver. 7); ἐκλ. ἐντ. from Isa. xxviii. 6 (see ver. 6). ἀνθρώπων is probably due to Rabbinic exegesis "read not בונים *builders* but בני אדם *sons of men*". St. Peter insists upon the contrast between God's judgment and man's in the sermon of Acts ii.

Ver. 5. Fulfilment of the saying, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it (John ii. 19). Christians live to God through Jesus Christ (Rom. vi. 11). For this development of the figure of building, *cf.* especially Eph. ii. 20 ff. — οἰκοδομεῖσθε, indicative rather than imperative. "It is remarkable that St. Peter habitually uses the aorist for his imperatives, even when we might expect the present; the only exceptions (two or three) are preceded by words removing all ambiguity, ii. 11, 17, iv. 12 f." (Hort).—οἶκος . . . ἅγιον, *a spiritual house for an holy priesthood.* The connection with *priesthood* (Heb. x. 21) and the offering of sacrifices points to the special sense of the House of God, *i.e.*,

6 πνευματι κὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέ κτους Θῶ διὰ Ιθ Χθ δι ότι
περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σειὼν λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν
ἀκρο γωνιαῖον ἔντειμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐ τῷ οὐ μὴ
7 καταισχυν θῇ· ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τειμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν· ἀπι
στοῦσιν[1] δὲ λίθος ὃν ἀ πεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκο δομοῦντες οὗτος
ἐ γενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας καὶ λίθος προσ κόμματος καὶ

[1] For ἀπιστοῦσιν Codex Alexandrinus, with others, reads ἀπειθοῦσιν.

the Temple; *cf.* (iv. 17; 1 Tim. iii. 5) **ναὸς δς ἐστε ὑμεῖς**, 1 Cor. iii. 16; Eph. ii. 21. So Heb. iii. 5 f., **οὗ (Χριστοῦ) οἰκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς . . .**—**Ἱεράτευμα**, *body of priests*, in Exod. xix. 6 (Heb. *priests*) xxiii. 22; 2 Macc. ii. 17; *cf.* 9 *infra.* Here Hort prefers the equally legitimate sense, *act of priesthood.* Usage supports the first and only possible etymology the second. The ideal of a national priesthood is realised, Isa. lxi. 6.—**ἀνενέγκαι . . . Χριστοῦ.** *to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.*—**διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χ.** is better taken with **ἀν.** than **εὐπροσδ.**; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 15, **δι' αὐτοῦ**, where the thankoffering is singled out as the fit type of the Christian sacrifice. Spiritual sacrifices are in their nature acceptable to God (John iv. 23) and Christians are enabled to offer them through Jesus Christ. **ἀναφέρειν** in this sense is peculiar to LXX, Jas. and Heb.

Ver. 6. **περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ**, *it is contained in Scripture.* The formula occurs in Josephus (Ant. xi. 7, **βούλομαι γενέσθαι πάντα καθὼς ἐν [τῇ ἐπιστολῇ] περιέχει**) and is chosen for its comprehensiveness.—**περιέχει** is intransitive as the simple verb and other compounds often are; *cf.* **περιοχή**, *contents*, Acts viii. 32.—**γραφῇ**, being a technical term, has no article.—**ἰδοὺ . . . καταισχυνθῇ**, formal quotation of Isa. xxviii. 16, preceding quotation from Psalms, as prophets always precede the writings. The LXX has **ἰδοὺ ἐμβάλλω ἐγὼ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια** (unique expansion of normal **θεμελιῶ** = יסד of Heb., *cf.* **εἰς τὰ θ.** below; Targum, ממני I *will appoint*) **Σειὼν λίθον πολυτελῆ** (**π.** duplicate of **ἔντιμον**; Heb., *a stone a stone;* Targum, *a king a king;* pointing to Jewish Messianic interpretation) **ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρ. ἔντ. εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς** (*a foundation a foundation*, Heb.) **καὶ ὁ πιστεύων** (+ **ἐπ' αὐτῷ** ℵAQ) **οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ** (= יבויש for יחיש of Heb. = *shall not make haste*; Targum, *when tribulation come shall not be moved*). The chief difference is that St. Peter omits all reference to the *foundation*, and substitutes **τίθημι**; LXX is conflate, **ἐμβάλλω εἰς** being the original reading and **τὰ θεμ.** added by some purist to preserve the meaning of the Hebrew root. This omission may be due to the fact that Christians emphasised the idea that the stone was a corner stone binding the two wings of the Church together (Eph. ii. 20) and regarded this as inconsistent with **εἰς κεφ.**

Ver. 7 f. The second quotation is connected with the first by means of the parenthetic interpretation: *The "precious"-ness of the stone is for you who believe but for the unbelievers it is . . . "a stone of stumbling"*. It is a stereotyped conflation of Ps. cxviii. 22 and Isa. viii. 14, which are so firmly cemented together that the whole is cited here where only the latter part is in point. The same idea of the two-fold aspect of Christ occurs in St. Paul more than once; *e.g., Christ crucified to Jews a stumbling-block . . . but to you who believe . . .* 1 Cor. i. 23. The problem involved is discussed by Origen who adduces the different effects of the sun's light.—**ἡ τιμή**, the **τιμή** involved in the use of the adjective **ἔντιμον.**, or rather Heb. יקרה underlying it. The play on the peculiar sense thus required does not exclude the ordinary meaning *honour* (for which *cf.* i. 7; Rom. ii. 10).—**λίθος ὃν . . . γωνίας** = Ps. *l.c.* (LXX)—the prophetic statement in scriptural phrase of the fact of their unbelief. The idea may be that the raising of the stone to be head of the corner makes it a stumbling-block but in any case **λίθος . . . σκανδάλου** is needed to explain this.—**λίθος προσκόμματος κ. π. σκ.** from Isa. viii. 14; LXX paraphrases the original, which St. Peter's manual preserves, reading **καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθῳ προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι** (common confusion of construct. with Gen.).—**οἱ . . . ἀπειθοῦντες**, des-

πέτρα σκανδάλου οἳ προσκό πτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπι στοῦντες 8 εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέ θησαν·[1] ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτὸν βασίλειον 9 ἱεράτευμα ἔθνος ἅγιο λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν· ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγ γείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ

[1] In view of "the argument which is intended to carry one back to the opening of the prophetic passage," Dr. Rendel Harris (*Side-Lights on New Testament Research*, pp. 209 f.) proposes to substitute **ἐτέθη** for **ἐτέθησαν**.

cription of the unbelieving in terms of the last quotation, *who stumble at the word being disobedient.* **τῷ λόγῳ** is probably to be taken with **πρ.** or both **πρ.** and **ἀ.** in spite of the stone being identified with the Lord. Stumbling at the word is an expression used by Jesus (Mark iv. 17, **διὰ τὸν λόγον σκανδαλίζονται**; Matt. xv. 12, **ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν**; John vi. 60, **τοῦτο—ὁ λόγος οὗτος—ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει**). For **ἀ.** *cf.* iv. 17, **τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ.—εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν**, *whereunto also* (*actually*) *they were appointed.* **ἐτέθησαν** comes from **τίθημι** (6); stone and stumbler alike were appointed by God to fulfil their functions in His Purpose. For the sake of the unlearned he only implies and does not assert in so many words that God appointed them to stumble and disobey; but his view is that of St. Paul (see Rom. ix., xi., especially ix. 17, 22); *cf.* Luke ii. 34. Didymus distinguishes between their voluntary unbelief and their appointed fall. If any are tempted to adopt such ingenious evasions of the plain sense it is well to recall the words of Origen: "If in the reading of scripture you stumble at what is really a noble thought, *the stone of stumbling and rock of offence*, blame yourself. You must not despair of this stone . . . containing hidden thoughts so that the saying may come to pass, *And the believer shall not be shamed.* Believe first of all and you will find beneath this reputed stumbling-block much holy profit (in Jer. xliv. (li.) 22, Hom. xxxix. = Philocalia x.).

Vv. 9 f. The Church, God's new people, has all the privileges which belonged to the Jews. In enumerating them he draws upon a current conflation of Isa. xliii. 20 f., **ποτίσαι τὸ γένος μου το ἐκλεκτὸν** (1) **λαόν μου ὃν περιεποιησάμην** (4) **τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγεῖσθαι** with Exod. xix. 65, **ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔσεσθέ μοι βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα** (2) **καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον** (3) **ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος** (4) **ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν** (1); and Ps. cvii. 14, **καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκ σκιᾶς θανάτου . . . ἐξομολογησάσθων τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων**—to which is appended Hos. i. 6, 8.—**γένος ἐκλεκτόν**, Isa. *l.c.* LXX (Heb., *my people my chosen*); **γένος**, *race* implies that all the individual members of it have a common Father (God) and are therefore brethren (*cf.* **υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ**, Acts xiii. 26); *cf.* i. 1, 6.—**βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα**, *a royal priesthood*, from Exod. *l.c.* LXX (Heb., *a kingdom of priests* = Apoc. i. 6, **βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς**). Christians share Christ's prerogatives. The *priesthood* is the chief point (see ii. 5) it is *royal.* Clement of Alexandria says: "Since we have been summoned to the kingdom and are anointed (*sc.* as Kings)". The comparison of Melchizedek with Christ perhaps underlies the appropriation of the title.—**ἔθνος ἅγιον**, to the Jew familiar, with the use of **ἔθνη** for Gentiles, as much a paradox as *Christ crucified.* But **λαός**, the common rendering of עַם in this connexion is wanted below, and St. Peter is content to follow his authority.—**λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν**, *a people for possession* = עַם סְגֻלָּה. The source of the Greek phrase is Mal. iii. 17, but the Hebrew title variously rendered occurs in the two great passages drawn upon. Deut. (vii. 6, etc.) has **λαὸς περιούσιος** which is adopted by St. Paul (Tit. ii. 14); but the phrase **εἰς π.** is well established in the Christian vocabulary, Heb. x. 39; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 14, and the whole title is apparently abbreviated to **περιποίησις** in Eph. i. 14.—**ὅπως . . . ἐξαγγείλητε**, from Isa. *l.c.* + Ps. *l.c.*, the latter containing the matter of the following designation of God. In Isa. **τὰς ἀρετάς μου** stands for תְּהִלָּתִי *my praise*; and this sense reappears in Esther xiv. 10. **ἀνοῖξαι στόμα ἐθνῶν εἰς ἀρετὰς ματαίων**, *the praises of idols.* Elsewhere it stands for הוֹד, *glory* (Hab. iii. 3; Zach. vi. 13). In the books of Maccabees (especially the fourth) it has its ordinary sense of *virtue*, which cannot

10 θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαὸς νῦν δὲ λαὸς Θῦ οἱ
11 οὐκ ἠ λεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλε ηθέντες. ἀγαπητοὶ παρακαλῶ
ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους ἀπέ χεσθαι[1] τῶν σαρκικῶ̄
12 ἐπιθυμιῶν αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἀνα
στροφὴν[2] ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καλὴν ἵνα ἐν ῷ καταλαλοῦσιν

[1] For ἀπέχεσθαι Codex Alexandrinus and others read ἀπέχεσθε: ε and αι are interchangeable in the manuscripts.

[2] Codex Vaticanus omits ἔχοντες, which is formally required to govern ἀναστροφήν. If ἀπέχεσθαι represents the infinitive, ἔχοντας would be more grammatical.

be excluded altogether here. The whole clause is in fact the pivot on which the Epistle turns. Hitherto Peter has addressed himself to the Christians and their mutual relations, now he turns to consider their relations to the outside world (i. 11 f.). In 2 Peter i. 3, ἀ. corresponds to θεία δύναμις, a sense which might be supported by Ps. *l.c.* (for discussion of other—very uncertain—evidence see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 95 ff., 362) and the events of Pentecost (see especially Acts ii. 11).—τοῦ . . . φῶς is derived from Ps. *l.c.*; the natural antithesis *light* is readily supplied (*cf.* Eph. v. 8, 14); *darkness* = heathenism in *cf.* 10.

Ver. 10, from Hosea i. 6, ii. 1(3); *cf.* Rom. ix. 25 (has καλέσω κάλεσον of Hos.); the terms are so familiar that μου is omitted by Peter as unnecessary (*cf.* γένος ἐκ. for τὸ γ. μου ἐ.).

Vv. 11 f. indicate generally the subject to be discussed. Beloved I exhort you to abstain from the lusts of the flesh, because they wage war against the soul. Slanders and even torments can only affect the body. But the lusts natural or acquired which you have renounced may hinder your salvation, as they have already impeded your mutual love. For the sake of your old friends and kinsfolk refuse to yield to their solicitations. If rebuffed they resort to persecution of whatever kind, remember that it is only a passing episode of your brief exile. Let your conduct give them no excuse for reproach; so may they recognise God's power manifest not on your lips but in your lives.—ἀγαπητοί, not an empty formulæ but explanation of the writer's motive. He set before them the great commandment and now adds to it as Jesus did, Love one another as I have loved you, John xiii. 34.—ὡς π. καὶ παρεπιδήμους with ἀπεχ. (motive for abstinence in emphatic position) rather than παρακαλῶ (as νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν, 2 Thess. iii. 15—the motive of exhortation is here expressed by ἀγ.) echoes παρεπιδήμοις of i. 1 and παροικίας of i. 17. The combination (= גר ותושב) occurs twice in LXX (Gen. xxiii. 4; Ps. xxxix. 13). Christians are in the world, not of the world.—ἀπέχεσθαι, *cf.* Plato, *Phaedo*, 82 C, true philosophers, ἀπέχονται τῶν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμιῶν ἁπάσων—not for fear of poverty, like the vulgar, nor for fear of disgrace, like the ambitious, but because only so can he, departing in perfect purity, come to the company of the gods".—τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, *the lusts of the flesh*. St. Peter borrows St. Paul's phrase, ἡμεῖς πάντες ἀνεστράφημέν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν (Eph. ii. 3), but uses it in his own way in a sense as wide as τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐ. (Tit. ii. 12). For the flesh is the earthly life (*cf.* Col. iii. 5) the transitory mode of existence of the soul which is by such abstinence to be preserved (i. 9).—αἵτινες . . . ψυχῆς, *because they are campaigning against the soul.*—στρατεύονται (*cf.* iv. 1 f., for military metaphor) perhaps derived from Rom. vii. 23, "I perceive a different law in my members warring against (ἀντιστρατευόμενον) the law of my mind;" *cf.* Jas. iv. 1, the pleasures which war in your members, and 4 Macc. ix. 23, ἱερὰν καὶ εὐγενῆ στρατείαν στρατεύσασθε περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας.—κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. The lusts of this earthly life are the real enemy for they affect the soul. Compare Matt. x. 28, which may refer to the Devil and not to God, and the Pauline parallel, ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος . . . ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντικεῖται (Gal. v. 17).

Ver. 12. Adaptation of the saying, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Matt. v. 16). The good behaviour on which the resolved ἀναστρέφεσθαι permits stress to be laid is the

ὑ μῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύοντες δοξά σωσι τὸν Θ̄ν̄ ἐν ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς. ὑποτά γητε 13 πάσῃ ἀνθρωπί νῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν Κ̄ν̄ εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπε ρέχοντι εἴτε ἡγεμό σιν ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμ πομένοις εἰς 14 ἐκδίκη σιν κακοποιῶν ἔπαι νον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν· ὅτι οὕτως 15 ἐστὶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θ̄ῦ ἀγαθο ποιοῦντας φειμοῦ τὴν

fruit of the abstinence of ver. 11; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 8; Jas. iii. 13. This second admonition is disjointed formally—against formal grammar—from the first; *cf.* Eph. iv. 1 f., **παρακαλῶ . . . ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνεχόμενοι.**—**ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,** *the people of God* (ii. 9) is a correlative term and implies the existence of *the nations*, who are ignorant and disobedient. The situation of the Churches addressed justifies the use of Dispersion in i. 1. But the point of the words here is this: you—the new Israel must succeed where the old failed, as it is written my name is blasphemed **ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν** on your account (Isa. lii. 5; LXX, cited Rom. ii. 24).—**ἵνα . . . ἐπισκοπῆς,** *in order that as a result of your good works they may be initiated into your secrets and come to glorify God in respect to your conduct when He at last visits the world, though now they calumniate you as evildoers in this matter.*—**ἐν ᾧ** in the case of the thing in which, *i.e.*, your behaviour generally; *cf.* iii. 16, iv. 4, and for **δοξ. τὸν θεὸν ἐν,** iv. 11, 16.—**καταλαλοῦσιν ὡς κ.** Particular accusations are given in iv. 15. This popular estimate of Christians is reflected in Suetonius' statement: Adflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominium superstitionis novae et *maleficae* (Ner. 16).—**ἐποπτεύοντες** takes Acc. in iii. 2 (*overlook, behold*, as in Symmachus' version of Ps. x. 14, xxxiii. 13); but here the available objects are either appropriated (**θεόν** with **δοξ.**) or far off (**ἀναστροφήν**). It will therefore have its ordinary sense of *become* **ἐπόπτης,** *be initiated.* The Christians were from the point of view of their former friends members of a secret association, initiates of a new mystery, the secrecy of which gave rise to slanders such as later Christians brought against the older mysteries and the Jews. St. Peter hopes that, if the behaviour of Christians corresponds to their profession, their neighbours will become initiated into their open secrets (for as St. Paul insists this hidden mystery has now been revealed and published).—**δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεόν,** *come to glorify God*—like the centurion, who said of the crucified Jesus, *Truly this was the Son of God* (Mark xv. 39)—*i.e.*, recognise the finger of God either in the behaviour of the Christians or in the whole economy (see Rom. xi.).—**ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς,** from Isa. x. 3, *What will ye do*—ye the oppressors of the poor of my people—*in day of visitation* (ליום פקדה) *i.e.* (Targum), *when your sins are visited upon you.* But St. Peter looks for the repentance of the heathen at the last visitation (*cf.* iv. 6), though the prophet found no escape for his own contemporaries. Compare Luke xix. 44.

Vv. 13-17. The duty of the Christian towards the State; compare Rom. xiii. 1-7.—**πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει,** *every human institution*, including rulers (14), masters (18), and husbands (iii. 1). **κτίζειν** is used ordinarily in many senses, *e.g.*, of peopling a country, of founding a city, of setting up games, feasts, altar, etc. In Biblical Greek and its descendants it is appropriated to *creation.* Here **κτίσις** is apparently selected as the most comprehensive word available; and the acquired connotation—creation by God—is ruled out by the adjective **ἀνθρωπίνῃ.** It thus refers to all human institutions which man set up with the object of maintaining the world which God created.—**διὰ τὸν κύριον,** *for the sake of the Lord.* **διά** may be (i) retrospective—*i.e.*, because Jesus said, Render what is Cæsar's to Cæsar *or*, generally, because God is the source of all duly-constituted authority; *or* (ii.) prospective *for the sake of Jesus* (*Jehovah*); your loyalty redounding to the credit of your Master in heaven.—**βασιλεῖ,** the Roman Emperor, as in Apoc. xvii. 9, etc.; Josephus B.J., v. 136, *v. infra.*—**ὑπερέχοντι,** *pre-eminent, supreme, absolute*, as in Sap. vi. 5, where **τοῖς ὑπερέχουσιν** corresponds to *those who are underlings of His Sovereignty* (4), to whom *power was given from the Lord* (3); *cf.* **δι' αὐτοῦ** below.—**ἡγεμόσιν,** properly *Governors of provinces*, but Plutarch uses the singular = *Imperator.* Peter rather follows the conventional rendering of the saying of Jesus, **ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε,** interpreted in the light of popular usage

16 τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνωσία· ὡς ἐλεύθεροι καὶ μὴ
ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλ' ὡς
17 Θεοῦ δοῦλοι πάντας τιμήσατε· τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε
18 τὸν Θεὸν φοβεῖσθε, τὸν βασιλέα τειμᾶτε. οἱ οἰκέται ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς
19 ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσι ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς σκολιοῖς. τοῦτο

(*cf.* Luke xxi. 12) or of Jer. xxxix. 3, **ἡγεμόνες βασιλέως Βαβυλῶνος.** Contrast vague general term, **ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχ· ὡς** . . . which St. Paul employed before his visit to Rome.—**πεμπ.**, *as being sent through the Emperor.* **διά** implies that the governors are sent by God acting through the Emperor; so Rom. xiii. 1-7 (*cf.* Sap. vi. 3) and John xix. 11, **εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν.—εἰς ἐκδίκησιν, κ.τ.λ.** The ruler executes God's vengeance (Rom. xii. 19) and voices God's approval (Ps. xxii. 25, **παρὰ σοῦ ὁ ἔπαινός μου**). The former function of governors has naturally become prominent, the latter is exemplified in the crowns, decrees and panegyrics with which the Greek and Jewish States rewarded their benefactors if not mere well-doers.—**οὕτως** . . . *since this is so* (referring to 13 f.) *God's will is that* . . . (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 14, **οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν θέλημα** where **οὕτως** refers to the preceding parable) rather than *God's will is thus namely that* . . . or . . . *well-doing thus.* Since God has set up governors who express His approval of well-doers, you as well-doers will receive official praise and thus be enabled to silence the slanderers. St. Peter is thinking of the verdict pronounced in the case of St. Paul and of Jesus himself.—**φιμοῦν**, (1) *muzzle* (1 Cor. ix. 9), (2) *silence* as Jesus did (Matt. xxii. 34, **ἐφίμωσεν τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους**).—**τὴν ἀγνωσίαν**, a rare word—perhaps borrowed from Job xxxv. 16, **ἐν ἀγνωσίᾳ ῥήματα βαρύνει**, *He multiplieth words without knowledge.* In 1 Cor. xv. 34, **ἀγνωσίαν γαρ θεοῦ τινες ἔχουσιν**, it is derived from Sap. xiii. 1, **οἷς παρῆν θεοῦ ἀγνωσία.** It is the opposite of **γνῶσις** (**ἀγνωσίας τε καὶ γνώσεως**, Plato, Soph., 267 B) *cf.* **ἄγνοια**, of Jews who crucified Jesus, Acts iii. 17.—**τῶν ἀφρόνων** = the foolish men who calumniate you (12). **ἀ.** is very common in the Wisdom literature (especially Proverbs); as used by Our Lord (Luke xi. 40) and St. Paul (2 Cor. xi.); it implies lack of insight, a point of view determined by external appearances.

Ver. 16. **ὡς ἐλεύθεροι**, the contrast with **τῆς κακίας** supports the connection of **ἐ.** in thought with **ἀγαθοποιοῦντας**, which explains the nature of the self-subjection required. Christians are *free* (Matt. xvii. 26 f. *q.v.*; John viii. 36; Gal. ii. 4) and therefore must submit to authority. Peter generalises summarily St. Paul's argument in Gal. v. 13, which refers to *internal* relations.—**καὶ μὴ . . . ἐλευθερίαν**, *and not having your freedom as a cloak of your malice.* For **ἐπ.** *cf.* Menander (apud Stobaeum Florileg.) **πλοῦτος δὲ πολλῶν ἐπικάλυμμ' ἐστιν κακῶν.** The verb is used in Ps. cited Rom. iv. 7 = כפר; and this sense may perhaps be contemplated here; early Christians regarded their freedom as constituting a propitiation for future as for past sins.

Ver. 17. Sweeping clause based partly on Rom. xiii. 7 f. (*cf.* Matt. xxii. 21), partly on Prov. xxiv. 21, **φοβοῦ τὸν θεὸν υἱὲ καὶ βασιλέα καὶ μηθετέρῳ αὐτῶν ἀπειθήσῃς.—πάντας τιμήσατε.** The aorist imperative is used because the present would be ambiguous; *cf.* **ἀπόδοτε**, Rom. *l.c.*, and for matter, Rom. xii. 10, **τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι**, since **πάντας** covers both *the brotherhood* and *the emperor.*—**οἱ οἰκέται**, vocative; the word is chosen as being milder than **δοῦλος** and also as suggesting the parallel between slaves and Christians who are God's household (ii. 5).—**ὑποτασσόμενοι** has force of imperative resuming **ὑποτάγητε** or goes with **τιμήσατε** (17) as being a particular application of that general principle.—**τοῖς δεσπόταις**, *to your masters*, not excluding God, the Master of all, as is indicated by the insertion of *in all fear* (*cf.* 17, etc.) and **τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν** (*cf.* Ps. lxxxvi. 4, **σὺ κύριος χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής**).—**τοῖς σκολιοῖς**, *the perverse*, *cf.* Phil. ii. 15, **ἵνα γένησθε . . . τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμωμα μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης**, where the full phrase is cited from Deut. xxxii. 5 (**σκ.** = עקש). The Vulgate has *dyscolis* = **δυσκόλοις**; Hesychius, **σκολιός. ἄδικος**; Prov. xxviii. 18, **ὁ σκολιαῖς ὁδοῖς πορευόμενος χ. ὁ πορευόμενος δικαίως.**

Vv. 19 f. Summary application of the teaching of Jesus recorded in Luke vi. 27-

γὰρ χάρις εἰ διὰ συνίδη σιν Θῦ ὑποφέρει τις λύπας πάσχων
ἀδίκως. ποῖον γὰρ κλέος εἰ ἁ μαρτάνοντες καὶ κο λαφιζό- 20
μενοι [1] ὑπομε νεῖτε; ἀλλ' εἰ ἀγαθοποι οῦντες καὶ πάσχον τες
ὑπομενεῖτε, τοῦ το χάρις παρὰ Θῷ. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε 21
ὅτι καὶ Χς̄ ἔπαθεν ὑ πὲρ ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ὑπο λιμπάνων ὑπογραμ
μὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθή σηται τοῖς ἴχνεσιν αὐτοῦ· ὃς 22
ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι
αὐτοῦ ὃς λοι δορούμενος οὐκ ἀν τελοιδόρει πάσχων οὐκ 23

[1] The third corrector of Codex Sinaiticus puts κολαζόμενοι for κολαφιζόμενοι with the assent of some cursives. Such variations may be due to careless copying or they may result from erroneous expansion and interpretation of abbreviations.

36 = Matt. v. 39-48.—**χάρις** seems to be an abbreviation of the O.T. idiom *to find favour* (חן) *with God*—*cf.* **χάρις παρὰ θεῷ** (20)—taken from St. Luke's version of the saying, **εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστιν** (vi. 32). — Compare **χάριτας** = רצון *that which is acceptable* in Prov. x. 32.—**διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ**, (i.) *because God is conscious of your condition* (**θεοῦ** subjective genitive), a reproduction of *thy Father which seeth that which is hidden* . . . (Matt. vi. 4, etc.); so **συνείδ.** in definite philosophical sense of *conscience* is usually followed by possessive genitive OR (ii.) *because you are conscious of God* (**θ.** objective genitive), *cf.* **σ. ἁμαρτίας**, Heb. x. 2. The latter construction is preferable: the phrase interprets **διὰ τὸν κύριον** with the help of the Pauline expression **διὰ τὴν σ.** (Rom. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 25) employed in the same context.—**πάσχων ἀδίκως**, emphatic. Peter has to take account of the possibility which Jesus ignored, that Christians might deserve persecution; *cf.* 20, 25.—**ποῖον κλέος**, *what praise* rather than *what kind of reputation* (**κλ.** neutral as in Thuc. ii. 45) *cf.* **ποία χάρις τίνα μισθόν**, Matt. **κλ.** (only twice in Job in LXX) corresponds to **ἔπαινος** above: **χάρις παρὰ θεῷ** shows that the praise of the Master who reads the heart is intended.—**κολαφιζόμενοι**, from description of the Passion, Mark xiv. 65, **ἤρξαντό τινες . . . κολαφίζειν αὐτόν**: *cf.* Matt. v. 39, **ὅστις σε ῥαπίζει**. So also St. Paul recalls the parallel between Christ's and the Christians' sufferings (1 Cor. iv. 11) **κολαφιζόμεθα**.—**ἀγαθοποιοῦντες**, opposed to **ἁμαρτάνοντες**, explains **ἀδίκως** (19).—**χάρις**, see on **χ.** ver. 19.

Ver. 21. **εἰς τοῦτο**, *sc.* to do well and to suffer, if need be, without flinching, as Christ did.—**ἐκλήθητε**, *sc.* by God; *cf.* **διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν θεοῦ**.—**ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**, ver. 22 supplies the essential point, which would be readily supplied, but Christ's suffering was undeserved (**δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων**, iii. 18).—**καί** *also* with reference to the similar experience of Christians; so Phil. ii. 5, **τοῦτο φρονεῖτε ἐν ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ**.—**ὑπογραμμόν** (1) *outline*, 2 Macc. ii. 28, *to enlarge upon the outlines of our abridgment*; (2) *copy-head*, *pattern*, to be traced over by writing-pupils (Plato, *Protag.*, 227 D; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, v. 8, 49, gives three examples of which **βεδιζαμψχθωπληκτρον σφιγξ** is one).—**ἐπακολουθήσητε**, reminiscence of Jesus' word to Peter, **ἀκολουθήσεις ὕστερον**, John xiii. 36.

Ver. 22 = Isa. liii. 9, **ἁμ.** being put for **ἀνομίαν** (חמס) and **εὑρ. δόλος** (so א^ca AQ, etc.) for **δόλον** (= Heb.) of LXX. The latter variation is due to conjunction of Zeph. iii. 13, **οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν γλῶσσα δολία**: Christ being identified with the Remnant. The former appears in the Targum: "that they might not remain who work sin and might not speak guile with their mouth".

Ver. 23. Combination of the Scripture **οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα** (Isa. liii. 7) with the saying **ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ διώξωσιν** (Matt. v. 11). For **λοιδ.** *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 12. **λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν** (**εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρόν** of Matt. *l.c.*), John ix. 28, the Jews **ἐλοιδόρησαν** the once blind man as Jesus' disciple and, for O.T. type Deut. xxxiii. 8, **ἐλοιδόρησαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀντιλογίας** (Levi = Christ the Priest, *cf.* **ἀντιλογία**, Heb. xii. 3).—**οὐκ ἠπείλει**, the prophecy **ἀπειλήσει τοῖς ἀπειθοῦσιν** (Isa. lxvi. 14) is yet to be fulfilled (Luke xiii. 27). Oec. notes that He threatened Judas, seeking to deter him and reviled the Pharisees, but not in re-

24 ἤπειλει παρεδί δου δὲ τῷ κρείνοντι δικαίως· ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνή νεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώμα τι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλο̄ ἵνα ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀ πογενόμενοι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν· οὗ
25 τῷ μώλωπι [1] ἰάθηται. ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμε νοι ἀλλὰ ἐπε-στράφη τε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμέ να καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶ ψυχῶν
III. 1 ὑμῶν. ὁμοί ως γυναῖκες ὑποτασ σόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις

[1] The superfluous αὐτοῦ after οὗ τῷ μώλωπι is omitted by Codex Vaticanus and other authorities. It would be repugnant to the ear of a Greek, but is not therefore to be regarded as necessarily absent from the original.

tort.—παρεδίδου. It is doubtful what object, if any, is to be supplied. The narrative of the Passion suggests two renderings: (i.) *He delivered Himself* (ἑαυτὸν omitted as in Plato, *Phaedrus*, 250 E). *Cf.* Luke xxiii. 46 (Ps. xxxi. 5), παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου and Isa. liii. 6; κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, *ib.* 12 παρεδόθη. (ii.) *He delivered the persecutors* (latent in passive participles λοιδ. and πάσχων), when He said *Father forgive them.* In ordinary Greek παραδίδωμι without object = *permit*; but this hardly justifies the rendering *He gave way to* (*cf.* δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ, Rom. xii. 19), *i.e.*, permitted God to fulfil His will. But most probably παρ. τῷ . . . represents the Hebrew ellipse, גֹּל אֶל־י׳ *commit to Jehovah* (Ps. xxii. 9) for the normal *commit, way, works, cause*; LXX (Syriac) has ἤλπισεν = Matt. xxvii. 43. Compare Joseph. Ant. vii. 9, 2, David περὶ πάντων ἐπιτρέψας κριτῇ τῷ θεῷ.—τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως, *cf.* i. 17; the award was the glory.

Ver. 24. Christ was not only *well-doer* but *benefactor*.—τὰς ἁμ. . . . ἀνήνεγκεν comes from Isa. liii. 12, LXX, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν (נָשָׂא usually translated λαμβάνειν), used also Heb. ix. 28. Christ is the perfect sin-offering: "Himself the victim and Himself the priest. The form of expression *offered up* our sins is due to the double use of חַטָּאָה for sin and sin-offering.—ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ, a Pauline phrase derived from the saying, *This is my body which is for you* (1 Cor. xi. 24), explaining αὐτός of Isa. *l.c.*—ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, replaces the normal complement of ἀναφέρειν, ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, in view of the moral which is to be drawn from the sacrificial language adopted. So Jas. ii. 21, ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον is substituted for ἐπάνω τῶν ξύλων of the original description of the offering of Isaac, Gen. xxii. 9. Christ died because He took our sins upon Himself (*cf.* Num. iv. 33, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν . . . ἀνοίσουσιν τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν). Therefore our sins perished and we have died to them, Col. ii. 14.—ἵνα . . . ζήσωμεν. Compare Targum of Isa. liii. 10, "and from before Jehovah it was the will to refine and purify the remnant of His people that He might cleanse from sins their souls: they shall see the kingdom of His Christ and . . . prolong their days".—ἀπογενόμενοι = (i.) *die* (Herodotus, Thucydides) as opposite of γενόμενοι, *come into being* OR (ii.) *be free from*, as in Thuc. i. 39, τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπογενόμενοι. The Dative requires (i.), *cf.* Rom. vi. 2, οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. The idea is naturally deduced from Isa. liii., Christ bore our sins and delivered His soul to death, therefore He shall see His seed living because sinless.—οὗ . . . ἰάθητε from Isa. liii. 5; μώλωπι, properly the *weal* or *scar* produced by scourgeing (Sir. xxviii. 17, πληγὴ μάστιγος ποιεῖ μώλωπας) thus the prophecy was fulfilled according to Matt. xxvii. 26, φραγελλώσας. The original has ἰάθημεν. The paradox is especially pointed in an address to slaves who were frequently scourged.

Ver. 25 = Isa. liii. 6, πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν combined with Ez. xxxiv. 6, where this conception of the people and their teachers (*the shepherds of Israel*) is elaborated and the latter denounced because τὸ πλανώμενον οὐκ ἐπεστρέψατε. Further the use of this metaphor in the context presupposes the saying *I am the good shepherd. . . . I lay down my life for the sheep* (John xii. 15).—ἐπίσκοπον, *cf.* Ez. xxxiv. 11, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκζητήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτά. It is to be noted that the command which Jesus laid on Peter, *feeding sheep*, comes from Ez. *l.c.*

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-6. Duty of wives (Eph. v. 21-24; Col. iii. 18; Tit ii. 4)—Submissiveness and true adorn-

ἀνδράσιν· ἵνα εἴ τινες[1] ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶ̄ ἀναστροφῆς ἄνευ λό γου κερδηθήσονται ἐποπτεύσαντες 2 τὴ̄ ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴν ἀνα στροφὴν ὑμῶν. ὧν ἔστω οὐχ ὁ 3 ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν κ̔ περιθέσεως χρυσίω̄ ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίω̄ κόσμος· ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος 4

[1] The variant οἵτινες for εἴ τινες serves as a reminder that in uncial manuscripts Є is apt to be confused with O and that words were not written separately from one another.

ment.—τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, *your own husbands*, the motive for submissiveness, Eph. v. 22; Tit. ii. 4. St. Peter assumes knowledge of the reason alleged by St. Paul (Eph. *l.c.*; 1 Cor. xi. 3) after Gen. iii. 16, αὐτός σου κυριεύσει.—καὶ εἰ . . . λόγῳ, *even if in some cases your husbands are disobedient to the word* (ii. 8), *i.e.*, remain heathens in spite of the preaching of the Gospel. St. Paul found it necessary to impress upon the Corinthian Church that this incompatibility of religion did not justify dissolution of marriage (1 Cor. xii. 10 ff.).—ἄνευ λόγου, *without word from their wives*. Peter deliberately introduces λ. in its ordinary sense immediately after the technical τῷ λ.—an example of what the grammarians call antanaclasis and men a pun. In his provision for the present and future welfare of the heathen husbands whose wives come under his jurisdiction he echoes the natural aspiration of Jews and Greeks; so Ben Sira said, *a silent woman is a gift of the Lord . . . a loud crying woman and a scold shall be sought out to drive away enemies* (Sir. xxvi. 14, 27) and Sophocles, *Silence is the proper ornament* (κόσμος) *for women* (Ajax 293). St. Paul forbids women to preach or even ask questions at church meeting (1 Cor. xiv. 34: at Corinth they had been used to prophesy and pray).—ἵνα . . . κερδηθήσονται, *be won*, *cf.* ἵνα κερδήσω in 1 Cor. ix. 20 ff. = ἵνα . . . σώσω, *ib.* 22, (*cf.*vii. 16.).

Ver. 2. ἐποπτεύσαντες, *having contemplated*; see on ii. 12. τὴν . . . ὑμῶν. ἐν φόβῳ, *cf.* i. 17 and Eph. v. 21. ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ· αἱ γυναῖκες: as no object is expressed, τοῦ θεοῦ must be supplied.—ἁγνήν, not merely *chaste* but *pure*, *cf.* i. 22 and iii. 4.

Ver. 3. The description of the external ornaments proper to heathen society seems to be based on Isa. iii. 17-23, where the destruction of the hair, jewels and raiment of the daughters of Zion is foretold.—ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν, *braiding of hair*. 1 Tim. ii. 19, πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ refers to the golden combs and nets used for the purpose; *cf.* ἐμπλόκια, Isa. iii. 18, for שְׁבִיסִים. Juvenal describes the elaborate coiffures which Roman fashion prescribed for the Park and attendance at the Mysteries of Adonis: tot premit ordinibus tot adhuc compagibus altum aedificat caput (Sat. vi. 492-504). Clement of Alexandria quotes 1 Peter iii. 1-4, in his discussion of the whole subject (*Paed.*, III. xi.); and in regard to this particular point says ἀπόχρη μαλάσσειν τὰς τρίχας καὶ ἀναδεῖσθαι τὴν κόμην εὐτελῶς περόνῃ τινι λιτῇ παρὰ τὸν αὐχένα . . . καὶ γὰρ αἱ περιπλοκαὶ τῶν τριχῶν αἱ ἑταιρικαὶ καὶ αἱ τῶν σειρῶν ἀναδέσεις . . . κόπτουσι τὰς τρίχας ἀποτίλλουσαι ταῖς πανούργοις ἐμπλοκαῖς, because of which they do not even touch their own head for fear of disturbing their hair—nay more sleep comes to them with terror lest they should unawares spoil τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἐμπλοκῆς (p. 290 P).—περιθέσεως χρυσίων, *i.e.*, rings bracelets, etc., enumerated in Isa. *l.c.*—ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων. Stress might be laid on κόσμος, or the crowning prohibition regarded as an exaggeration intended to counteract an ingrained bias. In either case the expression points to a remarkable precedent for this teaching in Plato's *Republic* IV., iii. ff. "Plato's assignment of common duties and common training to the two sexes is part of a well-reasoned and deliberate attempt by the Socratic school to improve the position of women in Greece. . . . Socrates' teaching inaugurated an era of protest against the old Hellenic view of things. . . . In later times the Stoics constituted themselves champions of similar views" (Adam, *ad loc.*). Accordingly gymnastics must be practised by women as by men: ἀποδυτέον δὴ ταῖς τῶν φυλάκων γυναιξὶν ἐπείπερ ἀρετὴν ἀντὶ ἱματίων ἀμφιέσονται.

Ver. 4. *Yours be the secret man of the heart not the outward ornament*. A better antithesis and a pretty paradox would be

ἐν τῶ ἀφθάρτῶ τοῦ ἡσυχίου καὶ πραέως πνεύματος ὃ ἐστιν
5 ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θῦ πολυ τελές. οὕτως γάρ πο τε καὶ αἱ ἅγιαι
γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς Θν̄ ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτὰς ὑ ποτασ-
6 σόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν· ὡς Σάρρα ὑπήκουεν τῶ
Ἀβραὰμ κύριον αὐτὸν καλοῦσα. ἧς ἐγενήθη τε τέκνα, ἀγα-
7 θοποιοῦ σαι, καὶ μὴ φοβούμε| ναι μηδεμίαν πτόησῑ.[1] ἄνδρες

[1] πτῶσιν for πτόησιν illustrates the danger of cursive writing, in which the ligature of two letters is apt to alter the normal shape of one or both.

secured by supplying **ἄνθρωπος** with **ὁ ἔξωθεν** and taking **κ.** as predicate: your ornament be *cf.* **οὕτως ἐκόσμουν ἑαυτάς** (ver. 5). But the order in ver. 3 is against this and a Greek reader would naturally think of the other sense of **κ.** = world universe and remember that man is a microcosm and "the universe the greatest and most perfect *man*" (Philo, p. 471 M.).—**ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος**, *the hidden man that is the heart* (or *which belongs to the heart*) is the equivalent of the Pauline *inner man* (Rom. vii. 22), *i.e.*, Mind as contrasted with *the outward man*, *i.e.*, flesh (Rom. *l.c.*, *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16). St. Peter employs the terms used in the Sermon on the Mount; *cf.* St. Paul's **ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος** and **περιτομὴ καρδίας**, Rom. ii. 29.—**ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ**, *clothed in the incorruptible thing* (or *ornament*, sc. **κόσμῳ**) contrasted with corruptible *goldens*; *cf.* Jas. ii. 2, **ἀνὴρ . . . ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ.**—**τοῦ . . . πνεύματος**, *namely*, *the meek and quiet spirit*. The adjectives are perhaps derived from the version of Isa. lxvi. 2, known to Clement of Rome (Ep. i. xiii. 4), **ἐπὶ τίνα ἐπιβλέψω ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τὸν πρᾳὺν καὶ ἡσύχιον καὶ τρέμοντά μου τὰ λόγια.** Jesus professed Himself, **πρᾳὺς καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ.** For **πνεύματος** compare **πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης**, Rom. i. 4. In Rom. ii. 29, **πν.** is coupled with *heart* as contrasted with *flesh* and outwardness. **ὅ** *which spirit* or *the posssesion of which* reference.—**πολυτελές** suggests use of conception of Wisdom which is *precious* above rubies (Prov. iii. 15, etc.); *cf.* Jas. i. 21, iii. 13, **ἐν πρᾳύτητι σοφίας** and description of *the wisdom from above*, *ib.* 17.

Ver. 5. **ποτε** refers vaguely to O.T. history as part of **αἱ . . . θεόν.** References to the holy women of the O.T. are rare in N.T. and this appeal to their example illustrates the affinity of Peter to Heb. (xi. 11, 35). Hannah is the obviously appropriate type (*cf.* Luke i. with 2 Sam. 1 f.); but Peter is thinking of the traditional idealisation of Sarah.

Ver. 6. **ὡς . . . καλοῦσα.** The only evidence that can be adduced from the O.T. narrative is *Sarah laughed within herself and said . . . "but my lord is old"* (Gen. xviii. 12). The phrase, if pressed, implies a nominal subjection as of a slave to her lord, but the context at any rate excludes *any hope in God*. Philo, who starts with the assumption that Sarah is Virtue, evades the difficulty; her laughter was the expression of her joy, she denied it for fear of usurping God's prerogative of laughter (*de Abr.*, ii. p. 30 M). The Rabbinic commentaries dwell upon the title accorded to Abraham and draw the same inference as Peter; but there are also traces of a tendency to exalt Sarah "the princess" as superior to her husband in the gift of prophecy, which St. Peter may wish to correct (as St. James corrects the exaggerated respect paid to Elijah, Jas. v. 17).—**ἧς . . . τέκνα.** Christian women became children of Sarah who is Virtue or Wisdom (Philo) just as men became children of Abraham. But the fact that they were Christians is still in the background; the essential point is that they must do the works traditionally ascribed to Sarah (*cf.* Rom. iv.; John viii.) and so justify their technical parentage, whether natural or acquired. Oec. compares Isa. li. 2, *Sarah your mother*.—**ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι**, the present participle emphasises the need for continuance of the behaviour appropriate to children of Sarah.—**μὴ . . . πτόησιν**, from Prov. iii. 25, LXX. Peter regards Sarah's falsehood (Gen. *l.c.*) as the yielding to a sudden terror for which she was rebuked by God. Fearlessness then is part of the character which is set before them for imitation and it is the result of obedience to the voice of Wisdom. Rabbinic exegesis associates the ideas of *ornament* with the promised child and that of peace between husband and wife with the whole incident.

Ver. 7. *Duty of husbands to their wives.* Application of principle **πάντας τιμήσατε.**—**κατὰ γνῶσιν**, for the

ὁμοίως συνοι κοῦντες κατὰ γνῶσι ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύ ει
τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀπο νέμοντες τειμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις
χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν.
τὸ δὲ τέλος, πάντες ὁ μόφρονες συμπαθεῖς φιλάδελφοι 8
εὔσπλαγ χνοι ταπεινόφρονες· μὴ ἀποδιδόντες κακὸ ἀντὶ κακοῦ 9
ἢ λοιδορί αν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας· τοὐ ναντίον δὲ εὐλογοῦ τες,
ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ἐ κλήθητε, ἵνα εὐλογία κληρονομήσητε. ὁ 10

woman is the weaker vessel—the pot—which the stronger—the cauldron—may easily smash (Sir. xiii. 2). **ὡς, κ.τ.λ.** point with comma after **γνῶσιν** and **τιμήν**. **σκεύει.** The comparison of Creator and creature to potter and clay is found first in Isa. xxix. 16, but is latent in the description of the creation (יצר) of Adam from the dust of the earth (Gen. ii. 7 f.). In the prophets it is developed and applied variously (Isa. xlv. 9 f., lxiv. 8; Jer. xviii. 6). In Sap. xv. 7, there is an elaborate description of the maker of clay images, in which **σκεῦος** replaces **πλάσμα** and *vessels which serve clean uses* are distinguished from *the contrary sort*. Thence St. Paul adopts the figure and employs it to illustrate the absolute sovereignty of the Creator, as Isaiah had done (see Rom. ix. 21), distinguishing *vessels intended for honour* from those *intended for dishonour*. Lastly 2 Tim. ii. 20 exemplifies the particular application of the figure, on which Peter's use of **σκεῦος** rests—**ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ** (1 Peter ii. 5, iv. 17) . . . **κ.τ.λ.** The comparative **ἀσθενεστέρῳ** proves that both husband and wife are *vessels* and assists to exclude the notion that St. Paul could mean to call a wife the vessel of her husband in 1 Thess. iv. 4.—**ὡς . . . ζωῆς**, *inasmuch as they are also heirs with you of the grace* (i. 10, 13) *of life* (ii. 24): the heavenly inheritance is not distributed according to earthly custom, which gave the wife no rights of her own.—**εἰς . . . ὑμῶν.** If the prayers are those of all (ver. 8) compare 1 Cor. vii. (**τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω . . . ἵνα σχολάσητε τῇ προσευχῇ**). Peter teaches that married life need not—if the wife be properly honoured—hinder religious duties, as St. Paul feared (*ib.* 32 ff.). If **ὑμῶν** = *you husbands* (as *v.l.* **συγκληρονόμοι** requires) *cf.* Jas. v. 4.

Vv. 8 f. Sweeping clause addressed to all, inculcating detailed **φιλαδελφία** after Rom. xii. 10, 15-17.

Ver. 8. **τὸ . . . τέλος**, *finally*. Oecumenius brings out the possible connotations of the word *goal* and also the law for all love since love is the end of the law.—**ὁμόφρονες**, *of one mind, united*, an Epic word. St. Paul's **τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν** but here wider than parallel expressing Rom. xii. 16, **τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες.**—**συμπαθεῖς** summarises **χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων** of Rom. xii. 15; *cf.* Heb. iv. 15 (of Christ), x. 34 (particular example of sympathy with "the prisoners").—**φιλάδελφοι**, *cf.* i. 22; Rom. xii. 10, **τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι.**—**εὔσπλαγχνοι**, *kind-hearted*, in Eph. iv. 32 (only here in N.T.) coupled with *kind . . . forgiving one another*; epithet of Jehovah in Prayer of Manasses, ver. 7 = *compassionate*, in accordance with metaphorical use of **σπλάγχνα κ.τ.λ.** derived from different senses of רחם. Here = **ἐνδύσασθε . . . τὰ σπλάγχνα τῆς χρηστότητος**, Col.—**ταπεινόφρονες** = **τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι**, Rom. xii. 16, *cf.* Prov. xxix. 23, LXX, *insolence humbleth a man but the humble* (**ταπεινόφρονας**) *Jehovah stayeth with glory* (**κ. ὕβρις**).

Ver. 9. **μὴ . . . κακοῦ**, from Rom. xii. 17; *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 15; Prov. xx. 22, *Say not I will recompense evil* (LXX **τίσομαι τὸν ἐχθρόν**): an approximation to Christ's repeal of the *lex talionis* (Matt. v. 38 ff.) which Plato first opposed among the Greeks (see *Crito.*, p. 49, with Adam's note).—**λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας** refers to pattern left by Christ (ii. 23).—**τοὐναντίον**, *contrariwise.*—**εὐλογοῦντες** with **λοιδ.**, 1 Cor. iv. 21; *cf.* Rom. xii. 14, **εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας** = Luke vi. 28.—**ὅτι . . . κληρονομήσητε**, Christians must do as they hope to be done by. They are the new Israel called to inherit blessing in place of the Jews, who are reprobate like Esau; *cf.* Heb. xii. 17, **ἴστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη.** So St. Paul reverses the current view which identified the Jews with Isaac and the Gentiles with Ishmael (Gal. iv. 22 ff.).

Vv. 10-12 = Ps. xxxiv. 12-17*a*. intro-

γὰρ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶ͞ν, καὶ ἰδεῖν ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς, παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ, καὶ χείλη τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι
11 δόλον. ἐκκλεινάτω δὲ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν·
12 ζητησάτω εἰρήνην, καὶ διωξάτω αὐτήν, ὅτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κ͞υ ἐπὶ δικαίους, καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν· πρόσωπον
13 δὲ Κ͞υ ἐπὶ ποιοῦντας κακά. καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς,
14 εἰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ[1] γένοισθε[2] ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι. τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε

[1] For ζηλωταὶ three secondary uncials substitute μιμηται.

[2] Codex Vaticanus is alone in reading γένοισθε for γενησθε (the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus has γενεσθαι).

duced by mere γάρ as familiar. The lips of Christians who wish to love life must be free from cursing and from guile as were Christ's (*cf.* Isa. *apud* ii. 23). If Jehovah is to hear their petition as He heard Christ's they also must turn from evil and do good (*cf.* ἀγαθοποιεῖν above) seeking peace within and without the Church.

Ver. 10. Peter omits the rhetorical question τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, which introduces ὁ θέλων in the original (LXX = Hebrew) but is influenced by it in the substitution of the third for the second person throughout. The change of ἀγαπῶν (= Hebrew) to ἀγαπᾶν καὶ removes the barbarisms θέλων ζωήν and ἀγαπῶν ἰδεῖν (= Hebrew) and secures the balance between the clauses disturbed by the omission of the opening words.—**ἰδεῖν ἡμ. ἀγαθάς** is the natural sequel of the alteration of the original (*days to see good*), which is already found in the LXX (ἡμ. ἰ. ἀγαθάς).—**ζωήν** = *earthly life* in the original corresponding to *days*. The text adopted by Peter makes it mean *eternal life*, parallel *good days*. Only with this interpretation is the quotation pertinent to his exhortation: *cf. that ye might inherit blessing* (9) with *fellow-inheritors of the grace of life* (7).—**παυσάτω, κ.τ.λ.**, parallel μὴ . . . λοιδορίαν (9); *cf.* ii. 22 f.

Ver. 12. **πρόσωπον Κυρίου**, *Jehovah's face, i.e., wrath* (Targum, *the face of Jehovah was angry*) as the following clause, *to cut off the remembrance of them* . . . shows; *cf.* Lam. iv. 16; Ps. xxi. 9. But Peter stops short and leaves room for repentance.

Ver. 13. **κακώσων** echoes ποιοῦντας κακά (as **ζηλ. τοῦ ἀγ.** echoes ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν); but the phrase comes also from O.T.: Isa. l. 9, Κύριος βοηθήσει μοι· τίς κακώσει με;—**τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταί.** The phrase sums up ver. 11. All that was good in Judaism, however it may have been perverted, finds its fulfilment in the new Israel (Rom. x. 2). *Some* Jews were zealots, boasting their zeal for the Lord or His Law, like Phinehas and the Hasmonaeans (1 Macc. ii. *passim*): *all* Christians should be *zealots for that which is good.* So Paul says of himself as Pharisee that he was *a zealot for his ancestral traditions* (Gal. i. 14). For him as for the colleague of Simon the Zealot the word retained a flavour of its technical sense; *cf.* Tit. ii. 14, *that He might cleanse for Himself a peculiar people, zealot of good* (καλῶν) *works; cf.* similar use of ἀφωρισμένος = Pharisee (Rom. i. 1). **τοῦ ἀγ.** in emphatic position.

Ver. 14. **ἀλλ' . . . μακάριοι.** *Nay if ye should actually suffer*—if some one, despite the prophet (13), should harm you—*for the sake of righteousness, blessed are ye.* Peter appeals to the saying, μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης (Matt. v. 10).—**πάσχοιτε, εἰ** with optative (*cf.* 17, εἰ θέλοι) is used to represent anything as generally possible without regard to the general or actual situation at the moment (Blass, *Grammar*, p. 213). The addition of καί implies that the contingency is unlikely to occur and is best represented by an emphasis on *should.* The meaning of the verb is determined by κακώσων above, *if ye should be harmed, i.e.*, by persons unspecified (αὐτῶν).—**δικαιοσύνην** perhaps suggested ζηλωταί, *cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 27-29, πᾶς ὁ ζηλῶν τῷ νόμῳ . . . ἐξελθέτω . . . τότε κατέβησαν πολλοὶ ζητοῦντες δικ. καὶ κρίμα.—**τὸν δὲ φόβον . . . ὑμῶν.** An adaptation of Isa. viii. 12 f. LXX, τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτοῦ μὴ φοβηθῆτε οὐδὲ μὴ ταραχθῆτε· κύριον αὐτὸν ἁγιάσατε καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος. The scripture

Κ̄ν̄ δὲ τὸν Χ̄ν̄[1] ἁγιάσα τε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑ μῶν ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ 15
πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λογο̄ περὶ τῆς
ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλ πίδος· ἀλλὰ μετὰ πρα ΰτητος καὶ φόβου
συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν· ἵνα ἐν ᾧ κατα λαλεῖσθε[2] κατ- 16
αισχῡ θῶσιν οἱ ἐπηρεάζον τες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴ̄ ἐν Χ̄ῶ̄
ἀναστροφήν· κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀγαθο ποιοῦντας εἰ θέλοι 17

[1] Three secondary uncials read θεόν (Θ̄Ν̄) for Χριστόν (Χ̄ν̄).

[2] For ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε Codex Sinaiticus with other authorities reads ἐν ᾧ καταλαλῶσιν ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν—an assimilation of the text to ii. 12.

corresponding to the saying, *Fear not them that kill the body; but fear rather him that can destroy both soul and body* (Matt. x. 28 parallels Luke xii. 4 f. where the description of God is modified). The sense of the original, *fear not what they* (*the people*) *fear; Jehovah of Hosts Him shall ye count holy and let Him be the object of your fear*, has been in part abandoned. For it is simpler to take *the fear* as referring to the evil with which their enemies try to terrify them, than to supply the idea that their enemies employ the means by which they themselves would be intimidated. Compare iii. 6.—**τὸν χριστόν**, gloss on **κύριον** = Jehovah; *cf.* ii. 3.—**ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις** *sc.* mere profession. Peter is probably thinking of the prescribed prayer, *Hallowed be thy name*, elsewhere in N.T. it belongs to God to sanctify Christ and men.—**ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν**, *ready for reply*. The contrast between the inward hope (parallels sanctification of Christ in the heart) and the spoken defence of it is not insisted upon; the second **δέ** is not to be accepted. The use of the noun in place of verb is characteristic of St. Peter. The play upon **ἀπολογίαν** *back-word* and **λόγον** cannot be reproduced. Properly *speech in defence*, **ἀ.** is used metaphorically (NB **παντί**) here as by St. Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 3, **ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν**; where also, though another technical word is introduced, no reference is intended to formal proceedings in a court of law. St. Peter is thinking of the promise which he himself once forfeited for unworthy fear, *I will give you mouth and wisdom* (Luke xxi. 14 f., xii. 11, uses **ἀπολογεῖσθαι**; Matt. x. 19, **λαλεῖν**).—**παντὶ . . . λόγον**, *to every one* (for dative *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 3) *that asketh of you an account*. The phrase (compare *Demosthenes Against Onetor*, p. 868, **ἐνεκάλουν καὶ λόγον ἀπῄτουν**) recalls the Parable of the Steward of Unrighteousness, of whom his lord demanded an account (Luke xvi. 1 ff.), as also the metaphor of iv. 10, **ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι**.—**μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου**, *with meekness* (*cf.* ver. 4) *and fear of God* (Isa. *l.c.* has the same play on the senses of *fear*).—**συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ἀγαθήν**, intermediate step between **διὰ σ. θεοῦ** and the quasi-personification of **σ. ἀ.** in ver. 21; so St. Paul says **οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα** (1 Cor. iv. 4) but goes on beyond the contrast between self-judgment and that of other man to God's judgment. Ver. 17 supplies the explanation here.—**ἵνα . . . ἀναστροφήν**, generalisation of Peter's personal experience at Pentecost, when the Jews first scoffed and then were pierced to the heart (Acts ii. 13, 37). Misrepresentation is apparently the extent of their present suffering (17) and this they are encouraged to hope may be stopped. The heathen will somehow be put to shame even if they are not converted (ii. 12).—**ἐν ᾧ**, *in the matter in respect of which*; see ii. 12.—**ἐπηρεάζοντες**, occurs in Luke vi. 28, **προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς**, and therefore constitutes another hint of contact between St. Luke and Peter (*cf.* **χάρις**, ii. 19). Aristotle defines **ἐπηρεασμός** as "hindrance to the wishes of another not for the sake of gaining anything oneself but in order to baulk the other"—the spirit of the dog in the manger. Ordinarily the verb means *to libel*, *cf.* **λαλῆσαι δόλον** (10).—**ὑμῶν . . . ἀναστροφήν**, *your* (possessive genitive precedes noun in Hellenistic Greek) *good-in-Christ behaviour*: **ἐν Χριστῷ** (iv. 14, 16) is practically equivalent to *Christian*, *cf. if any is in Christ a new creature*.

Ver. 17. **κρεῖττον**, *cf.* ii. 19 f., where **χάρις κλέος** correspond to **μισθὸν περισσόν** of the sources.—**εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα θεοῦ**. Again optative implies that it is a purely hypothetical case (*cf.* ver. 14). For the semi-personification

18 τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θ̄ῡ πά   σχειν ἢ κακοποιοῦν   τας· ὅτι καὶ Χ̄ς̄ ἅπαξ πε   ρὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν   δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκω̄   ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ   θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρ   κὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ

of *the will of God* compare Eph. i. 11, where the **θέλημα** has a **βουλή**; so Paul is Apostle *through the will of God* (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1). For the pleonastic expression *cf.* the verbal parallel **ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν**, John vii. 17. So *God's patience was waiting* (ver. 20).

Ver. 18. The advantage of suffering for well-doing is exemplified in the experience of Christ, who gained thereby quickening (ver. 21) and glory (ver. 22). How far the pattern applies to the Christian is not clear. Christ suffered *once for all* according to Heb. ix. 24-28; the Christian suffers *for a little* (v. 10). But does the Christian suffer also *for sins?* St. Paul and Ignatius speak of themselves as **περίψημα περικαθάρματα**; compare the value of righteous men for Sodom. But even if Peter contemplated this parallel it is quite subordinate to the main idea, *in which (spirit) even to the spirits in prison he went and preached them that disobeyed once upon a time when the patience of God was waiting in the days of Noah while the ark was being fitted out. . . .* The spirits who disobeyed in the days of Noah are the sons of God described in Gen. vi. 1-4. But there as in the case of Sarah St. Peter depends on the current tradition in which the original myth has been modified and amplified. This dependence supplies an adequate explanation of the difficulties which have been found here and in ver. 21, provided that the plain statement of the preaching in Hades is not prejudged to be impossible. The important points in the tradition as given in the Book of Enoch (vi.-xvi. *cf.* Jubilees v.) are as follows: the angels who lusted after the daughters of men descended in the days of Jared as his name (Descent) shows. The children of this unlawful union were the Nephilim and the Eliud. They also taught men all evil arts so that they perished appealing to God for justice. At last Enoch was sent to pronounce the sentence of condemnation upon these watchers, who in terror besought him to present a petition to God on their behalf. God refused to grant them peace. They were spirits eternal and immortal who transgressed the line of demarcation between men and angels and disobeyed the law that spiritual beings do not marry and beget children like men. Accordingly they are bound and their children slay one another leaving their disembodied spirits to propagate sin in the world even after it has been purged by the Flood. But Christians believed that Christ came to seek and to save the lost and the captives; all things are to be subjected to Him. So Peter supplements the tradition which he accepts. For him it was not merely important as connected with the only existing type of the Last Judgment or an alternative explanation of the origin and continuance of sin but also as the greatest proof of the complete victory of Christ over the most obstinate and worst of sinners.—**ἐν ᾧ** *sc.* **πνεύματι**: as a bodiless spirit in the period between the Passion (18) and the Resurrection-Ascension (22).—**καί**, *even* to the typical rebels who had sinned past forgiveness according to pre-Christian notions.—**τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν**, *the spirits in prison, i.e.*, the angels of Gen. *l.c.* who were identified with *my spirit* of Gen. vi. 3, and therefore described as having been sent to the earth by God in one form of the legend (Jubilees, *l.c.*). The name contains also the point of their offending (Enoch summarised above); *cf.* 2 Peter ii. 4; Jude 6; and the prophecy of Isa. lxi. 1 (which Jesus claimed, Luke iv. 8 f.), **κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν**. These spirits were *in ward* when Christ preached to them in accordance with God's sentence, *bind them in the depths of the earth* (Jub. v. 6).—**ἐκήρυξεν = εὐηγγελίσατο**, *cf.* Luke iv. 8. Before Christ came, they had not heard the Gospel of God's Reign. Enoch's mediation failed. But at Christ's preaching they repented like the men of Nineveh; for it is said that *angels subjected themselves to Him* (22, *cf.* **ὑποτάσσεσθαι**, throughout the Epistle.—**ἀπειθήσασίν ποτε**, their historic disobedience or rebellion is latent in the narrative of Gen. vi. and expounded by Enoch; *cf.* ii. 7 f., iii. 1, iv. 17. In LXX **ἀπ.** commonly = rebel (מָרַד).—**ἀπεξεδέχετο . . . μακροθυμία**, *God's long-suffering was waiting*. The reading **ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο** is attractive, as supplying a reference to the present period of waiting which precedes the second and final Judgment (Rom. ii. 4, ix. 22). The tradition lengthens the period of **πάρεσις** (Rom. iii. 25); but

πνεύματι · ἐν ᾧ καὶ[1] τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμα σιν πορευθεὶς 19
ἐκήρυ ξεν ἀπειθήσασίν πο τε ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο[2] ἡ τοῦ Θῦ 20
μακροθυμία ἐν ἡμέραις Νῶε κατα σκευαζομένης κειβώ
του εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι του τέστι ὀκτὼ ψυχαὶ διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδα-
τος · ὃ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπο̄ νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα οὐ σαρ- 21
κὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύ που ἀλλὰ συνειδήσε ως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτη

[1] Dr. Rendel Harris would restore Ἑνώχ after ἐν ᾧ καὶ (ἐ), supposing that a scribe has blundered "in dropping some repeated letters" (a case of *haplography*). See *Side-Lights on New Testament Research*, p. 208.

[2] Erasmus supposing an haplography read ἅπαξ ἐξεδέχετο for ἀπεξεδέχετο.

St. Peter limits it by adding *while the Ark was being fitted out* in accordance with Gen. If Adam's transgression be taken as the origin of sin the long-suffering is still greater. The idea seems to be due to ἐνεθυμήθην, *I reflected*, of the LXX, which stands for the unworthy anthropomorphism of the Hebrew *I repented* in Gen. vi. 6. Compare for language Jas. v. 7; Matt. xxiv. 37 f.; Luke xvii. 26 f.—εἰς ἥν, *sc. entered and.*—ὀλίγοι, κ.τ.λ. St. Peter hints that here in the typical narrative is the basis of the disciple's question, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι (Luke xiii. 23).—ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, so Gen. vii. 7; ψ. = *persons* (of both sexes), *cf.* Acts ii. 41, etc. The usage occurs in Greek of all periods; so נפש in Hebrew and *soul* in English.—διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος, *were brought safe through water.* Both local and instrumental meanings of δι are contemplated. The former is an obvious summary of the whole narrative; *cf.* also διὰ τὸ ὕδωρ (Gen. vii. 7). The latter is implied in the statement that the water *increased and lifted up the ark* (*ib.* 17 f.); though it fits better the antitype. So Josephus (Ant. I., iii. 2) says that "the ark was strong so that from no side was it worsted by the violence of the water and Noah with his household διασῴζεται". Peter lays stress on the water (rather than the ark as *e.g.*, Heb. xi.) for the sake of the parallel with Baptism (Rom. vi. 3; *cf.* St. Paul's application of the Passage of the Red Sea, 1 Cor. x. 1 f.).

Ver. 21. Baptism is generally the antitype of the deliverance of Noah. Christians pass *through water* (in both senses) to salvation; in each microcosm are the sins which must be washed away and the remnant which is to be saved. Therefore the antitypical water saves us (ὅ = τὸ ὕδωρ > δι' ὕδατος) being οὐ σαρκός, κ.τ.λ.; *cf.* Tit. iii. 5.—βάπτισμα, if not an interpolation explains ὃ ἀντ. *which corresponding to the* (pre-existent) *type* (*cf.* Heb. ix. 24 the earthly temple is ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν). The following definition by exclusion contrasts Christian baptism with Jewish and pagan lustrations and also with the Deluge which was a removal of sin-fouled flesh from the sinners of old (iv. 6); the former affected the flesh and not the conscience (Heb. ix. 13 f.), the latter removed the flesh but not the spiritual defilement proceeding from past sin. σαρκός and συνειδήσεως stand before their belongings for emphasis and not merely in accordance with prevalent custom. For ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου compare Isa. iv. 4 (sequel of the description of the daughters of Zion which is used above iii. 3), *Jehovah shall wash away their filth* (τὸν ῥύπον: LXX chivalrously prefixes *of the sons and*). ἐπερώτημα is explained by Oecumenius as meaning *earnest*, *pledge* as in Byzantine Greek law. Its use for the questions put to the candidate in the baptismal service (dost thou renounce . . .?) is probably due to St. Peter here. In ordinary Greek (Herodotus and Thucydides) it = *question* (ἐπ. having no force, as if implying a second additional question arising out of the first). Here the noun corresponds to the verb as used in Isa. lxv. 1, quoted by St. Paul in Rom. x. 20, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι = (1) a seeking, quest after God or (2) *request addressed to God* (supported by εἰς; *cf.* the formula ἔντευξις εἰς τὸ βασιλέως ὄνομα, a petition addressed to the king's majesty). In the latter case Peter will still be thinking as above and below of the disobedient spirits who presented a petition (ἐρώτησις) to God inspired by an evil conscience (see Enoch summarised above). At any rate συνειδ. is probably subjective or possessive rather than objective genitive. The believer who comes to baptism has believed in Christ and repented of his past sins, renounces them and the

22 μα εἰς Θῦ δί ἀναστάσε ως Ιῦ Χῦ ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δε ξιᾷ Θῦ[1] πορευ-
θεὶς εἰς οὐρανὸν ὑποταγέν των αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων ϗ ἐξου-
IV. 1 σιῶν καὶ δυνάμε ων Χῦ οὖν παθόντος[2] σαρκὶ[3] καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν
αὐ τὴν ἔννοιαν ὁπλίσα σθε· ὅτι ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπαυται
2 ἁμαρτίαις[4] εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώ πων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ
θελήματι Θῦ τὸν ἐπί λοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιῶ σαι χρόνον·
3 ἀρκετὸς γὰρ[5] ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος[6] τὸ βούλημα τῶ

[1] After θεοῦ the Vulgate adds *degluttiens mortem ut vitae aeternae heredes efficiamur.*

[2] The variant αποθανόντος for παθόντος is a simple case of erroneous transcription which does not affect the sense. Codex Alexandrinus adds the Christian gloss ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

[3] To σαρκὶ two secondary uncials prefix the preposition ἐν.

[4] For ἁμαρτίαις most manuscripts have ἁμαρτίας.

[5] After γὰρ the secondary uncials supply ἡμῖν, and the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus with many cursives ὑμῖν.

[6] The secondary uncials add τοῦ βίου to χρόνος and substitute θέλημα for βούλημα.

spirits which prompted them and appeals to God for strength to carry out this renunciation in his daily life.—δι' ἀναστ. with σώζει; compare 1 Cor. xv. 13-17.

Ver. 22. Christ went into Heaven—and now is on God's right hand (Ps. cx. 1)—when angels and authorities and powers had subjected themselves to Him in accordance with prophecy (Ps. viii. 7; *cf.* Heb. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.). For the orders of angels see also Rom. viii. 38; Eph. i. 21. Clearly they include the rebels of ver. 19 f. whom Jubilees calls *the angels of the Lord* (Jub. iv. 15) and Onkelos *the sons of the mighty* and their children (?) *the giants*.

Chapter IV.—Ver. 1. *Christ having died to flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought that* (or *because*) *he that died hath ceased to sins.*—παθόντος σαρκί. Peter goes back to the starting point of iii. 18 in order to emphasise the import of the first step taken by Christ and His followers, apart now from the consequences. The new life implies death to the old.—τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν. ἐ. only occurs once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. iv. 12, τῶν ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, but is common in LXX of Proverbs; compare (*e.g.*) Prov. ii. 11, ἔννοια ὁσία (תבונה, *discernment*) *shall keep thee*. Here it is the noun-equivalent of φρονεῖτε ὃ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ (Phil. ii. 1). Christ's *thought* (*or purpose*) which He had in dying is shared by the Christian: and it is defined by ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.—ὁπλίσασθε, *sc.* for the fight with sin and sinners whom you have deserted.—ὅτι . . . ἁμαρτίαις. This axiom is better taken as explaining *the same thought* than as motive for ὁπλ. St. Paul states it in other words, ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; compare the death-bed confession of the Jew, "O may my death be an atonement for all the sins . . . of which I have been guilty against thee". One dead—literally or spiritually—hath rest in respect of sins assumed or committed; so Heb. ix. 28 insists that after His death Christ is χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. πέπαυται echoes παυσάτω of iii. 10. In the Greek Bible the perfect passive occurs only once (Exod. ix. 34) outside Isa. i.-xxxix., where it is used three times to render שבת (*cf.* σαββατισμός, Heb. iv. 9). The dative ἁμ. is analogous to that following ζῆν ἀποθανεῖν (παθεῖν); the *v.l.* ἁμαρτίας is due to the common construction of παυ.

Ver. 2. Christians who were baptised into Christ's death and resurrection (Rom. vi. 2-11) are not taken *out of the world* at once (John xvii. 15); they have to live in the flesh but not to the flesh, because *they have been born not of the will of the flesh nor of man but of God* (John i. 13). Their duty is to their new Father.—εἰς τό . . . gives the result of ὅτι κ.τ.λ. which must be achieved by, and is therefore also the object of, the required ornament.

Ver. 3. The use of the rare ἀρκετός indicates the saying which St. Peter here

**ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι· πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις ἐπίθυμι
αις οἰνοφλυγίαις κώ μοις πότοις καὶ ἀθε μίτοις εἰδωλολατρεί
αις ἐν ᾧ ξενίζονται μὴ συντρεχόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν 4
τῆς ἀσωτίας ἀνάχυσι̅ βλασφημῦνταις οἳ ἀποδώσουσι λόγον 5**

applies, *sufficient unto the day* [that is past] *its evil*. Compare Ezek. xliv. 6, **ἱκανούσθω ὑμῖν ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν ὑμῶν**. The detailed description of *the evil* follows the traditional redaction of the simple picture of absorption in the ordinary concerns of life which Jesus is content to repeat (Matt. xxiv. 37, etc.). Eating, drinking, marrying were interpreted in the worst sense to account for the visitation and become gluttony, drunkenness and all conceivable perversions of marriage; see Sap. xiv. 21-27, followed by Rom. i. 29, etc.—**τὸ . . . πεπορευμένους**, from 2 Kings xvii. 8, **ἐπορεύθησαν τοῖς δικαιώμασιν τῶν ἐθνῶν**. The construction is broken (for the will . . . *to have been accomplished . . . for you walking*) unless **κατ.** be taken as if middle to **πεπορ.** as subject.—**ἀσελγείαις**, *acts of licentiousness* (as in Polybius); so Sap. xiv. 26. Earlier of wanton violence arising out of drunkenness (Demosthenes).—**οἰνοφλυγίαις**, *wine-bibbings*, Deut. xxi. 20, **οἰνοφλυγεῖ** = סבא. Noun occurs in Philo coupled with **ἀπλήρωτοι ἐπιθυμίαι**.—**κώμοις**, *revellings* associated with *alien rites*, Sap. xiv. 26. For **πότοις** *cf.* **ποτήριον δαιμόνων**, 1 Cor. x. 14 ff.—**ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρίαις**, a Jew's description of current Pagan cults, which were often *illicit* according to Roman law. For **ἀ.** *cf.* Acts x. 28, *it is unlawful for a Jew to associate with a foreigner*, and 2 Macc. vi. 5, vii. 1 (of swine flesh).

Ver. 4. **ἐν ᾧ**, *whereat*, *i.e.* (i.) at your change of life (2 f.) explained below by **μὴ συντρεχ. . . .** or (ii.) *on which ground*, because you lived as they did.—**ξενίζονται**, *are surprised*, as in ver. 12, where this use of **ξ.** (elsewhere in N.T. *entertain*, except Acts xvii. 20, **ξενίζοντα**) is explained by **ὡς ξένου . . . συμβαίνοντος**. Polybius has it in the same sense followed by dative, acc., **διά** with acc. and **ἐπί** with dative. So in Josephus Adam was *surprised* (**ξενιζόμενον**) that the animals had mates and he none, Ant., i. 1, 2) and the making of garments *surprised* God (*ib.* 4).—**συντρεχόντων**, from Ps. l. 18, LXX, *if thou sawest a thief*, **συνέτρεχες αὐτῷ**, *and with adulterers thou didst set thy portion*; where תרץ *consent* has been rendered as if from רוץ *run*. It thus corresponds to St. Paul's **συνευδοκεῖν** (Rom. i. 32).—**ἀσωτίας**, *profligacy*. According to Aristotle **ἀ.** is the excess of liberality, but is applied in complex sense to **τοὺς ἀκρατεῖς καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανηρούς**. Prodigality is in fact a destruction of oneself as well as one's property (*Eth. Nic.*, iv. 13).—**ἀσελγείαις . . . πότοις**. Violence and lust are classed with drunkenness, which breeds and fosters them. **ἀ.** is wanton violence as well as licentiousness. So the classic Christian example of the word is exactly justified; see Luke xv. 13, the Prodigal Son *squandered his substance, living* **ἀσώτως**.—**ἀνάχυσιν**, *excess, overflow*, properly of water (Philo ii. 508 f., description of evolution of air from fire, water from air, land from water). In Strabo (iii. 1, 4, etc.) = estuary. St. Peter is still thinking of the narrative of the Deluge, which was the fit punishment of an inundation of prodigality.—**βλασφημοῦντες**, put last for emphasis and to pave the way for ver. 5 in accordance with the saying, *for every idle word* (*cf.* Rom. iii. 8). The *abuse* is directed against the apostate heathens and implies blasphemy in its technical sense as opposed to the *giving glory to God* (ii. 12).

Ver. 5. **ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον**, *will render account* — if of their blasphemy, *cf.* Matt. xii. 36, if of their **ἀσωτία** (see note) *cf.* the steward of Luke xvi. 2.—**τῷ ἑτοίμως κρίνοντι**, *i.e.*, to Christ rather than to God (as i. 17). The Christians took over the Jewish doctrine that every man must give an account of his life (Rom. xiv. 10). As already Enoch (lxix. 27 = John v. 22, 27) taught that this judgment was delegated to Messiah. So St. Peter said at Caesarea *this is he that hath been appointed by God judge of living and dead* (Acts x. 43). Compare Matt. xxv. 31 ff. for a more primitive and pictorial statement. The use of **ἑτοίμως** probably represents עתיד (see i. 5) *i.e.*, *the future judge*; Greek readers would understand *the imminent judge* (*cf.* use of **ἑτοίμως** = *ready*, *sure to come*, Homer, *Il.*, xviii. 96, etc.). The *v.l.*

6 τῷ ἑτοίμως κρείνοντι[1] ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νε κροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη ἵ να κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώ-
7 πους σαρκὶ ζῶ σι δὲ κατὰ Θ͞ν πνεύματι. πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἤγγικεν· σωφρονήσα τε οὖν καὶ νήψατε εἰς προσευχάς·
8 πρὸ πάντω͞ τὴν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀγάπη͞ ἐκτενῆ ἔχοντες ὅτι
9 ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆ θος ἁμαρτιῶν· φιλόξε νοι εἰς ἀλλή-

[1] Codex Sinaiticus with the bulk of the manuscripts has ἔχοντι κρῖναι for κρίνοντι.

i. ἔχοντι κρῖναι softens the rugged original.|

Ver. 6. The judgment is imminent because all necessary preliminaries have been accomplished. There is no ground for the objection "perhaps the culprits have not heard the Gospel". As regards the living, there is a brotherhood in the world witnessing for Christ in their lives and the missionaries have done their part. As regards the dead Christ descended into Hades to preach there and so was followed by His Apostles. And the object of this was that though the dead have been judged as all men are in respect of the flesh they might yet live as God lives in respect of the spirit.—εἰς τοῦτο, with a view to the final judgment or = ἵνα, κ.τ.λ..—νεκροῖς, *to dead men* generally, but probably as distinct from the rebel spirits who were presumably immortal and could only be imprisoned. Oecumenius rightly condemns the view, which adds *in trespasses and sins* or takes *dead* in a figurative sense, despite the authority of *e.g.*, Augustine (*Ep.*, 164, §§ 1-18).—εὐηγγελίσθη, the Gospel was preached, the impersonal passive leaves the way open for the development of this belief according to which not Christ only but also the Apostles preached to the dead. Hermas, *Sim.*, ix. 165-167; *Cl. Al. Strom.*, vi. 645 f. So was provision made for those who died between the descent of Christ and the evangelisation of their own countries.—ἵνα, κ. τ. λ., *that though they had been judged in respect of flesh as men are judged they might live in respect of spirit as God lives.* The parallel between the dead and Christ is exact (see iii. 20). Death is the judgment or sentence passed on all men (Ecclus. xiv. 17 = Gen. ii. 17, iii. 19). Even Christians, who have died spiritually and ethically (Rom. viii. 10), can only hope wistfully to escape it (2 Cor. v. 2 ff.). But it is preliminary to the Last Judgment (Heb. ix. 27), at which believers, who are quickened spiritually, cannot be condemned to the second death (Apoc. xx. 6).

Ver. 7. But the end of all things and men has drawn nigh; Christians also must be ready, *watch and pray*, as Jesus taught in the parable of Mark xiii. 34-37 (*cf.* xiv. 38).—σωφρονήσατε parallels ἀσελγ. ἐπιθυμίαις (ver. 3) *cf.* 4 Macc. i. 31, *temperance is restraint of lust.* In Rom. xii. 3 St. Paul plays on the meaning of the component parts of σω-φρονεῖν, *cf.* εἰς σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν above.—νήψατε, corresponds to οἰνοφλυγίαις κώμοις πότοις (ver. 3); *cf.* i. 13, v. 8. St. Paul also depends on parable of Luke xii. 42-46 in 1 Thess. v. 6 ff.—εἰς προσευχάς, the paramount duty of Christians is prayer especially for the coming of the Lord (Apoc. xxii. 20; Luke xi. 2; *cf.* iii. 7).

Ver. 8. πρὸ πάντων, St. Peter emphasises the pre-eminent importance of love of man as much as St. John; *cf.* i. 22. —ἑαυτούς put for ἀλλήλους in accordance with the saying *thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself* as much as with the contemporary practice.—ὅτι . . . ἁμαρτιῶν, quotation of Prov. x. 12, *love hides all transgressions* which was adduced by Jesus (Luke vii. 47). The plain sense of the aphorism has been evaded by the LXX (πάντας τοὺς μὴ φιλονεικοῦντας καλύπτει φιλία) and Syriac translators substitutes *shame* for *love*. The currency of the true version is attested by Jas. v. 20, he that converted a sinner . . . καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν.

Ver. 9. Hospitality is the practical proof of this *love*; its practice was necessary to the cohesion of the scattered brotherhood as to the welfare of those whose duties called them to travel. The inns were little better than brothels and Christians were commonly poor. Chrysostom cites the examples of Abraham and Lot (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 2). The united advocacy of this virtue was successful—so much so that the Didache has to provide against abuses such as Lucian depicts in the biography of Peregrinus "a Christian traveller shall not remain more than two or three days . . . if he wishes to settle . . . is unskilled and

λους ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ· ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα 10
εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ δια κονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης
χάριτος θῦ· εἴ τις λαλεῖ ὡς λόγια θῦ· εἴ τις διακο 11
νεῖ ὡς ἐξ ἰσχυος ἧς χο ρηγεῖ ὁ θς· ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται
ὁ θς διὰ ιῦ χῦ ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰ
ῶνας τῶν αἰώνων ἀμήν. ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν 12
ὑμῖ πυρώσει πρὸς πειρα σμὸν ὑμῖν γεινομέ νῃ ὡς ξενοῦ

will not work he is a Χριστέμπορος, makes his Christian profession his merchandise."—ἀλλήλους, used despite ἑαυτούς above and below, perhaps because the recipients of hospitality belong necessarily to other Churches.—ἄνευ γογγυσμοῦ, St. Peter guards against the imperfection of even Christian human nature. Ecclus. xxix. 25-28 describes how a stranger who outstays his welcome is first set to menial tasks and then driven out.

Vv. 10 f. supplement the foregoing directions for the inner life of the Church and rest partly on Rom. xii. 6 (with simpler classification of *gifts*), partly on the conception of disciples as *stewards* (Luke xii. 42) serving out rations in God's house.—διακονοῦντες, in the widest sense (as διακονία in Acts vi. 1, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 5) in accordance with the saying, *the Son of Man came . . . to minister* (Mark x. 45), which is interpreted here, as part of the pattern, by the addition of an object (only here and i. 12); *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 19, τῇ χάριτι . . . τῇ διακονουμένῃ ὑφ' ἡμῶν.—οἰκονόμοι. The title is applied to all and not only to the governors as by St. Paul (1 Cor. iv. 1; Tit. i. 7); compare the question of St. Peter which precedes the source (Luke xii. 41 f.).

Ver. 11 follows the primitive division of ministry into that of the word and that of tables (Acts vi. 2-4); compare *prophecy* and ministry (in narrower sense like διακονεῖ here) of Rom. xii. 6.—λαλεῖ covers all the speaking described in 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10, *to one by means of the spirit hath been given a word of wisdom*, etc. . . . xiv. 6, 26.—ὡς λόγια θεοῦ (perhaps echoes κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν of Rom. xii. 6) *as being God's oracles* or *as speaking God's oracles*. The Seer is the model for the Christian preacher: Num. xxiv. 4, φησὶν ἀκούων λόγια θεοῦ. His message is the particular grace of God which he has to administer like the prophets and evangelists, i. 10-12.—διακονεῖ includes all forms of the ministration of God's gifts other than those of speech—primarily almsgiving, hospitality and the like.—ἵνα, κ. τ. λ. A liturgical formula such as this is necessarily capable of many special meanings.—ἐν πᾶσιν may refer particularly to the gifts or their possessors—hardly to the Gentiles as Oec. suggests (Matt. v. 16)—but so to limit it would be a gratuitous injustice to the author. The saying ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί is sufficient to justify this appendix to the exhortation *love one another in deed*—διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *through Jesus Christ* through whom the spirit descended on each of you, Acts ii. 33, through whom you offer a sacrifice of praise (Heb. xiii. 15); *cf.* δοξαζέτω τὸν θεὸν ἐν ὀνόματι τούτῳ.—ᾧ . . . The insertion of ἐστιν changes the doxology to a statement of fact and thus supports the interpretation of ᾧ as referring of the immediate antecedent *Jesus Christ*. Already He possesses the glory and the victory; realising this His followers endure joyfully their present suffering and defeat.

Ver. 12. ἀγαπητοί marks the beginning of the third division of the Epistle in which Peter having cleared the ground faces at last the pressing problem.—ξενίζεσθε, *be surprised*, as in ver. 4.—τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει, *the ordeal which is in your midst* or rather *in your hearts*.—ἐν ὑμῖν, *cf.* τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον (v. 1) but the test is internal—in what frame of mind will they meet it? Will they regard it as a strange thing or as a share in Christ's sufferings, part of the pattern?—πυρώσει. This conception of suffering as a trial not vindictive is stated in Jud. viii. 25, 27, ἐκείνους ἐπύρωσεν εἰς ἐτασμὸν καρδίας αὐτῶν; compare Zach. xiii. 19, πυρώσω αὐτοὺς ὡς πυροῦται ἀργύριον, Prov. xxvii. 21, χρυσῷ πύρωσις parallels *but a man is tried* . . . π. also occurs in the sense of *blasting*, Amos iv. 9; Apoc. xviii. 9, 18.

13 ὑμῖν συμβαίνοντος· ἀλλὰ καθὸ κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ Χ̄θ̄ παθήμασιν χαίρετε ἵνα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῆς δόξης 14 αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι· εἰ ὀνειδίζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χ̄θ̄ μακάριοι ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης [1] καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θ̄θ̄ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς 15 ἀναπαύεται· [2] μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης

[1] After δόξης the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus with the consent of many manuscripts adds καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

[2] At the end of the verse the secondary uncials add κατὰ μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφημεῖται κατὰ δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται.

Ver. 13. καθό, *so far as*, *i.e.*, so far as your suffering is undeserved and for Christ's name.—κοινωνεῖτε . . . παθήμασιν, *ye share the sufferings of the Messiah*. The dative after κ. usually denotes the partner; here the thing shared as in Rom. xv. 27; 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 John 11; and in LXX; Sap. vi. 23; 3 Macc. iv. 11. This idea is expressed even more strongly by St. Paul ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col. i. 24). It is derived from such sayings as *the disciple is as his Master* (Matt. x. 24 f.)—*the sons of Zebedee must drink his cup, be baptised with his baptism* (Mark x. 38 f.). To suffer in Christ's name is to suffer as representing Christ and so to share His sufferings.—ἵνα κ. τ. λ., from Matt. v. 12, χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. But St. Peter postpones the exultation. St. James (v. 10) follows Jesus in appealing to the pattern of the prophets. ἀποκαλύψει, the final *revelation* represents an original wordplay גלה on the quoted ἀγαλλιώμενοι = גיל.

Ver. 14. The Beautitude, μακάριοι . . . ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ is supported by prophecy which referred originally to the root of Jesse. Both are partially paraphrased for sake of clearness. For ἐν ὀνόματι; *cf.* Mark ix. 41, ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε. For the reproach *cf.* Heb. xiii. 13, *let us come out to him bearing His reproach*, with Ps. lxxxix., *so remember Lord the reproaches* (ὀνειδισμῶν LXX) *of thy servants*.—ὅτι . . . ἀναπαύεται, quoted from a current Targum of Isa. xi. 1 f., *a branch* (נצר: LXX, ἄνθος: Targ. *Messiah*) *from his roots shall grow and there shall rest upon him the spirit of Jehovah*. An elaborate description of this *spirit* follows, which Peter summarises by τὸ τῆς δόξης. The Glory is a name of God in the Targums (so John xii. 41 = Isa. vi. 5; Onkelos has יקרא דיי for יי) and its use here is probably due to the juxtaposition of Isa. xi. 10, *his rest shall be glorious*. It is not impossible that καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ is an insertion by first or later scribes for the benefit of Greek readers.

Ver. 15. γάρ. I assume that you suffer in Christ's name as representing Him and bearing only the reproach which attaches to it *per se*. The crimes of which slanderers had accused Christians are given in the order of probability and are selected as belonging to the pattern. Christ Himself was implicitly accused thereof by His persecutors and acquitted of each by independent witnesses, as the Gospels are at pains to show. He suffered the fate from which the *murderer* was preserved (Acts iii. 14) by the petition of the Jews; shared it with *thieves* or brigands, being delivered up to the secular arm as a *malefactor* (John xviii. 30). Such slanders the Christian must rebut for the credit of his Lord; that he must not be guilty of such crimes goes without saying.—ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος is distinguished from the preceding accusations by the insertion of ὡς; it is also an addition to the *pattern* of Christ, unless stress be laid on the sneer, *He saved others*. The word was apparently coined to express the idea of the itinerant philosopher of whatever sect current among the unphilosophical. Epictetus defends the true Cynic against this very calumny; he is a messenger sent from Zeus to men to show them concerning good and evil (Arrian, iii. 22, 23) . . . a spy of what is helpful and harmful to men . . . he approaches all men, cares for all (*ib.* 81) . . . neither meddler—περίεργος—nor busybody is such an one; for he is not busy about alien things—τὰ ἀλλότρια πολυπραγμονεῖ—when he inspects the actions and relations of mankind—ὅταν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἐπισκοπῇ (*ib.* 97). This zeal for the welfare of others was certainly the most obvious charge to bring against Christians, who indeed were not always content to

ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἀλ λοτριεπίσκοπος· εἰ δὲ ὡς Χρειστιανὸς 16
μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω δοξαζέ τω δὲ τὸν Θν̄ ἐν τῷ ὀνό ματι[1] τούτῳ
ὅτι ὁ και ρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ 17
Θῦ εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀ πὸ ἡμῶν τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων
τῷ τοῦ Θῦ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ εἰ ὁ δίκαιος μόλις σώζεται ὁ δὲ 18
ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανεῖται· ὥστε καὶ οἱ πάσ- 19
χοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θῦ πιστῷ κτιστῇ παρατιθέσθω
σαν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν ἀ γαθοποιΐᾳ. πρεσβυ τέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν V. 1

[1] The secondary uncials have μέρει for ὀνόματι.

testify *by good behaviour without word.* St. Paul heard of some at Thessalonica, μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους (2 Thess. iii. 11). Women generally if unattached were prone to be not merely idle but *meddlers speaking what they should not* (1 Tim. v. 13). So St. Peter (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 27) has emphasised the duty of all Christians—even of the wives of heathen husbands—to preach Christianity only by example and now deprecates their acquiescence in what some might reckon a title of honour. The fate of Socrates is the classical example of the suffering of such; and later one philosopher was scourged and another beheaded for denunciation of the alliance of Titus with Berenice (*Dio Cassius*, lxvi. 15). Punishment of this offence would depend on the power of the other man concerned who, if not in authority, would naturally utilise mob-law like Demetrius (Acts xix.).

Ver. 16. **εἰ δὲ ὡς χριστιανός**, *if one suffers as a follower of Christ, in the name of Christ* (14). See on Acts ix. 26 and Introduction.—**μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω** echoes the saying, *Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words of him also the Son of Man shall be ashamed when He cometh in the glory;* so St. Paul says *I suffer thus but am not ashamed* (2 Tim. i. 12; *cf.* 8).—**δοξαζέτω τὸν θεόν**, by martyrdom if necessary, for this sense the phrase has acquired already in John xxi. 19.—**ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ** = Mark ix. 41.

Ver. 17. That Judgment begins at the House of God is a deduction from the vision of Ezek. ix. (*cf.* vii. 4, *the* καιρός *has come*); the slaughter of Israelites who are not marked with Tau, is ordained by the Glory of the God of Israel; the Lord said, ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου ἄρξασθε and the men began at (ἀπό) the elders who were within in the house. The new Israel has precedence like the old even in condemnation; *cf.* Rom. ii. 8 f., τοῖς . . . ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ . . . ὀργὴ ἐπὶ . . . ψυχὴν . . . Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον.—**τῷ . . . εὐαγγελίῳ**, *cf.* Mark i. 14. The Gospel or Word, which God *spake in a Son*, succeeds to the law as the expression of the will against which all but the remnant (Ez. *l.c.*) rebel.

Ver. 18. To the summary excerpt from Ezekiel Peter appends the Septuagint version of Prov. xi. 31, which is followed by the Syriac and partially by the Targum: The original—according to the Masoretic text—is *Behold* or *if the righteous will be punished on the earth: how much more the wicked and the sinner.* The Greek, which probably represents a different Hebrew text, is more apt to his purpose and to the teaching of Jesus, which provoked the question, *Who then can be saved* (Mark x. 24-26).

Ver. 19. *So let even those who suffer in accordance with the will of God with a faithful Creator deposit their souls in well-doing.* The Christian must still follow the pattern. It is God's will that he share Christ's sufferings in whatever degree; let him in this also copy Christ, who said, *Father into thy hands I commit my spirit* (Luke xxiii. 46 = Ps. xxxi. 6) and bade His disciples lose their souls that they might find them unto life eternal. With this teaching Peter combines that of the Psalmist which is assumed by Jesus (Matt. vi. 25 ff.), *Jehovah knows His creature.* He the God of faithfulness (אל אמת, Ps. *l.c.*) is the faithful Creator to whom the soul He gave and redeemed (Ps. *l.c.*) may confidently return.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. **οὖν**, *therefore*—since your suffering is according to God's will and calls only for the normal self-devotion, which Christ required of His disciples—go on with the duties of the station of life in which you are called.—**πρεσβυτέρους**, not merely *older men* as contrasted with *younger* (ver. 5),

παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρε σβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χ̅θ̅
παθημά των ὁ καὶ τῆς μελλού σης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι
2 δόξης κοινωνὸς ποι μάνατε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ Θ̅θ̅ μὴ
ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ἑ κουσίως μὴ δὲ αἰσχρο κερδῶς ἀλλὰ

but *elders*, such as had been appointed by Paul and Barnabas in the Churches of Southern Asia (Acts xiv. 23). The collective **τῶν κλήρων** (ver. 3) and the exhortation, *shepherd the flock* (ver. 2) prove that they are the official heads of the communities addressed. Similarly St. Paul bade *the elders of the Church* (Acts xx. 17) at Ephesus *take heed to themselves and to all the flock in which the Holy Spirit appointed you overseers.* The use of the term in direct address here carries with it a suggestion of the natural meaning of the word and perhaps also of the early technical sense, one of the first generation of Christians. Both Jews and Gentiles were familiar with the title which was naturally conferred upon those who were qualified in point of years; the youthful Timothy was a marked exception to the general rule (i Tim. iv. 12).—**ἐν ὑμῖν.** Peter does not address them as mere officials, *your elders*, but prefers a vaguer form of expression, *elders who are among you; cf.* **τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον**, which also evades any impairing of the principle, *ye are Christ's.*—**ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος . . . κοινωνός.** This self-designation justifies Peter's right to exhort them. He is *elder* like them, in all senses of the word. If their sufferings occupy their mind, he was witness of the sufferings of Christ; of his own, if any, he does not speak. He has invited them to dwell rather on the thought of the future glory and this he is confident of sharing.—**μάρτυς . . . παθημάτων.** Such experience was the essential qualification of an Apostle in the strict sense; only those who were companions *of the Twelve in all the time from John's baptism to the Assumption* or at least *witnesses of the Resurrection* (Acts i. 22) were eligible; as Jesus said, the Paraclete shall testify and do you testify because ye are with Me from the beginning (John xv. 27). That he speaks of the sufferings and not of the resurrection which made the sufferer Messiah, is due partly to the circumstances of his readers, partly to his own experience. For him these sufferings had once overshadowed the glory; he could sympathise with those oppressed by persecution and reproach, who understood now, as little as he then, that it was all part of the sufferings of the Messiah. He had witnessed but at the last test refused to share them.—**ὁ . . . κοινωνός.** Peter will share the future glory which Christ already enjoys for it was said to him, *Thou shalt follow afterward* (John xiii. 36). St. Paul has the same idea in a gnomic form, **εἴπερ συνπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν** (Rom. viii. 17; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 10) which presupposes familiarity with the teaching of the risen Jesus *that the Christ must suffer and so enter into His glory*, Luke xxiv. 46; *cf.* i. 5, 13, iv. 13.

Ver. 2. The command laid upon St. Peter, *shepherd my sheep* (John xxi. 19) became the charge delivered to succeeding elders (*v.* Acts xx. 28) and a familiar description of the Christian pastor (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. ix. 7) who must copy the good Shepherd who obeyed where His predecessors fell short (Ez. xxxiv.).—**τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ.** Christendom is God's flock among you—not yours but God's.—**ἀναγκαστῶς.** *As a matter of constraint* contrasted with **ἑκουσίως**, *willingly*—not as pressed men but as volunteers. In times of persecution lukewarm elders might well regret their prominence; hence the need for the aphorism *if any aspire to oversight he desireth a noble work* (1 Tim. iii. 1). So of gifts of money St. Paul requires that they be **μὴ ἐξ ἀνάγκης** (2 Cor. ix. 7). It is possible that St. Paul's words, **ἀνάγκη μοι ἐπικεῖται** (1 Cor. ix. 16) had been wrested.—**αἰσχροκερδῶς.** If the work be voluntarily undertaken, the worker has a reward according to St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 16 f.). Base gainers are those who wish to make gain whence they ought not (Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.*, v. 1, 43).—**προθύμως.** The adverb occurs in 2 Chron. xxix. 34, LXX, where the Levites eagerly purified themselves; Heb. the Levites upright of heart to . . . The verb **προθυμεῖν** is used in Chron. to render נדב *offer freewill offerings.*

Ver 3. Application of the saying, *the reputed rulers of the nations lord it* (**κατακυριεύουσιν**) *over them . . . not so among you; but whosoever would be great among you he shall be your servant . . . for the Son of Man came . . . to serve* (Mark x. 42 f.).—**τῶν κλήρων**, the lots, *i.e.*, the portions of the new Israel who fall to

προθύ μως[1] καὶ φανερωθέν τος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος κομιεῖσθε 4
τὸν ἀμαρά̄ τινον τῆς δόξης στέ φανον· ὁμοίως νεώ τεροι 5
ὑποτάγητε πρε σβυτέροις· πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν τάπει
νοφροσύνην ἐγκομ βώσασθε[2] ὅτι Θς̄ ὑπε ρηφάνοις ἀντι-
τάσ σεται ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν· ταπει νώθητε 6

[1] Codex Vaticanus is alone in omitting verse 3, μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων ἀλλὰ τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.

[2] For the unfamiliar ἐγκομβώσασθε two cursives read ἐγκολπίσασθε, whence *insinuate* of the Vulgate.

your care as Israel fell to that of Jehovah (Deut. ix. 29, οὗτοι λαός σου καὶ κλῆρός σου). The meaning is determined by the corresponding τοῦ ποιμνίου and supported by the use of προσεκληρώθησαν *were made an additional portion* in Acts xvii. 4. So it is said of God's servant that He κληρονομήσει πολλούς (Isa. liii. 12). The Vulgate has *dominantes in cleris*, and Oecumenius following the usage of his time explains the phrase likewise as equivalent to τὸ ἱερὸν σύστημα, *i.e.*, the inferior clergy.—τύποι γεινόμενοι, *i.e.*, as servants according to Mark *l.c.*; *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 12.

Ver. 4. φανερωθέντος τοῦ ἀρχιποίμενος, *at the manifestation of the chief Shepherd*, *i.e.*, Christ. ἀρχιποίμην is the equivalent of ὁ ποίμην ὁ μέγας of Heb. xiii. 20, being formed on the analogy of ἀρχιερεύς = כהן הגדל; else it occurs only as Symmachus' rendering of נקד (LXX, νωκηδ) in 2 Kings iii. 4 and in a papyrus. *Cf.* appeal to Jehovah, ὁ ποιμαίνων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ . . . ἐμφάνηθι of Ps. lxxx. 1.—τὸν . . . στέφανον = the *crown of life which He promised* (Jas. i. 12). The metaphor is probably derived from the wreath of fading flowers presented to the victor in the games (*cf.* ἀμαράντινον); but it may also be due to the conception of the future age as a banquet, at which the guests were crowned with garlands (Sap. ii. 8, στεψώμεθα ῥόδων κάλυξιν πρὶν ἢ μαρανθῆναι). See on i. 4.

Ver. 5. νεώτεροι, the younger members of each Church were perhaps more or less formally banded together on the model of the σύνοδοι τῶν νέων, which are mentioned in inscriptions as existing distinct from the Ephebi in Greek cities, especially in Asia Minor (Ziebarth Die Griechische Vereine, 111-115). Compare the modern Guilds and Associations of Young Men. In 1 Tim. iv. 1, these natural divisions of *elders* and *youngers* are also recognised.—πάντες δὲ . . . Elders must serve; youngers submit. May all be lowly-minded towards one another—there is no need to add detailed commands.—ἐγκομβώσασθε is explained by Oecumenius as ἐνειλήσασθε περιβάλεσθε (wrap yourselves in, put round you), so the command corresponds to ἐνδύσασθε . . . ταπεινοφροσύνην of Col. iii. 12. But the choice of this unique word must have some justification in associations which can only be reconstructed by conjecture. The lexicographers (Hesychius, Sindas, etc.) give κόμβος κόσυμβος and ἐγκόμβωμα as synonyms. Pollux explains ἐγκομβ. as the apron worn by slaves to protect their tunic; so Longus, *Pastoralia*, ii. 35 f., in "casting his *apron*, naked he started to run like a fawn". Photius (Epistle 156) takes George Metropolitan of Nicomedia to task for his suggestion that it was a barbarous word: "You ought to have remembered Epicharmus and Apollodorus . . . the former uses it frequently and the latter in the 'Runaway' (a comedy) says τὴν ἐπωμίαν πτύξασα διπλῆν ἄνωθεν ἀνεκομβωσάμην." But the LXX of Isa. iii. 18 has τοὺς κοσύμβους = *front-bands* and Symmachus τὰ ἐγκομβώματα in ver. 20 for *bands* or *sashes*. Peter is therefore probably indebted again to this passage and says *gird* yourselves with the humility which is the proper ornament of women. If the word be taken in this sense a reference to John xiii. 4 ff., *Taking a napkin He girded Himself*, may be reasonably assumed —θεὸς . . . χάριν = Prov. iii. 34, LXX (θεός being put for κύριος, which to a Christian reader meant Christ); the Hebrew text gives *scoffers he scoffs at but to the humble he shows favour.* The same quotation is employed in similar context by St. James (iv. 6); the devil (see below) is the typical *scoffer*.

Ver. 6. ταπεινώθητε οὖν echoes the exhortation and its accompanied

οὖν ὑπὸ τὴ̄ κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ Θ̅Θ̅ ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν
7 καιρῷ· πᾶσαν τὴν μέ ριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρεί ψαντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν
8 ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶ̄ νήψατε γρηγορήσα τε ὁ ἀντί-
δικος ὑμῶ̄ διάβολος ὡς λέων ὠ ρυόμενος περιπατεῖ
9 ζητῶν καταπιεῖν ᾧ ἀντιστῆτε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει εἰδότες τὰ
αὐτὰ τῶν παθηματω̄ τῇ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑμῶ̄ ἀδελφότητι
10 ἐπιτε λεῖσθε· ὁ δὲ Θ̅ς̅ πάσης χάριτος ὁ καλέσας ὑ μᾶς

scripture in ver. 5—obey in order that the promise (Luke xiv. 11) may be fulfilled for you, *he that humbleth himself shall be exalted* (*sc.* by God). So too St. James, *subject yourselves therefore to God* (iv. 7).—**τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα.** God's *mighty hand* is a common O.T. expression; see Exod. iii. 19, etc. for connexion with deliverance and especially Ez. xx. 33 f., **ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ καὶ . . . ἐν θυμῷ κεχυμένῳ βασιλεύσω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.**

Ver. 7. **τὴν μέριμναν . . . αὐτόν** comes from Ps. lv. 12, **ἐπίριψον ἐπὶ Κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου,** which is the source of part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vi. 25 ff.).—**ὅτι . . . ὑμῶν** substituted for **καὶ αὐτός σε διαθρέψει** of Ps. *l.c.* in accordance with Jesus' amplification and application of the metaphor. God cares for His flock as the hireling shepherd does not (**οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων,** John x. 13).

Ver. 8. **νήψατε γρηγορήσατε,** *cf.* i. 13, iv. 7. So St. Paul, **γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν . . . ἡμέρας ὄντες νήφωμεν** (1 Thess. v. 6, 8) drawing upon the common source in the Parables of the Householder and Burglar, etc. (Matt. xxiv. 42 ff.) which set forth the sudden coming of the Kingdom.—**ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος,** *your adversary, Satan*—**ἀ.** (properly *adversary in law suit*) is used in the general sense of enemy in LXX. Of the description of Satan, *as a roaring lion* comes from Ps. xxii. 14, **ὡς λέων ὁ ἁρπάζων καὶ ὠρυόμενος**; *walketh* from Job i. 7, where Satan (**ὁ διάβολος** LXX, **Σατάν**, Aq.) **περιελθὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσας τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πάρειμι**; *seeking to devour* identifies him with Hades the lord of death; *cf.* Prov. i. 12, where the wicked say of the righteous man, **καταπίωμεν αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ᾅδης ζῶντα.** The present sufferings of the Christians are his handiwork as much as the sufferings of Jesus (1 Cor. ii. 6, 8) and of Job.

Ver. 9. **ᾧ ἀντίστητε.** St. James adds the same exhortation to his quotation of Prov. The connexion is not obvious but is perhaps due to the traditional exposition of לצים = **ὑπερηφάνοις** as referring to the Devil and his children. As God ranges Himself against scoffers, so must Christians resist the Devil who is working with their slanderous tempers. Oecumenius and Cramer's *Catena* both appeal to an extract from Justin's book against Marcion (?) which is preserved in Irenæus and quoted by Eusebius. The main point of the passage is that before Christ came the devil did not dare to blaspheme against God, for the prophecies of his punishment were enigmatic; but Christ proclaimed it plainly and so he lost all hope and goes about eager to drag down all to his own destruction.—**στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει,** *rock like in your faith*, abbreviation of **ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει τεθεμελιωμένοι καὶ ἑδραῖοι,** Col. i. 23; *cf.* **τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως,** Col. ii. 5 and Acts xvi. 5, **αἱ . . . ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει.** The metaphorical use of **στ.** in a good sense is not common. Peter perhaps thinks of the **στερεὰ πέτρα** (צור) of Isa. li. 1 and warns them against his own failing.—**εἰδότες . . . ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.** The rendering (first suggested by Hoffmann) *knowing how to pay* (that you are paying) *the same tax of sufferings as the brotherhood in the world is paying* seems preferable to the common *knowing that the same kinds of sufferings are being accomplished for* (*by*) . . . it assumes the proper idiomatic force of **ἐπιτελεῖσθαι** and accounts for **τὰ αὐτά** (*sc.* **τέλη**) followed by the genitive. Xenophon who is a good authority for Common Greek uses **ἐ.** thus twice:—Mem. iv. 8. 8, "but if I shall live longer perhaps it will be necessary to pay the penalties of old age (**τὰ τοῦ γήρως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι**) and to see and hear worse . . ." *Apol*, 33 nor did he turn effeminate at death but cheerfully welcomed it and paid the penalty (**ἐπετελέσατο**). For the dative with **τὰ αὐτά** *same as*, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 5, **ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ.**

Ver. 10. Your adversary assails you,

εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν τῷ Χῷ ὀλίγον παθόντας αὐτὸς καταρτίσει στηρίξει σθενώσει· αὐτῷ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν. 11 διὰ Σιλβανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὡς λογίζομαι δί ὀλίγων ἔγραψα παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ Θῦ εἰς ἣν 12

but God has called you to His eternal glory; first for a little you must suffer, His grace will supply all your needs. Ver. 9 is practically a parenthesis; **ὁ θεός** stands over against **ὁ ἀντίδικος** (ver. 8) as **δέ** shows.—**ὁ καλέσας**, for the promise of sustenance implied in the calling; *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 23 f.; 1 Cor. i. 8 f.—**ἐν Χριστῷ** goes with **ὁ . . . δόξαν**; God called them in Christ and only as they are in Christ can they enter the glory; *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 17-19, **εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις . . . θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ**.—**ὀλίγον παθόντας**, *after you have suffered for a little while.* The same contrast between temporary affliction and the eternal glory is drawn by St. Paul in 2 Cor. iv. 17, **τὸ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως . . . αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται**, where in addition to the antithesis be tween eternal glory and temporary suffering the *weight* of glory (play on meanings of root יקר) is opposed to *the lightness* of tribulation.—**αὐτός** has the force of **πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν** (1 Thess. v. 24).—**καταρτίσει**, *shall perfect.* When Simon and Andrew were called to leave their fishing and become fishers of men James and John were themselves also in a boat mending—**καταρτίζοντας**—their nets (Mark i. 16-19). The process was equally necessary in their new fishing and the word was naturally applied to the mending of the Churches or individual Christians who by their good behaviour must catch men (see *e.g.*, 1 Cor. i. 10). Only God can fully achieve this mending of all shortcomings; *cf.* Heb. xiii. 21.—**στηρίξει**, *shall confirm; cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 17, etc.; when the Kingdom of Heaven was stormed the stormers needed confirmation (Acts xviii. 23). This was the peculiar work assigned to St. Peter—*thou having converted confirm*—**στήρισον**—*the brethren* (Luke xxii. 32).—**σθενώσει** is only apparently unique, being equivalent to **ἐνισχύσει** or **δυναμώσει** (Hesychius) *cf.* Col. i. 11, **ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ** and Heb. xi. 34, **ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας** (parallel to **ὀλίγον παθ.** above).

Ver. 11. Liturgical formula, adapted in iv. 11 (**ἐστιν**), which occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 16; John 25; Apoc. i. 6; v. 13.

Vv. 12-14. Postscript in St. Peter's own handwriting, like Gal. vi. 11-18 (**ἴδετε πηλίκοις ὑμῖν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί**); 2 Thess. iii. 17 f. (**ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου**).—**διὰ Σιλουανοῦ**, *by the hand of my scribe S.;* so Ignatius writes **διὰ Βύρρου** to the Philadelphians (xi. 2) and the Smyrnaeans (xii. 1), but wishes to keep him with himself (Eph. ii. 1). That S. was also the bearer of the Epistle is indicated by the recommendation which follows. There does not seem to be any good reason for refusing to identify this S. with the companion of St. Paul and Timothy who wrote with them to the Church of Thessalonica and preached with them at Corinth (2 Cor. i. 19).—**τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὡς λογίζομαι.** One main object of the postscript is to supply S. with a brief commendation. He is presumably the appointed messenger who will supplement the letter with detailed application of its general teaching and information about the affairs of the writer. So St. Paul's Encyclical ends with *that ye may know my circumstances how I fare Tychicus the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord shall make known all things to you* (Eph. vi. 21 f.). S. was known probably to some of the Churches as St. Paul's companion: in case he was unknown to any, St. Peter adds his own certificate. For this use of **λογίζομαι** compare 1 Cor. iv. 1, **οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος**; 2 Cor. xi. 5, **λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων**.—**παρακαλῶν . . . θεοῦ**, motive and subject of the Epistle. St. Peter wrote *exhorting* as he said *I exhort you* (ii. 11, v. 1) and the general content of his exhortation may be given by the subordinate clause which follows: "That you stand in the grace, which I bear witness is truly God's grace". The acquired sense of the verb *comfort* (LXX for נחם) is not directly contemplated. The Epistle is a **λόγος παρακλήσεως** in the sense of **ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει**, Rom. xii. 8.—**ἐπιμαρτυρῶν**, *testifying to . . .* not *. . . in addition.* The verb does not

13 στῆτε· ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐ Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλε κτὴ καὶ 14 Μᾶρκος ὁ υἱός μου· ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλή λους ἐν φιλήματι ἀ γάπης· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν Χῷ.

occur elsewhere in O.T. (LXX has ἐπιμαρτύρομαι) or N.T.; but Heb. ii. 4 has the compound συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ.—ταύτην . . . θεοῦ, *that this is true grace of God*, *i.e.*, the grace—in the widest sense of the word which is theirs (i. 10) which God gives to the humble (v. 5). St. Peter was witness of the sufferings of Christ which they now share; he witnesses from his experience that the grace which they possess is truly God's grace, though sufferings are a passing incident of their sojourn here.—εἰς ἣν στῆτε, paraenetic summary of τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν (Rom. v. 2), from which the easier reading ἑστήκατε is derived.—ἡ . . . συνεκλεκτή. As *the co-elder* exhorts *the elders* so *the co-elect* (woman) greets the *elect sojourners* (i. 1). The early addition of *Church* represents the natural interpretation of the word, which indeed expresses the latent significance of ἐκ-κλησία, *the called out*, compare St. Paul's use of ἡ ἐκλογή in Rom. xi. 7. In v. 1 ff. Peter addresses bodies rather than individuals and in v. 9 he uses a collective term embracing the whole of Christendom. Accordingly the woman in question is naturally taken to mean the Church—and not any individual (see on Μᾶρκος). Compare the woman of Apoc. xii. 1 f. who is Israel—a fragment which presupposes the mystical interpretation of Canticles (see Cant. vi. 10) and generally the conception of Israel as the bride of Jehovah, which St. Paul appropriated, as complement of the Parables of the Marriage Feast, etc., and applied to the Church in Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 2). So in Hermas' *Visions* the Church appears as a woman. ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, *in Rome*, according to the Apocalyptic Code, the use of which was not merely a safeguard but also a password. Compare Apoc. xvii. 5, *on the forehead of the woman was written a mystery*, "*Babylon the great*," xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xviii. 2; Apoc. Baruch, xi. 1. So Papias reports a tradition ("they say") that Peter composed his first Epistle in Rome itself and signifies this by calling the city allegorically Babylon. The point of the allegory is that Rome was becoming the oppressor of the new (and old) Israel, not that it was the centre of the world (Oec.). Literal interpretations (i.) Babylon, (ii.) Babylon in Egypt are modern.—Μᾶρκος ὁ υἱός μου. Oecumenius interprets *son* of spiritual relationship and adds noting that some have dared to say that M. was the fleshly son of St. Peter on the strength of the narrative of Acts xii. where P. is represented as rushing to the house of the mother of John M. as if he were returning to his own house and lawful spouse. So Bengel, "Cöelecta sic coniugem suam appellare videtur; *cf.* iii. 7, Erat enim *soror*; 1 Cor. ix. 5, Et congruit mentio *filii* Marci". But granting that Petronilla (?) was missionary and martyr and that Peter may well have had a son—though Christian tradition is silent with regard to him—what have they to do sending greetings to the Churches of Asia Minor in this Encyclical?

Ver. 14. φιλήματι ἀγάπης. So St. Paul concludes 1 Thess. with greet all the brethren with an holy kiss (v. 26; *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16). "Hence," says Origen, "the custom was handed down to the Churches that after prayers (so Justin Apol., i. 65) the brethren should welcome one another with a kiss." Chrysostom (on Rom. *l.c.*) calls it "the peace by which the Apostle expels all disturbing thought and beginning of smallmindedness . . . this kiss softens and levels". But the practice was obviously liable to abuse as Clement of Alexandria shows, "love is judged not in a kiss but in good will. Some do nothing but fill the the Churches with noise of kissing. . . . There is another—an impure—kiss full of venom pretending to holiness" (Paed., iii. 301 P.). Therefore it was regulated (Apost. Const., ii. 57, 12, men kiss men only) and gradually dwindled.—εἰρήνη. The simple Hebrew salutation is proper to Peter's autograph postscript and links it with the beginning.—τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, *cf.* iii. 16, v. 10, and the saying, *Thus have I spoken to you that in me ye might have peace: in the world ye have tribulation but be of good cheer I have conquered the world* (John xvi. 33).

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL

OF

PETER

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

AUTHENTICITY AND DATE.

EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

Fourth Century.—In considering the external evidence for the authenticity of 2 Peter, it will be found most convenient to proceed from the earliest date when its place was fixed in the Canon of the New Testament. This date must be found in the fourth century A.D. Even then, the Epistle was rejected by the Syrian Church, where it was not accepted till early in the sixth century, and only by the Monophysites. The view of the Church of Rome is represented chiefly by JEROME, whose influence was paramount in the formation of the Vulgate Canon. He mentions the doubts raised by the differences in style and character between 1 and 2 Peter (*Quæst. ad Hedib.* Migne, *Pal. Lat.*, xxii. 1002). Jerome, however, is clearly expressing only the objections of scholars. He says: "Scripsit duas epistulas, quae Catholicae nominantur; quarum secunda a plerisque eius esse negatur, propter stili cum priore dissonantiam," where "a plerisque," and the nature of the difficulty expressed, both point to the opinion of the learned class, which he does not himself share. The Epistle is quoted in the last quarter of the fourth century by "AMBROSIASTER"[1] and by AMBROSE OF MILAN (*de Fide*, iii. 12). In an African list, CANON MOMMSENIANUS, belonging to the middle of the fourth century, 2 Peter is found inserted, but with a protest, which indicates rejection in the mind of the scribe. DIDYMUS, who wrote a commentary on 2 Peter, towards the end of the fourth century, uses the following words, which are a fragment come down to us in a Latin translation, "non igitur ignorandum *praesentem epistolam esse falsatam*, quae licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est". How are we to explain the words in italics, in view of the fact that in the *De Trinitate*, a later treatise, Didymus quotes repeatedly from 2 Peter? Chase suggests that the phrase represents the Greek words ὡς νοθεύεται αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστολή, which would

[1] *Cf.* Souter, *Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 196 f., *Pseudo-Augustine Quaestiones*, etc. (Vindob. 1908), p. 499.

mean that the writer was only stating the opinion of others, more or less contemporary. Zahn (*Gesch. Kan.*, I. i. p. 312) urges that Didymus is here recording a judgment of the second or third century, but there appears to be no conclusive reason to doubt that he is recording a contemporary opinion. Eusebius (*H. E.*, iii. 3) discusses the canonicity of 2 Peter, and makes the following important statement: τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρειλήφαμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν· "The opinion has been handed down to us that the so-called Second Epistle (of Peter) is not canonical, but it has been studied along with the other Scriptures, as it appears profitable to many". In the *H. E.*, iii. 25, 2 Peter is placed among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, although "accepted by the majority" (γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς). Eusebius had a second class of ἀντιλεγόμενα which he regarded also as spurious (νόθα), and 2 Peter is classed with James, Jude, 2 and 3 John as disputed books which were also γνώριμα. The evidence of Eusebius is specially valuable (1) because he records the opinion that in his day 2 Peter was regarded as uncanonical; (2) because he records a judgment of the past against it; (3) he failed to find any recognition of the book as Petrine in the earlier literature known to him, and his knowledge was wide. There can be little doubt that Eusebius himself rejected the idea of Petrine authorship, but he was also one of those to whom it was a "profitable" book. Constantine entrusted Eusebius with the preparation for use in the new Capital, of fifty copies of the Scriptures, which contained 2 Peter. This quasi-official standard practically did away with the distinction between 'acknowledged' and 'disputed' books (Chase, *H. D. B.*, iii. 806 a).

Another indication of fourth century opinion is the inclusion of 2 Peter in the catalogues of Gregory Nazianzen (d. 391), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Athanasius (d. 373). One catalogue which is contained in the Codex Claromontanus (sixth century), and regarded by Tischendorf and Westcott as earlier than the fourth century, recognises seven Catholic Epistles, together with the Shepherd of Hermas, Acts of Paul, and Apocalypse of Peter. On the other hand, in the list of Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (c. 380), only one Epistle of Peter is recognised. We have already seen that the Syriac-speaking churches unanimously rejected 2 Peter, and considerable importance is to be attached to the fact that Chrysostom acknowledges only the Catholic Epistles, and that Theodore of Mopsuestia describes five Epistles, among which is 2 Peter, as "mediae auctoritatis". "Since Chrysostom's expositions, at any

rate, were addressed to popular audiences, the rejection of the Epistle by the great teachers in question must have reflected the usage of the Antiochene Church in general." (Chase, *op. cit.*, iii. 805.)

If we pass in review the evidence afforded by the usage of the fourth century in regard to this Epistle, we find that there was a considerable prevailing feeling of doubt as to the Petrine authorship, along with instances of definite rejection. It is, however, specially significant, in view of the modern tendency to depreciate the Epistle, that it seems to have gained a place in the Canon by virtue of its contents and its useful opposition to the doctrines of false teachers.

Third Century.—METHODIUS, a bishop of Lycia at the end of the third century, who suffered in the Diocletian persecution, explicitly quotes 2 Peter iii. 8 in the fragment *De Resurrectione.* Zahn (*Gesch. Kan.*, I. i. p. 313) has collected some passages in the same treatise which seem to echo 2 Peter iii. 10-13, and while in these the thought, rather than the language, recalls 2 Peter, there seems no reason to doubt the reference. Methodius regards the Apocalypse of Peter also as inspired (Comm.; Virg., ii. *b*). A further presumption in favour of the use by Methodius of 2 Peter is found in the DIALOGUE OF ADAMANTIUS, written probably in the later years of Constantine, which makes large use of the works of Methodius. In this work 2 Peter is quoted. FIRMILIAN, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, evidently refers to 2 Peter in a letter to Cyprian (No. 75). His words are: "Stephanus adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos . . . qui in epistolis suis haereticos exsecrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt". The allusion to heretics applies only to 2 Peter.

We come now to the evidence of ORIGEN. In his extant Greek works there is a reference to 2 Peter of a somewhat ambiguous kind. "Peter left one recognised Epistle, and perhaps a second; for it is disputed" (Πέτρος δέ . . . μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν· ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ); (quoted Eusebius, *H. E.*, VI. xxv. 8). In the Latin translation of his works by Rufinus there are some passages expressly quoting 2 Peter, *e.g.*, 2 Peter, i. 4, "ad participationem capiendam divinae naturae sicut Petrus Apostolus edocuit" (*Ep. ad Rom.* iv. 9. Ed. Lomm., vi. 302). 2 Peter, i. 2, "Petrus in epistola sua dicit. Gratia uobis et pax multiplicatur in recognitione Dei" (*ib.*, viii. 6. Ed. Lomm., vii. 234). 2 Peter, ii. 19, "Scio enim scriptum esse, quia unusquisque a quo vincitur huic et servus addicitur" (*in Exod.* xii. 4. Ed. Lomm., ix. p. 149). Also in a passage which contains an allegorical use of the trumpet blasts before Jericho, it is written, "Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum

suarum personat tubis" (*Hom. in Jos.*, xii. 1. Ed. Lomm., xi. 62). These passages have had grave doubt cast on their genuineness by Dr. Chase (*op. cit.*, p. 803*b*). There can, at least, be no doubt, judging from the one undisputed reference, that Origen reflects a serious division of opinion in his time, and that his own opinion tends towards rejection (ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν) of the Petrine authorship.

As regards CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, the main question to be settled is whether in the *Hypotyposeis* he comments on 2 Peter. If we are to take the statements of Eusebius (*H. E.*, VI. xiv. 1) and Photius (*Bibliothec*, 109), he commented "on all the Catholic Epistles". On the other hand, Cassiodorus, who wrote some 300 years afterwards, gives most conflicting evidence. At one time he says that Clement expounded the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments "from beginning to end," and in another passage, where he is giving a list of the canonical Epistles expounded by Clement, he omits 2 Peter. Moreover, in Cassiodorus' translation of Clement's Expositions, none are given of 2 Peter. The difficulty may be solved by supposing that in Clement's work, 2 Peter had a place beside the Apocalypse of Peter, which was included in the *Hypotyposeis*. (So Chase, *op. cit.*, 802 *a*, and Zahn. *Forsch.* iii. p. 154.) Clement distinctly quotes the Apocalypse of Peter as the work of Peter, and as Scripture (*Eclogæ ex Script. Proph.*, xli., xlviii., xlix). Accepting the statements of Eusebius and Photius quoted above, and supposing that for purposes of exposition 2 Peter was merged in the Apocalypse of Peter, we may find confirmation of the first statement of Cassiodorus in certain passages of Clement's writing which have been collected by Mayor (*The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, Introd.*, cxix.) and Bigg (*Commentary on First and Second Peter*, p. 202). In these the word-parallels are striking, but they would not necessarily constitute valid evidence in themselves.

In the writings of CYPRIAN we find no trace of 2 Peter, but it must not be forgotten that Firmilian's letter to him, quoted above, contains a clear allusion. In HIPPOLYTUS there are found passages that point to acquaintance with 2 Peter (Chase, 804 *b*, Bigg, p. 203). A portion of evidence that must not be omitted here is afforded by the division of sections in CODEX B. In this manuscript there are two divisions of sections, and one is older than the other. The double division is preserved in all the Catholic Epistles except 2 Peter, where the older division is wanting. The conclusion is inevitable that in the older form of Codex B, 2 Peter was wanting.

To sum up the evidence of the third century, we find that 2 Peter was in use so far as to influence the thought of Hippolytus in Rome, to be commented on by Clement of Alexandria, and to be expressly quoted by Firmilian and Methodius in Asia Minor. Although no reference is found in the writings of Cyprian of Carthage, yet Firmilian's letter with the quotation is addressed to him. This is scarcely evidence, but it certainly implies Cyprian's knowledge of the Epistle, and also that he would concur in its use as a source of quotation. Again, the two great Egyptian versions of this century, the SAHIDIC and BOHAIRIC, both contain 2 Peter. If we accept a conjectural emendation of Zahn's in the language of the MURATORIAN CANON, there is contained in it a reference to the division of opinion in the Church with regard to this Epistle (*Gesch. Kan.* i., p. 110 n.).[1] Origen's statement that "it is disputed," represents a widespread doubt as to its genuineness. This attitude, combined with a general willingness to respect its contents, must be regarded as the mind of the church about 2 Peter in the third century.

Second Century.—In a document which is preserved in a seventh century MS. entitled ACTUS PETRI CUM SIMONE (xx., ed. Lips., p. 67) there occurs a passage which contains several striking parallels with 2 Peter. The following phrases may be noted (1) "majestatem suam videre in monte sancto," (2) "vocem eius audivi talem qualem referre non possum". In (2) there is a parallel to the rather remarkable phrase, φωνῆς τοιᾶσδε, of 2 Peter i. 17. It is true that the extant MS. only represents a Latin translation of the original Greek, and that editors and translators *may* interpolate. At the same time, it is difficult not to regard Chase as over-sceptical in seeking to discredit the parallel by regarding the whole passage as an interpolation (*op. cit.*, 802 *b*). There seems no reason why we should not accept the passage as an important second century attestation of 2 Peter, and as an indication that the Epistle had already some position in the Church. Turning next to the CLEMENTINE LITERATURE, we have in the *Recognitions* (v. 12) what appears to be a reference to 2 Peter ii. 19: "Unusquisquis illius fit servus cui se ipse subjecerit". Rufinus

[1] The passage in question reads, as amended by Zahn, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri (unam) tantum recipimus (epistulam; fertur etiam altera), quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt". The emendations are apt, but is it possible, if we have regard to the loose grammatical construction everywhere in the document, that no change is needed? The Apocalypse of Peter may be referred to as the document "quam quidam, etc.," and we have seen reason to believe (*e.g.*, in case of Clement of Alexandria), that 2 Peter and the Apoc. Petri were sometimes regarded as one whole.

is again the translator of the *Recognitions*, and we are reminded of his translation of Origen (*In Exod. Hom.*, 12), "Unusquisque a quo vincitur huic et servus addicitur". The translations are both of the same passage in 2 Peter, and the variety in the language, so far from countenancing a theory of interpolation on the part of Rufinus may well indicate that he is translating at different times separate references to the same passage. In the *Homilies* (xvi. 20) there occurs a reference, pointed out by Salmon (*Introduction*, p. 488 n.) to 2 Peter iii. 9, τοὐναντίον μακροθυμεῖ, εἰς μετάνοιαν καλεῖ. The context also is confirmatory. Peter is speaking of the blasphemies of Simon Magus, which appear to have been similar in character to the false teaching that is denounced in 2 Peter. All things have been as they were from the foundation of the world. The earth has not opened; fire has not come down from heaven; rain is not poured out; beasts are not sent forth from the thicket to avenge their spiritual adultery. Then come the words quoted, "But, on the contrary, he is long-suffering, and calls to repentance". Yet Chase says, "It is difficult to see what there is in the context which specially recalls 2 Peter." The coincidences mentioned by Salmon (*op. cit.*, p. 488) in the writing of THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH are inconclusive, although the words in ii. 9, οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματόφοροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφῆται γενόμενοι recall 2 Peter i. 21. In ii. 13, ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι συνεχομένῳ, may be compared with 2 Peter i. 19. Similarly, in TATIAN, *Or. ad Graecos*, 15 (Otto vi., p. 70), σκήνωμα (= body) is reminiscent of its similar use in 2 Peter i. 13. To found an argument, however, for the use of 2 Peter by these writers on such single words and expressions is precarious. They might well be part of the current vocabulary. In the *Apology* of ARISTIDES (129-130) a passage occurs that naturally suggests 2 Peter i. 11 and ii. 2. ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἥτις τοὺς ὁδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν (*Apolog.*, xvi.). IRENÆUS introduces a quotation from 1 Peter with the words, "Petrus ait in epistola sua" (iv. 9, 2), but this does not necessarily imply that he knew only one Petrine letter. He knew 2 John, and yet quotes 1 John in the same phrase. The phrase in 2 Peter iii. 8 occurs in Irenæus v. 23, 2, "Dies Domini sicut mille anni," and in v. 28, 3, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς χίλια ἔτη. In both passages, however, the words are connected with Chiliasm, which is absent from the thought of 2 Peter. In THE EPISTLE OF THE CHURCHES OF LYONS AND VIENNE, with which Irenæus was closely connected (date 177-179) we find the words ὁ δὲ διὰ μέσου καιρὸς οὐκ ἀργὸς αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ ἄκαρπος ἐγίνετο (*cf.* 2 Peter i. 8).

The most important question in the external evidence of the second

century arises in connexion with the Apocalypse of Peter, to which Harnack assigns the date 110-160, or probably 120-140. The work is used by the Viennese Church, and therefore the earlier date is more likely. Only a fragment of the Apocalypse is preserved to us, in which there are some striking coincidences with 2 Peter (*cf.* M. R. James, *A Lecture on the Revelation of Peter*). Some of these may be quoted here: (1) πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ ὁδοὺς καὶ δόγματα ποικίλα τῆς ἀπωλείας διδάξουσιν· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας γενήσονται. καὶ τότε ἐλεύσεται ὁ θεός . . . καὶ κρινεῖ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας (Apoc. § 1; *cf.* 2 Peter ii. 1, iii. 7, 12.) (2) ὁ Κύριος ἔφη, Ἄγωμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος . . . ἀπερχόμενοι δὲ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί (Apoc. § 2; *cf.* 2 Peter i. 18). The passage goes on to say that the Apostles desired "that He would show them one of our righteous brethren who have departed," ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί (2 Peter iii. 11) εἰσι τὴν μορφήν, καὶ θαρσήσαντες παραθαρσύνωμεν καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπους (*cf.* ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν, 2 Peter i. 16); ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον (i. 19). (3) τόπον . . . αὐχμηρὸν πάνυ; . . . σκοτεινὸν εἶχον αὐτῶν τὸ ἔνδυμα κατὰ τὸν ἀέρα τοῦ τόπου (§ 6; *cf.* i. 19). (4) A frequent use of κολάζειν, or the noun (*cf.* §§ 6, 7, 10, 11, 2 Peter ii. 9). (5) οἱ βλασφημοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης (§ 6; *cf.* § 13 and 2 Peter ii. 2, 21). (6) (*a*) λίμνη τις . . . πεπληρωμένη βορβόρου (§ 8. βόρβορος occurs in § 9 twice, and in § 16); (*b*) ἐκυλίοντο (§ 15; *cf.* ii. 22). (7) ἀμελήσαντες τῆς ἐντολῆς τοῦ θεοῦ (§ 15; *cf.* ii. 21, iii. 2). (8) (*a*) ἡ γῆ παραστήσει πάντας τῷ θεῷ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως καὶ αὐτὴ μέλλουσα κρίνεσθαι σὺν καὶ τῷ περιέχοντι οὐρανῷ (quoted by Macarius Magnes, *Apocritica* iv. 6). (*b*) τακήσεται πᾶσα δύναμις οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἑλιχθήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄστρα πεσεῖται Mac. Magn. *op. cit.* iv. 7; *cf.* 2 Peter iii. 10-13; see Mayor, ed. pp. cxxx. ff.).

All scholars are agreed that these and other coincidences are more than accidental (*cf.* Salmon, *op. cit.*, p. 591). Various hypotheses to account for them are suggested.

(1) Did 2 Peter borrow from the Apocalypse? (Harnack, *Chronologie*, p. 471). A comparison, however, of the language of the two documents suggests that 2 Peter is simpler and shorter in the expression of the same ideas; and in some cases, ideas and phrases, separated in 2 Peter, are gathered together in one passage in the Apocalypse (*cf.* (1), (2), (8) above). Bigg (*op. cit.*, p. 207) also contends against this hypothesis on the ground that the description of hell is suggested by Plato, Aristophanes, Homer, and especially Virgil, and points to a later date than the Epistle. The rare word ταρταρώσας is indeed used by 2 Peter of the punishment of the wicked after death, and the conception is undoubtedly derived from heathen

mythology. The word, however, is found in Jewish writings, which 2 Peter may have read (see note on ii. 4).

(2) Are 2 Peter and the Apocalypse by the same author? (Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 347). This view is opposed by Chase (*op. cit.*, 815) on the ground of the difference in style. "The Apocalypse," he says, "is simple and natural in its style. There is nothing remarkable in its vocabulary." The argument would seem to be conclusive, as the style of 2 Peter is unmistakable, and would be easily recognised. At the same time, the undoubted similarity between the two writings "not only in words or indefinitely marked ideas, but also in general conceptions—*e.g.*, in both there is the picture drawn of Christ on the mountain with His Apostles, the latter being admitted to a secret revelation which they should afterwards use for the confirmation of their disciples—seems to be an argument of some strength in favour of the view that the two documents are the product of the same school" (Chase).

(3) Does the Apocalypse borrow from 2 Peter? Some of the arguments already adduced against the contrary hypothesis (i.) are really in favour of this supposition. The "naturalness of the words and phrases as they stand in their several contexts in the Apocalypse," which is brought forward by Chase as an argument against this third hypothesis (*op. cit.*, p. 815 *b*) is really only a compliment to the style of the writing, and an indication that the writer has no intention of slavishly imitating 2 Peter, or of forming a kind of mosaic of his own and another's diction. As regards the absence in the Apocalypse of the strange and remarkable phrases of 2 Peter, that they were strange and remarkable might be precisely the reason why they were avoided or modified. ἐβασάνιζεν in 2 Peter ii. 8 is rendered by δοκιμάζω in Apocalypse, § 1; the reference to the Transfiguration in the Apocalypse is fuller than in 2 Peter, and would seem to indicate reflection on the Petrine narrative (*e.g.*, *cf.* addition of οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταί to simple ἡμεῖς in 2 Peter i. 18; and expression τὸ ὄρος for τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει). Such a phrase as ἐν τόπῳ σκοτεινῷ, might well be a paraphrase of ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, a much rarer word, and it is extremely unlikely that αὐχμ. would be substituted for σκοτεινός. It is therefore most probable that the Apocalypse is indebted to 2 Peter, which would suggest a date for the Epistle earlier than 120-140 (*cf.* p. 181).

In the so-called Second Epistle of Clement (130-170) there is a passage deserving of notice. γινώσκετε δὲ ὅτι ἔρχεται ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος καὶ τακήσονται αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλυβδος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια

καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων (xvi. 3). One or two interesting points are raised by this passage.

(1) Where does the writer derive the conception of the day of judgment as meaning the destruction of the universe by fire? He clearly quotes Mal. iv. 1, Isa. xxxiv. 4, but these passages are not sufficient to suggest the idea unless to one already familiar with the doctrine. Bigg (*Comm.* pp. 214-15) argues at some length that this doctrine is ultimately to be traced to 2 Peter. Justin (*Apol.*, i. 20) traces the belief in the world-fire to the Sybil (Book iv.) and Hystaspes. Bigg holds that both these belong to the same family as the pseudo-Petrine literature. The destruction of the world by fire was not an article of faith among the Jews, and Philo argues strongly against it (*On the Incorruptibility of the World*). The office of fire in the O.T. is to purify, and not to destroy (Isa. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxvi. 15, 16, 22; Mal. iv. 1). In the N.T. (*e.g.*, Heb. xii. 26-29; 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 8; Apoc. xxi. 1) the conception of fire is distinctly that of a purifying agency. It is to be noted, however, against Bigg's view, that the conception of 2 Peter is not altogether at variance with the doctrine of the N.T. about the office of fire. The destruction of the present universe is vividly described in Chapter III., but the writer evidently has the idea of purification in his mind, and not of annihilation. "Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness" (iii. 13). Accordingly, if the passage quoted from 2 Clement is to be taken in the sense of annihilation by fire, it cannot be regarded as founded exclusively on 2 Peter.

(2) Is there anything in the language to connect the two? ἡμέρα κρίσεως is found in N.T. only in St. Matthew's Gospel (x. 15, xi. 22, 24), in 1 John (iv. 17), and in 2 Peter (ii. 9, iii. 7). In 2 Peter iii. 10, however, the expression is ἡμέρα κυρίου. τήκομαι is also a word common to 2 Peter (iii. 12) and the passage in 2 Clem. An important coincidence is φανήσεται . . . ἔργα, which may be an attempt to make sense of the very doubtful reading in 2 Peter iii. 10 (ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται). On the whole, the similarity of language and the affinity of thought in the two passages must be regarded as establishing a connexion. (For other coincidences, see Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, p. 534 n.)

In the Epistle of Barnabas (130-31, Harnack), in a Chiliastic passage, the words occur, ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα παρ' αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη. αὐτὸς δέ μοι μαρτυρεῖ λέγων, ἰδοὺ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ἔσται ὡς χίλια ἔτη (xv. 4). It has been pointed out that παρ' αὐτῷ is very close to 2 Peter's παρὰ κυρίῳ, and the repetition of the words points to the quotation of some

recognised utterance of Scripture. Barnabas, also, is in the habit of using λέγει to introduce his quotations from Scripture. The question is whether he is quoting 2 Peter iii. 8 or some other source. The context in Barnabas is different from that in 2 Peter. He is dealing with the mystical interpretation of the passage Gen. ii. 16. Also, in 2 Peter no Chiliastic meaning is attached, as in Barnabas. In all probability, 2 Peter iii. 8 is regarded by Barnabas as an authority for Chiliasm, along with Rev. xx. 4 ff., which he quotes. In THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS (110-140, Harnack) there are certain words and phrases that are found only in 2 Peter, μιασμός (Sim. v. 1, 2); βλέμμα (in different sense = *appearance;* Sim. vi. 2, 5); δυσνόητος (Sim. ix. 14, 4); αὐθάδεις, applied to false teachers (Sim. ix. 22, 1.)[1] In CLEMENT OF ROME (93-95, Harnack) we find several phrases which, in N.T., are peculiar to 2 Peter: τοὺς δὲ ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας εἰς κόλασιν καὶ αἰκισμὸν τίθησιν (xi. 1); ἐπόπτης (used, however, of God) (lix. 3); αὐθάδη (i. 1); μῶμος (lxiii. 1); μεγαλοπρεπεῖ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ (ix. 2), but μεγαλοπρεπεῖ βουλήσει occurs previously in same paragraph; Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν (vii. 6). The passage in Clem. xxxiv. may also be noted: εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων κ. ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ (*cf.* 2 Peter i. 4).[2] These coincidences in Barnabas, in Clement, and in the Didache are scarcely conclusive as quotations, but they suggest a *milieu* of thought corresponding to 2 Peter.

To what conclusion does the evidence of the second century lead? Chase says, "If we put aside the passage from the Clementine Recognitions and that from the Acts of Peter, as open to the suspicion of not accurately representing the original texts, there does not remain, it is believed, a single passage in which the coincidence with 2 Peter can, with anything approaching confidence, be said to imply literary obligation to that Epistle" (*cf.* Bacon, *Introd.*, 173). It ought, however, to be noted that the passage in the Clementine Recognitions can only be set aside on the ground that Rufinus can fairly be accused of interpolation; and the evident coincidences in the *Actus Petri cum Simone* can be dismissed only on account of distrust of the Latin translator of the work. We have also the evidence of

[1] Of the passages collected by Zahn (*der Hirt der Hermas*, p. 431) as having affinity with 2 Peter, the most striking is Sim. vi. 4, 4: τῆς τρυφῆς καὶ ἀπάτης ὁ χρόνος ὥρα ἐστὶ μία. τῆς δὲ βασάνου ἡ ὥρα τριάκοντα ἡμέρων δύναμιν ἔχει. ἐαν οὖν μίαν ἡμέραν τρυφήσῃ τις καὶ ἀπατηθῇ κ.τ.λ. (*cf.* 2 Peter ii. 13).

[2] Spitta, p. 534 n., points out a passage in the Didache (iii. 6-8) having a remarkable affinity with Jude and 2 Peter. γόγγυσος, a rare word (Jude 16) is used. βλασφημία, αὐθάδης and τρέμων are twice repeated (*cf.* 2 Peter ii. 10).

dependence in the Apocalypse of Peter. It is doubtful whether any of the Apostolic Fathers make use of the Epistle, but the coincidences in word and thought in 2 Clement, Barnabas, Hermas, Didache, and Clement of Rome cannot be ignored. They at least suggest a possible atmosphere of thought for 2 Peter. On the whole, the evidence of the second century would suggest a date for the Epistle not much later than the first decade. There is an entire absence of evidence for the Petrine authorship.

CHAPTER II.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF AUTHENTICITY.

1. The obvious first step to be taken is to examine the *References to the Gospel History* in the Epistle, and to consider what light they may throw on the authorship of the Epistle.

(1) Chap. i. 3. τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς. The reference of the participle is to Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (*cf.* note). Does ἡμᾶς refer to the Apostles, and in particular to the call of St. Peter? This interpretation involves that ἡμῖν in i. 1 likewise refers to the Apostles. Other indications, however, in the Epistle point to a group of scattered Christian communities in Asia Minor as the recipients of the letter, and the sense in i. 1 seems to be that the readers of the letter, who are isolated and harassed by false teachers, are set on equal terms with "us," who occupy a less difficult position, and enjoy greater outward privileges. Again, in i. 4 the best attested reading is ἡμῖν (not ὑμῖν), and clearly there the reference is to the writer and readers together. So ἡμῶν ought to be taken in i. 2. ἡμᾶς must therefore consistently be referred to the body of readers with whom 2 Peter identifies himself in thought, as united in their common faith, and not to the Apostles alone. Spitta (*op. cit.*, pp. 37 ff.), arguing for the reference to the Gospel History, takes ἡμᾶς as referring to the calling of the immediate Apostles, in contrast to those who believed in response to their preaching. Such a sense would by no means suit ἡμῖν in i. 4. Also, in i. 10 κλῆσιν clearly refers to writer and readers taken together. Moreover, καλεῖν in N.T. is by no means confined to the call of the first disciples (*cf.* Matt. ix. 13). In Rom. ix. 24 the thought is almost exactly parallel to this passage, "even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles".

(2) Chap. i. 16 ff.—*The Transfiguration.*—If we compare the reference here with the Synoptic accounts, there emerge some interesting points of difference. All three Synoptics speak as though the glory had its source from within. Such can only be the significance of μετεμορφώθη (Matt. and Mark): and the ἐγένετο . . . ἕτερον of

Luke is an indication that he interpreted the phenomenon as an inward change. He also tells us that it was ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι, "as he was praying," that the change took place (Luke ix. 29). 2 Peter, on the other hand, seems to think of the glory as having an outward source, like what happened in the case of Moses (Exod. xxxiv. 29 ff.; 2 Cor. iii. 7 ff.), as a *reflexion* of the glory of God, an outward attestation in addition to the voice (λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, i. 17). Spitta argues that this is a more natural and primitive account, and therefore independent of the account in the Synoptics, which shows traces of later thought playing upon the incident. There can be no doubt that the conception of the glory as *external* is found in 2 Peter, but it is not regarded as an attestation previous to the voice, as in the Synoptics. On the contrary, the two aorist participles imply coincident action, the first really taking the place of a finite verb (*cf.* the common phrase, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν). "He received honour and glory when there came to Him," etc. Moreover, τιμή can only refer to the attestation of the voice (see note on passage). To this extent 2 Peter differs from the Synoptic gospels. Are we then justified in regarding the disparity as a mark of the eye-witness? There are, however, other characteristics of the passage in 2 Peter which rather point to *literary* dependence on the Synoptic account. (*a*) The reading of ℵACKL, adopted in the text, is οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα, which differs from Matt. xvii. 5 only in respect that (α) εἰς ὃν is substituted for ἐν ᾧ (see note on passage), (β) ἐγώ is inserted, and (γ) ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ is omitted. Again, σκηνώματι (ii. 12) σκηνώματος (ii. 14) and ἔξοδον (v. 15) occurring together, seem to indicate that the vocabulary of the Synoptic account was lingering in the mind of the writer. σκήνωμα, a rare and unusual word in this sense, is used characteristically in the sense of the ordinary σκῆνος, and may have been suggested by the σκήνη of the Gospel narrative. ἔξοδος belongs to Luke's own vocabulary in reporting the conversation of the three men, and its employment indicates acquaintance with his Gospel. "Omission of details of the history (*e.g.*, the presence of Moses and Elias) in an allusion contained in a letter cannot reasonably be taken to show that a writer is giving an account independent of, or more primitive than, that of the Synoptists" (Chase, *op. cit.* iii. 809 *b*, but *cf.* Zahn, *Introd.* II., pp. 217 f.). Moreover, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει indicates a later stage of thought than the simple εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν (Mark, ix. 2; Matt. i. 7), or εἰς τὸ ὄρος (Luke ix. 26). It implies not only the assignment of a definite locality, but also the ascription of a "sacred" site, "a known mountain which had now become consecrated as the scene of the vision" (Mayor, *op. cit.*,

cxliv.). It is, of course, also possible to take ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει in sense of Isa. xi. 9, lxii. 25, where it is used of the Messiah's kingdom. "Perhaps 2 Peter means that in the Transfiguration the three Apostles were admitted to behold the glories of that kingdom, without alluding to any particular Jewish mountain" (Mayor, iv., note 1). The passage betrays reflexion on the original incident, and is written from the standpoint of one who is concerned chiefly to interpret the "glory" of Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration as prophetic of His δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, which is the theme of the Epistle (ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος), and as establishing the truthfulness of the Apostles who preached the παρουσία.

(3) Chap. i. 14: *Prophecy of the death of St. Peter.*—ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις . . . καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἐδήλωσεν μοι. Clearly there is here a reference to the incident in John xxi. 18. In the notes, ταχινή is taken to mean "imminent" and not in the sense of sudden death Spitta, amongst others, has argued strongly (pp. 88 f., 491 f.) that there is here no reference to the Gospel history, and is supported by Mayor. It is contended that the words ὅταν γηράσῃς, in John xxi. 15, imply that death was not imminent, and that in old age a man does not require a prophecy to tell him that death is near. Moreover, in the Johannine passage, the emphasis is not on the time but on the *manner* of St. Peter's death. It is further suggested that some special revelation by Jesus to St. Peter of the near approach of death, not recorded in Scripture, must be meant, and that a reference may be intended to the story contained in the legend, "Domine quo vadis?" found in the Clementine Homilies, and in the Apocalypse of Peter. The foregoing argument is founded on the supposition that καθὼς necessarily refers to the whole preceding clause, ὅτι . . . μου. It need not be so. The writer speaks as an old man, and the reference would then be to the prophesied death in old age. The objection that old age in itself is a warning of approaching death seems trivial. That fact would not prevent the mention of a prophecy regarding it. Again, it is not necessary to suppose that 2 Peter actually has the passage John xxi. 18 in his mind. He may be referring independently to the incident. It is suggestive to compare the use of καθὼς καὶ here with iii. 15. There the καθὼς καὶ is added as a kind of afterthought, and is not really dependent on the principal verb ἡγεῖσθε. It has really the significance of another principal clause. The syntax would seem to be similar in i. 14. The matter of knowledge (εἰδὼς) is that death is near at hand, however that knowledge is suggested to him, and the clause καθὼς καὶ is added by way of further illustration. It is unreasonable to demand that the thought in 2 Peter

must be an exact replica of the passage in John, if the reference is to be the same.

(4) Chap. ii. 20 (γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων) is clearly a reminiscence of the words of Jesus recorded in Matt. xii. 45, Luke xi. 29.

These four references to the Gospel history have now been examined. The first may be set aside, and the other three may be regarded as indicating no more than a knowledge of the Gospels, and especially of two incidents in the life of St. Peter. They do not nearly amount to evidence that the writer is the Apostle himself.

The paucity of references to the Gospel history, in an Epistle purporting to be written by the Apostle Peter, is remarkable. It contains only one reference to the actual words of Jesus (ii. 20), but indirectly these may be referred to in ii. 1 = Matt. x. 33; i. 8 = Luke xiii. 7-8; iii. 4 = Matt. xxiv. 37-42. We would expect that the mind of an intimate disciple would have been saturated with reminiscences of our Lord's teaching, and would have dwelt easily on the great events of His Life. In this respect we may compare 2 Peter most unfavourably with the genuine first Epistle. In the former there is no mention of the Passion or Resurrection, and there is a strange absence of that vivid sense of the Risen Lord as living and reigning in grace, which is so characteristic of the writings of the Apostles, who "had been begotten again unto a living hope". It is also a matter for serious consideration as against the genuineness of the Epistle, that the references to the Gospel history are introduced apparently to support the character of one writing as St. Peter, and to distinguish his statements from σεσοφισμένοι μῦθοι (i. 16). (But *cf.* Bigg. p. 231.)

2 *The Personality of St. Peter in the Epistle.*—(1) Chap. i. 1: Συμεὼν Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The significance of the form Συμεὼν is very obscure. The point to be emphasised at present is that St. Peter is here represented as the writer of the Epistle. If, however, the Petrine authorship is untenable, how is the expression to be justified? In this connexion, one or two questions call for consideration.

(*a*) Does the form of the words afford any indication that the name of St. Peter is being used by a later writer? His own description of himself in 1 Peter i. 1 is Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The form Συμεὼν is used only in one other passage, *viz.*, Acts xv. 14, in the address of St. James at the Council of Jerusalem. δοῦλος is found in Jude 1, and in view of the evident dependence of 2 Peter on Jude, this fact may be regarded as significant. Again, if Spitta is right in supposing that by the use of the pre-Christian name, Συμεὼν, the writer

puts himself on a level with those whom he addresses, and prepares the way for the epithet ἰσότιμον ("equally privileged," as between Jew and Gentile), it is evident that the whole title given to St. Peter is carefully chosen by a process of reflection. There is, therefore, a presumption that another mind is at work here, which has also borrowed largely from Jude in chap. ii.

(*b*) If the name of St. Peter has been thus used, the Epistle is pseudonymous. What is the distinction between pseudonymity in early Christian writings and forgery? Does pseudonymity imply ethical fault, and does it affect the authority of a writing? A most uncompromising position in this regard is characteristic of the older criticism. Westcott (*Canon*, pp. 352 f.) in speaking of the disputed books of the Canon, says: "The Second Epistle of St. Peter is either an authentic work of the Apostle, or a forgery; for in this case there can be no mean. . . . It involves a manifest confusion of ideas to compensate for a deficiency of historical proof by a lower standard of canonicity. The extent of the Divine authority of a book cannot be made to vary with the completeness of the proof of its genuineness. The genuineness must be admitted before the authority can have any positive value, which from its nature cannot admit of degrees; and till the genuineness be established, the authority remains in abeyance." In a note, Westcott adds, "These books (2 Peter, James, Jude, Hebrews) have received the recognition of the Church in such a manner that, if genuine, they must be canonical".

The use of the term "forgery" in such a connexion ought to be avoided.[1] In the first place, the expression is an entire misunderstanding of the origin of much of the pseudepigraphic literature of the time, and on other grounds the term is equally objectionable. It is, in effect, an attempt to browbeat the judgment into the acceptance of such books as genuine, on account of the difficulty of believing that the Church could accept into the Canon what is supposed to be the product of fraud and deceit. The question of pseudonymity cannot be settled "by a profession of moral indignation". The idea that literary property is guarded by ethical considerations is essentially modern. "Believers frequently borrowed from the books of other believers or of unbelievers, without mentioning any source, and without considering themselves in any way as thieves." "With the best intentions and with the clearest consciences they put such words into the mouth of a revered Apostle as they wished to hear enunciated with Apostolic authority to their contemporaries, while yet they did not regard themselves in the smallest degree as liars and

[1] Zahn, who himself upholds the Petrine authorship, says "The mere occurrence of Peter's name in an ancient writing is no proof of authorship" (*Introd.*, ii., p. 270).

deceivers" (Jülicher, *Introd.*, E. Tr., p. 52). The standard of genuineness applied to the early Christian writings, and especially in the formation of the Canon, was their conformity to the teaching of the Church. Were they orthodox or heretical? A case in point is the story related by TERTULLIAN (*De Baptismo*, xvii.) of the writer of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, who was compelled to give up his office "on the ground that he imputed to Paul an invention of his own" (quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans). He defended himself by saying that he wrote out of regard for Paul, and that therefore he had not an evil conscience. The plea was evidently accepted, and he was convicted, not of literary fraud as such, but because he dared to advocate the heretical view that women had a right to preach and to baptise. We must also take into account in our estimate of pseudepigraphy what Jülicher calls "the boundless credulity of ecclesiastical circles to which so many of the N.T. Apocrypha have owed their lasting influence". Eusebius (*H. E.*, i. 13) quotes as genuine an Epistle purporting to be written by Christ to Agbarus. "It is evident," says Mayor (p. xxv., note 1), "that there were among the early Christians good and pious men who had no scruple about impersonating not saints alone, but the Lord of saints Himself. We should gather the same from the readiness with which the orthodox worked up and expurgated the religious romances by which the heretics sought to popularise their doctrines."

The practice of pseudepigraphical writing is exemplified in the O.T. in Ecclesiastes, and in the apocryphal books of Wisdom, Esdras, Baruch, Enoch, and the Sibylline Oracles. The second century produced many pseudonymous books, such as the Gospel of Peter, which, after being read in the churches of Cilicia for some time, was at length forbidden by Serapion, bishop of Antioch, about the end of the century, on account of its docetic teaching. The unknown writer of 2 Peter made use of the name of St. Peter, both in order to mark his views as important, and because he believed them to be in accordance with what would have been St. Peter's teaching under similar circumstances.

(*c*) The foregoing may enable us to rid our minds of prejudice when we come to consider the question as to whether any genuine teaching of St. Peter is contained in this Epistle. Are there contained in the Epistle any actual reminiscences of St. Peter's teaching, and is the work written by a disciple of St. Peter?[1] No attempt, of course, can be made to disentangle from the rest of the writing

[1] *Cf.* Ramsay, *Church in Roman Empire*, pp. 492-3; Moffatt, *Historical New Testament*, p. 598.

what might be regarded as the utterances of the Apostle, but a presumption in favour of the hypothesis of actual reminiscence may be obtained from a comparison of 1 and 2 Peter (see chap. iv.). Weiss has said that "no document in the N.T. is so like 2 Peter as 1 Peter". Moreover, there is probably a reference in the second Epistle itself (i. 15), which is corroborated by tradition, to the fact that St. Peter's teaching was subsequently embodied in the Gospel of St. Mark (so Jülicher, *Introd.*, E. Tr., p. 240). Mayor (p. cxliii. ff.) also favours this view, and successfully defends it against the objections of Zahn (*Introd.*, ii., pp. 200-9).[1] Bigg considers that the statement in i. 15 gave rise to the whole body of pseudo-Petrine literature (*op. cit.* p. 265). It is to be noted also that in two passages in the Epistle the pseudonymous writer betrays the consciousness that he is faithfully and honestly setting forth nothing inconsistent with the teaching of the Apostle. In iii. 1 he is not afraid to set the contents of his Epistle alongside those of 1 Peter without fear of contradiction,[2] and again in iii. 15, his concern is evidently to show that there is no inconsistency between the Petrine and the Pauline teaching. These, and the other considerations adduced above ought to be a guarantee at least of the good faith of the writer of this Epistle.

(2) Another instance where the personality of St. Peter is allowed to obtrude itself is found in i. 16, in the use of the word ἐπόπται. The word means eye-witness, with perhaps an added sense, derived from Gnostic sources, of spiritual vision. In the Apocalypse of Peter, there is an account of the Transfiguration which contains the words ἡμεῖς οἱ δώδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐδεήθημεν ὅπως δείξῃ ἡμῖν ἕνα τῶν ἀδελφῶν . . . τῶν ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, ἵνα ἴδωμεν ποταποί εἰσι τὴν μορφήν (*cf.* Mayor, cxxv. note). Similarly in i. 18, of the Voice at the Transfiguration, 2 Peter has ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν. Jülicher, in commenting on the pseudepigraphic character of 2 Peter, says that "the author never loses consciousness of the part he is playing," and "constructs his fiction methodically". Among other instances, he cites this passage describing the Transfiguration. He sees in the structure of the Epistle only "an artificial production of learned ingenuity" (*Introd.*, E. Tr., pp. 240, 241). It may be granted that the choice

[1] If the words μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον are taken as implying that the Apostle was not yet dead, we are immediately involved in all the insuperable difficulties connected with a date for the Epistle earlier than A.D. 64, the traditional date of Peter's martyrdom. On the other hand, it is easy to see how this expression might be put into the mouth of Peter by a later disciple, who well knew his mind and the preparations he had made for preserving his teaching after his death.

[2] For consideration of the question whether the reference here is really to 1 Peter, see p. 205.

of the Transfiguration as the only incident in the Synoptic account of St. Peter's life, to which reference is made, is an indication that the writer has made choice of this incident as suitable to his theme. At the same time, if it was legitimate for him to write under the honoured name at all, he could hardly have done so more naturally than he does in i. 16-18, especially as it is extremely probable that here he is making use of an actual reminiscence of the teaching of St. Peter himself (*cf.* notes on the passage).

(3) Chap. iii. 15.—**ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος.** The examination of the whole passage in the Commentary leads to the conclusion that the Epistles of St. Paul are regarded as in the same rank with the O.T. Scriptures. The date thus implied makes it impossible that the actual writer is St. Peter. Why, then, the conjunction of the two names? There can be little doubt that 2 Peter wishes to impress upon his readers the consistency of the teaching of St. Peter and St. Paul against the Antinomian interpretation of the Christian faith. The affectionate terms in which St. Paul is spoken of are exactly those that might have been used by St. Peter himself of his fellow-apostle, and if St. Peter were known to be already dead, how could there be any sane intention to deceive the readers? The phrase **ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς** is used by St. Paul of Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7) and of Onesimus (Col. iv. 9; Philem. v. 16). No doubt the readers of this Epistle were acquainted with the disagreement between the two Apostles described in Galatians ii. 11-14. 2 Peter only reiterates the fact that there was never any fundamental opposition between their teaching. St. Peter's full sympathy with the Pauline teaching is evident in the First Epistle, and this passage may easily be true to his mind. It is indeed significant that the attitude taken up towards the Pauline teaching is not without reserve (iii. 16, **ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα**), but the warm-hearted reference may be a real reminiscence.

CHAPTER III.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE AS TO DATE.

We have next to examine any hints that may be given in the Epistle itself as to the Date of its composition.

(1) Chap. i. 15.—Here reference is made to the death of St. Peter as imminent. Other considerations render it impossible to hold that this Epistle was published during the lifetime of the Apostle who died *c.* 64 A.D. (see pp. 189 f.). The context shows that if the words μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον are put into the mouth of St. Peter by a later writer, the period of writing must have been some time after his decease. ἑκάστοτε (as occasion arises) in v. 15 implies that occasion has arisen more than once to refer to the posthumous teaching. ἔχειν ὑμᾶς, κ.τ.λ., implies a document or documents already in the possession of the Church. Again, if we are to see in this verse a reference to the tradition connecting St. Peter with the Gospel of Mark, we know that this tradition is at least much earlier than the time of Papias (140–160), who is quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.*, iii. 39) as saying, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε, Μᾶρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. Papias himself is reporting the testimony which he had received orally from the Presbyter. From the perfectly natural way in which the reference is introduced, we would conclude that 2 Peter has not in view a tradition which he found in such a writer as Papias, but betrays either a personal knowledge of the intentions of St. Peter himself, or an acquaintance with those who did know his mind. Hence a date not very much later than the end of the first century is probable.

(2) In chap. iii. 4 the words occur, ἀφ᾽ ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. Here οἱ πατέρες refers to the immediately preceding generation of Christians. The whole sentence reflects the disappointment and disillusionment experienced by those who saw men and women believing in the coming of the Lord in their life-time, and dying without having realised their expectation, and who felt that all signs of an immediate coming in their

own day were absent. Such an atmosphere of thought would be most intense in the second generation of Christians, and much of the Epistle is meant for the encouragement of those who still expected the delayed Parousia of the Lord, and whose minds were likely to feel the element of truth in the words of the false teachers. ἀφ' ἧς need not denote a long interval of time (*cf.* Luke vii. 45). It may therefore be possible that the Epistle is addressed to the second generation of Christians. Moreover, chap. i. 16-18 is most naturally regarded as addressed to those "who have not seen, and yet have believed," and the superior position of the eye-witnesses therein implied is an idea that would be most prominent in sub-Apostolic times.

(3) Chap. iii. 8.—As an indication of an early date for the Epistle, the absence of any millennial significance in this passage has been adduced (Bigg, pp. 214, 295). Against this, Mayor (*op. cit.* cxxvi.) has pointed out that we learn from Justin Martyr (*Dial.*, chap. 80) that there were also many orthodox believers in his time who refused to accept the millenial teaching. It may, however, be noted that the passage in Justin hardly negatives Dr. Bigg's conclusion. There it is said that "many think otherwise," *i.e.*, in opposition to a millenial doctrine. In 2 Peter, the context in which the words are used is entirely apart from any millenarian notion at all. The significant thing is that 2 Peter, unlike all subsequent writers does not employ Psalm xc. 4. in connection with the idea. He is dealing with the very verse out of which Chiliasm arose, and he could hardly have so completely ignored the opinion unless he had been writing at a date previous at least to its later widespread acceptance in the Church.

At what time the view became common in the Early Church is uncertain. In Barnabas xv. 5 we meet with the conception, but there is no trace of the doctrine in either 1 Clem., Ignatius, Polycarp, the Epistle to Diognetus, or the Didache. Hermas is not uninfluenced by the idea. In none of the apologists, except Justin, is there any trace of Chiliasm. 2 Peter iii. 8, therefore, with its peculiar use of Psalm xc. 4 would indicate a date certainly much earlier than Justin Martyr (140-161), who refers to the belief as a tenet of the orthodox faith, and probably earlier than Barnabas. If the absence of reference to millenial doctrine in 1 Clem., Ignatius, and the Didache means the same as in 2 Peter, a date at the very end of the first century and the very beginning of the second is probable for our Epistle.

(4) Chap. iii. 2.—τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν. The writer must be regarded as including himself among the Apostles (*cf.* i. 1), and not as

making any distinction between himself and them. The phrase need not necessarily mean "the Twelve," but rather missionaries from whom the knowledge of the Gospel was first received.[1] Of these the writer is one (i. 16). ἀπόστολος is so used Phil. ii. 25, 2 Cor. viii. 23 (*cf.* discussion of term in Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, Bk. iii. ch. i.). The passage, therefore, does not exclude a date later than the Apostolic Age.

(5) Chap. iii. 16.—Two considerations are suggested by this reference to St. Paul that have a bearing on the date of the Epistle. (*a*) Paul's Epistles are included in a body of writings called γραφαί, and we have reason to suppose that τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς probably refers to the O.T. Scriptures. (*b*) The "unlearned and unstable" distort these Epistles of Paul to their own destruction. Both these statements require that the date of the Epistle be postponed so as to leave room for them. (*a*) renders it quite impossible to fix a date in the life-time of Peter. The statement implies not necessarily a collection of Pauline letters such as we have in the Canon of the N.T., but the epithet γραφή would be applied if certain letters of Paul were accustomed to be read in the churches. That interpretation would not require a date later than the end of the first century. At the same time (*b*) demands that time must be allowed to enable the Pauline Epistles to gain such a position of recognised authority in the Church as Scripture that they can be misinterpreted by "unlearned and unstable souls". All these circumstances would be met by a date quite early in the second century.

(6) Chap. ii.—The resemblances in this chapter to the Epistle of Jude are undoubted. There are parallels in thought and language also in Jude 1, 2 = 2 Peter i. 1, 2; Jude 3, 2 = Peter i. 12; Jude 17-19 = 2 Peter iii. 1-3; Jude 20-25 = 2 Peter iii. 14-18. Spitta, Zahn, and Bigg are among the foremost defenders of the view that 2 Peter is prior to Jude. Irresistible arguments, however, may be adduced for the opinion that the relationship is the other way. For the discussion of the question the reader may be referred to the Introduction to Jude. At the moment we are concerned with the question only in so far as it has a bearing on the date of 2 Peter. A date not later than A.D. 90 is assigned to Jude by Chase, Mayor, Salmon, Plummer, Spitta. The limits 100-180 are accepted by

[1] Two conceptions of the term "apostle" are found in the early church, a wider, based on the Jewish official use of the term, and a narrower, confined to the "Twelve". The two conceptions existed side by side, and "the narrower was successful in making headway against its rival" (Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, i. p. 408). If the wider use is found here, it would amount to an argument for an early date to the epistle.

Jülicher and Harnack. The arguments for the second century date are examined by Chase (*op. cit.*, pp. 803 f.), and found insufficient.[1]

If the date in the last decade of the first century be accepted for Jude, 2 Peter must be later; but there is not that evidence of advance in the Gnostic views opposed in 2 Peter upon those in Jude to warrant our assigning to 2 Peter a date much later than Jude.

To sum up the *internal* evidence for the date of 2 Peter, the considerations adduced in (3) would fix the *terminus ad quem* at least previous to 140-160, the probable date of Justin, in whose day Chiliasm was an orthodox belief. On the other hand, (1), (2), (5) would render it possible to regard the Epistle as the product of a time not very much later than the apostolic, and perhaps (4) may also be regarded as confirmatory in this connexion. The relationship to Jude would suggest a date not earlier than A.D. 100. The *external evidence,* as we have seen, would render possible a date not later than the first decade of the second century. Perhaps A.D. 100-115 may be tentatively suggested as the extreme limits.

[1] A summary of the evidence may here be given:—

1. πίστις, spoken of in Jude 3-20, as a formulated deposit, is used in practically the same way in Gal. i. 23, iii. 23, vi. 10, etc.

2. In ver. 17 the language need not imply that the apostolic period is long past. The mention of oral instruction (ἔλεγον) would quite suit a date in early sub-apostolic times, when some of the Apostles were dead and some scattered.

3. The argument from the use of apocryphal books is invalid. Of the two quoted by Jude, Enoch is assigned by most scholars to a date B.C., and the Assumption of Moses was probably written within the first thirty years A.D.

4. The Gnostic views attacked in the Epistle are not necessarily of late date.

CHAPTER IV.

RELATION TO 1 PETER.

It is a very generally accepted result of criticism that the two Epistles of Peter are not by the same hand. Jerome (*Script. Eccles.*, 1), in connexion with 2 Peter, remarked on the "stili cum priore dissonantiam" (see p. 175). So marked are these differences between the two Epistles, that even Spitta and Zahn, who defend the authenticity of 2 Peter, are therefore obliged to give up the real Petrine authorship of 1 Peter. They admit that 2 Peter is a letter from the Apostle's own hand, and attribute the First Epistle to Silvanus, under the direction of the Apostle, in accordance with their interpretation of 1 Peter v. 12 (Spitta, *op. cit.*, pp. 530 ff.; Zahn, *Introd.* II., pp. 149 ff.).

Space does not permit of a full discussion of this question, and the reader is referred to the minute and elaborate treatment of the subject in Mayor's edition (pp. lxviii. ff.). Reference may be made briefly to the following points:—

1. *Resemblances in Vocabulary and Style.*—(1) *Vocabulary*— (*a*) χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη, 2 Peter i. 2, 1 Peter i. 2; use of καλεῖν, 2 Peter i. 3 and 1 Peter i. 15, ii. 9, 21, iii. 9, v. 10; with κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν, 2 Peter i. 10, may be compared the foregoing references to use of καλεῖν in 1 Peter, and the use of ἐκλεκτός, 1 Peter i. 1, ii. 4, 9; θέλημα 2 Peter i. 21, and 1 Peter ii. 15, iii. 17, iv. 2, 19; with ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις *cf.* πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις 1 Peter iv. 3; ἐπόπται, 2 Peter i. 16, and ἐποπτεύοντες, 1 Peter ii. 12, iii. 2; ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι, 2 Peter iii. 14, and ἄμωμος καὶ ἄσπιλος, 1 Peter i. 19; ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, 2 Peter ii. 14, and πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας, 1 Peter iv. 1.

The foregoing resemblances are remarkable as extending to the uses of the same words or ideas in similar connexions. The following single words may be noted as being largely confined, in their use in the N.T. to 1 and 2 Peter:—

	2 Peter.	1 Peter.	Rest of N.T.
ἀναστροφή . .	2	5	5
ἀπόθεσις . .	1	1	0
ἀρετή . . .	3	1 (pl.)	1
ἀσεβής . . .	1	1	6 (3 in Jude.)
ἀσέλγεια . .	3	1	6 (1 in Jude.)
ἄσπιλος . . .	1	1	2
προγινώσκω .	1	1	3

(*b*) Including these already mentioned, Mayor, *op. cit.*, pp. lxix., lxx. gives a list of 100 words common to both Epistles. He also gives a list of 369 words occurring in 1 Peter and not in 2 Peter, 230 words occurring in 2 Peter and not in 1 Peter.

(*c*) One remarkable difference is in the word used for the Second Advent. In 2 Peter παρουσία (i. 16, iii. 4, 12), in 1 Peter ἀποκάλυψις (i. 7, 13, iv. 13) is used.

The facts contained in (*a*) are sufficient at least to suggest literary dependence between the two Epistles, but (*b*) and (*c*) entirely negative the possibility that they are by the same hand.

(2) *Style.* "The style of 1 Peter is simple and natural, without a trace of self-conscious effort. The style of 2 Peter is rhetorical and laboured, marked by a love for striking and startling expressions" (Chase, *D. B.*, iii. 812 *a*). As against this estimate, it may be questioned whether the two Epistles are so far apart in style as it is usual to say they are. Mayor says, "There can be no doubt that the style of 1 Peter is, on the whole, clearer and simpler than that of 2 Peter, but there is not that chasm between them which some would try to make out" (p. civ.). As regards *grammatical similarity*, he sums up the results of a most learned discussion (chap. iv.) as follows: "As to the use of the article, they resemble one another more than they resemble any other book of the N.T. Both use the genitive absolute correctly. There is no great difference in their use of the cases or of the verbs, except that 1 Peter freely employs the articular infinitive, which is not found in 2 Peter. The accusative with the infinitive is found in both. The accumulation of prepositions is also common to both. The optative is more freely used in 1 Peter than in 2 Peter. In final clauses 2 Peter conforms to classical usage in attaching the subjunctive to ἵνα, while 1 Peter, in one place, has the future indicative. 2 Peter is also more idiomatic in the use of such elliptical forms as ἕως οὗ, ἐφ' ὅσον, ἀφ' ἧς. On the other hand, 1 Peter shows special elegance in his use of ὡς in comparisons, and emphasises the contrast between the aorist and the present imperative by coupling τιμήσατε with τιμᾶτε in ii. 7" (pp. civ., cv.). It is

incumbent on scholars to give every weight to these utterances, especially in view of such extreme criticism of the style of 2 Peter as that of Dr. E. A. Abbott (*Exp.*, ii., vol. iii.; *From Letter to Spirit*, §§ 1123-1129).

2. *Attitude to the Old Testament.*—It has been reckoned by Hort (Appendix, *Notes on* 1 *Peter*, p. 179) that there are thirty-one quotations from the O.T. in 1 Peter as against five in 2 Peter. Also, an examination of the quotations in 2 Peter (ii. 2, 22, iii. 8, 12, 13), and of the references to O.T. history (Noah, ii. 5; Lot, ii. 6-9; Balaam, ii. 15-16) show that they are not only much fewer in number, but that 2 Peter never formally quotes the O.T., and that the actual allusions are of a much less intimate and spiritual character than in 1 Peter. Incidentally it may be pointed out (*cf.* Chase, *op. cit.*, p. 813 *a*) that this is the opposite of what we would expect if St. Peter wrote the Epistle to Jewish Christians (so Spitta and Zahn).

3. *Relation to the Pauline Epistles.*—1 Peter displays a close connexion of thought with Romans and Ephesians in particular. "The connexion though very close, does not lie on the surface. It is shown more by identities of thought and similarity in the structure of the two Epistles as wholes than by identities of phrase" (Hort, *I Peter*, p. 5). 2 Peter, on the other hand, is extremely non-Pauline in thought. The idea of the μακροθυμία of God in chap. iii. might easily be the common property of the Christian consciousness. Even granting that there were special circumstances in the origin of 1 Peter, that would largely account for the presence of Pauline thought in the mind of St. Peter as he wrote (*cf.* Chase, *D. B.*, 788, 789), it cannot be regarded as possible that the difference in the circumstances both of writer and readers which we find in 2 Peter would lead to such a complete freedom from Pauline influence.

4. *Devotional Expression.*—There is a great contrast in devotional thought and feeling between the two Epistles. It has already been noted (pp. 186-9) that the references to the great events in the life of Christ are strangely few. The only allusion to His sufferings and death is contained in τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην (ii. 1). The only crisis in His life that is mentioned is the Transfiguration. No mention is made of the Holy Spirit except as the source of inspiration of the ancient prophets (i. 21). Prayer is not alluded to. The Apostles were essentially witnesses to the Resurrection, but on the Resurrection 2 Peter is silent. Instead, the writer guarantees the truth of the Apostolic teaching by an appeal to the Transfiguration (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 2, 3, 11, 19-21, ii. 24, iii. 18, 21, 22).

There is also a striking difference between the two writers in

their personal attitude and relationship towards Jesus Christ. A warmth and intensity of feeling is apparent all through 1 Peter, which displays a much more vivid and tender sense of the reality of the grace and presence of the Risen Christ in the individual heart (*cf.* i. 8, 18, ii. 9, 21, iv. 12 f., v. 16) than the second epistle. "The flame of love," so bright in the first epistle, burns but dimly in the second. 2 Peter contains what Mayor calls "reverential periphrases," such as θεία φύσις, θεία δύναμις, μεγαλειότης, μεγαλοπρεπὴς δόξα, κυριότης. ἐπίγνωσις, ἐπιγινώσκω are the only words that are used of the deepest and most intimate religious experience, communion of heart with the Living Christ. It is true that the thoughts of God's long-suffering (iii. 9-15) and His care of the righteous (ii. 9) are full of tender meaning, but we do not find in 2 Peter that sense of personal relationship to Christ, founded on memories of past, and an actual sense of present discipleship, which transfuses the thought of the first epistle, and we miss the penitential sense of cleansing through the death of Christ so prominent in 1 Peter (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 18-19, ii. 21-23). The references to the Risen Lord in 2 Peter are few, and are pervaded chiefly by a sense of His majesty (*cf.* i. 16, ii. 1, 3, 12, 17, 20, 21, iii. 7, 10, 12). Even where the language is purely hortatory, as in 2 Peter, chap. i., the difference of tone and manner compared with 1 Peter is quite clearly marked. Thus the religious and devotional atmospheres in the two Epistles are far apart. Allowance must no doubt be made for the varying circumstances under which they were written. The one is written to a scattered body of Christians who are suffering persecution, and are in special need of spiritual comfort and stimulus; the other is directed against the immoral influences of false teaching. At the same time external circumstances are quite insufficient to account for these fundamental differences in the religious attitude of the two writings. Such a change could not take place in the history of a single personality, unless through some crisis completely revolutionising thought and feeling.

CHAPTER V.

VOCABULARY AND STYLE OF 2 PETER.

THE extreme limit of depreciatory criticism of the style of 2 Peter is reached in the epithet applied by Dr. E. A. Abbott, (*Expositor* ii., vol. iii.; *From Letter to Spirit* 1121-1135), who describes it as "Baboo Greek". The most moderate treatment of the subject is found in the article, so often referred to, by Dr. Chase. We may briefly summarise the chief points of criticism.

* 1. *The large number of words found in 2 Peter, and nowhere else in the N.T.* The full list may be given: **ἄθεσμος,**[1] **ἀκατάπαυστος, ἅλωσις,**[1,2] **ἀμαθής,**[2] **ἀμώμητος,**[2,3] **ἀποφεύγειν,**[1,2] **ἀργεῖν,**[1,2,3] **ἀστήρικτος,**[2] **αὐχμηρός,**[2] **βλέμμα,**[2] **βόρβορος,**[1,2,3] **βραδύτης,**[2] **διαυγάζειν, δυσνόητος, ἐγκατοικεῖν,**[2] **ἑκάστοτε,**[2,3] **ἔκπαλαι,**[3] **ἔλεγξις,**[1] **ἐμπαιγμονή, ἐντρυφᾶν,**[1] **ἐξακολουθεῖν,**[1,3] **ἐξέραμα, ἐπάγγελμα,**[2] **ἐπόπτης,**[1,2,3] **ἰσότιμος, κατακλύζειν,**[1,3] **καυσοῦσθαι, κύλισμα, λήθη,**[1] **μεγαλοπρεπής,**[1,3] **μέγιστος,**[1,3] **μίασμα,**[1,2] **μιασμός,**[1] **μνήμη,**[1,3] **μυωπάζειν, μῶμος,**[1] **ὀλίγως, ὁμίχλη,**[1,2] **παραφρονία, παρεισάγειν, παρεισφέρειν,**[2,3] **πλαστός,**[2] **ῥοιζηδόν, σειρός, στηριγμός,**[2,3] **στοιχεῖον**[1] (in sense of physical elements), **στρεβλοῦν,**[1,2] **ταρταροῦν, ταχινός,**[3] **τεφροῦν, τήκεσθαι, τοιόσδε, τολμητής, ὗς,**[1,3] **φωσφόρος,**[3] **ψευδοδιδάσκαλος.**

One or two remarks on the list may be offered.

(1) Largely on the ground of the use by 2 Peter of such a remarkably long list of **ἅπαξ λεγόμενα** the vocabulary of 2 Peter has been characterised as an "ambitious" one (Chase). It has also been described as "bookish," ** with a strong inclination for striking and poetical words.

It is undoubtedly true that many of the words marked [2] are found only in the Greek dramatists or historians, but it is rash to conclude that at the time 2 Peter was written all of them were still poetical words. Moreover, the use of poetical language is not incompatible with the prophetic tone in 2 Peter. The words marked [3] are found in various Papyri, representing the vernacular of daily life, in which much of the N.T. was written. It will be noted that

* Words marked [1] are found in LXX, [2] in classical writers, [3] in Papyri (for reff. see *Comm.*).

** *E.g.* Moulton, *Proleg.*, pp. 97-8. But *cf.* note on II. 5 in *Comm.*

in four cases the so-called ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of 2 Peter are found both in the classics and in the vernacular. This suggests that most ordinary of all occurrences in the history of words, the passing of a word from the language of literature into the language of common speech. Again, the case of words such as ἀμώμητος, ἀργεῖν, etc., taken along with the fact that the study of colloquial Greek is in its infancy, suggests that caution is required in peremptorily condemning the use of certain words in 2 Peter as barbarisms. No less than sixteen words in the above list are found in Papyri.

(2) At the same time it is undoubtedly true that the style of 2 Peter is often rhetorical, and contains some most successful attempts after sonorous effect, (*e.g.*, note the rhythm of ii. 4-9, and *cf.* the remarks of Mayor, p. lviii. and Bigg, pp. 227 ff.). The writer is himself impressed with the majesty of his theme, and it is of great interest to note that in some cases he may probably be making use of the liturgical language of his day. An inscription has been discovered in Stratonicea in Caria, dating from the early imperial period, containing a decree of the inhabitants in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and of Hekate. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, E. Tr., pp. 360 ff.) has pointed out one or two most suggestive parallels in the inscription with 2 Peter i. 3 ff. The phrases τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ἀρετάς, τῶν κυρίων Ῥωμαίων αἰωνίου ἀρχῆς, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν εἰσφέρεσθαι, and the superlative μεγίστων (θεῶν) occur. In the case of θεία δύναμις, where 2 Peter was usually supposed to be employing philosophical language, he appears really to be quoting a current religious term, well known perhaps to the very readers of his Epistle. With the phrase θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως (i. 4) may be compared φύσεως κοινωνοῦντες ἀνθρω[πί]νης from a religious inscription of Antiochus I. of Kommagene (middle of first century B.C.). It is probable, also, that the use of words like μεγαλοπρεπής, ταρταροῦν and εὐσέβεια (which also occurs in the Carian inscription, and is a common N.T. word); δωρέομαι, ἀρέτη (i. 3), ἐπιχορηγεῖν, and phrases like διεγείρειν ἐν ὑπομνήσει may be traced to the same liturgical source.

2. *Solecisms.*—Chase gives a list of certain expressions in the Epistle "which, *so far as our knowledge of the language goes*, appear to be contrary to usage." These are βλέμμα (ii. 8), καυσοῦσθαι (iii. 10-12), μελλήσω (i. 12), μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι (i. 15), μυωπάζειν (i. 9), παρεισφέρειν (i. 5), σειρός (ii. 4). For discussion as to the meaning of these see the *Commentary in loc.* That something may be said for their use is proved by the remarks of Mayor (pp. lx. ff.).

3. *Reiteration of Words.*—There is a well-marked reiteration of words in the vocabulary of 2 Peter, *e.g.*, ἐπιχορηγεῖν (i. 5, 11); βέβαιος

(i. 10, 19); ὑπομιμνήσκειν, ἐν ὑπομνήσει, μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι (i. 12, 13, 15; iii. 1); ἐνεχθείσης, ἐνεχθεῖσαν (i. 17, 18); ἀπώλεια (ii. 13, iii. 7-16); ἐφείσατο (ii. 4, 5); τηρεῖν (ii. 4, 9, 17; iii. 7); στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα (iii. 10, 12).

Chase asserts that "the extraordinary list of repetitions" stamps the vocabulary as "poor and inadequate" (*op. cit.*, 808). In reply, it may be urged, (1) This sweeping condemnation is scarcely consistent with the occasional use of very rare words on the part of the writer. (2) Reiteration may arise from other causes than a limited vocabulary. It may arise "either from a liking for resonant sounds, or from a desire to give emphasis by the use of line upon line, or from both" (Mayor, p. lvii. f.). (3) A similar habit of repeating words is found in 1 Peter (*cf.* Bigg, pp. 226 f.).

The foregoing remarks on the vocabulary and style of 2 Peter are necessary and timely, in view of the current tendency to depreciate these. Many of the phrases in 2 Peter have found a permanent place in the religious language of the Christian Church. It would be rash to acquit the writer entirely of all faults of style that have been attributed to him, but his ordinary intelligence must at least be vindicated. Chap. iii., "On the Style of 2 Peter," of Mayor's edition is worthy of close study, as tending to restore the style of 2 Peter to that respect which enabled it to be studied in the time of Aurelius, though not regarded as canonical, along with other Scriptures, "as it appears profitable to many".

CHAPTER VI.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF WRITING.

1. *Readers.*—To whom was the Epistle written? The crucial passage in this connexion is iii. 1, where the Epistle referred to is most naturally understood to be 1 Peter. The objection is urged by Spitta, Zahn, and more recently by Mayor, that the description of the contents in iii. 1, 2 is inapplicable to 1 Peter. Yet in 1 Peter i. 10-12 we have almost an exact parallel to τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, and 1 Peter is full of reminiscences of the teaching and example of Jesus (τῆς . . . ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος) (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 15, 16, ii. 13-17, 23, etc.; *cf.* also ii. 1, τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς). The ethical difficulty caused by this interpretation of the reference, if the two Epistles are not by the same author, is no greater than that aroused by the use of the apostolic name in i. 1 (see *Introd.*, pp. 189-91). Moreover, we have no reason to expect anything but a statement in iii. 1 of what the two Epistles have in common. The words do not exclude the supposition that their contents differ in many respects. The readers, then, are, in general, those mentioned in 1 Peter i. 1, *viz.*, Christian communities of Asia Minor.

Mayor (*op. cit.*, pp. cxxxvii. ff.) has again defended the view that 2 Peter is written to the Roman Church.[1] He founds his argument on 2 Peter iii. 15, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν Παῦλος ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, holding that καθώς must be explained by the immediately preceding admonition, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, which is more distinctly stated in Romans ii. 4, iii. 25, 26, ix. 22, than elsewhere. Various objections may be urged against this view. (1) It is extremely doubtful whether the reference καθώς can be thus narrowed, so as to include only ver. 14. The introduction of the comparison with Paul seems to arise from a desire to show that in general there is no discrepancy between the Petrine and the Pauline teaching. (2) Even although the Epistle to the Romans is meant, it would be no proof that 2 Peter was written to the Roman Church, as it is evident from

[1] So Grotius, Dietlein.

ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, and τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς (ver. 16), that the Epistles of Paul had reached the rank of γραφαί, and were known to the Church at large. (3) Even if the narrower reference of καθὼς is adopted, the idea of μακροθυμία is echoed also in 1 Corinthians and Thessalonians (1 Cor. xv. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 16). If the wider reference is taken, almost any of the Pauline Epistles may be meant, as the doctrine of God's free grace is reflected in many of them. It is also, of course, quite possible that the reference may be to a lost Epistle.[1]

That practically the same class of readers as in 1 Peter is meant, is confirmed by τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν (i. 1).[2] The phrase may be regarded as referring in general to the isolated position of the readers, who are made to feel, as in 1 Peter i. 1, 2, that they too are recipients of the grace of God and objects of His special choice. The words in 2 Peter may well be a succinct expression of the idea in the opening verses of the First Epistle. In the one case the readers are suffering persecution; in the other, they are being led astray and harassed by false teaching. In both cases the words carry a message of comfort.

The question may be raised whether i. 16, ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου . . . δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, implies that the Apostle himself had preached to these readers, and whether this is compatible with an Asiatic community as recipients of the letter. In 1 Peter the Apostle does not appear to have been personally acquainted with his readers or to have himself laboured among them, and there is no trace in the career of St. Peter of an Asiatic ministry. The words, however, do not necessarily imply that Peter had himself preached the Gospel to those who are addressed. The plural may be used of a single person (*cf.* Moulton, *Proleg.*, p. 86). The mask would seem to be thrown off for the moment, and the actual personality of the unknown writer to obtrude itself in this pseudonymous Epistle. That he should have taken no special pains to prevent this, is itself an indication of good faith on the writer's part, and of his lack of any intention to deceive. He himself is the preacher.

The general character of the address in 2 Peter is undoubted. The Epistle is written to a wide class of Christians readers

[1] Hofmann (vii. 2, 113 ff.) argues that the reference is to Ephesians. An important discussion of whole question is found in Spitta (pp. 286-88).

[2] In connexion with these words, it has been argued whether they indicate Jewish or Gentile Christians. The presumption is in favour of the latter (see *Commentary in loc.*). The use of a word like ταρταρώσας (ii. 4) indicates a Hellenic atmosphere of thought, and the phrase in ii. 20, ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου seems most applicable to Gentiles.

who are not recent converts (i. 12), "ein für weite Kreise der Kirche bestimmtes pastorales Rundschau" (Spitta, *op. cit.*, p. 483). 1 Peter also is general in its destination. 2 Peter may well be addressed to the same localities as 1 Peter, although to a later generation of Christians, under different circumstances. This would also supply a motive for the use of the Apostle's name.

2. *False Teachers.*—The description of the false teachers given in chap. ii. is taken in the main from the Epistle of Jude. It ought to be noted, however, that the object in view in the two Epistles is somewhat different. Jude is, above all, a polemic against the false teaching. 2 Peter is written with a view to confirming the faith of the Christian communities in the face of the delayed Parousia. The false teachers in 2 Peter "have brought a new idea into the field. . . . They cast doubt on the Christian eschatological expectation . . . appealing in support of their view to a deeper knowledge of Christ (i. 2, 3, iii. 18, *cf.* i. 16-18), a particular conception of the O.T. (i. 20, iii. 16), and certain Pauline positions (iii. 15 f., *cf.* ii. 19)" (Von Soden, *op. cit.*, p. 194). They are "mockers" (ἐμπαῖκται) who say, ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; (iii. 4). In this fact, we may find a partial explanation of the use made by 2 Peter of Jude. He makes use of an authoritative description of their real character, making certain changes dictated by his own views as to the use of apocryphal books (*e.g.*, omission of story of Michael), and by the special circumstances of those he addresses.

A remarkable circumstance in the language employed is that the writer speaks at one time of the false teachers as about to come (ii. 1 f., iii. 3), at another as though they were already active (ii. 11, 12, 17 f., 20, iii. 5, iii. 16). All such explanations as that the writer projects himself into the future, and from that point of view vividly regards future events as actually happening; or that he is at one time thinking of communities where the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι are actually at work, and at another of communities where their influence has not yet penetrated, may be set aside. The simplest explanation seems to be that again the writer, when he speaks of them in the present tense, throws off the prophetic mask, and depicts what he knew was actually happening.[1]

Do the characteristics mentioned in this Epistle point to a Gnostic sect? It has been pointed out that there is one important difference between the libertines of Jude's Epistle and those of

[1] Henkel suggests that the False Teachers, who are active in other communities, are regarded as presenting only an imminent possible danger to the readers of 2 Peter (*Der Zw. B. des Apostelfürsten Petrus*, p. 37 ff.).

2 Peter (*cf.* Chase, *op. cit.*, iii. 811). In the former, not so much teaching as practice, was in question, while, in 2 Peter, they are called ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, and seem to have been engaged in the active propagation of false doctrine. The use of γνῶσις in i. 5 f. can scarcely be without reference to that intellectualism, with its hidden wisdom, and exclusive mysteries, so characteristic of Gnosticism (*cf.* Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 73-113). The word ἐπόπτης (i. 16) is a Gnostic term meaning one who has been initiated into the mystery. Jude, on the other hand, seems to feel that the movement he combats is also doctrinal in its import; for he urges his readers "to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" (ver. 3), and the heresy he opposes must have had a certain materialistic basis (κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, ver. 8). There is also implied a certain doctrinal process in the words, χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι (ver. 4). Thus, in both cases, the readers are warned against what was really a matter both of life and of doctrine, and the situation in 2 Peter need not necessarily imply a stage at least much later in the development of the false teaching. In these Epistles it can scarcely be doubted that we are in the presence of an incipient Gnosticism, and the two directions in which the Gnostic tendency led, *viz.*, Intellectualism and Antinomianism, are clearly marked. On this latter aspect, the emphasis is laid, not only in the Epistles, but in the N.T. generally. The new movement caused great anxiety to the leaders of the Church, owing chiefly to its immoral tendency. For long the heretics were in communion with the Christian Church, and it was not until the second century that the cleavage widened out to its true limits (*cf.* E. F. Scott, *Apologetic of the N.T.*, pp. 146 ff.). These false teachers in Jude and 2 Peter were partakers in the rites of the Christian Church (Jude 12; 2 Peter ii. 13). Incidentally, it may be mentioned that their description in 2 Peter does not in itself warrant a date for its composition in the second century, and certainly not a date so much later than Jude, as is usually supposed.

2 Peter, then, gives us in general a picture of the prevalence of Antinomian heresy, which has as its results the corruption of morals, and a certain materialistic tendency which led to disbelief in the Person of Christ (ii. 1), and a denial of the ethical nature of God (iii. 8, 9; *cf.* also Philipp. iii. 18 f). 2 Peter is throughout eminently ethical in its tone. Religion and life are inseparably connected, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς (i. 3). The true γνῶσις must contain ethical qualities (i. 6). The Christian must take pains "to

make his calling and election sure" by godliness of life (i. 10). We are not, however, left without traces of the doctrinal position of these false teachers. The Gnostic position which demanded γνῶσις, or a hidden wisdom which leads to perfection, is tacitly opposed in the use of the word ἐπίγνωσις, which is used by St. Paul to denote "complete knowledge" or "saving knowledge" (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12; Philem. 6). Mayor suggests (*op. cit.*, p. 171) that ἐπίγνωσις came into use to distinguish the "living knowledge of the true believer from the spurious γνῶσις which had then begun to ravage the Church". The true ἐπίγνωσις carries with it "all that is needed for life and godliness" (i. 3). These Gnostics evidently held that Revelation in itself was incomplete. Those, however, who possess ἐπίγνωσις are made θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, a phrase which originates in a philosophic atmosphere, and no doubt reflects a sense of opposition to the pure intellectualism of these false teachers, who would claim to be κοινωνοὶ θείας φύσεως by means of wisdom or γνῶσις alone. τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων (i. 9) is a reference to the darkness which was mistaken for light, because the γνῶσις that accompanied it was so unethical (*cf.* the whole passage, i. 5-9). σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις (i. 16) refers to those fictions connected with the emanation of æons, so characteristic of the Gnostic system (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; 2 Tim. iv. 4; Tit. i. 14), by virtue of which the Person of Christ was regarded as the emanation of an æon, in union with a human body. In contrast to this idea, the writer claims that the Apostles were ἐπόπται . . . τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. The Voice proclaims Him to be actually ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου (i. 17). What seems to be a denial of the Person and Work of Christ is referred to in i. 1 τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. πλαστοῖς λόγοις (fictitious words) of i. 3 may be compared with σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις of i. 16. κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας (ii. 10), δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν (ii. 11) evidently cannot refer to any denial of human authority, but rather to sceptical views regarding the influence of spiritual powers, good or evil, upon the life of the individual. Such a belief was part of the orthodox Jewish thought of the time (see *Commentary in loc.*). ἐλευθερίαν . . . ἐπαγγελλόμενοι (ii. 19) may be set alongside the passage dealing with the misuse and misinterpretation of the Pauline doctrine of free grace (iii. 16), which provided the theoretic basis for Antinomianism. These false teachers questioned the truth of the Parousia expectation (iii. 4) on the ground (1) *of the uniformity of nature* (πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως) which is met by the argument that the heavens and the earth were created by the word of God, and that the earth has already been flooded by the same divine agency (iii. 5-7). (2) *The indestructibility*

of matter, against which it is asserted that in the day of the Lord οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται (iii. 10). Finally, we are told that the false teachers use the Scriptures of the O.T. as a basis for their heretical teaching (iii. 16).

It is thus apparent that in 2 Peter, far more than in Jude, the doctrine as well as the life of the false teachers is in question. Their ethical character is described in words largely borrowed from Jude, and in no measured terms. They speak evil of the way of truth (ii. 2); make merchandise of their followers (ii. 3); are fleshly and lustful (ii. 10-12); practise a vulgar hedonism (ii. 13); defile the love-feasts by their presence (13); deceive the hopes of their followers, like waterless fountains (16). They are Christians in name, steal into the Church without disclosing their impious views (ii. 1, 20, 21), and are boastful and irreverent (ii. 10, 18).

The question arises whether these false teachers can be identified with any known heretical sect. Some critics have sought to distinguish between the libertines of chap. ii. and the mockers of chap. iii., but there is really no difficulty in identifying the two.[1] The denial of the Parousia by the mockers is really the outcome of a materialistic philosophy, and the denial of a future judgment would have the tendency to emancipate from all moral restraint. "There may have been shades of difference between them; some, perhaps, had a philosophy, and some had not; but in the eyes of a Christian Preacher, judging the party as a whole by its practical results, they would all seem to wear the same livery" (Bigg, *op. cit.*, p. 239, *cf.* Henkel, *op. cit.*, p. 37).

Harnack, who holds that Jude was written 100-130, suggests that the attack in that Epistle is aimed at some of the older forms of Gnosticism, among which he mentions the Nicolaitans. This sect is known to have had considerable influence in Asia Minor, and is mentioned by name in Rev. ii. 6, 15, in the Epistles to Ephesus and to Pergamum. In the case of the latter Church they are represented as existing side by side, and probably as identical with a sect of "Balaamites" (ii. 14). No doubt the same sect is accused of immorality in the Epistle of Thyatira (ii. 20). In 2 Peter ii. 15, 16 the example of Balaam is adduced as a parallel to the conduct of the false teachers, and it would appear that the name of Balaamites was given as a nickname to the Nicolaitans. Irenæus (iii., c. 1) tells us that the Nicolaitans held the doctrine of two Gods—the God who created the world, and the Father of Jesus; that an æon descended upon Jesus, and again returned into the Pleroma before the Cruci-

[1] *Cf.* Henkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 21 ff., where the question is fully discussed.

fixion. The language of 2 Peter iii. 5-9, relative to the creation and the present government of the world, through the long-suffering of the Creator, might well have in view some such doctrine as this. The accusation, also, of distorting the Scriptures of the O.T. (iii. 16) would also be explained, as also the statement in Jude 4 and 2 Peter ii. 1 about the heretics' denial of Christ. It is probable that these views were common to the Nicolaitans along with other early Gnostic sects, such as the followers of Simon Magus (*cf.* Mayor, *op. cit.*, pp. clxxviii. ff.).

On the intellectual side, Gnosticism originated in a compromise with Greek thought, and an attempt to adapt the Christian teaching to the current philosophy. It is probable that, on the side of conduct, the immoralities that are so vividly denounced in Jude and 2 Peter were due to a similar compromise with the customs and ideas of the Græco-Roman society of the day. The Nicolaitan teaching, as described in Rev. ii., was "evidently an attempt to effect a reasonable compromise with the established usages of Græco-Roman society, and to retain as many as possible of those usages in the Christian system of life. It affected most of all the educated and cultured classes in the Church, those who had most temptation to retain as much as possible of the established social ideas and customs of the Græco-Roman world, and who by their more elaborate education had been most fitted to take a somewhat artificial view of life, and to reconcile contradictory principles in practical conduct through subtle philosophical reasoning" (Ramsay, *The Letters to the Seven Churches*, pp. 337 ff.).

It had evidently become the custom in the Early Church to use the most unsparing language in denouncing these Gnostic errors. Both in Revelation and in Jude, the language is violent, and 2 Peter deals with the false teachers in the same temper. This may render it difficult, at the present day, to understand the exact theoretic position of a sect like the Nicolaitans, and it is a well-known fact that certain philosophic positions in religion, adopted and advocated by men who are themselves of blameless life, may really lead in the case of weaker followers to great moral laxity. If we consider the picture of Græco-Roman society drawn by St Paul in Romans i., it is not to be wondered at that these heresies, which led to such moral compromises, should be vigorously denounced by the Christian teacher. Nothing else "could have saved the infant Church from melting away into one of those vague and ineffective schools of philosophic ethics. . . . An easy-going Christianity could never have survived; it could not have conquered and trained the world; only

the most convinced, resolute, almost bigoted adherence to the most uncompromising interpretations of its own principles could have gained the Christians the courage and self-reliance that were needed" (Ramsay, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*).

3. *Place of Writing.*—On this topic, there is very little ground for judgment beyond vague conjecture. Chase favours the view that 2 Peter is of Egyptian origin. He founds his opinion (1) on the supposition that the Apocalypse of Peter and 2 Peter belong to the same school, (2) that Clement of Alexandria appears to have placed the two documents side by side, and commented on them together in his Hypotyposeis, (3) certain resemblances in thought and word with Philo and Clement of Alexandria (*op. cit.*, p. 816 f.). Jülicher (*Introd.*, E. Tr., p. 239) suggests that the Epistle originated either in Egypt or in Palestine. Palestine is selected on the ground that the Epistle is directed against one of the earlier and less known Gnostic sects which flourished in that country or in Syria. Deissmann, on the basis of the Stratonicean inscription already quoted (*op. cit.*, pp. 367 f.) inclines to the view that the local colouring of the Epistle belongs to Asia Minor. He awaits the result of further inquiry "how far its peculiar vocabulary has points of contact with that of literary sources (of the imperial period) from Egypt, or Asia Minor, including those of the papyri and the inscriptions". There can be little doubt that the readers are in Asia Minor, but does not the form of address, τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, point to a writer at some distance from his readers, though well acquainted with their circumstances? (*cf.* p. 206).

LITERATURE.

Friederich Spitta. *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas.* 1885.

H. v. Soden. *Hand-Commentar Zum N.T.*, vol. iii., 1892.

F. H. Chase. Art. 2 Peter in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*, vol. iii., 1900.

Charles Bigg. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (*International Critical Commentary*). 1901.

J. B. Mayor. *The Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter.* 1907.

Amongst older commentaries of the present century referred to are those of Alford (ed. 1898), Hofmann (1875), Huther (in Meyer, 1852. E. Tr., 1881), A. Wiesinger (in Olshausen, *Bibelwerk*, 1862), Dietlein (1851).

The general question of authenticity is discussed in the following:—

Salmon's *Introduction*, pp. 481, ff. 1894.

Jülicher's *Introduction*, E. Tr., 1904, pp. 232 ff.

Zahn's *Introduction*, E. Tr., 1909, vol. ii., pp. 134 ff.

B. Weiss. *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, pp. 256 ff.

Grosch. *Die Echtheit des zweiten Briefes Petri*, 1889.

McGiffert. *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, 1897, pp. 600 ff.

Sanday. *Inspiration*, 1893, pp. 346 ff., 382 ff.

E. A. Abbott. *Expositor*, Jan.-March, 1882. "From Letter to Spirit," §§ 1121-1135.

Karl Henkel. *Der zweite Brief des Apostelfürsten Petrus, geprüft auf seine Echtheit.* (From R. C. Standpoint), 1904.

ABBREVIATIONS OF REFERENCES TO PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS.

P. Amh. *The Amherst Papyri*, edd. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. (London, 1900-01.)

P. Fay. *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, edd. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt and D. G. Hogarth (Egyptian Exploration Fund. London, 1900.)

P. Fior. *Papiri Fiorentini*, ed. G. Vitelli. (Milan, 1905-06.)

P. Gen. *Les Papyrus de Genève*, 1. *Papyrus Grecs*, ed. J. Nicole. (Genève, 1896-1900.)

P. Grenf. I. *An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*, ed. B. P. Grenfell. (Oxford, 1896.) II. *New Classical Fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, edd. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. (Oxford, 1897.)

P. Hib. *The Hibeh Papyri* I., edd. Grenfell and Hunt. (Egyptian Exploration Fund. London, 1906.)

P. Lond. *Greek Papyri in British Museum*, 3 vols. (London, 1893, 1898, 1907.)

P. Oxy. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edd. Grenfell and Hunt. (Egyptian Exploration Fund. London, 1898, 1899, 1903, 1904.)

P. Par. Paris Papyri in *Notices et Extraits*, xviii., ii., ed. Brunet de Presle. (Paris, 1865.)

P. Petr. *Flinders Petrie Papyri* in Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, "Cunningham Memoirs" (Nos. viii., ix., xi.), 3 vols. (Dublin, 1891-1893.)

P. Tebt. *The Tebtunis Papyri*, 2 vols. (University of California Publications. London, 1902, 1907.)

B.G.U. *Griechische Urkunden*, from the Berlin Museum.

C.I.A. *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*. Berlin, 1873- .

O.G.I.S. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, ed. W. Dittenberger, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1903-05.)

For the references to Papyri I am indebted to the "Lexical Notes from the Papyri," appearing in *Expositor*, 1908-9, by Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, D.D., D.Lit., and the Rev. George Milligan, D.D., and to private communications from these scholars.

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS.

ZNTW. Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, herausgegeben von Erwin Preuschen.

MME. Notes from the Papyri in *Expositor*, 1908, by Professor Moulton and Dr. Milligan.

Moulton Proleg. Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. i. Prolegomena by Professor J. H. Moulton.

Abbott, J. G. Johannine Grammar by Edwin A. Abbott.

WM. Winer's Grammar of N.T. Greek, 3rd edition, by W. F. Moulton.

H.D.B. Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible (5 vols.).

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Β̄.

I. 1. ΣΥΜΕΩΝ[1] Πέτρος δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 2. χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν

[1] Συμεων ℵAKLP syrr., Treg., Ti., WHm; Σιμων B, vulg., sah., boh., WH.

Chapter I. Vv. 1-2. *The Greeting.* "Simeon Peter, slave and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have obtained a faith of equal honour with our own, through the justice of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you in the saving knowledge of our Lord."

Ver. 1. The form Συμέων is only once used elsewhere of Peter in Acts xv. 14. τοῖς κ.τ.λ. The question as to who are the actual recipients of the letter, is matter for discussion in the Introduction (chap. vi. 1). The presumption is in favour of a body of non-Jewish Christians. ἡμῖν. probably means, in accordance with its use elsewhere in the chapter, the whole Christian community to which the writer belongs (see Introd. p. 186). ἰσότιμον. It is doubtful whether ἰσοτ. means "like in honour" or "like in value". Both meanings are found (*cf.* Mayor, p. 80). We may compare the sense of τιμή in v. 17 (see note), where the sense is clearly of an honour conferred (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 7), which would suggest the same meaning here. ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ . . . Χριστοῦ. ἐν is instrumental,. δικ. has the sense of "justice" or "impartiality," and is opposed to προσωποληψία. God is no respecter of persons. There is no distinction in His sight between the faith of an eye-witness, and the faith of those "who have not seen". With this non-theological sense of δικ. *cf.* ἄδικος in Hebrew vi. 10; also 1 John i. 9. Θεοῦ refers to Christ, *cf.* John xx. 28. σωτῆρος, a title used by the Emperor. "Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland's contention (ZNTW, pp. 335 ff.) that Christians from the latter part of i. A.D. onward, deliberately assumed for their Divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men" (*i.e.*, the Emperors). Moulton, *Proleg.* p. 84 (*cf.* Spitta, p. 523; Chase, *D. B.* iii. 796). πίστιν ἐν δικ. can hardly be taken together (*cf.* Eph. i. 15, 1 Tim. iii. 13), as the relation of the believer to Christ in this epistle is rather that of γνῶσις or ἐπίγνωσις (*cf.* v. 2). (*Cf.* Zahn. *Introd.* ii. pp. 218-9).

Ver. 2. χάρις . . . πληθυνθείη. : the same form of salutation as in 1 Pet. i. 2. ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. (For history of ἐπίγνωσις see Mayor's note, pp. 171 ff.; Robinson's *Excursus* in *Ephesians.*) ἐπίγνωσις in this epistle corresponds to πίστις in the Pauline sense (Spitta, p. 522). In Rom. i. 21 γνόντες is used of the imperfect knowledge of God possessed by the heathen world, and in v. 28 he contrasts it with the Christian or perfect knowledge of God. (καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει.) *Cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 12, Col. i. 9. "ἐπίγνωσις, involving the complete appropriation of all truth and the unreserved acquiescence in God's will, is the goal and crown of the believer's course" (Lightfoot, note on Col. i. 9). *Cf.* Introd. p. 209; note v. 8; Paget, *Spirit of Discipline*, pp. 112 ff. ἐπίγνωσις implies a more intimate and personal relationship than γνῶσις. It would be a useful word, seeing that γνῶσις had become associated with Gnosticism, then incipient in the Church. Mayor quotes Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. p. 372, and *Str.*, vi., p. 759, where κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν is twice opposed to κατὰ περίφασιν (= on a broad general view, *cf.* Mayor's note, p. 213). Grace and peace are multiplied in and through this more

a 1 Cor. iv. 18, Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 4. Mem. 1, 6, 5.

ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν,[1] 3. ᵃὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης διὰ τῆς ἐπι-

[1] του θεου και Ιησου του κυριου ημων MSS. generally, Ti., Treg., WH; om. του θεου καὶ Ιησου P, vulg., Minusc., 69, 137, 163, Spitta, Zahn., Nestle. A strong argument in favour of omission is the fact that consistently throughout the epistle Jesus alone appears as the object of επιγνωσις or γνωσις. Additional confirmation is the use of αυτου (sing.) in v. 3.

intimate heart knowledge of Jesus Christ, in contrast to a mere barren γνῶσις.

Vv. 3, 4. *The Promises and their Source.* "Inasmuch as His Divine Power has granted us all things that are needed for life and piety, by means of the personal knowledge of One who called us by the impression of his own glory and excellency; and through this glory and excellency have been granted promises that are precious to us and glorious, in order that, by means of these, ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature, escaping the corruption that is in the world owing to lust."

Throughout this passage, the contrast between ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς, and 2 p. plur. in γένησθε (ver. 4) must be preserved. ἡμῖν implies the apostolic circle, who, by virtue of their own experience of the δόξα and ἀρετή of Christ, are able to transmit to these readers certain promises "precious to us, and glorious." (So Spitta, Van Soden).

Ver. 3. τῆς θείας δυνάμεως is originally a philosophic term (Plato, *Ion.* 534 C., Arist. *Pol.* vii. 4) *cf.* τὸ θεῖον as used by St. Paul in speaking to philosophers at Athens (Acts xvii. 29). The subject is Christ (*cf.* δύναμις κυρίου, Luke x. 17; 1 Cor. v. 4; 2 Cor. xii. 9; and v. 16, of this chapter). The phrase θεία δύναμις is contained in an inscription of Stratonicea in Caria in honour of Zeus Panhemerios and Hekate, belonging to the early Imperial period. 2 Peter would thus be availing himself of one of "the familiar forms and formulæ of religious emotion" (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 367). αὐτοῦ is taken as referring to Κυρίου in ver. 2, which would confirm the reading adopted. πάντα . . . τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν. ζωή is the new life that belongs to believers in Christ. εὐσέβεια is also found in the inscription quoted above. This word and its cognates are found in N.T. only in Acts, this Epistle, and in the Pastoral Epistles. They are also common in inscriptions of Asia Minor, and were apparently familiar terms in the religious language of the Imperial period. In εὐσέβεια, the emphasis of meaning lies towards "godliness" in its practical, rather than its devotional aspect, *i.e.*, what God requires of man "pious conduct". In 1 Tim. iii. 16 Christ is spoken of as "the secret of piety" (τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον). The conjunction of the two ideas ζωή and εὐσέβεια is significant. Religion does not narrow, but expand the province of life. The life in Christ is not "a little province of peculiar emotion . . . . If we fear that it may lose itself in the vast and often lawless universe of life beneath, the danger is to be averted not by wilfully contracting it within a narrower field, but by seeking greater intensity of life in deeper and more submissive communion with the Head Himself in the heavens" (Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, p. 147). δεδωρημένης (="gifted" or "granted"). This word and its cognates always carry a certain regal sense describing an act of large-handed generosity. *Cf.* Mark xv. 45 of the giving by Pilate of the body of Jesus to Joseph; John iv. 10; James i. 17. The same sense is found in Gen. xxx. 20, Prov. iv. 2, Isa. lxii. 3; and O.G.I.S. 517[7] (iii. A.D.) with reference to the gift by Marcus Aurelius of a new law-court, ὁπότε ἐδω[ρ]ήσατο τῆι πατρίδι ἡμῶν [τ]ὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν δικῶν. τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς. Judging from usage elsewhere in N.T., the reference would here be to God, who is always the Caller. 2 Peter, however, shows great independence of thought in other directions, and it is more likely that the reference is to Christ, especially as ἐπίγνωσις is used consistently in relation to Christ (i. 8, ii. 20). (So Spitta, Von Soden, Mayor). "Cognitionem dei praesupponit haec epistula, ver. 3. Cognitionem autem Domini nostri, nempe Jesu Christi urget proprie" (Bengel). *Cf.* 2. Clem. ix. 5. χριστὸς . . . ἐγένετο σὰρξ καὶ οὕτως ἡμᾶς ἐκάλεσεν. ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ. Has ἰδίᾳ an intensive force here, or has it an exhausted sense

γνώσεως τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ,[1] 4. δι' ὧν τὰ τίμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα[2] ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν

[1] δια δοξης και αρετης BKL, 31, WH. Recurrence of δια in vv. 3, 4 would lead to dittography, and correction to genitive easily follows. The versions are unanimous in favour of the reading adopted.

[2] τιμια και μεγιστα ημιν B, syrp, spec., WH, Mayor; μεγιστα και τιμια ημιν ACP, syrp (A, syrp υμιν), 13, 31 + Treg.

merely equivalent to a personal pronoun? The emphasis conveyed in the former interpretation would better carry on the sense of πάντα. δόξα is used in sense of John i. 14. ἀρετή is an interesting word. There is considerable evidence to prove that it is not used here in the ordinary Greek philosophical sense of "virtue," although the combination of δόξα and ἀρετή is not infrequently found in philosophical writings (*cf.* Plat. *Symp.* 208 D. Plut. *Mor.* 535). Deissmann, following the Stratonicean inscription already mentioned, renders "manifestation of power," *i.e.*, in miracle (*op. cit.* pp. 95-97). In 1 Pet. ii. 9 it is used in plural, in LXX sense = "praises" (תְּהִלָּה). (*Cf.* Thuc. i. 33.) In P. Hib. xv. 83 ff. (iii. B.C.) the younger men are exhorted to employ their bodies εὐκαίρως τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ποιησαμένους τῆς αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς, "in a timely display of their prowess" (G. and H.). In later papyri ἀρετή is used as title of courtesy, *e.g.*, P. Oxy. 71, ii. 18 (iv. A.D.). εἴ σου δόξειεν τῇ ἀρετῇ = "if it please your Excellency". Foucart defines ἀρετή as "vim divinam quae mirabilem in modum hominibus laborantibus salutem afferret" (*cf.* Hort's note, 1 Peter, p. 129 and MME, Sept. 1908).

The phrase τοῦ καλέσαντος . . . ἀρετῇ contains one of the finest ideas in the N.T. What could be a more effective answer to the intellectualism of the Gnostic teachers or its modern equivalent, than the impression produced on the lives of men, and especially the early disciples, by the Personality of Jesus? They beheld His glory in the evidences of miraculous knowledge and power which Jesus showed at the time of their call (John i. 42, 47-51; Luke v. 4). Their sense of His moral greatness overcame all resistance on their part (Luke v. 8; John i. 49). If 2 Pet. is lacking in devotional expression, his apologetic for the person of Christ is cast on most effective lines. Reason can only compass the facts of Revelation, in terms of antinomies, and it is vain to meet inadequate theories of the person of Christ by dogmatic subtlety. The Life and Death of our Lord, if its significance is to be fully understood, must be looked upon largely as an acted parable, and Christian experience—the *impression* of δόξα καὶ ἀρετή—is an indispensable constituent of dogmatic *expression*.

Ver. 4. δι' ὧν. Reference is to δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ (so Kühl, Dietlein, Wiesinger, Brückner, Mayor) ἐπαγγέλματα = "promised blessings". No doubt what 2 Peter has chiefly in view is the particular comprehensive ἐπάγγελμα of His Second Coming (*cf.* iii. 4, ἐπαγγελία and iii. 13). The Parousia will be the vindication of all moral and spiritual effort. Christ promised forgiveness to the sinful, rest to the weary, comfort to the sad, hope to the dying and life to the dead. If the reference adopted above of δι' ὧν is correct, the sense would be that in the character and deeds of the Incarnate One, we have a revelation that is itself a promise. The ἐπαγγέλματα are given, not only in word but also in deed. The very life of Christ among men, with its δόξα and ἀρετή is itself the Promise of Life, and the Parousia expectation is also a faith that He lives and reigns in grace, having "received gifts for men". δεδώρηται. Passive, see note on ver. 3. ἵνα διὰ τούτων . . . φύσεως. τούτων refers to ἐπαγγέλματα. The hope and faith kindled in us by the promises are a source of moral power. "The history of the material progress of the race is the history of the growing power of man, arising from the gradual extension of his alliances with the forces which surround him. . . . He arms himself with the strength of the winds and the tides. He liberates the latent energy which has been condensed and treasured up in coal, transforms it into heat, generates steam, and sweeps across a continent without weariness, and with the swiftness of a bird. . . . Moving freely among the stupendous energies by which he is encompassed, he is strong in their strength, and they give to his volitions—powerless apart from them—a large and effective expression. The his-

ἐπιθυμίᾳ [b] φθορᾶς. 5. καὶ αὐτὸ [c] τοῦτο δὲ σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, 6. ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ

b Gen. after ἀποφυγ. found here only.
c Xen. *Anab.* 1, 9, 21, Plat· *Protag.* 310e.

tory of man's triumphs in the province of his higher and spiritual life is also the history of the gradual extension of his alliance with a Force which is not his own. . . . In Christ we are 'made partakers of the divine nature'" (Dale, *Atonement*, pp. 416, 417). **θεία φύσις** is originally a philosophic term, *cf.* Plat. *Symp.* ii. 6, Philo (ed. Mangey), ii. pp. 51, 647; ii. 22, 143, 329, 343. **θεῖος** is found in a papyrus of 232 A.D. = "imperial" (Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 218, note 2). Probably 2 Peter is here again making use of a current religious expression (*cf.* note on **θεία δύναμις**, ver. 3). **ἀποφυγόντας . . . φθορᾶς.** The aorist participle is used of coincident action. Moral emancipation is part of the **κοινωνία θείας φύσεως.** The idea of participation in the Divine Nature is set between the two pictures, one of hope, **τὰ τίμια ἡμῖν καὶ μέγιστα ἐπαγγέλματα**, the other of despair, **τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς.** The way to God is through the Redemption of Christ. The approach to God is an "escape," and not an act of intellectual effort. **φθορά** in philosophic writers is the counterpart of **γένεσις**, *cf.* Plat. *Rep.* 546A, *Phaed.* 95E. Aristot. *Phys.* 5, 5, 6. It expresses not sudden but gradual dissolution and destruction. The scriptural meaning alternates between destruction in the moral, and in the physical sense. In the N.T. the significance is physical, in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, Col. ii. 22, Gal. vi. 8, ii. Pet. ii. 12; moral here, as in 2 Pet. ii. 19, Rom. viii. 21. Man becomes either regenerate or degenerate. Either his spiritual and moral powers are subject to slow decay and death, the wages of sin (**ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ**), or he rises to full participation in the Divine. **ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ**, a compact phrase. The corruption consists in **ἐπιθυμία**, which may be interpreted in the widest sense of inordinate affection for earthly things. **ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ**; *cf.* Rom. viii. 21. **φθορά** becomes personified as a world-wide power to which all creation including man is subject. In Mayor's edition there is a valuable study of **φθορά** and cognates (pp. 175 ff.). The idea contained in **φθορά**, moral decay, is illustrated in Tennyson's "Palace of Art," and "Vision of Sin"; also in Byron, *e.g.*, "Stanzas for Music".

Vv. 5-7. *Faith is not only illumination but character.* "Nor is this all. On your part bring the utmost earnestness to bear, and in your faith supply moral energy, and in your moral energy understanding, and in your understanding self-control, and in your self-control patient endurance, and in patient endurance piety, and in piety brotherly love, and in brotherly love love."

Ver. 5. **καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ**, a phrase that emphasises the fact of the **δώρημα** as having its logical outcome in character. "The soul of religion is the practick part" (Bunyan). On the other hand, 2 Peter here teaches that so-called practical Christianity without the spiritual motive is incomplete and unintelligent. **σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες**, an impressive phrase. *Cf.* similar ideas in Rom. xii. 11, Heb. vi. 11. It is a warning against sluggishness and self-indulgence in the spiritual life. **ἐπιχορηγήσατε.** The A.V. trans., "add to," is insufficient. **χορηγός** in Attic drama is one who defrays the cost of the chorus, at the bidding of the State, as an act of citizenship (Dem. 496, 26). It was a duty that prompted to lavishness in execution. Hence **χορηγέω** came to mean "supplying costs for any purpose," a public duty or **λειτουργία**, with a tendency, as here, towards the meaning, "providing more than is barely demanded". In P. Oxy. 282[6] ff. (30-35 A.D.), a man complains that his wife had deserted him, although **ἐπεχορήγησα αὐτῇ τὰ ἑξῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν** ("I provided for her suitably and beyond my resources"). **ἐπι-** denotes a particular application of **χορηγέω** (*cf.* Moulton, *Proleg.* p. 113). **ἐν** "is used each time of that which is supposed to be theirs" (Alford). **ἀρετή**: "strenuus animae tonus ac vigor" (Bengel)—a manifestation of moral power. **γνῶσιν**, understanding, implying insight, circumspection, discretion, discernment (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 18). *Cf.* Didache, ix. 3 (in Eucharistic prayer), xi. 2, where **γν.** is conjoined with **δικαιοσύνη.**

Ver. 6. **ἐγκράτειαν**: "self-control": accompanied by, and arising from, knowledge, and not a mere product of fear or submission to authority. **ὑπομονήν**: "steadfastness"—not turned aside from the faith by trial and suffering (*cf.* Luke viii. 15, Rom. v. 3 ff.). The desponding

ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν, 7. ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. 8. ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν. 9. ᾧ γὰρ [d] μὴ πάρεστιν ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν μυωπάζων, λήθην λαβὼν

d Acts xv. 29 (D), 1 John iv. 3, Tit. i. 11.

doctrine of the false teachers would itself call for **ὑπομονή** in the readers. Mayor compares the Aristotelian **καρτερία** (*cf.* Heb. xi. 27). **εὐσέβειαν.** In the Epistle the false teachers are **ἀσεβεῖς** (*cf.* note on v. 3).

Ver. 7. **φιλαδελφίαν**: "affection towards the brethren," *i.e.*, of the same Christian community. **ἀγάπην**: probably love towards all, even enemies; not directed by sense and emotion, but by deliberate choice (*cf.* Matt. v. 44). Mayor interprets: "Love to God manifesting itself in love to man and to the whole creation, animate and inanimate".

Vv. 8-11. *Further emphasis on the connexion between faith and morality, and its reward.* "If you have these virtues, and are not sparing in your use of them, you will not be ineffective and unfruitful in the direction of deepening your Christian experience. Where these virtues are not present a man is blind, near-sighted as it were, and entirely forgetful of the great fact that he is purified from the sins of the past. With this danger in view, your earnest purpose ought to be to make sure your calling and election. Steadily practise these virtues and you will not stumble; for thus there will be ministered unto you an abundant entrance into the eternal kingdom."

Ver. 8. **πλεονάζοντα**: "abound". In classical use = "exaggerate". The word here again emphasises the display of a regal, uncalculating and unwearied spirit in the practice of the Christian graces. **ἀργούς.** Perhaps "ineffective" or "ineffectual," a meaning which is further emphasised in **ἀκάρπους.** In The Didache, 12, are given directions for discriminating genuine from false among the itinerant teachers. "If he wishes to settle with you and is a tradesman, let him work and let him eat. If he has no trade, according to your wisdom provide how he shall live as a Christian among you, but not in idleness (**μὴ ἀργός**). If he will not do this, he is making merchandise of Christ. Beware of such men." Here is illustrated the passage from the ordinary sense of **ἀργός**, which really signifies "idle" for want of occupation, and not by choice, to the ethical significance. *Cf.* James ii. 20, "Faith without works is **ἀργή**". Matt. xx. 6, "Why stand ye here all the day, **ἀργοί**?" and the reply. *Cf.* also use of **ἀργεῖ** in ii. 3. In P. Par. II. 4(9)[4] (iii. B.C.), certain quarrymen complain that they "are idle (ἀργοῦμεν) for want of slaves to clear away the sand". *Cf.* P. Par. II. 20. **ὅπως . . μὴ ἀργῆι τὰ πλοῖα.** P. Lond. 208[10] (ii. A.D.). **λόγος ἐργατῶν ἀργησάντων.** In P. Lond. III. p. 27 (a census-return of 160 or 161 A.D.) a certain Apollonius is described as belonging to "the leisured class of Memphis". (**τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως ἀργῶν**). P. Fior. 1. P. Amh, 97? (both ii. A.D.) **ἐλαιουργίου ἀργοῦ** = "an oil-press which is out of working order" **εἰς τὴν . . . ἐπίγνωσιν.** Here the writer returns to the idea, introduced by **ἀποφυγόντες . . . φθορᾶς** in v. 4, that morality and religion are intimately connected. Some have sought to interpret the words as meaning "with reference to the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ," on the ground that **ἐπίγνωσις** has already been postulated as the source of "all things needed for life and godliness," and cannot now be regarded as an end to be attained. Yet **ἐπίγνωσις** may be regarded as both the beginning and the end of morality (*cf.* iii. 18, Col. i. 6 ff. Phil. i. 9). The translation of A.V. is correct (**εἰς** = in, expressive of result). **ἐπίγν.** contrasted with **γνῶσις** marks "a higher degree of intensity, an energy of deeper penetration. It is not a quiescent state, the resting in an acquirement, but the advance of one to whom easy attainment is but the impulse of fresh effort; one who is not content to know, but ever, in Hosea's words (vi. 3), follows on to know" (Paget, *Spirit of Discipline*, p. 112). Each advance in the Christian life deepens and widens our spiritual understanding. "Die **ἐπίγν.** ist ihrer Natur nach etwas, was wächst" (Von Soden).

Ver. 9. **μυωπάζων**: "short-sighted". Only once elsewhere in Greek literature in Ps. Dionys. *Eccl. Hier.* ii. 3. This is one of the words to which exception has been taken in 2 Peter. It is both rare, and it seems to contradict **τυφλός.** Spitta and Von S. translate "wilfully blind". Mayor (p. lxi.) (fo lowing Beza,

e Heb. i. 3. τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ [e] ἁμαρτιῶν. 10. διὸ μᾶλλον, ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι· ταῦτα γὰρ ποιοῦντες οὐ [f] μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε· 11. οὕτως γὰρ πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ εἴσοδος εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

f Moulton, *Proleg.* pp. 188 ff.

g Matt. xxiv. 6 only.

12. Διὸ [g] μελλήσω[1] ἀεὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπομιμνήσκειν περὶ τούτων,

[1] μελλησω ℵABCP, vg., Ti., Treg., WH; ουκ αμελησω KL, syrr. The analogy of σπουδασω in ver. 15 favours reading adopted. Yet, in MSS., there is frequent confusion between μελλω and μελω, *e.g.*, John xii. 6, 1 Peter v. 7, Matt. xxii. 16, where μελλω is incorrect. Field (*Notes on Trans. of N.T.* p. 240) suggests that true reading here is μελησω (*cf.* on σπουδαζω ver. 15).

Grotius, Huther, etc.) interprets the word as limiting τυφλός. "He who is without the virtues mentioned in i. 5-7 is blind, or to put it more exactly is short-sighted; he cannot see the things of heaven, though he may be quick enough in regard to worldly matters." λήθην λαβών. A periphrastic form. *Cf.* Jos. *Ant.* ii. 6, 9; also 2 Tim. i. 5, Heb. xi. 29. τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. Is the reference to baptism? This view is rendered very probable by the use of πάλαι. For the idea of cleansing from pre-baptismal sin, *cf.* Barnabas, xi. 11, Hermas, *Mand.* iv, 3. *Vis.* ii. 1. Spitta adheres to the general interpretation of καθ. as the work of Christ on the moral life. *Cf.* ii. 20-22, 1 Jn. iii. 3. While καθαρισμός is used of the ceremonial washings of the Jews, John iii. 25, it is also used of the work of Christ in Heb. i. 3 (*cf.* Zahn. *Introd.* ii. 232).

Ver. 10. σπουδάσατε. An Imperative. "A sharp and urgent form" (Moulton, *Proleg.* i. 173). βεβαίαν. *Cf.* Deissmann, *B. S.* pp. 105 ff. The word has a legal sense. βεβαίωσις is the legal guarantee, obtained by a buyer from a seller, to be gone back upon should any third party claim the thing. Here the readers are exhorted to produce a guarantee of their calling and election. This may be done by the cultivation of the Christian graces, *Cf.* Eph. iv. 1. "To walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye are called." κλῆσιν καὶ ἐκλογήν. What is the difference between these two? καλέω used in Gospels = "bid to a feast". κλητοί would, therefore, imply those bidden; ἐκλεκτοί = those who have become true partakers of God's salvation. *Cf.* Matt. xxii. 14. Not all who hear the Divine Voice (κλῆσιν) progress in Christian conduct, which is the token of ἐκλογήν. οὐ μὴ πταίσητε, as a blind or short-sighted person might do.

Ver. 11. Note the accumulation in this verse of words suggesting splendour and fulness. ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται. *Cf.* note on v. 5. Mayor says that here the word "suggests the ordering of a triumphal procession," and compares Plut. Vit. 994, ὁ δῆμος ἐθεᾶτο τὰς θέας ἀφειδῶς πάνυ χορηγουμένας. εἴσοδος. *Cf.* Heb. x. 19. In a theatre, εἰσ. is the place of entrance for the chorus (Ar. *Nub.* 326; *Av.* 296), and in P. Par. ii. 41, we find εἴσοδος κοινή = of the door of a house. The great description of the entrance of the pilgrims into the celestial city in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Pt. i., may be quoted in illustration. αἰώνιον βασιλείαν. does not occur elsewhere in N.T. or Apostolic Fathers (*cf.* Aristotle's *Apol.* xvi., and Clem. *Hom.* x. 25), but αἰωνίου ἀρχῆς occurs in the Stratonicean inscriptions already quoted (Deissmann, *op. cit.* p. 361).

Vv. 12-15. *The aim of the writer, and the urgency of his message.* "You are already acquainted with and established in the truth, so far as revealed to you, but, in view of the great issues, I shall always be prepared to awaken you to a sense of these things. In my lifetime I feel bound to do so, especially as I know that death is imminent, as Jesus declared to me. I shall also do my best to enable you to refer to these things as opportunity occurs, even after my decease."

Ver. 12. μελλήσω. What is the exact significance of the future? It can hardly be simply a periphrastic future. "The idea is rather that the writer will be prepared in the future, as well as in the past and in the present to remind them of the truths they know, whenever the necessity arises" (Zahn. *Introd.*, ii., p. 211; quoted with approval by Nestle. *Text. Criticism of N.T.* pp. 333-34). ἐστηριγμένους. This word is used by Jesus in the warning given of Peter's fall, and its spiritual result. καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου (Lk. xxii. 32). *Cf.* 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Pet. iii. 17, where στηριγμός = "stead-

[h] καίπερ εἰδότας καὶ ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ. 13. δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ἐφ᾽ ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι, διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει, 14. εἰδὼς ὅτι ταχινή ἐστιν ἡ ἀπόθεσις [i] τοῦ σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐδήλωσέν μοι. 15. σπουδάσω [1] δὲ καὶ ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ

h Phil. iii. 4, Heb. v. 8, vii. 5, xii. 17.
i For construction of ἔχειν with infin. see Matt. xviii. 25, Eph. iv. 28.

[1] σπουδαζω ℵ 31, arm., syrp, "an intentional alteration . . . copyists and translators could not bring themselves to read here again a promise of Peter's, which he seemed not to have fulfilled" (Zahn, Introd. ii. p. 212). These remarks apply also to variants for μελλησω (ver. 12) (*ibid. cf.* Nestle, *Textual Criticism of N.T.* p. 324).

fastness of mind". **ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ.**—"in the present truth," *i.e.* in so far as you yet have experience of it. *Cf.* note on v. 8.

Ver. 13. **δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι.** "I consider it a duty." The language in vv. 13, 14, is studiously solemn and impressive. **σκηνώματι**, used in literal sense of "tent" in Deut. xxxiii. 18. In Acts vii. 46, it is used of the Tabernacle of God. Elsewhere in N.T. **σκῆνος** is used in the metaphorical sense of human existence. *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 4. A similar use of **σκήνωμα** is found in *Ep. ad Diogn.* 6. **ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν θνητῷ σκηνώματι κατοικεῖ. σκηνή** is the word used by Peter in the transfiguration story (Matt. xvii. 4; Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 33). **διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει· διεγ.** is always used in N.T. = "awaken" or "rouse from sleep" (except in Jn. vi. 18 of the sea); significant in view of the reference to the Transfiguration in vv. 16 ff. *Cf.* **διαγρηγορήσαντες** ("fully awake") in St. Luke's account; *Introd.* p. 187.

Ver. 14. **ταχινή** "imminent," *cf.* ii. 1. A poetical word peculiar to 2 Peter in N.T. The *process* described by **ἀπόθεσις** can hardly be "sudden," Plat. *Rep.* 553D, but there is always an impression of suddenness to the onlooker, who lifts up his eyes some morning, and finds the tent or the encampment gone where he had seen it yesterday. An inscription in C.I.A. III. 1344[3], reads **ζωῆς καὶ καμάτου τέρμα δραμὼν ταχινόν**, where sense can only be "brief" (but see discussion in Zahn. *Introd.*, ii., pp. 212 f.). **ἀπόθεσιν τοῦ σκην. ἀποτίθεμαι** is used of "putting off a garment" (Acts vii. 58); and might here be connected with the idea of taking off a tent-cover (So Spitta). Probably "removal" is the proper translation. In B.G.U. 606[5] (iv. A.D.) **[πρὸς ἀ]πόθεσιν ἀχύρου** (for removal of a chaff-heap) is found. *Cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 21, **οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου.** **καθὼς καὶ . . . ἐδήλωσέν μοι.** There seems no reason to doubt the reference here to John xxi. 18, 19, as Spitta and others have done (see Introduction, pp. 96 f.).

Ver. 15. **σπουδάσω.** The form is used by Polybius and later writers for the classical **σπουδάσομαι. ἑκάστοτε** goes with **ἔχειν** = "on each occasion when you have need". The word is found apparently in the same sense in P. Gen. 31[3]/. (ii. A.D.), **ἑκάστοτέ σοι κατ᾽ ἐπιδημίαν παρενοχλῶν** ("causing you annoyance on each occasion when you are at home"). **τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι.** What is the reference in **τούτων**? It must have the same reference as in verse 12, *viz.* to the practice of the Christian graces, and the larger reference must be to some systematic body of instruction. This might easily take the form of reminiscences of the example of Jesus Himself, and the allusion may be to the Petrine reminiscences contained in the Gospel of St. Mark (*cf.* **μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων** (Peter and Paul) **ἔξοδον Μᾶρκος τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκεν** Iren. iii. 1. 1.). "He has already referred to Christ (v. 3), as having called them **ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ**"; surely nothing could be more appropriate, more helpful to a godly life, than that Peter should leave behind the picture of this **δόξα καὶ ἀρετή** drawn from his own recollection. And the following words, **οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένος κ.τ.λ.** (v. 16) seem to imply a statement of facts" (Mayor, cxliii., where see whole discussion against Zahn. *Introd.* II. pp. 199 ff.). **ἔξοδον.** The same word is used in Luke ix. 31 of the death of Christ. It seems to include the thought of subsequent glory (*cf.* *Expositor*, vi. ii. pp. 73 f. Smith, *Days of His Flesh*, pp. 274 f.) The meaning "death" is found in B.G.U. 168[14]. (ii.-iii. A.D.). **ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν (το)ῦ Εὐδαίμονος ἔξοδον.**
τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι: "refer

τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι. 16. οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις [k] ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου μεγαλειότητος. 17. λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν, φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε

k Amos ii. 4, Isa. lvi. 11, *cf.* 2 Peter ii. 2, 15.

to"; always in Greek writers, from Herodotus down = "mentionem facere, "make mention of" (*cf.* Grimm-Thayer under **μνήμη**). The sense here seems much the same. The document "referred to" would be an authentic source of information. *Cf.* P. Fay, 19[10] (ii. A.D.) [**ἀκριβ**]**εστάτην μνήμην ποιούμενος**.

Vv. 16-18. *The fact of the Transfiguration a guarantee of the writer's truthfulness.* "For we are not without facts to rest upon. Our preaching of the power and coming of Jesus Christ was not based on sophistical myths. We were eye-witnesses of His Majesty. For He received from God the Father honour and glory, a voice coming to Him through the splendour of the glory, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased'. This voice we heard, as it was borne from heaven, when we were with Him in the Holy Mount." (For a comparison of this passage, with the Synoptic account, see Introduction, pp. 94 ff.).

Ver. 16. **σεσοφισμ. μύθ.** *Cf.* **σεσοφισμένη μήτηρ**.: "suppositious mother". Greg. Nyss. i. 171 D. This is evidently the character attributed to the facts of the Christian Gospel by the False Teachers. They specially sought to discredit the outlook for the Second Advent. **μῦθοι** is often used in the Pastoral Epistles of the fanciful Gnostic genealogies (1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7; Tit. i. 14). **ἐγνωρίσαμεν**. Used in N.T. of preaching the Gospel (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 1). **δύναμιν καὶ παρουσίαν**. For collocation of words, *cf.* Matt. xxiv. 30, Mark ix. 1. For **δύναμις**, see note on verse 3. **παρουσίαν**. Chase (*op. cit.* 797*a*) regards the word here as denoting the first coming of Christ, because (1) the context speaks of history and not of prophecy; (2) the word itself naturally bears this meaning. He admits, however, that elsewhere in the N.T and in this Epistle it is used of the Second Coming (*cf.* Ignat. *Philad.* 9). Justin (*Dialogue* 32) distinguishes "two advents,—one in which He was pierced by you; a second, when you shall know Him, Whom you have pierced". There is, however, no real difficulty here in taking **παρ.** in the usual sense, which, indeed, is more in harmony with the context. The Transfiguration itself, as used by this writer, is regarded as a basis for belief in the Second Advent, against the False Teachers.

Dr. Milligan, in his recent edition of Thessalonians, gives a valuable note on **παρουσία** (p. 145). He mentions that it occurs frequently in the Papyri as a kind of *terminus technicus* with reference to the visit of the king, or some other official. (P. Petr. ii. 39 (*e*), 18 (iii. B.C.). P. Tebt. 48, 13 f. (ii. B.C.), 116 (ii. B.C.). P. Gren., ii. 14 (*b*), 2 (iii. B.C.)). Dittenberger, *Sylloge*, 226, 84 ff. (iii. BC.). **τῶν δὲ ἀρχόντων συναγαγόντων ἐκλησίαν καὶ τήν τε παρουσίαν ἐμφανισάντωντοῦ βασιλέως**. "We fall back upon" these examples of the word "the more gladly because for this particular sense of the word the Jewish sacred writings give us little help" (*ibid.*). The word must, therefore, have come into use, in this application to the Second Advent, in apostolic times, as faithfully representing the meaning of Jesus Himself (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 37, 39). The usual classical sense of the word as "presence" must not be disregarded. Taken together with the other meaning illustrated by the **Κοινή**, **παρουσία** would thus seem to combine in itself the meaning of "actual presence," and a near "coming". This combination of meaning in the consciousness of the early Church, with its perplexity as to the interpretation of our Lord's promise, would seem to be reflected in John xvi. 16-18. **ἐπόπται**: used of those who had attained the highest degree of initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. Judging from the use of **ἐποπτεύω** in 1 Peter, the word may have passed into ordinary speech, but no doubt is used here to enhance the splendour of the vision, and the honour done the disciples, at the Transfiguration—"admitted to the spectacle of His grandeur' (Moffat, *H. N. T.* p. 600). **ἐπόπτης** is applied to God in Esth. v. 1, 2 Macc. vii. 35, *cf.* O.G.I.S., 666[25] **τὸν Ἥλιον Ἅφμαχιν ἐπόπτην καὶ σωτῆρα** (reference to an Egyptian Sun-god). Hofmann holds that the reference is rather to the Resurrection and Ascension. **μεγαλειότητος**. *Cf.* Luke ix. 43, Acts xix. 27.

ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς[1] δόξης Ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν, εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ [l] εὐδόκησα,—18. καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ [m] ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει· 19. καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον, ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε [n] προσέχοντες ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, [o] ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ καὶ φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν·

l Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5, Mark i. 11, Luke iii. 22.
m Acts ix. 12, x. 3, xi. 3, xxvi. 13, Luke x. 18.
n 3 John vi., Acts x. 33, Phil. iv. 14.
o Mark xiv. 32 Luke xiii. 8.

[1] απο της μεγαλοπ. syrr.

Ver. 17. **λαβὼν.** It is well-nigh impossible to say what is the case agreement of the participle here. It is at least certain that the subject is Jesus. Dietlein, Schott, Ewald, and Mayor agree that the writer intended to go on, **ἐβεβαίωσεν τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον**, for which he substitutes **καὶ ἔχομεν βεβαιότερον**, after the parenthetic 18th verse. **παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός.** See Hort's note, 1 Pet. i. 2. The usage (without the article) indicates the growth of a special Christian terminology. The two words are treated as one proper name. **τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν.** A frequent combination, *cf.* Ps. viii. 6, Job. xl. 10, 1 Peter i. 7, Rom. ii. 7, 10, 1 Tim. i. 17, Heb. ii. 7, 9. **τιμή** is the personal honour and esteem in which Jesus is held by the Father, *cf.* Hort's note on 1 Pet. i. 7. "Honour in the voice which spoke to Him; glory in the light which shone from Him" (Alford). **φωνῆς . . . τοιᾶσδε.** This is the only instance of **τοιόσδε** in N.T. = "to the following effect". **ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης.** Retaining reading **ὑπὸ**, we may regard **μεγ. δόξα** as a vehicle of expression. The voice expresses its significance. It is not a mere accompanying phenomenon of the voice. *Cf.* the instrumental dative in i. 21 after **ἠνέχθη. μεγ. δόξης** corresponds to "the bright cloud" (**νεφέλη φωτεινή**) of the Synoptics. **οὐρανός** is used in verse 18 to describe the source from which the voice came; "the sky," *cf.* iii. 12, 13. **εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα.** Moulton (*Proleg.* p. 63) points out that tendency in N.T. is for **εἰς** to encroach on the domain of **ἐν**. *Cf.* John i. 18, **ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον** (*ib.* p. 235).

Ver. 18. **ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ.** The phrase indicates a view of the place and incident which has been taken up into and sanctified in the religious consciousness of the Church. *The Gnostic Acts of Peter* use the phrase "in monte sacro". **ἅγιος** signifies a place where Jehovah manifested Himself, *cf.* Exod. iii. 5, Isa. lii. 1.

Vv. 19-21. *The Transfiguration confirms Prophecy.* "Thus we have still further confirmation of the words of the prophets, a fact to which you would do well to give heed, as to a lamp shining in a murky place, meant to serve until the Day break and the Day-Star arise in your hearts. Recognise, above all, this truth, that no prophecy is restricted to the particular interpretation of one generation. No prophecy was ever borne through the instrumentality of man's will, but men spoke, direct from God, impelled by the Holy Spirit."

Ver. 19. **βεβαιότερον.** Originally a legal term. See note v. 10; *cf.* Phil. i. 7, 2 Cor. i. 21. **τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον**, *i.e.* all in the O.T. scriptures that points to the Coming of the Messiah. The prophecy is now supported by its partial fulfilment in the Transfiguration. **ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες.** "to which ye do well to take heed". "**καλ. ποιήσεις** c. aor. part. is the normal way of saying 'please' in the papyri, and is classical" (Moulton *Proleg.* p. 228). **ὡς λύχνῳ . . . καρδ. ὑμῶν.** Spitta would eliminate the words **ἕως οὗ . . . ἀνατείλῃ** as a gloss founded on Ps. cxix. 105 and 4 Esdras xii. 42. **αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ**, properly = "dry" or "parched": then "squalid" or "rough". Here it means "murky". In Aristot. *de Color.* 3 **τὸ αὐχμηρόν** is opposed to **τὸ λαμπρόν. φωσφόρος.** "Morning - star." Not found elsewhere in Biblical Greek. The LXX word is **ἑωσφόρος**. In the poets, the word is always applied to Venus (Cicero, *Nat. Deorum*, 2, 20).

This verse has been much discussed. It may be well to mention three grammatical points that emerge. (1) The reference of **ᾧ**. It is simplest to understand it as referring to *the content of the preceding clause*, and not to **τὸν προφ. λόγον** alone, *viz.* the fact that the **προφ. λογ.** is now **βεβ.** on account of the Transfiguration. (2) **ἕως οὗ κ.τ.λ.** is to be taken with **φαίνοντι**, not with **προσέχοντες.** (3) **ἐν τ. κ. ὑμῶν** is connected

p 2 Peter iii. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 1. q Heb. xii. 11, x. 39. r Art. absent owing to growth of a special Christian terminology. *Cf.* Jude 8, 2 Peter ii. 10, ii. 18, i. 20. (Mayor, *Ed.* xxvii. ff.).

20. τοῦτο [p] πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας [q] ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται· 21. οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος [r] ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ [1] ἄνθρωποι.

[1] απο Θεου BP, syr[h], boh., WH, Ti.; αγιοι Θεου ℵKL, syr[p] + Treg.; αγιοι sah.; αγιοι του Θ. A; αγιοι απο θ. C.

with ἀνατείλῃ alone, and not with διαυγάσῃ. With these presuppositions we may briefly consider the two leading interpretations.

1. Mayor may be taken as representative of the view that the verse is wholly an exhortation to "search the Scriptures". There are three stages: the prophetic lamp (τὸν προφ. . . . τόπῳ); the Gospel dawn (ἡμέρα διαυγ.); the inner light of the spirit (φωσφόρος . . . ὑμῶν.). "The lower degree of faith in the written word will be followed by divine insight". He compares Euth. Zig. ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος τοὺς ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ φωταγωγεῖ ἕως καθαρὸν ὑμῖν τὸ φῶς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διαφανῇ καὶ ὁ νοητὸς ἑωσφόρος, τουτέστι Χριστός, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν ἀνατείλῃ. (*cf.* Huther, Alford). The objection to this view is that it seems to ignore the place given to the Transfiguration as a religious fact for writer and readers alike (ἔχομεν).

2. Another and more probable view naturally takes ἕως οὗ . . . ὑμῶν as referring to the Second Advent. This preserves the usual meaning of ἡμέρα in the Epistle, and it also gives point to the striking sequence of metaphors. The λύχνῳ φαίνοντι is the confirmation of the prophetic word by the Transfiguration which the writer has given them (*cf.* v. 16); and this is made all the more probable if we take the reference suggested for ᾧ in (1) above. The αὐχμ. τόπῳ would be the world in which they live (*cf.* Ps. cxix. 105). This lamp is meant to serve until the glorious appearing. One objection to the eschatological interpretation of ἕως οὗ κ.τ.λ. is the phrase ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν which implies an inward Coming. This is largely repelled if we accept its grammatical connection with ἀνατείλῃ alone ((3) above). "The Morning-Star arises in their hearts, when the σημεῖα of the approaching Day are manifest to Christians. The fulfilment of their hope is at the door: the Lord is at hand" (von Soden). See note on ver. 9.

Ver. 20. τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες. "Recognising this truth above all else" (in your reading of Scripture). The False Teachers appealed to the O.T. scriptures in support of their doctrine. ὅτι πᾶσα . . . οὐ γίνεται. πᾶσα . . . οὐ need not be regarded as a Hebraism. It is as normal as in 1 Jn. ii. 21, Jn. iii. 16. ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως. This passage is a noted crux. (1) Hardt, followed by Lange, Spitta and others interpret ἐπιλυσ. = *dissolutio*. "No prophecy of S. is of such a kind that it can be annulled". But no satisfactory instance of ἐπιλυσ. in this sense can be adduced. (2) Accepting the sense of ἰδ. ἐπιλ. = "private," or "human interpretation," Von Soden sees a reference to the methods of the false teachers in their attitude to Scripture (*cf.* v. 16, ii. 1). ἰδίας "is opposed to the φωνὴ ἐνεχθεῖσα of i. 17". (3) It seems most satisfactory to understand ἰδ. ἐπιλ. as the meaning of the prophet himself, or what was in the prophet's mind when he wrote; the fulfilment in any particular generation or epoch. "The special work of the prophet is to interpret the working of God to his own generation. But in doing this, he is laying down the principles of God's action generally. Hence there may be many fulfilments of one prophecy, or to speak more exactly, many historical illustrations of some one principle of Providential Government" (Mayor, p. 196). The genitive ἐπιλύσεως is gen. of definition and not of origin. "No prophecy is of such a nature as to be capable of a particular interpretation."

Ver. 21. οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ. With ἠνέχθη *cf.* vv. 17, 18. ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύμ. . . . φερόμενοι, *cf.* Acts ii. 2. ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας. Here we have the only reference to the Holy Spirit in the Epistle, and only in this connexion, *viz.* as the source of prophetic inspiration. The spirit is an agency rather than an agent. The men speak. The spirit impels. It is of much signific-

II. 1. **Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν** [a] **ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἱρέσεις** [a] **ἀπωλείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι, ἐπάγοντες**

a Vv. 4, 10, Jas. i. 25. See Moulton, *Proleg.* 74.

ance for the interpretation of the whole passage that **ἄνθρωποι** occupies a position of emphasis at the end of the sentence, thus bringing into prominence the human agent. The prophets were not ignorant of the meaning of their prophecies, but they saw clearly only the contemporary political or moral situation, and the principles involved and illustrated therein.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-3. *The False Teachers and their Judgment.* "Yet there were also false prophets in the ancient community, just as among you there will be false teachers. They will not hesitate to introduce alongside the truth corrupting heresies, even denying their Redeemer, and bringing on themselves swift destruction. Many will imitate their vicious example, and thereby the way of truth will be discredited. Nay, further, actuated by covetousness, they will make merchandise of you by lying words. Yet you must not think that the judgment passed on all such long ago is inactive. Their destruction is awaiting them."

Ver. 1. **ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ. ἐν τῷ λαῷ** is used for the chosen people in LXX. **ψευδοπροφῆται.** A class of False Prophets is frequently mentioned in the O.T. In the earlier ages it is not suggested that there was conscious deceit on the part of the prophet. His prophecy is false, if it is proved so by the event (Jer. xxviii. 9). "When a prophet lies, without being inspired by a false or impotent god, it is because God in His anger against Israel's sin means to destroy him, and therefore put into the prophets 'a lying spirit'". (Schulz. *O.T. Th.* i. 257). *Cf.* 1 Kings xxii. 5 ff. These are the prophets who cry "peace, peace," when God is really going to bring judgment. In the later period superstitious acts and pagan practices, such as spiritualism, ventriloquism, professional soothsaying, became common (*e.g.* Jer. xxvii. 9; Isa. viii. 19). The cardinal distinction between the true and the false prophet lay in the moral character of their teaching (Jer. xxiii. 21, 22). **ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.** The characteristics of their teaching are well-marked in this Epistle. See Introduction, pp. 207 ff. Compare Phil. iii. 18 f., "enemies of the Cross," who brought tears of shame to the eyes of the Apostle; the abuses of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. xi.; also Galat. ii. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 13.

παρεισάξουσιν. What is the force of **παρα-**? The idea of "stealth" or "secrecy"—"stealthily to introduce"—is hardly in accord with their character described elsewhere as **τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες** (ii. 10). Rather the idea seems to be of the introduction of false teaching alongside the true, whereby the **ὁδὸς ἀληθείας** is brought into disrepute. *Cf.* **παρεισενέγκαντες**, i. 5. The idea of stealth is present in **παρεισάκτους** (Gal. ii. 5). **αἱρέσεις.** Clearly **αἵρεσις** here is used in original sense of "tenet" ("animus," "sententia") (So Spitta, von Soden, Weiss; but *cf.* Zahn., *op. cit.* ii. 233). In Galat. v. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 19, the sense is "dissensions," arising from such diversity of opinion. It is used in the sense of "sect" in Acts v. 17, xv. 5, xxiv. 5. The **ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι** were within the Church. Even the "Alogi," who disputed the fourth Gospel in second century, were not excommunicated. They were, as Epiphanius says, "one of ourselves". *Cf.* MME., *Expos.* Feb. 1908. **αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας.** The Genitive contains the qualifying idea—"corrupting tenets". Our identification with a great cause may be maintained, as in the case of the false teachers, but personal motives may sadly deteriorate, and the influence of the life may breed corruption. *Cf.* Ignat. *Trall.* vi. 1; *Eph.* vi. 2. **καὶ τὸν ἀγορ. . . . ἀρνούμενοι. καὶ** = "even". *Cf.* Mark i. 27. If the ordinary use of **δεσπότης** in early Christian writers is followed here, *viz.*, as referring to God, **ἀγοράζω** would also be used of God, who redeemed Israel out of Egypt (2 Sam. vii. 23). The reference here, however, is to Christ (*cf.* Mayor, p. xvii.). The N.T. use of **ἀγορ.** is illustrated in 1 Cor. vi. 20, where reference might be to God; but in *ib.* vii. 23 reference is clearly to Christ. So in Rev. v. 9. *Cf.* our Lord's words in Mark x. 45, about "giving his life a ransom" and Jude v. 4. The "denial" seems to have consisted in an inadequate view of the Person and Work of Christ, and their relation to the problem of human sin. *Cf. Epp. of Peter*, J. H. Jowett, pp. 230 ff. **ταχινήν.** See note on i. 14. **ἐπάγοντες.** The

ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν· 2. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται· 3. καὶ [b] ἐν πλεονεξίᾳ πλαστοῖς λόγοις ὑμᾶς [c] ἐμπορεύσονται· οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ [d] νυστάζει. 4. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ σειραῖς[1]

b 1 Tim. ii. 2, 2 Cor. ii. 1, viii. 2, Luke i. 44.
c Ezek. xxvii. 21.
d Acts iii. 13, 1 Cor. viii. 6.

[1] σειραις KLP, vulg., syrr., boh. +; σειροις ABC, WH, Treg.; σιροις א, Ti. The two last are mere variations in spelling: the last gives a different word which seems less applicable to ζοφου. The difficulty is, however, partially explained by regarding σειραις as suggested by δεσμοις of Jude 6. σειρος or σιρος is a pit for the storage of grain, and so far as known, the word "does not seem to suggest anything awful or terrible" (Mayor). The presumption, considering dependence of whole chapter on ideas of Jude, is in favour of σειραις.

middle might have been expected. *Cf.* v. 5, where the active is suitably used.

Ver. 2. **ἀσελγείαις.** are "acts of lasciviousness". **ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας. ἀληθεία** contains the root-idea of "genuineness". It combines the ideas of the knowledge of God and His purposes in Christ; and of the human obligation to right living that springs from it. "He that doeth truth cometh to the light." The writer of 2 Peter is, as always, concerned to oppose a merely intellectual Gnosticism, which has its ultimate fruit in immorality. *Cf.* Ps. cxix. 29, 30. **βλασφημηθήσεται.** The whole Church suffered in reputation because of these men. *Cf.* Rom. ii. 24, 1 Tim. vi. 1.

Ver. 3. **ἐν** is causal. **πλεονεξίᾳ** = "covetousness". *Cf.* Luke xii. 15. **πλαστοῖς**: here only in N.T., "manufactured," "feigned," "artificial". **ἐμπορεύσονται** Originally used in intrans. sense = "go a-trading". *Cf.* Jas. iv. 13. Then = "import," in trans. sense. Here = "make gain of," "exploit". *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 17, 1 Tim. vi. 5.

οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ: "whose judgment has for long not been inactive," although there is an appearance of delay. This delay is the argument used by the false teachers. **ἔκπαλαι** occurs in O.G.I.S., 584[5] (ii. A.D.), **δι' ὧν ἔκπαλαι αὐτὴν** (sc. **τὴν πατρίδα**) **εὐεργέτ[ησεν]**. (*Cf.* iii. 4 and ii. 1, **ἐπάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινὴν ἀπώλειαν.**) For **ἀργεῖ** see note on i. 8. The judgment has long been gathering, and is impending. **νυστάζει.** The word used of the slumbering virgins in Matt. xxv. 5. In Isa. v. 27 it is used of the instruments of God's anger employed against those guilty of social abuses.

Vv. 4-10*a*. *A historical illustration of the Divine judgment on the wicked, and care of the righteous.*

"God spared not angels who sinned, but having cast them into Tartarus, gave them over to chains of darkness, reserving them for judgment. He spared not the ancient world, but guarded Noah, with seven others, while the impious world was overwhelmed by a flood. So Divine judgment was extended to the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which were overwhelmed by ashes, and overthrown by earthquake, as an example of what is in store for impious persons, while righteous Lot was delivered, grieved and wearied as he was by the profligate life of the lawless. For day after day this man with his righteous instincts, in his life among them, was vexed with the sight and sound of their lawless deeds. In all this we have a proof that the Lord knows how to deliver the godly out of trial, and to keep the ungodly under discipline until the day of judgment, especially those who follow the polluting lusts of the flesh and despise authority."

Ver. 4. **εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεός** . . . introducing a series of conditional sentences. The apodosis is found in **οἶδεν κύριος** . . . of v. 9. **σειραῖς.** No doubt a rendering of **δεσμοῖς** in Jude 6, agreeably to the practice of this writer, who is somewhat fond of using rarer words, instead of the more commonplace. **σειρά** usually means a "cord" or "rope" (Homer, *Il.* xxiii., 115, *Od.* xxii., 175). It would seem to mean "a golden chain" in *Il.* viii., 19, 25, *cf.* Plato. *Theatetus*, i. 53 C. The meaning "fetters" is peculiar to 2 Peter (for *var. lect.* **σειροῖς**, see textual note). **ταρταρώσας** = "cast into Tartarus". The verb is a **ἅπαξ λεγ. τάρταρος** occurs in three passages of LXX. (Job xl. 15 (20), xli. 22 (23), Prov. xxiv. 51 (xxx. 16): but in none of these is there any corresponding idea in the Hebrew. The word also occurs in Enoch xx. 2, where Gehenna is the place of

ζόφου [1] ταρταρώσας παρέδωκεν εἰς κρίσιν τηρουμένους,[2] 5. καὶ ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλὰ [e] ὄγδοον [f] Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν [g] ἐπάξας· 6. καὶ πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας τεφρώσας [h] καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν [3] τεθεικώς, 7. καὶ δίκαιον Λὼτ καταπονούμενον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων [i] ἐν ἀσελγείᾳ ἀναστροφῆς ἐρύσατο,—

e Plato, *Legg.* 3, 695c, Plut. *Pelop.* c. 13, Dem. i. 812, 3 Macc. v. 27.
f Art. absent ii. 7, *cf.* Abbott, J. G. pp. 57 f.
g Luke xiii. 34, Acts xiv. 27.
h Matt. xx. 18.
i 1 Pet. iii. 2.

[1] **ζοφου** ℵBCKLP, Ti., Treg., WH; **ζοφοις** ℵA. "The latter reading may have arisen from a marginal **-οις** intended to connect **σειραις**, but wrongly applied to **ζοφου**" (Māyor, *Ed.* p. cxciv.).

[2] **τηρουμενους** BCKLP, syr[h] + Ti., Treg., WH; **κολαζομενους τηρειν** ℵA, latt., Syr[p], boh., sah.

[3] **ασεβεσιν** BP, syr[h], syr[p], WH; **τοις ασεβεσιν** sah., boh.; **ασεβειν** ℵACKL, vulg., Treg., Ti.

punishment for apostate Jews, and Tartarus for the fallen angels. In Homer (*e.g. Il.* viii. 13) Hades is the place of confinement for dead men, and Tartarus is the name given to a murky abyss beneath Hades in which the sins of fallen Immortals (Kronos, Japetos, and the Titans) are punished (*cf.* Salmond, *H.B.D.* ii. 344 *a*). Hence 2 Peter uses this word in agreement with the Book of Enoch and Greek mythology, because he is speaking of fallen angels and not of men. As regards the cosmology that is here implied, it has been suggested that the earth is not regarded as flat, but the universe is conceived as two concentric spheres, the outer heaven, the inner the earth. The nether half of heaven is Tartarus, and the nether half of the earth is Hades (St. Clair, *Expositor*, July, 1902). The use of the word by 2 Peter is remarkable as implying an atmosphere of Greek thought in the circle in which he moved, and for which he wrote. **ζόφος** in Homer is used of the gloom of the nether world, *Od.* xx. 356, *cf.* Heb. xii., 18. Also v. 17 and Jude 6, 13. It is implied that fallen angels and unrighteous men alike undergo temporary punishment until the day of their final doom, *cf.* ver. 9. Enoch x. 4, 12, lxxxviii. 2.

Ver. 5. **ἀρχαίου κόσμου.** The article is omitted, which is not a mark of illiteracy. This chapter is prophetic in form, and the omission of the article is characteristic of that style. *Cf.* Job. iii. 10, Judges v. 5. (See Mayor, *Ed.* xxxiv. xxxv.). **δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα.** **κηρ.** in this sense is used in N.T. only here, and in 1 Tim. ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. 11. 2 Peter again borrows from Jewish tradition as to the preaching of Noah. *Cf.* Jos. *Antiq.* i. 3, 1, Clem. Rom. i. 7. **κατακλυσμόν**, *cf.* Matt. xxiv. 38, 39, Luke vii. 27, Gen. vi. 17. **ἐπάξας.** Aorist participle implies co-incident action. "He saved N. . . . while he sent, etc." **ἐπάγω** is used of "setting-on," "letting loose," *e.g.* "dogs". *Odyssey*, xix. 445, Xen. *Cyr.* x. 19. **ὄγδοον.** "with seven others". Classical Greek usage is to add **αὐτόν.** There is much difficulty as to the significance of the numeral. The reference is no doubt to the number of Noah's family. The numeral is placed in a prominent place in the sentence to lay stress on the small number saved out of the inhabited world, as a striking example of mercy in the midst of judgment, *cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 20. *Cf.* P. Petr. iii. 28. **ὅτι ἐδραγματοκλέπτει τρίτος ὤν** (*bis*), *cf.* Abbott, J. G. § 562

Ver. 6. **πόλεις Σοδ. καὶ Γομορρ.** Not genitive of apposition, but cities of the district, where Sodom and Gomorrah were situated. *Cf.* Jude 7. **Σ. καὶ Γ. καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν. καταστροφῇ** is dative of instrument, "condemned them by overthrow". Gen. xix. 24, 25 seems to imply some further destruction after the fire. Perhaps an earthquake is meant, a common accompanying phenomenon of volcanic disturbance. **ὑπόδειγμα . . . τεθεικώς,** "constituting them an example to ungodly persons of things in store for them." With **μελλ.** *cf.* Heb. xi. 20, Col. ii. 17. **τεφρώσας** = "cover up with ashes" (not "reduce to ashes") —found in a description of the eruption of Vesuvius. (Dio. Cass. lxvi. p. 1094).

Ver. 7. **καταπονούμενον,** the word applied to the condition of the slave whom Moses delivered, Acts vii. 24. It implies outward discomfort. **ἀθέσμων.** *Cf.* iii. 17,

8. βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ δίκαιος [1] ἐνκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ἐβασάνιζεν,—9. οἶδεν Κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ [k] ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, 10. μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ [l] μιασμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας. τολμηταὶ

k Infinit. with οἶδα 1 Tim. iii. 5, Jas. iv. 17, Matt. vii. 11, Phil. iv. 12, 1 Thess. iv. 4, classical.

l Luke iv. 22, Col. i. 13, Rom. i. 26.

[1] ο δικαιος ℵACKLP, syrr., Treg., Ti.; om. ο B, vulg., WH.

"a stronger word than ἄνομος, because θεσμός is used especially of a divine ordinance, a fundamental law" (Mayor).

Ver. 8. **βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ἀκοῇ.** Two interpretations are possible (1) Instrumental dative after ἐβασάνιζεν. "He vexed his righteous soul by what he saw and heard." The objections are (*a*) the long interval that separates βλ. κ.τ.λ. from ἐβασάνιζεν, (*b*) that βλέμμα is never elsewhere used of the thing seen, but is used of sight from the subjective, emotional, and volitional point of view. Hence (2), reading δίκαιος without the article, and taking βλ. κ.τ.λ. with that word, we may translate with the Vulgate "aspectu et auditu justus". His instincts of eye and ear were nobler than those of the society around him. **ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας.** "Day in, day out." *Cf.* ἡμέρα καθ' ἡμέραν in Ps. lxviii. 19. **ἐβασάνιζεν.** It is somewhat peculiar that the active should be used. "He vexed, distressed his righteous soul." May it not be that in the use of the active a certain sense of personal culpability is implied? Lot was conscious that the situation was ultimately due to his own selfish choice (*cf.* von Soden).

Ver. 9. **οἶδεν Κύριος, κ.τ.λ.** Apodosis to protasis begun in ver. 4. **πειρασμοῦ.** See Mayor's note on Jas. i. 2. The idea here is primarily of those surroundings that try a man's fidelity and integrity, and not of the inward inducement to sin, arising from the desires. Both Noah and Lot were in the midst of mockers and unbelievers. This πειρασμός is the atmosphere in which faith is brought to full development. It was a condition even of the life of Jesus. ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου (Luke xxii. 28). It is the word used by St. Luke of the Temptation (Luke iv. 13). On the one hand, πειρασμός is not to be lightly sought (Luke xi. 4), or entered into carelessly (Mark xiv. 38); the situation of πειρασμός may itself be the result of sin (1 Tim. vi. 9). On the other hand, it is a joyous opportunity for the development of spiritual and moral strength (Jas, i. 2, 12). πειρασμός becomes sin only when it ceases to be in opposition to the will. The word is peculiar to the N.T. **ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν**: "to keep the unrighteous under punishment until the day of judgment". The reference may be the same as in 1 Pet. iii. 19, τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν, if we interpret "spirits in prison" as meaning those who had disobeyed the preaching of Noah, and to whom Christ preached. *Cf.* Book of Enoch, x. 4 f. **ἡμέραν κρίσεως.** This day is also the day of Parousia. The same expression is used in iii. 7. It is called ἡμέρα κυρίου (iii. 10); ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα (iii. 12). Three great results are brought about on that day. (1) The ungodly will suffer ἀπώλεια (iii. 7; *cf.* ii. 1, iii. 16). It is noteworthy that the ultimate fate of the fallen angels is not described except as κρίσις (ii. 4). (2) Dissolution of the material universe by fire (iii. 11, iii. 7, iii. 12, iii. 10). (3) The righteous are promised "new heavens and a new earth". In this new universe, or environment, righteousness has its home (iii. 13). The difficult passage (i. 19), about the day-star, has reference to this ἡμέρα κυρίου, when the great Day shall dawn, and the sign of it shall cheer the hearts of the faithful, and the lamp of prophecy will be no longer needed.

Ver. 10*a*. **μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς . . . πορευομένους,** "especially those who follow the flesh as their leader". *Cf.* Matt. iv. 19, 1 Tim. v. 15. In Isa. lxv. 2 we have πορευομένοις . . . ὀπίσω τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. The writer now passes from the sin of Sodom to the sin of the Libertines. **ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ.** ἐπιθυμία is used of strong desire generally; "lust" in its older meaning. *E.g.* Luke xxii. 15. μιασμοῦ is a qualitative genitive, as in ii. 1. αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας: "a polluting desire". **κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας.** κυρ. cannot be taken in a purely abstract sense, "despising authority". κυριότης

αὐθάδεις, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. 11. ὅπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ

is used in the abstract sense of the Lordship of Christ in Didache iv. 1. Honour him who speaks the word of God, **ὡς κύριον, ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν.**

As is suggested by this passage in the Didache, we may conclude that by **κυριότητος καταφρονοῦντας** is meant a despising of the Lordship of Christ, which was the central theme of the apostolic teaching and preaching. The writer in ver. 10*b*, goes on to speak of their attitude towards **δόξας**, or "angelic beings". *Cf.* Jude 8, **κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν.** It is true that in Col. i. 16, **κυριότητες** form one of the ranks of angels in the false Gnostic teaching, but there is no indication that the Libertines here spoken of taught any elaborate angelology. On the contrary, they spoke lightly of the Unseen Powers generally. Their teaching seems to have been materialistic in tone. They were **ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ** (ver. 12)—creatures of natural instinct, not employing the higher powers of reason (**ἄλογα**).

Vv. 10*b*-14 *Further description of the False Teachers.* "Presumptuous and arrogant, they do not shrink from irreverent speech about the unseen powers, while even angels, who are far superior to these false teachers in greatness and might, do not dare to bring against these powers an irreverent accusation. Their irreverence is therefore of an ignorant type, as of unreasoning animals, who are born creatures of instinct, and are fitted only for capture and destruction. Their destruction will be in keeping, and they will be defrauded of what is really the wages of fraud. Their notion of pleasure is to spend the day in delicate living. They are spots and blemishes, luxuriating in their pleasures, while they feast with you. Their eyes are full of adultery, and they are insatiable in sin, alluring unstable souls. With hearts experienced in covetousness, they are children of the curse."

Ver. 10*b*. **τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις. αὐθ.** is to be taken as an epithet of **τολμηταί.** The idea in **τολμ.** is of shameless and irreverent darlng. **αὐθάδεις** (**αὐτὸς** and **ἥδομαι**) = "self-willed," "arrogant". In 1 Tim. i. 7, the **ἐπίσκοπος** must not be **αὐθάδης,** where the thought seems to be of irresponsibility in regard to the community. *Cf.* Didache iii. 6, **μὴ γίνου γόγγυσος· ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν βλασφημίαν· μηδὲ αὐθάδης μηδὲ πονηρόφρων· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων βλασφημίαι γεννῶνται.** The false teachers push forward their views, regardless of consequences. *Cf.* P. Amh. 78, 13 f. (ii. A.D.), **μ[ου] πλεονεκτῖ ἄνθρωπος ἀ(υ)θάδης.** "An audacious man is taking advantage of me." **δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. δόξας** is used of Unseen Powers whether good or evil. How can **βλασφημ.** be used of evil powers? It is obvious that we must find some sense for **βλασφημεῖν** here; and also in Jude 8, that will be applicable to **δόξας,** apart altogether from their moral character. In Plato, *Rep.* 381 E, there occurs a passage dealing with the popular conception of the gods, which holds that they may sometimes change their form, and "in the likeness of wandering strangers, bodied in manifold forms, go roaming from city to city" (*cf.* Homer, *Od.* xvii. 485). By such notions, as taught for example by mothers to their children, men may be said, "**εἰς θεοὺς βλασφημεῖν**". Not only are these a misrepresentation of the Divine, but their tendency is to make light of it, belittle it, detract from its dignity. Some such sense of **βλ.** seems to be required here. The false teachers may have scoffed at the idea both of angelic help, and of diabolic temptation. Their tendency seems to have been to make light of the Unseen, to foster a sense of the unreality both of sin and of goodness, and to reduce the motives of conduct to a vulgar hedonism (*cf.* Mayor's note, p. 74).

Ver. 11. **ὅπου** = "whereas". The interpretation of this verse turns on the meaning of **κατ' αὐτῶν.** Does it refer to the false teachers, or to a distinction between two sets of angels, which finds an illustration in the contest between Michael and Satan for the body of Moses? (Jude, 9). In the latter case **κατ' αὐτῶν** would refer to the fallen angels. Another possible interpretation is that **ἄγγελοι ἰσχύϊ καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες** are a superior class of archangels (Spitta), and **κατ' αὐτῶν** would refer to the **δόξαι** in general. Chase suggests that the reference is to the false teachers, and angels are represented as bringing before the Lord tidings as to the conduct of created beings, whether angels or men (*op. cit.* 797 *b*).

m Use of dat. instead of accus. indicates progress towards extinction of prepp. with three cases (Moulton, *Proleg.* 106). Luke v. 25.

[m] Κυρίῳ βλάσφημον κρίσιν. 12. οὗτοι δέ, ὡς ἄλογα ζῷα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν, ἐν [n] οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται, 13. ἀδικούμενοι [1] μισθὸν ἀδικίας· ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι

n Rom. x. 14, vi. 21, xiv. 21, John xix. 37.

[1] αδικουμενοι ℵ BP, syr[h] + WH; κομιουμενοι ACKLℵ[c], boh., spec., syr[h] + Ti., Treg.

We may note the tendency in 2 Peter exemplified here to put in general terms what Jude states in the particular, in the story of Michael and Satan. The particulars of Jude are omitted (as also the name Enoch afterwards) in order to avoid direct reference to apocryphal writings. Accordingly the sentence, οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν, is only intelligible by reference to Jude 9, where Michael does not himself condemn Satan, but says ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι κύριος. *Cf.* note on βλασφημοῦντες, v. 10.

Ver. 12. γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ—"born creatures of instinct". Instinct is here distinguished from the rational centres of thought and judgment. They are ἄλογα ζῷα. Their chief characteristic is that they are "alive," and have no sense of the moral issues of life. Like animals, they exist εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν. ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες = ἐν τούτοις ἃ . . . "Speaking lightly of things they are ignorant of". Spiritually they are incapable. They know not what they do, in thus clouding moral issues. ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται. Here is a subtle example of the dependence of this epistle upon Jude. In Jude 10, we have ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται, referring to ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς . . . ἐπίστανται. The sense in 2 Peter is confused, and there is no distinction between the two kinds of knowledge, although the intended meaning in both passages is the same. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 5, 6.

Ver. 13. ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας (*cf.* v. 12). This playing upon words is characteristic of 2 Peter, ἀδικεῖν has usually the sense of "doing harm to" (*cf.* Acts xxxv. 10; Galat. iv. 12). Here it would seem to mean "being defrauded of the wages of fraud," or "being done out of the wages of wrong-doing". It has been customary to see in this phrase an illustration of the irresponsible use of words in 2 Peter. "Another example of the author's love of far-fetched and artificial expressions" (Mayor). In P. Eleph., however 27a[24]/ (iii. B.C.), the writers ask for a receipt with reference to a certain business transaction. τούτου δὲ γενομένου ἐσόμεθα οὐκ ἠδικημένοι "this having been arranged, we shall not be defrauded". To this may be added Mayor's citation of Plut. Cato Mi. 17 (p. 766) εὑρὼν χρέα παλαιὰ τῷ δημοσίῳ πολλοὺς ὀφείλοντας καὶ πολλοῖς τὸ δημόσιον, ἅμα τὴν πόλιν ἔπαυσεν ἀδικουμένην καὶ ἀδικοῦσαν. The accusative *rei* after ἀδικ. is very unusual. In classical writers it is found only with ἀδίκημα. μισθὸν ἀδικίας suggests the experience of Balaam, of whom the same expression is used in ver. 15, who never received his promised hire from Balak (Num. xxiv. 11). Death deprives the false teachers of all their reward. For significance of the name "Balaam," in connexion with the false teachers, see Introduction, p. 118. ἡδονὴν in N.T. only in a bad sense, *cf.* Luke viii. 14, Tit. iii. 3, Jas. iv. 1-3. τρυφή only in N.T. in Luke vii. 25 where it is used of "delicate living," a luxurious life, but with no special blame attached. The word is also used of gifts of wisdom in Prov. iv. 9, *cf.* Ps. xxxvi. 8, "the river of thy pleasures". Eden is called παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς, Gen. ii. 15, iii. 13, 24. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ "in the day-time,", 'in broad day-light". σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι, *cf.* Ephes. v. 27, 2 Pet. iii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 19, Jude 12. μῶμος "reproach," "disgrace". *Cf.* Hort. on 1 Pet. i. 19, where he traces the way in which μῶμος and ἄμωμος, came to be used with superficial meaning of "blemish," *cf.* Ephes. i. 4, v. 27, Heb. ix. 14. ἐντρυφῶντες: "to be luxurious," *cf.* Xen. *Hell.* iv. 1, 30. ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν: to be taken with ἐντρυφ. ἀπάτη is a favourite word of Hermas (*Mand.* viii. 5) and is frequently joined by him with τρυφή (*Mand.* xi. 12 and throughout *Parable* 6). According to Deissmann, ἀπάτη in popular Hellenistic has the meaning "pleasure". *Cf.* Matt. xiii. 22 = Mark iv. 19 (Luke viii. 14), (see his *Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheis-*

ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις [1] αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν, 14. ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς [o] μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους [2] [p] ἁμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους, καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην [p] πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα· 15. καταλείποντες εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν ἐπλανήθησαν, ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ τοῦ Βόσορ [3]

o Matt. x. 10, Heb. iii. 1, Eph. ii. 12.
p 1 Peter iv. 1, Jas. i. 13.
q Heb. iii. 12.

[1] **απαταις** ℵACKLP, syr^h (mg. **αγαπαις**), WH, Ti.; **αγαπαις** A²B, sah., syr^p + Treg., WHm. At first sight it would seem probable that 2 Peter has misread **ἀγαπαις** in Jude 12. Confusion is common in MSS. of O.T. between **ἀγαπαω** and **ἀπαταω, ἀγαπη** and **ἀπατη** (*e.g.*, Ps. lxxviii. 36). Yet **ἀπατη, ἀπαταω** has been proved to be the correct reading in many cases. **αὐτων** here is an argument in its favour. Nestle (*op. cit.* pp. 324 ff.) and Zahn (*op. cit.* ii. p. 235 f.) argue strongly for **αγαπαις** and omission of **υμιν** (**συνευωχουμενοι** = "feasting with one another") (Mayor, *Ed.* cxcvii).

[2] **ακαταπαυστους** ℵCKLP, 13, 31, Ti., Treg.; **ακαταπαστους** AB, WH. The latter reading "may have originated in a faulty pronunciation on the part of the reader, or the **υ** may have been accidentally omitted at the end of the line, as in B, where one line ends with **πα-** and the next begins with **-στους**" (Mayor, *Ed.* cxcvii. *cf.* Moulton, *Proleg.* p. 47).

[3] **Βοσορ** ℵ^cACKLP, boh., syr^h, Ti., Treg.; **Βεωρ** B, syr^p, sah., WH, Weiss; **Βεωορσορ** ℵ. There can be little doubt that **Βοσορ** is the correct reading. The reading of ℵ is manifestly due to a combination of **Βοσορ** and a marginal correction **-εωρ**. Zahn. (*op. cit.* ii. p. 292) says that everywhere in LXX, Josephus, Philo, only the forms **Βεορ** or **Βαιορ** occur, and that **Βοσορ** is inexplicable except as a mistake on the part of 2 Peter due to "imperfect pronunciation or defective hearing". Nestle, however (*op. cit.* p. 244), after Holmes-Parsons, cites **υιον του Βοσορ** in the Georgian version of Jos. xiii. 22. **Βοσορ** also occurs as name of a place in Deut. iv. 43, 1 Sam. xxx. 9, 1 Macc. v. 26. "The support of the ordinary name by B against the other MSS. may be compared with its support of **Σιμων** against **Συμεων** in i. 1" (Mayor, *Ed.* cxcviii.).

mus, (*Neue Jahrb. f. d. Klass. Altertum*, 1903), p. 165, n. 5).

Ver. 14. **ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας.** For use of genitive with this verb, *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 1. See Grammatical Note. **δελεάζοντες.** *Cf.* v. 18 and Mayor's note on Jas. i. 14, "entice or catch by a bait". **κατάρας τέκνα.** *Cf.* **τέκνα ὑπακοῆς**, 1 Pet. i. 14.

Vv. 15, 16. *Example of Balaam.* "They have left the straight way and wandered from it, having followed the way of Balaam, who loved the ways of wickedness, and was rebuked for his transgression, when a dumb ass spoke with a man's voice, and forbade the infatuation of the prophet."

Ver. 15. **τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ.** The comparison of the conduct of the False Teachers to that of Balaam is significant as determining their character and motive (see Introduction, pp. 207 ff.). The writer of 2 Peter takes the miraculous narrative in Numbers xxii. 21-35 literally. It is no disparagement of the value of the illustration that we, in our day, can no longer do so. Balaam had the gift of real spiritual vision. He is described in Numbers xxiv. 36 as one "whose eye was closed," *i.e.* to outer things, and also as one "which seeth the vision of the Almighty, falling down and having his eyes open," *i.e.* to spiritual vision. Balaam was one who allowed the greed of gain to become stronger than the prophetic impulse. He is conscious that he is tempting God, and an evil conscience makes him irritable. He fears lest God may yet interfere to rob him of his reward. When the ass starts aside he beats it, but ultimately his passion is subdued by the momentary triumph of his higher spiritual instincts, when he begins to suspect that in the stubbornness of the animal there is really the power of God exercised to hinder him in his course. The angel with the drawn sword is often the form that men's religion takes who are disobeying the voice of conscience. "There is a strange depth of meaning in the appealing eye of an ill-treated animal. It is an appeal, in the first place, to whatever remnant of pity and generosity may still survive in the heart of the man who ill-treats it, but it is an appeal, in the second place, to the

ὃς μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν, 16. ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν ἰδίας παρανομίας· ὑποζύγιον ἄφωνον ἐν ἀνθρώπου φωνῇ φθεγξάμενον ἐκώλυσεν τὴν τοῦ προφήτου παραφρονίαν. 17. οὗτοί εἰσιν πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι καὶ ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. 18. ὑπέρογκα γὰρ ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι δελεάζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκὸς ἀσελγείαις τοὺς ὀλίγως[1] ἀποφεύγοντας τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους, 19. ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι,

[1] **ολιγως** ABℵc, vg., syrr., sah., boh., Treg., Ti., WH; **οντως** ℵCKLP; **οντως** would require aor.; **αποφυγοντας** ("clean escaped" A.V.), read by KLP. In the MSS. **οντως** is hardly distinguishable from **ολιγως** (Mayor, *Ed.* cxcviii.).

justice of the God who made them both, a cry of which we may be sure it has entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. When animals are put to unnecessary suffering, either in the shambles or as beasts of burden, or in the interests of science or sport, or for any other reason, cases are sure to arise in which we may justly apply the words of our Epistle, and say of such poor tortured creatures that with their dying gaze, no less clearly than if they had spoken with man's voice, they forbade the madness of their torturers" (Mayor, p. 203). *Cf.* F. W. Robertson, *Sermons*, *Ser.* iv. pp. 40 f.

Ver. 16. **ἔλεγξιν δὲ ἔσχεν**, a periphrasis for the passive of **ἐλέγχω**, = "was rebuked". **ἰδίας παρανομίας**, emphatic, "his own transgression". Two interpretations of **ἰδίας** are possible. (1) The **παρανομ.** is a characteristic trait in Balaam (Keil. Weiss). (2) As prophet, Belaam was expected to do and teach God's law. He whose duty it is to rebuke others is himself rebuked for his own transgression" (Hundhausen, Wiesinger). **παρανομία** = "a particular transgression" as distinct from **ἀνομία** = "disobedience in general". **παραφρονίαν**, "infatuation". Balaam is proceeding against what he knows to be the Divine will.

Vv. 17-19. *The Libertines are themselves slaves.* "They are like waterless wells, and mists that the wind disperses. For them is reserved the fate of gloomy darkness. They utter ponderous nothings, and allure through their lusts those who were just escaping from the temptations of heathen life. Promising freedom to others, they are themselves slaves of corruption. Every one is a slave to that which has mastered him."

Ver. 17. **πηγαὶ . . . ἐλαυνόμεναι.** It is interesting to compare the expressions in 2 Peter here with Jude 12. It would appear as though he had felt that **νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι** was a contradiction in terms, and instead he substituted **πηγαί**. **λαίλαπος** is a strong expression = "gale," a "storm of wind". *Cf.* Mk. iv. 37, Lk. viii. 23. **οἷς ὁ ζόφος . . . τετήρηται** is somewhat out of place here, and is used appropriately of meteors in Jude 13.

Ver. 18. **ὑπέρογκα.** *Cf.* Jude 16. No doubt the reference is to the use of Gnostic terms. **ματαιότης**, used specially of moral insincerity. *Cf.* **ματαίας ἀναστροφῆς**, "heartless conduct," 1 P. i. 18. There is no corresponding reality behind their words. **σαρκὸς**, to be taken with **ἀσελγείαις**, which is in apposition to **ἐπιθυμίαις**. **τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας**: "those who are just escaping"; who have been impressed with Christian truth, and have had strength to separate themselves from their old surroundings and customs; but are led to return through the compromises suggested by the false teachers. The phenomenon is not uncommon in all missionary work, of men who have escaped from "Gentile vices, but are not yet established in Christian virtues" (Bigg). **τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους** = governed by **ἀποφεύγοντας**: "(escaping from) those who live in error"; *i.e.* from their old heathen companionships. "There is great passion in the words. Grandiose sophistry is the hook, filthy lust is the bait, with which these men catch those whom the Lord had delivered, or was delivering" (Bigg).

Ver. 19. **ἐλευθερίαν.** Doubtless that Antinomianism is indicated to which the doctrine of Grace has ever been open. *Cf.* Galat. v. 13. It arises from the ever-recurring confusion of liberty and license. The training of conscience is contemporaneous with the growth of Christian character. The Pauline teaching, which abrogated external legality, was open to

αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς· ᾧ γάρ τις ἥττηται, τούτῳ [r] δεδούλωται. 20. εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν [s] ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις [r] δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττῶνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. 21. κρεῖττον γὰρ [s] ἦν αὐτοῖς [t] μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς· 22. συμβέβηκεν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς

r Acts xi. 17 (Rec.).
s Rom. ix. 3, 2 Cor. xii. 11, Matt. xxv. 27, xxvi. 9, 24, Arist. *Nub.* 1215, Xen. *Anab.* 7. 7. 40.
t Luke xvii. 1 (*om.* (?) τοῦ ξ).

abuse, and might easily be dangerous to recent converts from heathenism. **φθορᾶς.** See Mayor's note, ed. p. 175. **φθορά** is that gradual decay of spiritual and moral sense that follows on wilful self-indulgence. **ᾧ γάρ . . . δεδούλωται.** *Cf.* Rom. vi. 16, viii. 21, John viii. 34.

Vv. 20-23. *The consequences of falling away.* "The case of their victims is a serious one. They have escaped from the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and are once more entangled and worsted by these. Their last state becomes worse than the first. It were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than in spite of such knowledge, to depart from the holy commandment committed to them. They illustrate the truth of the proverb: 'the dog that turned back to his own vomit, and the sow that went to bathe to wallowing in the mud'."

Ver. 20. Here, again, **γὰρ** loosely introduces the subject of the victims allured by the false teachers away from their former faith. **τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου.** (Lev. vii. 8, Jer. xxxix. 34), occurs only here in N.T. In LXX the word seems to have a technical religious sense, the profanation of flesh by ordinary use which is set apart for sacrifice. This sense lingers here. The body is sacred to God, and to give licentious rein to the passions is **μίασμα.** *Cf.* **μιασμός**, v. 10, and **μιαίνω**, Jude 8. **τοῦ κόσμου** is the world in the sense of the heathen society and its practises. **ἐπιγνώσει.** See note on i. 2. **τούτοις** is governed by **ἐμπλακέντες** = "entangled by these". *Cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 4. **γέγονεν αὐτοῖς, κ.τ.λ.** *Cf.* Matt. xii. 45, Luke xi. 26, and Heb. vi. 4-8, x. 26.

Ver. 21. **ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης.** Also called "the way of truth," ii. 2, "the straight way," ii. 15. **ἐντολῆς.** Elsewhere in N.T. the singular is used to mean a particular precept. *Cf.* Rom. vii. 12, 1 Tim. vi. 14. It is characteristic of this writer to emphasise the aspect of Christianity, not only as faith, but as the moral law **ἁγίας ἐντολῆς.** *Cf.* i. 5. **ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν.** A strong ethical note pervades the teaching of 2 Peter.

Ver. 22. **τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας**: "the content of the true proverb" has been "verified," or "realised" in their case. The first proverb is found in Prov. xxvi. 11. The second is apparently not derived from a Hebrew source. Both are quoted familiarly in an abbreviated form (*cf.* WM. p. 443). The interpretation of the second is an exegetical crux. Bigg takes **λουσαμένη** = "having bathed itself in mud". The sense is, "not that the creature has washed itself clean in water (so apparently the R.V.), still less that it has been washed clean (as A.V.), and then returns to the mud; but that having once bathed in filth it never ceases to delight in it". This, however, is to force the meaning of **λουσαμένη**, which is consistently used of washing with water. Again, the *point* of the proverb is to illustrate **τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων.** The dupes of the false teachers were cleansed and returned to pollution.

The question is important whether **λουσαμένη** is Middle or Passive? Dr. Rendel Harris (*Story of Aḥikar*, p. lxvii.) may have discovered the original proverb in the following, appearing in some texts of Aḥikar. "My son, thou hast behaved like the swine which *went to the bath* with people of quality, and when he came out, saw a stinking drain, and went and rolled himself in it". If this be the source of the **παροιμία**, **λ.** is Middle (Moulton, *Proleg.* pp. 238-39).

A friend of my own, with a knowledge of animals, tells me that the pig is often washed in certain forms of dishealth, to open the pores of the skin. The animal, being unprotected by hair, finds the sun's heat disagreeable, and wallows again in the mud for coolness. The dried mud protects the skin from the rays. **βόρβορος** found only here and in

u Luke xx. 25, Jas. iv. 1 Cor. vii. 33. v Mid.? Matt. xxvii. 5. a For this use of so-called epexegetical infinitive see Moulton, *Proleg.* pp. 203-204. b Col. iii. 16, 2 Cor. vii. 5, ix. 10, Phil. i. 29.

[u] παροιμίας, Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα, καί Ὗς [v] λουσαμένη εἰς κυλισμὸν βορβόρου.

III. 1. Ταύτην ἤδη, ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν, 2. [a] μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, 3. τοῦτο πρῶτον [b] γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευό-

Jer. xxxviii. 6. *Cf.* Acta Thomae, 53. **εἶδον βόρβορον . . . καὶ ψυχὰς ἐκεῖ κυλιομένας.** In the *Legends of Pelagia*, which, though late, are written in good vernacular Greek, both noun and corresponding verb are found. **ἐλθοῦσα περιστερὰ μελάνη καὶ βεβορβορωμένη περιεπέτατό μοι, καὶ τὴν δυσωδίαν τοῦ βορβόρου αὐτῆς οὐκ ἠδυνάμην φέρειν.** (*Die Pelag. Legend.*, ed. Usener, p. 21). Bishop Wordsworth suggested that the double proverb is an inexact quotation of two iambic lines—

εἰς ἴδιον ἐξέραμ᾽ ἐπιστρέψας κύων
λελουμένη θ᾽ ὗς εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου.

If he is right, 2 Pet. cannot be charged with the use of the two rare words, **βορβόρου** and **ἐξέραμα.** Bigg suggests (ed., p. 228) that the Proverbs of Solomon had been unified by some Jewish paraphrast, and this one of the pig added to the canonical collection.

CHAPTER III.—Vv. 1-4. *Prophets and apostles have warned us that delay will lead to denial of the Second Advent.*

"I am now writing my second letter to you. In both I seek to rouse you to honest reflection on the words formerly spoken by the holy prophets, and on the commandment of our Lord delivered by your missionaries. Especially realise the truth of their warning, that there will come in the last days scoffers, with scoffing questions, walking after their own lusts, and saying, 'Where is the promise of His appearing? For,' say they, 'from the time the fathers fell asleep, everything remains as it has been from the beginning of creation'."

Ver. 1. For **ἤδη** with numeral, *cf.* John xxi. 14. **δευτέραν ἐπιστολήν.** Does this refer to 1 Peter? See Introduction, p. 205. **ἐν αἷς**: "in both of which," *constructio ad sensum.* **διεγείρω . . . ὑπομνήσει**: *cf.* i. 13. **εἰλικρινῆ**: *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 8, 2 Cor. i. 12, ii. 17, Phil. i. 10. **εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν** is a technical philosophic term used by Plato. *Phaed.* 66 A = "pure reason," such as the geometer employs. In *Phaed.* 81 C, **εἰλικρινὴς ψυχή** is opposed to **ψ. μεμιασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος.** 2 Peter here cannot be acquitted of a confusion in the use of philosophic terms, probably picked up loosely in conversation. At the same time, **διάνοια** is also used in the philosophic sense of **ψυχή** in Gen. xvii. 17, Deut. vi. 5, Num. xv. 39; also in N.T. Coloss. i. 21, 1 Pet. i. 13. **εἰλικρινής** is of doubtful etymology, and signifies ethical purity, a mind uncontaminated and unwarped by sensual passion. The opposite state is described in Plato, *Phaed.* 81, "She thinks nothing true, but what is bodily, and can be touched and seen, and eaten and drunk, and used for men's lusts".

Ver. 2. Borrowed from Jude 17. **μνησθῆναι**: epexegetical infinitive. See grammatical note. **καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων, κ.τ.λ.** Double possessive genitive "of the Lord's command delivered by your apostles". Chase (*op. cit.* p. 811 *a*) suggests that **διά** should be inserted after **τῆς**, and compares the title of the Didache, **διδαχὴ κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.** **ἐντολή** = teaching of our Lord on the fulfilment of the moral law, *cf.* ii. 21, John xii. 50. **ἀποστόλων**: Are the Twelve meant? *cf.* Introd. pp. 195-6. Probably **ἀπ.** signifies just those from whom they received the first knowledge of the gospel, accredited missionaries of the Church. The word is used of Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 25, and of other than apostles, 2 Cor. viii. 23.

Ver. 3. **τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες.** Accusative is required, but all MSS. have nominative, *cf.* Jude 18. **ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν.** Mockers are one of the signs of the approach of the end, *cf.* 1 John ii. 18. **ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται:**

μενοι, 4. καὶ λέγοντες Ποῦ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας [c] αὐτοῦ; ἀφ' ἧς γὰρ οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως [d] διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. 5. λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο θέλοντας ὅτι οὐρανοὶ ἦσαν ἔκπαλαι καὶ γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ [e] λόγῳ· 6. δι' ὧν ὁ τότε κόσμος ὕδατι κατακλυσθεὶς ἀπώλετο·

c 1 John ii. 12 2 John 6.
d John xv. 27, viii. 58, 1 John iii. 8, Jer. i. 5, Ps. lxxxix. 2.
e Rom. iii. 24, Eph. ii. 8.

ἐμπαίκτης is an unclassical form, *cf.* Mark xv. 20. This verse is not part of the prophetic or apostolic message of ver. 2, but a particular caution of the writer, based on Jude.

Ver. 4. **ποῦ ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.** The coming of our Lord in the near future was evidently an integral part of the apostolic teaching, *cf.* i. 16. "There is no sure evidence that Jesus sought to undermine the assumption of His followers, that the final glory would be manifested in their day; and even this we may fairly qualify with the remembrance that a main motive of the principal eschatological discourse, reported by the Synoptists, is to warn the disciples against premature expectations" (J.H. Muirhead, *Eschatology of Jesus.* pp. 126, 127). **τῆς παρουσίας**: See note on i. 16. **ἀφ' ἧς γάρ, κ.τ.λ.** "The fathers," must mean those of the preceding generation, in whose life-time the **παρουσία** was expected. **οὕτως**=*in statu quo*. **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως**, *i.e.*, "contrary to all previous human experience". The Teaching of our Lord Himself in one aspect would imply that the actual **παρουσία**, would be attended with no outward previous disturbance of life to act as a warning. Men would be engaged in their ordinary occupations and pleasures (Matt. xxiv. 36-42). The development and ripening of the moral and spiritual issues of men's lives are often not outwardly apparent (*cf.* Paget's "*Studies in the Christian Character*,"—"*The Hidden Issues*," pp. 89 ff).

Vv. 5-7. *The first part of the argument against the scoffers.* "It is not true that the course of the world is unchanging. They have wilfully forgotten that the heavens existed originally, and the earth was formed out of water, and by means of water, by the Word of God. By this very water and Word the world, as it then was, was overwhelmed and perished. The present heavens and earth, by the same Word, are treasured up for fire, being reserved for the day when impious men shall meet their doom and destruction."

Ver. 5. **λανθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο.** "This escapes their notice." **τοῦτο** is nominative. **θέλοντας**: "wilfully" "of their own purpose". **ἔκπαλαι** (*cf.* note, ii. 3): "originally," *i.e.* before the creation of the world. The Rabbinical school of Shammai held that Gen. i. 1, **ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν** meant that the heaven was in existence before the six days' work, *i.e.* **ἔκπαλαι**. Perhaps this notion is present here. **ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος.** Two kinds of water are meant. The first may refer to the primeval watery chaos—"the face of the waters" (Gen. i. 2). The second is perhaps connected with the formation of the dry land by "the gathering together of the waters into one place" (Gen. i. 9). But the meaning is obscure (*cf.* Mayor, ed. lxxxiii.; Chase, *op. cit.* 797). **συνεστῶσα**="was formed". *Cf.* Philo, i. p. 330. **ἐκ γῆς καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἀέρος καὶ πυρὸς συνέστη ὅδε ὁ κόσμος.** The above interpretation is in substantial agreement with Alford's, who distinguishes "the waters above the firmament," and "the fountains of the great deep". The Hebrew had no notion of evaporation. The rivers run into the sea, and the water returns subterraneously to their sources again (Eccles. i. 7).

Ver. 6. **δι' ὧν.** Mayor and Schmeidel, against the evidence of nearly all manuscripts, read **δι' ὅν.**. This is rendered unnecessary (1) if the above rendering of **ἐξ ὕδατος κ.τ.λ.** is taken, and the plural **δι' ὧν** refers to the two waters. **δι' ὅν** would refer to **λόγῳ** alone, or (2) if **δι' ὧν** refers to **ὑδάτων** and **λόγῳ** taken together, which would in some ways suit the sense of the whole passage better. The false teachers had ignored the agency of the Divine word. **κατακλυσθείς**; **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.; found several times in P.Tebt. *e.g.* 54[17] *ff* (B.C. 86) [**ὥστε**] . . . **συμβεβηκότων κατακλυσθῆναι.** "So that in consequence of what happened, it was flooded"; 56[8] *f* (late ii. B.C.) **γείν[ωσ]κε δὲ περὶ τοῦ κατακεκλύσθαι τὸ πεδίον** "but know about our plain having been inundated".

7. οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ τῷ αὐτῷ[1] λόγῳ τεθησαυρισμένοι εἰσὶν πυρὶ τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως καὶ ἀπωλείας τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. 8. Ἓν δὲ τοῦτο μὴ λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι μία ἡμέρα παρὰ Κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. 9. οὐ βραδύνει Κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται, ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ βουλόμενός τινας ἀπολέσθαι ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν χωρῆσαι. 10. Ἥξει δὲ [f] ἡμέρα Κυρίου ὡς

f WM. iii. § xix. 2 (b).

[1] τῳ αυτῳ ABP, vulg., sah., boh., WH, Ti.; τῳ αυτου ℵCKL, syrr., Treg.

Ver. 7. **πυρὶ τηρούμενοι.** According to the Jewish conception of the rainbow promise, water would not again be the destructive agency. The heaven and the earth are reserved for destruction by fire. **τεθησαυρισμένοι**: "set apart for". The writer means that both the rainbow promise and the delay are not to be regarded as implying that there will be no more great cosmical changes.

The idea of the association of a great cosmical change with the coming of Christ is an interesting one. It involves the question of our environment when the natural is exchanged for the spiritual body. This writer evidently expects not complete annihilation of the present environment, but a "new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (v. 13). St. Paul speaks of "the deliverance of the creation itself from the bondage of corruption into the glory of the liberty of the children of God". "We are not informed as to the nature of our future environment, yet it must be such as to satisfy all the longings, and give scope for all the activities of a perfected humanity" (Mayor, ed. p. 207. See also his most interesting and suggestive note: "*Answer to the objection that no change is possible in the material universe*"; and with whole passage, vv. 5-7, *cf.* Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies*, p. 24.)

Vv. 8-10. *A further argument to explain the apparent delay.* "One thing beloved, you must not forget. The sense of the duration of time in the Divine Mind is not the same as in the human. One day is the same to God as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. God must not be judged as slack by human standards, in the fulfilment of His promise. He is better than the promise. He is long-suffering to usward, not willing that some should perish, but that all should come to repentance. We know not when His long-suffering will be exhausted. The day of the Lord will come as a thief. Then the heavens will pass away with hurtling noise, and the elements being burned, shall pass away, and the earth and the works of men contained in it, will be made manifest."

Ver. 8. **μία ἡμέρα, κ.τ.λ.** *Cf.* Ps. xl. 4. The literal application of this statement to the story of creation, employed by patristic writers, in which one day is interpreted as 1000 years, and therefore the creation in six days really means 6000 years, is of course absurd. On the other hand, it can scarcely be said that the writer of 2 Peter has attained to the conception that the category of time does not exist for the Divine Mind. Rather the meaning is that infinite compassion overrides in the Divine Mind all finite reckoning. *Cf.* Barnabas, 15, Justin, *Dialogue*, 81.

Ver. 9. **οὐ βραδύνει . . . ἡγοῦνται.** The idea that is combated is that God has made a promise and has not kept it, He is, however, better than His promise. The additional element of His **μακροθυμία** is brought into play. God is greater than men's conception of Him, especially if theirs is a mechanical view of the universe.—**ὥς τινες βραδύτητα ἡγοῦνται.** As nowhere else in the Epistle, here the writer of 2 Peter enables us to view the summit of the Christian Faith, and to rise to a magnificent conception of God. **μὴ βουλόμενός, κ.τ.λ.** Delay does not spring from an unwillingness or impotence to perform. His will is not even that "some" should perish, though that is regarded by the writer as inevitable. Are we to see here opposition in the writer's mind to the purely logical interpretation of the Pauline teaching on Predestination? Some will perish, but it is not His Will. His Will is that all should come to repentance. The goodness of God should lead to repentance.

Ver. 10. **ἡμέρα Κυρίου.** No distinction is made between the Day of the Lord, and the Coming of Christ. This is remarkable, as excluding any idea of mil-

κλέπτης, ἐν ᾗ οἱ οὐρανοὶ ῥοιζηδὸν [g] παρελεύσονται, στοιχεῖα δὲ καυσούμενα λυθήσεται, καὶ γῆ καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἔργα εὑρεθήσεται.[1] 11. Τούτων οὖν πάντων λυομένων ποταποὺς δεῖ ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς

g John xix. 31, Rev. xxi. 12, 1 Tim. v. 25, Luke xxiv. 11, Xen. *Anab.* 1, 7, 17.

[1] ευρεθησεται ℵBKP, syrp; ουχ ευρεθησεται sah.; κατακαησεται AL, syrh, Ti.; καυθησεται vel.; κατακαυθησονται al.; αφανισθησονται C; om. και γη . . . ευρεθησεται vulg.; om. ευρεθησεται spec. Both Nestle and Mayor agree in suggesting the passive of a compound of ρεω (καταρυησεται or διαρρυησεται. I am indebted to Professor J. H. Moulton for the information that the late Henry Bradshaw, of Cambridge, suggested the reading εργα αργα ευρεθησεται. As against this, and in favour of the text as it stands, we have 2 Clem. xvi. 3, which seems to be a paraphrase of this passage. καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὡς μόλυβδος ἐπὶ πυρὶ τηκόμενος, καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ κρύφια καὶ φανερὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

lenarian teaching, which speedily made its appearance in the Early Church. **ὡς κλέπτης**, *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 2, Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39, Apoc. iii. 3, xvi. 15. That day will surprise those who are clinging to the idea that no change is possible. **ῥοιζηδὸν**, onomatopoetic, expressing the sound produced by rapid motion through the air, *e.g.*, flight of a bird, or an arrow. It is also used of the sound of a shepherd's pipe. No doubt the sound of a fierce flame is meant. "It is used of thunder in Luc. *Jup. Trag.* 1; of the music of the spheres in Iamblich, *Vit. Pyth.* c. 15; Oecumenius says the word is especially used of the noise caused by a devouring flame" (Mayor, *ed.* p. 157). **στοιχεῖα.** Spitta interprets στ. as being the spirits that preside over the various parts of nature. But the situation of στ. between γῆ and οὐρανοὶ makes it practically certain that the heavenly bodies are meant. The universe consists of οὐρανοί, στοιχεῖα and γῆ. οὐρανοὶ is the vault of heaven, "the skies". στ. would therefore mean sun, moon and stars. *Cf.* Justin. *Apol.* ii. 5, *Trypho.* 23. *Cf.* Isa. xxxiv. 4, Joel ii. 30, 31, Matt. xxiv. 29, Apoc. vi. 12-14 in illustration of the Jewish belief that the stars will share in the final destruction of the Last Day. **καυσούμενα.** A medical term, used of the heat of fever (καῦσος). This is the only known use of the word applied to inanimate objects. Whether the writer of 2 Peter has here indulged a fondness for unusual words, or whether καυσόομαι was ever used in other than a medical sense in the Κοινή, it is impossible as yet to say. In any case it denotes a violent consuming heat. **εὑρεθήσεται.** The only alternative reading that is worthy of notice in connexion with this difficult passage is κατακαήσεται, but one would expect a word expressing dissolution, like παρελεύσονται, or λυθήσεται. εὑρεθήσεται is found in an absolute sense in Clement, *Cor.* ix. 3 (of Enoch) οὐχ εὑρέθη αὐτοῦ θάνατος, "his death was not brought to light". In 2 Clem. xvi. (see textual note) φανήσεται is the paraphrase of εὑρεθήσεται (*cf.* Introd. pp. 182 f.).

Vv. 11-16. *The ethical value of the Parousia expectation.* "Seeing then that all these things are to be dissolved, how great an effect it ought to exercise on our whole moral and religious life, as we look forward to and hasten the coming of the day of God. The skies shall be set on fire and dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fiercest heat, but we look for new skies and a new earth according to His promise, in which righteousness shall find a home. Wherefore, beloved, with such expectations, endeavour to be found in peace, spotless and blameless. Do not reckon the long-suffering of our Lord as an opportunity for licence, but as a means of salvation, as our beloved brother Paul wrote you in the wisdom granted to him. He indeed spoke in all his letters of these things, in which there are some things hard to be understood, which ignorant and unstable persons wrest, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction."

Ver. 11. **λυομένων.** Present used for a future. Mayor translates "are in process of dissolution," as though the principle of φθορά were already at work; but this is a conception foreign to the mind of the writer, who uses it only in a moral significance. Nature is "reserved" (θησαυρίζεσθαι) for destruction. Dissolution is the goal in sight. **ποταπούς.** "What sort of men." A later form of ποδαπός. **ὑπάρχειν** implies not merely existence, but existential character. **ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις.** The use

ἐν ἁγίαις ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ εὐσεβείαις, 12. προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, δι' ἣν οὐρανοὶ πυρούμενοι λυθήσονται καὶ στοιχεῖα καυσούμενα τήκεται. 13. καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινὴν κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ. 14. Διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα προσδοκῶντες σπουδάσατε ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι [h] αὐτῷ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 15. καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν, 16. ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις[1]

h 2 Cor. xii. 20.

[1] πασαις ταις ℵKLP, Ti.; om. ταις ABC, Treg., WH, Weiss.

of the plural in cases of abstract nouns is peculiar to the writer and to 1 Peter. He emphasises once more the close connexion between morality and religion.

Ver. 12. **σπεύδοντας.** Either (1) "earnestly desiring," *cf.* Isa. xvi. 5, **σπεύδων δικαιοσύνην**, or (2) preferably, "hastening the coming". "The Church may be said to bring the day nearer when it prays, 'Thy kingdom come'" (Bigg). The writer is here referring to the Jewish idea that the sins of men prevented Messiah from appearing. "Si Judaei poenitentiam facerent una die, statim veniret Messias, filius David."

The words are capable of a still more spiritual meaning, which, however, is rather beyond the consciousness of this writer. The kingdom of God is "within" us, and Christians may be said to hasten this coming by holiness of life. Christian conduct is itself both a rebuke to vice and a realisation of the presence of Christ in the hearts of His disciples.

τήκεται. Again present for future. The phrases in this verse are repeated from ver. 10 in order to introduce the more impressively the idea in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. **καινοὺς δὲ οὐρανοὺς . . . προσδοκῶμεν.** *Cf.* Isa. lxv. 17. **ἔσται γὰρ ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινή.** Enoch xci. 16. See note on ver. 7. **οὐρανός** might appropriately be translated "sky". **ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ**; "wherein righteousness dwells," or "has its home". In the word there is both the sense of permanence and of persuasive influence. Both in the hearts of men, and the new environment, there will be nothing that militates against righteousness. The Parousia is both judgment on the wicked and triumph for the kingdom. *Cf.* v. 7.

Ver. 14. **ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι αὐτῷ. αὐτῷ** is dative = "in relation to Him," or "in His sight". *Cf.* Rom. vii. 10. **εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον**; Ephes. i. 4, **εἶναι ἁμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ.** For **ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι**, *cf.* note on v. 13. **ἀμώμητος** occurs in *Epistle of Aristeas* (ed. Wendland), with reference to sacrificial victims. **ἐν εἰρήνῃ.** Peace and righteousness are one. *Cf.* Ps. lxxxv. 10. The "well-doers" will be able to meet the Parousia with calm expectation.

Ver. 15. **καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου . . . ἡγεῖσθε.** *Cf.* v. 9. The Divine long-suffering is capable of interpretation as "slackness," or as opportunity for license instead of as **σωτηρίαν**, an opportunity for repentance. **καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἀγαπητὸς . . . ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν.** The interpretation here largely depends on (1) whether the reference of **καθὼς** is confined to the idea in the first clause of the verse, or (2) is to be extended to include **ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι . . . εἰρήνῃ** in ver. 14, or (3) is still further extended to include the whole treatment of moral disorder arising from delayed Parousia. In the case of (1) Romans would be the most appropriate among the known canonical epistles. In that epistle the idea of God's long-suffering is most prominent (*cf.* ii. 4, iii. 25, 26, ix. 22, 23, xi. 22, 23). (2) Almost any of St. Paul's epistles might be meant. (3) If the question of moral disorder arising from difficulties about the **παρουσία** is placed in the foreground, "none of the existing Pauline Epistles can be in question except 1 Corinthians (in this Church there were very similar extravagances, and the Resurrection was by some denied) and Thessalonians" (Bigg). A decision on this point involves the discussion on the destination of the epistle, for which see Introduction, pp. 205 f. (*cf.* Zahn., *Introd.* ii., pp. 211-2). **ὁ ἀγαπητὸς . . . Παῦλος** need not imply that Paul was alive. **κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 10, Gal. ii. 9, 1 Cor. iii. 66, Col. i. 28.

Ver. 16. **ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ταῖς**

ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν [i] αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.

i Acts ii. 8, Tit. i. 12.

17. Ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῇ

ἐπιστολαῖς. This statement implies neither the inclusion of all the epistles that have come down to us, nor the formation of a canon. It is much more natural to take it as referring to a collection of letters made not long after Paul's death, and read in the churches. The term **ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν ἀδελφὸς** in ver. 15 would seem to refer to one whose memory is still quite fresh in the hearts of the readers. **λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων**: "where he touches on these subjects" (Mayor). **περὶ τούτων** indicates a widening of the reference to include Paul's treatment of the whole question of the Second Coming. The mention of Paul's name here implies a desire on the part of the writer to show that on this point the Pauline and Petrine teaching are at one. The false teachers founded their Antinomian doctrine on Paul's teaching about the Grace of God. **ἐν αἷς, κ.τ.λ.** This clearly involves that a collection of letters is meant. **δυσνόητά τινα.** "What are the **δυσνόητά** referred to? "Probably St. Paul's doctrine of God's free grace (Rom. iii. 5-8), with his apparent disparagement of the law in Rom. iii. 20-28, iv. 15, v. 20, vi. 4, vii. 4-11; his teaching with regard to the **πνευματικοί**, 1 Cor. i. 15; with regard to the strong, whom he seems to justify in their neglect of the rule made at the Apostolic Council, as to **εἰδωλόθυτα** (Acts xv. 29; Rom. 14; 1 Cor. viii., x. 25); as regards the Resurrection in baptism (Rom. vi. 3-11; Col. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 12); perhaps as regards predestination (Rom. ix. 11-21), and the Parousia (2 Th. ii.)" (Mayor). **οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι.** **ἀμαθής** is not used elsewhere in the N.T. It signifies not so much "unlearned" as "uneducated"; a mind untrained and undisciplined in habits of thought, lacking in the moral qualities of a balanced judgment. **ἀστήρικτοι** refers more to conduct, those whose habits are not fully trained and established. The reference of **ἀμ. καὶ ἀστηρ.** is of course not to the Libertines, but to a class among the readers. In ver. 17 **στηριγμός** is used of the readers, in distinction to the False Teachers, who are called **ἀθέσμων**. **στρεβλοῦσιν**: of persons, "to torture," of things, "to wrest" or "twist".

ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς. (1) There has been much discussion among commentators as to the meaning of **γραφάς**. Spitta takes **γραφάς** in sense of "writings," and concludes that these were by companions of the Apostle Paul; but this is a very unusual sense of **γραφή** unless the name of an author is given. Mayor and others interpret as the O.T. Scriptures; while some who are prepared to assign a late date in the second century to the epistle, think that both Old and New Testament Scriptures are meant. On every ground the hypothesis of **γραφάς** = O.T. Scriptures is to be preferred. (2) The difficulty in connexion with the meaning of **γραφάς** is largely occasioned by the phrase **τὰς λοιπὰς γρ.** Does this mean that the Epistles of St. Paul are regarded as Scripture? Attempts have been made (*e.g.*, by Dr. Bigg) to cite classical and other parallels that would justify the sense for **τὰς λοιπάς**, "the Scriptures as well". In these, certain idiomatic uses of **ἄλλος** and other words are referred to, but no real parallel to this sense of **λοιπός** can be found, and the connexion implied in **λοιπός** is closer than **ἄλλος**. The result of the whole discussion is practically to compel us to take **τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς** in the obvious sense "the rest of the Scriptures," and we cannot escape the conclusion that the Epistles of Paul are classed with these. The intention of the author of 2 Peter seems to be to regard the Pauline Epistles, or those of them that he knew, as **γραφαί**, because they were read in the churches along with the lessons from the O.T.

Vv. 17, 18. *Final exhortation.* "Having then, brethren, been forewarned, be on your guard lest you fall from your own foundation, carried away by the error of lawless men. Grow in the grace and knowledge of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To Him be glory both now and in the day of eternity."

Ver. 17. This verse gathers up various thoughts that appear elsewhere in the epistle. **Προγινώσκοντες** repeats **τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες** of i. 20, iii. 1; **ἀθέσμων** occurs ii. 7; **πλάνῃ** ii. 18. **συναπαχθέντες** (*cf.* Galat. ii. 13), "carried away". **ἀθέσμων**, see note ii. 7.

k Gal. ii. 13. τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ [k] συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ, 18. αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

στηριγμοῦ, "steadfastness"; perhaps "foundation" is better, although in this sense we would expect **στήριγμα**. There is, however, a tendency in N.T. to confuse words in **-μα -μος**. *Cf.* **κύλισμα** (2 Pet. ii. 22). **ἁρπαγμός** (Phil. ii. 6). The foundation is the **χάρις** and **γνῶσις** of v. 18. **ἰδίου** is in emphatic contrast to the untrustworthy basis of the Libertine teaching.

Ver. 18. **ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ Κυρίου, κ.τ.λ.** The genitive is to be taken with both words. **γνῶσις** here means "spiritual instruction," a knowledge that has its source in Christ Himself, as distinct from **ἐπίγνωσις**, which is personal communion with Christ (see note i. 5). **γνῶσις** is the privilege of the "friend" of Christ. *Cf.* John vii. 17, xv. 15. **αὐτῷ.** Note that the doxology is addressed to Christ, and, therefore, **κυρίου ἡμῶν.** also refers to Him. **εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος**: "in the day of eternity". The meanings of **εἰς** and **ἐν** in later Greek are somewhat interchangeable (*cf.* Moulton, *Proleg.* 234 f.). **ἡμ. αἰῶνος** is a very rare phrase not found elsewhere in N.T. It is found in Sir. xviii. 10, where the phrase is **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος**. The more usual expression is **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.** "**εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας** becomes so immediately the ruling phrase that this Petrine doxology cannot have been written after liturgical expressions had become in any degree stereotyped" (Bigg).

THE EPISTLES

OF

ST. JOHN

INTRODUCTION.

The First Epistle.

The first Epistle differs from all the other N.T. Epistles save the Epistle to the Hebrews in this, that it is anonymous. The author, however, claims to have been an eye-witness of the Word of Life (i. 1-3) and speaks throughout in a tone of apostolic authority, and there is abundance of primitive and credible testimony that he was St. John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and the last survivor of the Apostle-company.

1. *The MSS. Titles.*—AB Ἰωάνου (-άννου) α: א Ἰωάννου ἐπιστολὴ α: L ἐπιστολὴ καθολικὴ τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Ἰωάννου: P Ἰωάννου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ ἀποσ(τόλου ἐπιστολὴ) α. Two later MSS. have interesting titles—13 ἐπιστολὴ α Ἰωάννου· εὐαγγελικὴ θεολογία περὶ χ̄υ: f βροντῆς υἱὸς Ἰωάννης τάδε χριστιανοῖσιν.[1]

2. *Patristic Evidence.*—Polycarp. *ad Philipp.* viii.: πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν—a manifest echo of 1 John iv. 2, 3. This proves the early date of our Epistle and the esteem in which it was held, and if it does not attest the Johannine authorship, it at least suggests it. Polycarp had known several of the Apostles and of those who had seen the Lord; he had been a disciple of St. John and had been ordained by him bishop of Smyrna; and he was the leading ecclesiastic in the whole of Asia. *Cf.* Jer. *Script. Eccles.;* Iren. III. iii. 4.

Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 39) says that Papias, whom Irenæus had called "a hearer of John and a comrade of Polycarp, an ancient man

[1] St. Augustine's discourses on the First Epistle are entitled "Ten Treatises on the Epistle of John to the Parthians (*In Epistolam Joannis ad Parthos Tractatus Decem*)," and he elsewhere quotes from the Epistle under this strange title (*Quæst. Ev.* ii. 39). Probably the Epistle was entitled in some MS. Ἰωάννου τοῦ παρθένου, as the Apocalypse is entitled in 30 αποκαλυψ. του αγιου ενδοξοτατου αποστολου και ευαγγελιστου παρθενου ηγαπημενου επιστηθιου ιωαννου θεολογου, and ΤΟΥ-ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΥ was mistaken for ΠΡΟΣΠΑΡΘΟΥΣ. The Latin frag. of Clem. Alex.'s exposition of the Second Epistle begins: "Secunda Joannis epistola quæ ad virgines scripta," where "Joannis ad virgines" probably represents Ἰωάννου τοῦ παρθένου.

(Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνήρ)," "used testimonies from the first (former) epistle of John (κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς)". προτέρας is merely a grammatical inaccuracy, as conversely πρῶτος for πρότερος in Matt. xxi. 36; Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 30; Heb. x. 9; Rev. xxi. 1. *Cf.* Eus. *H. E.* iii. 24: ἡ προτέρα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν . . . αἱ λοιπαὶ δύο.

Irenæus, a disciple of Polycarp[1] and bishop of Lyons, quotes 1 John ii. 18, 19, 21, 22, iv. 1, 3, v. 1, and says expressly that he is quoting from the Epistle of St. John.[2]

The Muratorian Canon (about A.D. 170) includes our epistle and ascribes it to St. John: "Quid ergo mirum si Johannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistulis suis proferat, dicens in semetipso: *Quæ vidimus oculis nostris, et auribus audivimus, et manus nostræ palpaverunt, hæc scripsimus?*" *Cf.* 1 John i. 1.[3]

These testimonies are primitive, and there is no need to adduce in addition the later and abundant testimonies of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Athanasius.

With no less unanimity and emphasis does ancient tradition ascribe the Fourth Gospel to St. John, and it hardly admits of reasonable doubt that the Gospel and the Epistle are from the one pen. They agree in style, language, and thought. They have the same Hebraistic style, abounding in parallelism (*e.g. cf.* 1 John ii. 10, 11 with John iii. 18, 20, 21) and parataxis (the co-ordinating καί is the favourite conjunction). Their style is identical, and it is unique in the N.T. They have, moreover, common phrases and expressions *Cf.* Ep. i. 1, 2 with Gosp. i. 1, 2, 4, 14; Ep. i. 4 with Gosp. xv. 11, xvi. 24; Ep. ii. 1 with Gosp. xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7; Ep. ii. 8 with Gosp. xiii. 34, xv. 10, 12; Ep. ii. 11 with Gosp. xii. 35; Ep. iii. 8, 15 with Gosp. viii. 44; Ep. iii. 11, 16 with Gosp. xv. 12, 13; Ep. iii. 12 with Gosp. vii. 7; Ep. iii. 13 with Gosp. xv. 18, 19; Ep. iii. 14 with Gosp. v. 24; Ep. iv. 6 with Gosp. viii. 47; Ep. iv. 12 with Gosp. i. 14; Ep. iv. 14 with Gosp. iii. 17; Ep. v. 3 with Gosp. xiv. 15, 21; Ep. v. 6-8 with Gosp. xix. 34, 35; Ep. v. 9 with Gosp. v. 32, 34, 36, viii. 17, 18; Ep. v. 10 with Gosp. iii. 33; Ep. v. 12 with Gosp. iii. 15, 36; Ep. v. 13 with Gosp. xx. 31; Ep. v. 14 with Gosp. xiv. 13, 14, xvi. 23; Ep. v. 20 with Gosp. xvii. 3. Then they have in common certain fundamental conceptions which are thus defined and enumerated by Dr. H. J. Holtzmann: "the Son of God in the Flesh, the Life, which has its source in Him and is identical with Him, the Being in Him, the Abiding in God, the Love of God actualised in the Sending of

[1] Jer. *Script. Eccles.* [2] Iren. III. xviii. 5, 8.
[3] The Mur. Can. is given in Routh's *Reliq. Sacr.*, i. pp. 394 seq.

the Son, the resultant Commandment of Brotherly Love, the Walking in the Light, the Begetting of God, the Overcoming of the World, etc.; the antitheses of Life and Death, Light and Darkness, Love and Hate, Truth and Lying, Father and World, God and Devil, Children of God and Children of the Devil." Thus inextricably are the two works intertwined. "Our Epistle," says Rothe, "has throughout as its presupposition the peculiar conception of the person and history of the Redeemer, in general the peculiar conception of Christianity, which prevails in the Gospel. Consequently, if the Fourth Gospel is a work of the Apostle John, our Epistle also belongs as indubitably to him; as in the contrary case our Epistle could be no composition of the Apostle John."

The common authorship has nevertheless been called in question on the ground of certain alleged divergences which, says Schmiedel, "are explained much more easily on the assumption that the two writings come from different writers though belonging to one and the same school of thought." The divergences are (1) linguistic, and (2) doctrinal.[1]

(1) The words ἀγγελία, ἐπαγγελία, διάνοια, παρουσία, ἐλπίς, ἀνομία, and others occur in the Epistle and not in the Gospel. But what then? A writer need not exhaust his entire vocabulary in a single writing: that would argue extreme barrenness of mind. Does it follow that the Third Gospel and the Book of Acts are by different authors because ἐλπίς never occurs in the former and eight times in the latter, or that the Epistle to the Romans is not St. Paul's because ἱλαστήριον occurs in it and in no other of his Epistles? The only reasonable inference from the occurrence of words in the Epistle which are absent from the Gospel is that the former is not an imitation of the latter.

(2) The following instances of doctrinal divergence are adduced: (*a*) ἱλασμός in Ep. ii. 2, iv. 10 and nowhere else in the N.T.; whereas, says Martineau, "the gospel knows nothing of an atoning or propitiatory efficacy in the blood of Christ". It is true that the word is not found in the Gospel, but the idea is. *Cf.* i. 29, x. 11, 15, xi. 49, 52. (*b*) χρῖσμα (Ep. ii. 20, 27) is another ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. The very idea, however, is found in the Gospel (xiv. 26, xvi. 13). (*c*) The Gospel is more spiritual in its eschatology, representing the Judgment not as future but as present (iii. 18) and the Coming of Christ as happening in the experience of each believer (xiv. 3); whereas the

[1] See Holtzmann's *Einl. in das N.T.*, and his elaborate discussion: *Das Probl. des erst. johann. Br. in sein. Verhält. zum Ev.* in *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* (1881-82); Martineau's *Seat of Auth.*, p. 509; Schmiedel in *Encycl. Bibl.*, vol. ii., cols. 2556-7.

Epistle represents the παρουσία (ii. 28) as "a visible individual occurrence" on a particular day (iv. 17). This is simply erroneous. The Gospel also speaks of a final and universal Judgment (v. 29), "the last day" (vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; xi. 24), and a personal Coming of Christ (xxi. 22, 23).[1] (*d*) The Παράκλητος is the Holy Spirit in the Gospel, Jesus in the Epistle. Here, however, there is no divergence. The doctrine of the Epistle explains the Gospel's ἄλλον Παράκλητον (xiv. 16). See commentary on ii. 1.

It is beyond reasonable doubt that the Epistle and the Gospel are from the same pen. "The identity of authorship in the two books," says Lightfoot,[2] "though not undisputed, is accepted with such a degree of unanimity that it may be placed in the category of acknowledged facts." And they have a very intimate connection. This is abundantly apparent from internal evidence. The Epistle opens with a reference to the Gospel-narrative, and there is an unmistakable relation between 1 John v. 13 and John xx. 31 (see commentary). Indeed the Epistle throughout has the Gospel as its background and is hardly intelligible without it. It is, in the language of Lightfoot,[3] "a devotional and moral application of the main ideas which are evolved historically in the sayings and doings of Christ recorded in the Gospel". And it is significant that the Muratorian Canon mentions the First Epistle in connection with the Gospel, and the Second and Third Epistles after an interval in their natural place among the other Epistles of the N.T.

The precise connection between them is nowhere indicated, but it appears from a consideration of the historical situation. The fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 dispersed the Church, and a colony of disciples found a home in Asia Minor. It was a considerable and increasingly influential community, including, in the phrase of Polycrates of Ephesus, "great luminaries (μεγάλα στοιχεῖα)"—not only the Apostles Philip[4] and Andrew[5] but, according to abundant and trustworthy tradition, St. John.[6] The latter fixed his residence at Ephesus, where there was a church founded by St. Paul.[7] It was the proudest boast of Ephesus that she was "the Temple-sweeper (νεωκόρος) of Artemis" (Acts xix. 35), and the Temple which she had reared for her goddess was one of the Seven Wonders of the ancient

[1] John xxi. is an addition to the Gospel. but it is by the same hand, "a postscript from the same pen as the rest" (Renan).

[2] *Ess. on Sup. Rel.*, pp. 186 f. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[4] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 31, v. 24. [5] *Mur. Can.*

[6] On the credibility of this tradition see Drummond, *The Char. and Auth. of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 814 ff.

[7] Iren. III. iii. 4.

world; and in that historic and brilliant city St. John exercised his ministry to the end of his long life, which lasted until the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98-117).[1]

It was an active and gracious ministry. It had Ephesus for its headquarters, but it comprehended a wide area. St. John took oversight of all the Christian communities in the surrounding country—such as the churches of Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea (*cf.* Rev. ii.-iii.), counselling and strengthening them by letters and visitations. "He would go away when invited," says Clement of Alexandria,[2] "to the neighbouring districts of the Gentiles, here to appoint bishops, there to form new churches, and there to put into the office of the ministry some one of those that were indicated by the Spirit." And Clement proceeds to relate an interesting story, μῦθον οὐ μῦθον. The Apostle once visited a neighbouring city—Smyrna, according to the Alexandrian Chronicle—and saw there a lad of stalwart form, charming face, and ardent spirit. "I deposit this lad in thy keeping," he said to the bishop, "with all earnestness, taking the Church and Christ to witness." The bishop accepted the trust and, when St. John returned to Ephesus, took the lad home, nurtured him, and finally baptised him. Then, thinking he had done enough, he let him alone, and the lad fell into evil company, committed a crime, and, fleeing to the mountains, became the captain of a band of brigands. By and by St. John revisited that city, and after settling the business which had brought him, he said: "Now then, bishop, restore us the deposit which the Saviour and I entrusted to thee". The bishop was thunderstruck, supposing that he was being accused of some pecuniary intromission. "It is the lad that I am requiring," explained St. John, "and the soul of the brother." The bishop groaned and wept: "He is dead!" "How? When? And what death?" "He is dead to God," said the bishop, and told the story. The Apostle rent his robe and with a loud cry smote his head. "A fine guardian of the brother's soul did I leave in thee! Let me have a horse forthwith and some one to show me the way." And he rode off and found the lost youth, and by tender entreaties won him to penitence and brought him back to the Church.

Such was the ministry of St. John at Ephesus, and it was far on in the course of it that he wrote his Gospel, "having employed all the time an unwritten message".[3] He wrote it, says the Muratorian Canon, "at the exhortation of his fellow-disciples and bishops," *i.e.*, his own congregation at Ephesus and his colleagues in the neigh-

[1] Iren. III. iii. 4. [2] *De Div. Serv.* 42. [3] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 24.

bouring churches within the circuit of his supervision. It was intended for the instruction and edification of the Christians all over that extensive area. And the Epistle is, in the phrase of Lightfoot, a "commendatory postscript" to the Gospel. This explains the circumstance of its having neither address nor signature. It was not sent to a particular community, and since it was an appendix to the Gospel, it had no need to be inscribed with the author's name.

The aim of the Epistle is twofold—polemical and religious. Irenæus says[1] that "John the disciple of the Lord desired by the declaration of his Gospel to remove the error which had been sown among men by Cerinthus and, much earlier, by those who are called Nicolaitans". And this is borne out by the companion Epistle. It is against these two heresies that the polemic of the latter is directed.

1. It is said that the Nicolaitans were the followers of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons (Acts vi. 5),[2] and this strange story is told of him by Clement of Alexandria[3]: "He had, they say, a beautiful wife, and after the Ascension of the Saviour, being taunted by the Apostles with jealousy, he brought the woman forward and gave who would permission to marry her. This, they say, is in accordance with that expression of his: 'We must abuse the flesh'. And indeed the adherents of his sect follow up the incident and the saying absolutely and unquestioningly and commit fornication without restraint". Clement proceeds to attest the moral purity of Nicolas and explain his action as an inculcation of ascetic self-restraint, but certainly the sect which bore his name was given over to licentiousness. Clement says elsewhere[4] that they were "dissolute as he-goats," and others bear like testimony.[5] They were Antinomians, disowning moral obligation, *nullam differentiam esse docentes in mœchando et idolothyton edere*;[6] herein being forerunners of the Gnostics and justifying Tertullian's classification of them with the Cainites.[7] This heresy was rampant among the churches of Asia Minor in St. John's day (*cf.* Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15), and he deals with it in our Epistle. See i. 5-ii. 6, 15-17, iii. 3-10.

2. Cerinthus also was an Antinomian,[8] but his distinctive heresy was a theory of the Person of Christ. He taught in Asia, but he had been trained in Egypt,[9] and the foundation of his system, as of

[1] III. xi. 7. [2] Iren. I. xxiii.
[3] *Strom.* iii. 4; *cf.* Eus. *H. E.* iii. 29. [4] *Strom.* ii. 20.
[5] *Cf.* Tert. *Adv. Marc.* i. 29; Hippol. *Phil.* vii. 36.
[6] Iren., *l.c.* [7] *De Præscript. Hær.* 33.
[8] Dionysius of Alexandria in Eus. *H. E.* iii. 28.
[9] Theodoret. *H. E.* ii. 3.

Marcion's, was that postulate of Greek philosophy—the inherent and necessary evil of matter. "He said that the world had not been made by the First God, but by a power which is separate from the Authority which is over the Universe and ignorant of the God who is over all. And he supposed that Jesus had not been begotten of a virgin, but had been born of Joseph and Mary as a son in like manner to all the rest of men, and became more righteous and prudent and wise. And after the Baptism the Christ descended into him from the Sovereignty which is over the Universe, in the form of a dove; and then He proclaimed the unknown Father and accomplished mighty works, but at the end the Christ withdrew from the Jesus, and the Jesus had suffered and been raised, but the Christ had continued throughout impassible, being spiritual."[1] The essence of this is the dissolution (λύσις) of the Person of our Lord, the distinction between the human Jesus and the divine Christ. St. John encountered Cerinthus at Ephesus, and strenuously controverted his error. Irenæus and Eusebius quote a story of Polycarp's that the Apostle once visited the public baths, and, seeing Cerinthus within, sprang out of the building. "Let us flee," he cried, "lest the building fall, since Cerinthus, the foe of the Truth, is within it!"[2] And all through our Epistle he has the heresy in view. See ii. 18-23, iv. 1-6, 13-15, v. 1-12.

The Epistle has also a religious purpose. Its key-note is Love. "Locutus est multa," says St. Augustine, "et prope omnia de caritate." Its doctrine of love is distinctive and profound. The love which it inculcates is love for God and love for the brotherhood of believers—love for God manifesting itself in love for the brotherhood, and love for the brotherhood inspired by the love wherewith the Father has loved all His children. Special emphasis is laid on the latter. It is the whole of religion, it is all that God requires (*cf.* ii. 8-11, iii. 10-18, iv. 7-v. 2); for it implies love for God, and love for God implies a right attitude of heart and mind toward Him. This is the dominant doctrine of the Epistle, and it was the constant message of the Apostle's later ministry, so much so that, it is said, his people grew weary of its incessant reiteration. See St. Jerome's story quoted in commentary on iv. 7.

This had not always been his manner. He had not always been the Apostle of Love. He had once been the precise opposite—self-seeking (*cf.* Mark x. 35-45 = Matt. xx. 20-28), fiery, passionate, and vindictive (*cf.* Luke ix. 51-56), meriting the title which Jesus gave him "the Son of Thunder" (Mark iii. 17). His doctrine of

[1] Iren. I. xxi. [2] Iren. III. iii. 4; Eus. *H. E.* iv. 14.

the Supremacy of Love was a late discovery, and he proclaims it as such (see commentary on ii. 7-11). It was not merely an article of his polemic, a protest against the loveless intellectualism wherewith St. Ignatius charges the heretical teachers (τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας), who had "no concern for love, none for the widow, none for the orphan, none for the distressed, none for the bondman, none for the hungry or the thirsty."[1] It was a personal confession. That was an aspect of the Gospel which St. John had himself too long failed to perceive; and it may be that it had been revealed to him by two life-transforming experiences. (1) His Exile in Patmos (Rev. i. 9).[2] During that season of retirement he could look back over his interrupted ministry and review his methods. Incidents like his encounter with Cerinthus would recur to him, and would appear to his chastened spirit ill accordant with "the meekness and sweet reasonableness of Christ" (2 Cor. x. 1). It was right that he should contend for the Truth, but had not his intemperate zeal too often caused needless offence and defeated its own end by hardening the hearts of his opponents? He would discover the truth of St. Paul's precept that "the Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle towards all" (2 Tim. ii. 24). (2) The writing of his Gospel. As he lived over again those three years of blessed fellowship and told "what he had heard and seen concerning the Word of Life," he would realise the pity and patience of the gentle Jesus, and feel as though he had never until that hour understood the Gospel-story. And he would address himself to what remained of his ministry in a new spirit. "Little children, love one another." "Master, why do you always say this?" "Because it is the Lord's commandment, and if only it be done, it is enough."

The Second and Third Epistles.

There is no doubt that the Second and Third Epistles are from the same hand. *Cf.* 2 John 1 with 3 John 1; 2 John 4 with 3 John 3, 4; 2 John 10 with 3 John 8; 2 John 12 with 3 John 13, 14. Are they also the work of St. John?

This was a disputed question in the early Church. Eusebius in his chapter "On the Acknowledged Divine Scriptures and those that

[1] *Ad Smyrn.* vi. *Cf.* Barn. *Ep.* xx. 2: οὐκ ἐλεῶντες πτωχόν, οὐ πονοῦντες ἐπὶ καταπονουμένῳ . . . ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον καὶ καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον.

[2] Put by Eus. *H. E.* iii. 23 in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81-96), by Epiphan. *Hær.* li. 33 in that of Claudius (A.D. 41-54).

are not such (περὶ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων θείων γραφῶν καὶ τῶν μὴ τοιούτων)" [1] includes the Second and Third Epistles of John (ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου) among "those that are controverted yet recognised by most (τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς)". So Origen: [2] "He (John) has left an epistle of a very few lines; also, let it be granted, a second and a third, since not all allow that these are genuine. However, there are not a hundred lines in them both." And in the fourth century an opinion was put forward, which still finds favour, that their author was indeed John, only not John the Apostle but another John denominated "the Presbyter". [3]

There is, however, very strong evidence, both internal and external, on the other side. They exhibit coincidences of thought and language which link them with the First Epistle. *Cf.* 1 John ii. 7 with 2 John 5; 1 John ii. 18, iv. 1-3 with 2 John 7; 1 John ii. 23 with 2 John 9; 1 John iii. 6, 9 with 3 John 11. And the external testimony, though scanty, is weighty. The Muratorian Canon, despite the corruption of the passage, plainly attests the two epistles as works of the Apostle John and as accepted in the Catholic Church (*superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur*). Irenæus [4] quotes 2 John 11 with the preface Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητὴς ἐπέτεινε τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ὑμῶν λέγεσθαι βουληθείς. And again, after a reference to the First Epistle, he quotes 2 John 7, 8 as a saying of the Lord's disciple John "in the aforesaid epistle". [5] This slip of memory only makes the attestation more effective. Irenæus knew that it was a saying of St. John that he was quoting: the Second Epistle no less than the First was the Apostle's. Clement of Alexandria too recognised more than one Epistle of St. John, for in one place he quotes 1 John v. 16 as occurring "in his larger Epistle (ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ)," [6] and elsewhere he speaks of "the Second Epistle of John". [7]

The ground for the ascription of the two smaller epistles to John the Presbyter is the fact that their author styles himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος. But it can hardly be maintained in view of his self-revelation in the Third Epistle. He appears there as exercising authoritative supervision over a wide circle of churches, writing to them, visiting them, interfering in their dissensions and settling these by his personal and solitary arbitrament, sending deputies and receiving their

[1] *H. E.* iii. 25.
[2] *Comm. in Ev. Joan.* v. 3 (ed. Lommatzsch, vol. i., p. 165).
[3] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39; *cf.* Jer. *Script. Eccles.* under *Joannes Apostolus*; *Papias*.
[4] I. ix. 3. [5] III. xvii. 8. [6] *Strom.* ii. 15.
[7] *Adumbrat. in Ep. Joan.* ii.

reports. This is precisely the sort of ministry which, as we have seen,[1] St. John exercised in Asia Minor, and it would have been impossible for any lesser personage than an Apostle.[2] It may, moreover, be questioned whether such slight compositions as these two little letters would have won recognition had they not been recommended by the name of the Apostle John. And it was natural that the latter should style himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος. The term was not only an official designation (*cf.* 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19). The second generation of Christians used it of their predecessors, "the men of early days," *Männer der Vorzeit*, who had witnessed the great beginnings. Thus, Papias uses it of the Apostles,[3] and Irenæus in turn uses it of Papias and his contemporaries.[4] It was therefore natural that St. John, the last of the Apostles, the sole survivor of "the elder men," should be known among the churches of Asia as ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

And indeed it is very questionable whether this John the Presbyter ever existed. He was discovered by Eusebius in the preface to Papias' work *Expositions of Dominical Oracles*, but "it is well," remarks Barth, "to distinguish between what Papias really says and what Eusebius has made of his words". Here are the words of Papias: "I shall not hesitate to incorporate for you with my interpretations as many things as I once learned well from the elders (τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) and remembered well, guaranteeing their truth. For I did not, like so many, take pleasure in those that have so much to say but in those that teach the truth, nor in those that remember alien commandments but in those that remember the commandments that have been given by the Lord to the Faith and come from the Truth itself. Now if anywhere one came in my way who had been a follower of the elders (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), I would search[5] the words of the elders—what Andrew or Peter had said (εἶπεν), or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; and (I would search) the things which Aristion and the elder John (ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης), the Lord's disciples, say (λέγουσιν)".[6]

[1] See p. 231.

[2] *Cf.* Barth, *Die Hauptprobl.*, S. 26: "In der That nun ist diese 'patriarchalisch-monarchische' Autorität unerklärlich bei einem einfachen Presbyter einer Localgemeinde; sie erklärt sich aber vollkommen, wenn der πρεσβύτερος wie Paulus ein Apostel gewesen ist."

[3] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39. [4] V. xxxvi. *et passim*. Similarly in Heb. xi. 2.

[5] ἀνέκρινον, not "enquire about". Jerome (*Script. Eccles.* under *Papias*) rightly renders *considerabam*.

[6] Eus. *H. E.* iii. 39.

And this is what Eusebius makes of the passage: "Here it is worthy of observation how he twice enumerates the name of John. The former of these he reckons along with Peter and James and Matthew and the rest of the Apostles, plainly indicating the Evangelist; and the other John after an interval he ranks with others outside the number of the Apostles, having put Aristion before him, and he plainly names him 'an elder (πρεσβύτερον)'; so that the truth of their story is hereby demonstrated who have said that two persons in Asia have had the same name, and there are two tombs in Ephesus and each is called John's to this day."[1] Eusebius had a theological interest in putting this construction on the passage. He disliked the Chiliasm of the Apocalypse, and he was glad to find a second John to whom he could ascribe its authorship. And he has certainly perverted the passage. Papias is here defining the plan of his work. His method was (1) to quote a *logion* of Jesus, (2) to interpret it, and (3) to illustrate it by any story which he had gleaned from oral tradition. Such stories he derived from two sources. One was their followers' reports of what they had heard from the lips of "the elders," *i.e.*, as Papias used the term, the Apostles. These reports he "searched" for suitable illustrations. But he was not wholly dependent on hearsay. Two of the men who had been with Jesus were still alive in the earlier years of Papias—Aristion, not an Elder or Apostle but a disciple of the Lord, and the Elder John; and he enjoyed the advantage of hearing their living voices, and he "would search" their discourses for the material he required. The transition from "had said (εἶπεν)" to "say (λέγουσιν)," though ignored by Eusebius, is significant and explains the double mention of St. John. Papias had derived his knowledge of St. John's teaching from two sources: (1) from the reports of men who had companied with him and the other Apostles while they still tarried at Jerusalem, and (2) from his own lips after his settlement at Ephesus, where, Irenæus says,[2] Papias had been one of his "hearers". ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης must mean "the Apostle John," since the Apostles have just been called "the Elders" (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), and it is impossible that the term should bear different meanings within the compass of a single sentence. In his phrase "from the Truth itself (ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας)" Papias echoes 3 John 12, and this renders it more than likely that he called St. John ὁ

[1] Eusebius probably had this story from Dionysius of Alexandria (*cf. H.E.* vii. 25). It means simply that in the fourth century there were two rival sites for St. John's burial-place.

[2] See p. 243.

πρεσβύτερος because the latter had so styled himself in each of the Epistles.[1]

The Second Epistle is addressed ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, and the meaning of the address is a disputed question.[2] It was supposed by St. Jerome,[3] and the idea is approved by many moderns, that "the elect lady"[4] is a figurative appellation, signifying either the whole Church (Hilgenfeld, Mangold) or a particular community (Hofmann, Ewald, Huther, Wieseler). The main arguments are that the universal affection spoken of in verse 1 could hardly have been felt for an individual, and that it is "not improbable" that this is the Epistle referred to in 3 John 9.[5] The metaphor is indeed paralleled by Eph. v. 22-33 and Rev. xxi. 9; but it is the Church which is thus designated, not a particular community, and, on the ecclesiastical interpretation, it is a particular community that is here addressed, since St. John sends greetings to the "elect lady" from "the children of her elect sister" (verse 13), *i.e.*, presumably, his own congregation. And, moreover, the simplicity of the little letter precludes the possibility of so elaborate an allegory, while the tenderness of its tone stamps it as a personal communication.

It is therefore not a church but a lady that is addressed, and there are authority and reason for regarding Κυρία as her name.[6] The name was common in those days, and it occurs, *e.g.*, in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, 498: Ἀντωνίᾳ Ἀσκληπιάδι τῇ καὶ Κυρίᾳ. 914: Αὐρήλιος Ἀπφοῦτος υἱὸς Ἀρεοῦτος μητρὸς Κυρίας. It is the Greek form of Martha, which means "mistress (*domina*)". The objection has been urged that, if it be a proper name, St. John must have written not ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ but Κυρίᾳ τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ on the analogy of Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ in 3 John 1; but either construction is permissible. The former is paralleled by 1 Peter i. 1: ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, and if

[1] On the identity of John the Presbyter and John the Apostle see Barth, *Hauptprobl.*, S. 26-29; Farrar, *Early Days*, Exc. xiv.

[2] *Cf.* scholium quoted by Euth. Zig.: ἢ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν γράφει ἢ πρός τινα γυναῖκα διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἐντολῶν τὴν ἑαυτῆς οἰκίαν οἰκονομοῦσαν πνευματικῶς.

[3] *Ep. ad Ageruchiam.*

[4] The words, however, can hardly mean more than "*an* elect lady".

[5] Schmiedel in *Encycl. Bibl.*, vol. ii., col. 2560. *Cf.* B. Weiss, *Einleit.*

[6] Others take Ἐκλεκτῇ as the name ("the lady Electa"). Clem. Alex.: "ad quandam Babyloniam (probably a confused reference, for which the translator is responsible, to 1 Peter v. 13) *Electam* nomine". Clement apparently took Electa as the Church personified, for he proceeds: "significat electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ". But then Ἐκλεκτῆς in verse 13 must also be a proper name, and two sisters can hardly have borne the same name.

there be any irregularity, it is in the latter, where τῷ ἀγαπητῷ is a defining after-thought (*cf.* 1 John i. 2: τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, "the life, the eternal life"). Carpzov would identify Kyria (Martha) with the sister of Lazarus and Mary. The family of Bethany disappear from the Gospel-story after the feast in Levi's house at the beginning of the Passion-week. They probably fled to escape the fury of the rulers, and it is just possible that they had found a home in Asia Minor like so many other refugees from Palestine.[1] And now Martha is living in one of the cities of St. John's diocese, a widow with a grown-up family; and it is natural that she should be dear to the Apostle and honoured by the whole Church. This is a pleasant fancy, but it is nothing more.

The facts are sufficiently interesting. The epistle is addressed to a devout lady named Kyria, who resided in one of the cities near Ephesus with a grown-up family. It is remarkable how large a part was played by women in the life of the primitive Church, especially in Asia Minor,[2] and Kyria was an honourable and influential personage not only in her own community but all over that wide area (verse 1). It is probable that, like that of Nympha at Colossæ,[3] her house was the meeting-place of the Church, according to the custom of those days when there were no ecclesiastical edifices; and it appears from verse 10 that she afforded hospitality to the itinerant evangelists of whom the Third Epistle speaks. A sister of Kyria, presumably deceased, had a family resident at Ephesus and connected with St. John's congregation; and several of Kyria's sons had visited their cousins. The Apostle had met with them and found them earnest Christians, and in the gladness of his heart he wrote to their mother, testifying his gratification, giving some kindly counsel very needful in those days of intellectual unrest, and expressing the hope that he might ere long visit her.

The Third Epistle is addressed to "Gaius the beloved". Gaius (never Caius) was one of the commonest of names, and there are three who bear it in the N.T. (1) Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), (2) Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), and (3) Gaius of Corinth (Rom. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. i. 14). The name being so common, our Gaius may very well have been different from all these, but it is affirmed in the interesting *Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ* ascribed to St. Athanasius that St. John composed his Gospel during his exile in Patmos and that Gaius of Corinth acted as his amanuensis and

[1] See p. 246. [2] *Cf.* Ramsay, *The Church in the Rom. Emp.*, p. 67.
[3] Col. iv. 15: Νύμφαν καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίαν (WH Nest).

published it at Ephesus.[1] And it appears from the "Apostolic Constitutions" (vii. 46) that one Gaius was ordained by St. John first "bishop" of Pergamum.

Whatever be the value of these traditions, it is evident that Gaius was a prominent personage, probably bishop or presbyter, in one of the churches of Asia Minor, and St. Paul's description of Gaius of Corinth, "the host of me and of the whole Church," might have been written of him. Trouble had arisen in his congregation, the ringleader being Diotrephes, probably a wealthy layman. The primitive Church was rent by factions, each swearing by one or other of the great teachers (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 10-17), and it may be that Diotrephes belonged to the Pauline faction and abjured St. John and disowned his authority.[2] The actual truth, however, is that he was an opinionative and domineering man who insisted on having his own way in everything. The occasion of the trouble was a visit which had been paid to the Church of Gaius by a company of itinerant evangelists (*wandernde Glaubensboten*). This order of "prophets" was a recognised institution. Their office was to travel about preaching to the Gentiles and seeking to win them to the Faith. There were sometimes unworthy men among them who traded on the Gospel and merited the stinging epithet of "Christ-traffickers (χριστέμποροι)," and very stringent regulations are laid down regarding them in the *Didache;*[3] but their ministry was a needful and heroic one. They abandoned everything for Christ's sake and, to obviate misrepresentation, took nothing from the Gentiles—no food, no lodging. Thus they were dependent on the good offices of the believers wherever they went, and it was a debt of honour to see that they suffered no lack. Gaius had given a hospitable welcome to that company of "prophets"; but Diotrephes, disowning the Apostle's authority, opposed the reception of his emissaries and would have denied them entertainment. On their return to Ephesus they reported the incident at a meeting of the Church; and St. John wrote this letter and sent it by Demetrius, commending the action of Gaius and intimating his intention of

[1] τὸ δὲ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγέλιον ὑπηγορεύθη τε ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ ἠγαπημένου, ὄντος ἐξορίστου ἐν Πάτμῳ τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐξεδόθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ διὰ Γαΐου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ ξενοδόχου τῶν ἀποστόλων, περὶ οὗ καὶ Παῦλος Ῥωμαίοις γράφων φησί· ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γάϊος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[2] It has been thought incredible that the great Apostle should have been so cavalierly treated (*cf.* verses 9, 10), but great men are usually less honoured by their contemporaries than by after generations.

[3] xi.-xiii. *Cf.* 2 John 10, 11.

visiting his Church at an early date and reducing the recalcitrant Diotrephes to order.

The Text of the Epistles.

The accompanying Greek text is the *regia editio* (1560) of Robert Stephanus (Etienne), commonly known in England as the *Textus Receptus*.[1] Constructed from a few late and inferior MSS. when the science of Textual Criticism was yet unborn, it is far from satisfactory; and the principal variants are presented in the critical notes, The long and patient labours of Mill, Bentley, Griesbach, Lachmann. Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort have cleared away the rubbish of corruption and reduced uncertainty to a minimum; and Dr. Eberhard Nestle's text (British and Foreign Bible Society) is probably a very close approximation to the sacred autographs. It is "the resultant of a collation" of the monumental recensions of Tischendorf (8th edition, 1869-72), Westcott and Hort (1881), and Bernhard Weiss (2nd edition, 1905). "The readings adopted in the text are those in which at least two of these editions agree."

The *materia critica* is copious and excellent. 1. Greek MSS. :—

- ℵ Codex Sinaiticus, 4th c. Discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and 1859 in the monastery of St. Catherine at the foot of Mount Sinai. Now at St. Petersburg.
- A Codex Alexandrinus, 5th c. Brought from Alexandria to Constantinople by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople (d. 1638), and sent by him to King Charles I. in 1628 by the hand of Thomas Roe on the return of the latter from a Turkish embassy. Now in the British Museum.
- B Codex Vaticanus, 4th c. In the Vatican Library at Rome.
- C Codex Ephraemi, 5th c. A rescript or palimpsest, written over in 12th c. with a Greek version of thirty-eight treatises of Ephraemus Syrus. In the National Library at Paris. In 1834-35 the librarian Carl Hase had the original writing revived by a chemical process, the applica- of Giobertine tincture. The codex was written, probably in Egypt, in 5th c.; corrected first, probably in Palestine, in 6th c. (C^2), then, probably at Constantinople, in 9th c. (C^3).
- K Codex Mosquensis, 9th c. Brought to Moscow from the monastery of St. Dionysius at Mount Athos.

[1] See C. R. Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's *Nov. Test. Gr.*, pp. 212 *sqq.*

L Codex Angelicus Romanus, 9th c. In the Angelic Library of the Augustinian monks at Rome.

P Codex Porfirianus, 9th c. A palimpsest found by Tischendorf in 1862 among the books of Bishop Porfirius Chiovensis.

D Codex Bezæ, 5th or 6th c. In the Library of the University of Cambridge, to which it was presented by Theodore Beza in 1581. The Greek text with a slavish Latin translation. Much mutilated, our Epistles being represented only by the Latin version of 3 John 11-15.[1]

These manuscripts are uncials,[2] and there are besides upwards of two hundred minuscules or cursives, ranging in date from 9th c. to 16th c.[3]

2. Ancient Versions:[4]—

Syriac—

(1) **Syr^{vg}** Peshitto or Vulgate, 3rd (?) c. Contains the First Epistle.

(2) **Syr^{ph}** Philoxenian or Heraclean Version, 6th c. The three Epistles.

(3) **Syr^{bo}** Pococke's edition (1630) of 2 Pet. and 2 and 3 John from codex in Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Vg Latin Vulgate, St. Jerome's revision (A.D. 382-84). The three Epistles.

Egyptian—

(1) **Cop** Memphitic Version, 3rd (?) c. The three Epistles.

(2) **Sah** Thebaic Version, 3rd (?) c. The three Epistles.

Aeth Ethiopic Version, from 4th to 6th c. The three Epistles.

Arm Armenian Version, 5th c. The three Epistles.

These versions have no small value for the determination of the original text. It is usually plain which of several disputed readings the translator had before him, and whether his MS. contained a word or passage of doubtful authenticity.

Literature.

Clem. Alex. *Adumbrationes in Epp. Joan.* i., ii. (a rude Latin translation); Didymus, the blind teacher of St. Jerome in the Catechetical School of Alexandria (A.D. 308-95), commentary on the

[1] Gregory, pp. 345 *seq.*

[2] The signs $^{*\ 2\ 3\ a\ b\ c}$ affixed to uncials denote corrections by later hands,

[3] Gregory, pp. 616 *seq.* [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 803 *seq.*

Cath. Epp., translated into Latin by Epiphanius Scholasticus; Aug., *In Epistolam Joannis Tractatus Decem* (1st Ep., stopping abruptly at v. 3); Bede, *Expos.;* Euthymius Zigabenus (12th c.).

Erasmus, *In N. T. Annotat.;* Luther; Calvin (1st Ep.); Beza; Carpzov, *Commentatio in Ep.* 2 *Joan.; in Joan. Ep.* 3 *Brevis Enarratio;* Wetstein; Bengel; Lücke; Olshausen; Neander (1st Ep.); Düsterdieck; Huther in Meyer (translated by T. & T. Clark); Braune in Lange; Alford; Haupt (1st Ep., translated by T. & T. Clark); Rothe, *Der erste Brief Johannis practisch erklärt* (a beautiful work); Alexander in *Speaker's Commentary;* Plummer in *Cambridge Bible;* Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John;* H. J. Holtzmann in *Hand-commentar zum Neuen Testament;* Bernhard Weiss, *Die drei Briefe des Ap. Joh.;* Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity,* chaps. xxxi-vii.; Cox, *Private Letters of St. Paul and St. John;* Maurice, *Epistles of St. John;* Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal;* Law, *Tests of Life* (Lectures on 1st Ep.).[1]

[1] The two last appeared after this commentary was written.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΠΡΩΤΗ[1].

I. 1. [a]Ο [a]ἮΝ [b]ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ [c]ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ [d]ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ [2] αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν [e]ἐψηλάφησαν περὶ

a Rev. i. 4, 8. b John i. 1. c 2 Peter i. 16. d John i. 14. e Luke xxiv. 39; John xx. 27.

[1] See Introd., p. 243.

[2] Tert. (*de Anim.* 17; *adv. Prax.* 15) quotes thus: *quod vidimus, quod audivimus, oculis nostris vidimus et manus nostræ contrectaverunt de sermone vitæ*, as though reading ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, κ.τ.λ.

THE FIRST EPISTLE.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-4. The Preface. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we beheld and our hands felt, concerning the Word of Life—and the Life was manifested, and we have seen and testify and announce to you the Life, the Eternal Life, which was with the Father and was manifested to us—that which we have seen and heard, we announce to you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us. Yea, and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ. And these things we are writing that our joy may be fulfilled."

The Apostle here characterises and commends his Gospel (*cf.* Introd. p. 246). 1. *Its theme*—the earthly life of Jesus. No mere biography, since Jesus was not one of the children of men but the Eternal Son of God, the Word made flesh. (*a*) An ineffable wonder but no dream, an indubitable reality. His readers might doubt it, since they belonged to a later generation and had never seen Jesus; but St. John had seen Him, and he assures them, with elaborate iteration, that it is no dream: "These eyes beheld Him, these hands felt Him". "Because," says Calvin, "the greatness of the thing demanded that its truth should be certain and proved, he insists much at this point". (*b*) His narrative was necessarily incomplete, since the infinite revelation was larger than his perception or understanding of it. "He would give only a little drop from the sea, not the sea itself" (Rothe). A complete biography of Jesus is impossible, since the days of His flesh are only a segment of His life, a moment of His eternal years. 2. *His purpose in writing it:* (*a*) that his readers might share his heavenly fellowship; (*b*) that his joy might be fulfilled.

Ver. 1. ὃ, *i.e.* the Logos and the Eternal Life which He manifested. *Cf.* v. 4: πᾶν τὸ γεγεννημένον with note. ἦν, "verbum æternitatis significativum non habentis initium" (Clem. Alex.). It "was" ere it "was manifested". ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, בְּרֵאשִׁית (Gen. i. 1). The Logos already was when time began. "The design of the Apostle is to remove the idea of novelty which could lessen the dignity of the Gospel" (Calvin). *Cf.* Athan., *Synops. Script. Sacr.*: θεολογῶν δὲ ἐξηγεῖται μὴ νεώτερον εἶναι τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς μυστήριον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἀεὶ τυγχάνειν αὐτὸ νῦν δὲ πεφανερῶσθαι ἐν τῷ Κυρίῳ. ἀκηκόαμεν, "we have heard"; either the editorial "we" (*cf.* Rom. i. 5; Col. iv. 3); or, with Lightfoot, St. John and the elders of Ephesus who had certified the authorship and authenticity of the Gospel (xxi. 24); or "I and the rest of the Apostles"—not hearsay but the testimony of eye-witnesses. ἐθεασάμεθα, "we beheld"—a spectacle which broke on our astonished vision. This seems to be the force of the transition from perfect to aorist, though it may be simply an instance of the decay of the distinction between perfect and aorist

[f] τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· 2. καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ἑωράκαμεν, καὶ [g] μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, [h] ἥτις ἦν [i] πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν· 3. ὃ ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν,[1] ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς [k] κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν· καὶ [l] ἡ κοινωνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 4. καὶ ταῦτα [m] γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα

f John i. 1, 4. g John i. 7, xxi. 24; Acts i. 8, ii. 32. h Heb. viii. 6; Mark iv. 20; Phil. iv. 3. i John i. 1, 2. k Acts ii. 42. l ii. 24; John xvii. 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 13. m ii. 12, 13.

[1] και υμιν ℵABCP, Syr^{vg}, Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

(see Moulton's *Gram. of N.T. Gk.*, i. pp. 142 f.). **ἐψηλάφησαν**: the word is used of the fumbling of a blind man in Gen. xxvii. 12 LXX **μή ποτε ψηλαφήσῃ με ὁ πατήρ**. **περὶ**, *in Betreff des Wortes des Lebens* (Holtzmann); *i.e.* "We did not grasp all the wonder but only its skirts". "*Vom Worte des Lebens* will er verkündigen, denn *ihn selbst* verkündigen zu können, dazu fühlte er sich nicht in Stande" (Rothe). **τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς**, "the Word who gives life," "des Wortes, ohne welches es kein Leben gibt" (Holtzmann). Calvin: "Genitivus loco epitheti pro Vivifico". Rothe's "das Wort vom Leben (the word concerning life)" is Pauline (*cf.* Phil. ii. 16) but not Johannine.

Ver. 2. A parenthesis reiterating the assurance of the reality of the manifestation. The Apostle heaps assurance upon assurance with elaborate emphasis, and the cumbrousness of his language should not be removed by devices of construction or punctuation, making ver. 1 a complete sentence: (1) "That which was from the beginning (is) that which we have heard, etc."; (2) "That which was from the beginning, which we have seen . . . beheld, our hands also handled". *Cf.* Tert. in crit. n. **μαρτυροῦμεν**, according to the Lord's parting charge (*cf.* John xv. 27; Luke xxiv. 48; Acts i. 8). **ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Rev. i. 2, 9, xix. 10) was the apostolic **ἀπαγγελία**. **ἀπαγγέλλομεν, κ. τ. λ.**: "Whence we gather that Christ cannot be preached to us without the Heavenly Kingdom being opened to us, so that, being wakened from death, we may live the life of God" (Calvin). Observe the note of wonder in the Apostle's language. Speech fails him. He labours for expression, adding definition to definition.

Ver. 3. **ὃ ἑωρ. καὶ ἀκ.**, not merely a resumption but a reiteration of the protasis. **καὶ ὑμεῖς**, "ye also" who have not seen Jesus. **κοινωνίαν**, not merely knowledge through hearsay of what the Apostles had known as eye-witnesses, but personal and direct communion with the living Lord. This St. John proceeds to make plain. The phrase **καὶ . . . δὲ**, *et . . . vero, atque etiam*, introduces an important addition or explanation (*cf.* John vi. 51, viii. 16, 17, xv. 27; Acts xxii. 29; Heb. ix. 21; 2 Peter i. 5). "Christ walks no longer in the flesh among us, but He appears still continually to the world of men and reveals Himself to those who love Him. Through faith a real personal contact with the Christ now glorified in the Spirit is possible" (Rothe). There is a gracious constraint on all who know this blessed fellowship to bring others into it. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 16. Bunyan, preface to *The Jerusalem-Sinner Saved*: "I have been vile myself, but have obtained mercy, and I would have my companions in sin partake of mercy too, and therefore I have writ this little book".

Ver. 4. **ἡμεῖς**, clearly the editorial plural. The reading **ὑμῶν** seems at the first glance more attractive than **ἡμῶν** as evincing a generous solicitude on the part of the Apostle for the highest good of his readers, *viz.*, the fulfilment of their joy. Rothe: "Wer es weis, dass das uranfängliche Leben erschienen ist und er mit demselben und dadurch mit dem Vater Gemeinschaft haben kann, dessen Herz muss hoch schlagen". In truth, however, **ἡμῶν** evinces a still more generous solicitude—the very spirit of Jesus. As He could not be happy in Heaven without us, so the Apostle's joy was incomplete unless his readers shared it. *Cf.* Samuel Rutherford:—

> "Oh! if one soul from Anwoth
> Meet me at God's right hand,
> My heaven will be two heavens
> In Immanuel's land."

Vv. 5-10. The Message of the Incarnation and the Duty which it brings. "And this is the message which we have heard from Him and are announcing to you, that God is light, and darkness—in Him there is none. If we say

[n] ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν [1] ᾖ πεπληρωμένη. 5. Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν [2] ἡ [o] ἐπαγγελία [3] ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ [p] ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστι, καὶ [q] σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία. 6. [r] ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, ψευδόμεθα, καὶ οὐ ποιοῦμεν τὴν ἀλήθειαν· 7. [s] ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν, ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί, κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων, καὶ [t] τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [4] τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαρίζει [5]

n John iii. 29, xv. 11, xvi. 24, xvii. 13; 2 John 12. With ἡμῶν cf. 3 John, 4.
o iii. 11.
p Matt. xxviii. 11; John iv. 25, xvi. 12, 14, 15; 1 Peter i. 12.
q John i. 4, 5, 8, 9, viii. 12, ix. 5; James i. 17.
r ii. 4, John iii. 19-21; John, viii. 12, xii. 35, 36.
s Exod. x. 22, 23.
t Heb. ix. 13, 14.

[1] **υμων** ACKP, Syr^ph^., Vg., Cop., Aeth., Arm., Aug.; **ημων** ℵBL, many minusc., Syr^vg, Sah., edd.

[2] **εστιν αυτη** ℵBCKLP, edd.

[3] **αγγελια** ℵ^c^ABKL, Syr^vg^., Vg. (*annuntiatio*), Aeth., Arm., Aug. (*annuntiatio*), edd.

[4] **Ιησου Χριστου** AKL, Syr^ph, Vg., Cop., Tert. (*de Pudic.* 19), Aug.; om. **Χριστου** ℵBCP, Syr^vg, Sah., Arm., edd.

[5] **καθαρισει** or **καθαριει** some lesser authorities, Cop., Sah., Aug. (*purgabit*).

that we have fellowship with Him and be walking in the darkness, we lie and are not doing the Truth; but if we be walking in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from every sin. If we say that we have not sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the Truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, faithful is He and righteous to forgive us the sins and cleanse us from every unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we are making Him a liar and His Word is not in us."

Ver. 5. **ἀγγελία** in N.T. only here and iii. 11. **ἐπαγγελία** could only mean "promise" (*cf.* ii. 25). **ἀπαγγέλλειν** and **ἀναγγέλλειν** both mean "announce," the former with reference to the source of the message (**ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ**) and the latter to its destination. "*Quod Filius annunciavit, renunciat apostolus*" (Haupt). **οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία**: the double negative makes a stronger negative (*cf.* Luke xxiii. 53). The manifestation of God in Christ was to those who beheld it a splendid glory, the breaking of a great light into the darkness of a sinful and sorrowful world. *Cf.* Matt. iv. 14-16. Light means warmth, health, sight, in a word "life" (*cf.* ver. 2).

Light is given that we may "walk in it" and enjoy its blessings. It is thus that the Gospel attains its end and fulfils its purpose in us. The Apostle now proceeds to warn his readers against two heresies which ignored this condition of heavenly fellowship.

Vv. 6, 7. The heresy of Antinomianism, represented by the Nicolaitans (*cf.* Introd. p. 248). **ἐὰν εἴπωμεν**, a gentle and charitable hypothesis. He does not charge his readers with actually holding this pernicious doctrine, and he includes himself ("we," not "ye"). **περιπατεῖν**, Heb. הָלַךְ, of the whole course of life. The Greek phrase is **ἀναστρέφεσθαι** (*conversari*). God is light and sin darkness, *peccata tenebræ sunt* (Aug.), and it is impossible to be living in sin or compromising with it and at the same time be enjoying fellowship with God. **ψευδόμεθα**: we may believe the lie, being self-deceived (ver. 8); for disobedience to the Truth blinds us to it. Knowledge comes by doing (*cf.* John vii. 17). **τὴν ἀλήθειαν**, see note on ver. 8. "Walking in the light" has two blessed results: (1) "fellowship with one another," which may mean either *fellowship with God—He with us and we with Him* (Aug., Calv.), or *communion of saints—our fellow-believers with us and we with them.* In fact the one idea implies the other. They are inseparable. Communion with our brethren is the consequence and evidence of communion with God. *Cf.* iv. 20. (2) "Cleansing in the blood of Jesus." **τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ**, God's Infinite Sacrifice for the sin of the world—a N.T. phrase of peculiar poignancy and fragrance. *Cf.* Ignat. *ad Rom.* vii.: **τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγάπη ἄφθαρτος.** When we walk in the light, that demonstration of the length to which God has gone in sacrifice for our sakes, is ever before us, and the amazing spectacle subdues our hearts, takes possession of them, and drives out every evil affection. *Cf.* Catherine of Siena: "The blood and tears of the Divine Son are able

ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. 8. Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι [u] ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, ἑαυτοὺς [v] πλανῶμεν, καὶ [w] ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν. 9. [x] ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας. 10. ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν, [z] ψεύστην ποιοῦμεν αὐτόν, καὶ [a] ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν.

II. 1. [a] Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε· καὶ

u John ix. 41, xv. 22, 24, xix. 11. v ii. 26, iii. 7, iv. 6; Rev. ii. 20, xii. 9; Matt. xxii. 29, xxiv. 4, 5, 11, 24. w ii. 4. x Ps. xxxii. 5; Prov. xxviii. 13. y Rom. iii. 26. z Rom. iii. 4. a i. 8, ii. 4; John v. 38, viii. 37. a Gal. iv. 19 (T.R., WH). *Cf.* comm.

to cleanse us from head to foot". **πάσης ἁμαρτίας,** "every sin,' *i.e.* every outbreak of the sinful principle; not "all sin" (**πάσης τῆς ἁμαρτίας**). *Cf.* Rom. iii. 19: **πᾶν στόμα . . . πᾶς ὁ κόσμος.**

Vv. 8-10. The heresy of Perfectionism. Some might not say, with the Antinomians, that they were absolved from the obligation of the moral law, but they maintained that they were done with sin, had no more sinful propensities, committed no more sinful acts. In opposition hereto the Apostle asserts two facts: (1) *Inherent corruption.* Distinguish **ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν** ("to have sin") and **ἁμαρτάνειν** ("to sin"), corresponding to the sinful principle and its manifestation in specific acts. Our natures are poisoned, the taint is in our blood. Grace is the medicine, but recovery is a protracted process. It is begun the moment we submit ourselves to Christ, but all our lives we continue under treatment. **πλανῶμεν,** "lead astray" (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 12). **ἡ ἀλήθεια,** in Johannine phraseology not simply "der Wahrheitssinn, die Wahrhaftigkeit der Selbstprüfung und der Selbsterkenntniss" (Rothe), but the revelation of "the True God" (ver. 20; John xvii. 3), which came "through Jesus Christ" (John i. 17), Himself "the Truth" (John xiv. 6). Nearly equivalent to **ὁ λόγος** (ver. 10). The Truth is a splendid ideal, never realised here, else it would cease to be an ideal; always as we pursue it displaying a fuller glory, And thus the nearer we approach it the further off it seems; when we walk in the light we see faults which were hidden in the darkness. Self-abasement is a characteristic of the saints. When Juan de Avila (A.D. 1500-69) was dying the rector of his college approached him and said: "What joy it must be to you to think of meeting the Saviour!" "Ah!" said the saint, "rather do I tremble at the thought of my sins." (2) *The frequent falls of the believer.* We all "have sinned (**ἡμαρτήκαμεν**)," *i.e.*, committed acts of sin (**ἁμαρτίας**) manifesting the strength and activity of the sinful principle (**ἡ ἁμαρτία**) in our souls. This, however, is no reason for despair. There is a remedy—forgiveness and cleansing in the blood of Jesus; and there is a way of obtaining it—confession. **πιστός,** *i.e.*, to His promise (*cf.* Heb. x. 23). **δίκαιος**: He would be unrighteous if He broke His promise ratified by the blood of Jesus. Peace is not got by denying our sinfulness and our sins, but by frankly confessing them and availing ourselves, continually and repeatedly, of the gracious remedy. "Woe to that soul which presumes to think that he can approach God in any other way than as a sinner asking mercy. Know yourself to be wicked, and God will wrap you up warm in the mantle of His goodness" (Juan de Avila). "Remission of sins cannot be sundered from penitence, nor can the peace of God belong to consciences where the fear of God does not reign" (Calv.).

Perfectionism has two causes: (1) *The stifling of conscience:* "we make Him a liar, *i.e.*, turn a deaf ear to His inward testimony, His voice in our souls. (2) *Ignorance of His Word:* it "is not in us". Such a delusion were impossible if we steeped our minds in the Scriptures. Consider the lapses of the saints, *e.g.*, David, Peter.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1, 2. The Remedy for the Sins of Believers. "My little children, these things I am writing to you in order that ye may not sin. And if any one sin an Advocate have we with the Father—Jesus Christ, a righteous One. And He is Himself the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world."

Ver. 1. Observe the sudden change in the Apostle's manner. His heart is very tender toward his people, and he adopts an affectionate and personal tone: (1) He passes from the formal "we" to "I". (2, He styles them **τεκνία μου,** *filioli mei, meine Kindlein*—his favourite appellation (*cf.* ii. 12, 28; iii. 7, 18; iv. 4; v. 21). Not only was it very suitable

ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, [b] παράκλητον ἔχομεν [c] πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν [d] δίκαιον· 2. καὶ αὐτὸς [e] ἱλασμός ἐστι [f] περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

b Cf. comm. c i. 2.
d Matt. xxvii. 19; Luke xxiii. 47; Acts vii. 52, xxii. 14; 1 Peter iii. 18.
e In N.T. only here and iv. 10, ἱλαστήριον Rom. iii. 25; Heb. ix. 5; ἱλάσκεσθαι Luke xviii. 13; Heb. ii. 17.
f Rom. viii. 3.

on the lips of the aged teacher, but it was a phrase of Jesus (*cf.* John xiii. 33). St. John had caught the phrase and its spirit. He remembered how the Master had dealt with His disciples, and he would deal with his people after the same fashion and be to them what Jesus had been to himself—as gentle and patient.

He assumes this tone because he is about to address a warning to them, and he would fain take the sting out of it and disarm opposition. He foresees the possibility of a two-fold perversion of his teaching: (1) "If we can never in this life be done with sin, why strive after holiness? It is useless; sin is an abiding necessity". (2) "If escape be so easy, why dread falling into sin? We may sin with light hearts, since we have the blood of Jesus to cleanse us." "No," he answers, "I am not writing these things to you either to discourage you in the pursuit of holiness or to embolden you in sinning, but, on the contrary, in order that (ἵνα) ye may not sin." *Cf.* Aug.: "Lest perchance he should seem to have given impunity to sins, and men should now say to themselves, 'Let us sin, let us do securely what we will, Christ cleanses us; He is faithful and righteous, He cleanses us from all iniquity,' he takes from thee evil security and implants useful fear. It is an evil wish of thine to be secure; be anxious. For He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, if thou art always displeasing to thyself and being changed until thou be perfected." As a physician might say to his patient: "Your trouble is obstinate; the poison is in your blood, and it will take a long time to eradicate it. But I do not tell you this to discourage you or make you careless; no, on the contrary, to make you watchful and diligent in the use of the remedy"; so the Apostle says: "My little children, these things I am writing to you in order that ye may not sin".

If, however, we fall into sin, let us not lose heart, for **Παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα. παράκλητος,** "one called to your side," so, in a forensic sense, "one who undertakes and champions your cause," "an advocate". Vulg., *Advocatus;* Luth., *Fürsprecher bei dem Vater.* Here of the ascended Jesus; in John xiv. 16, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 7, of the Holy Spirit, where Vulg. simply transliterates *Paracletus*, and both our version ∞ give "Comforter," Luth., *Tröster*—an impossible rendering, since the word is not act. but pass. Render "Advocate" in every case. *Cf.* saying of R. Li'ezer ben Jacob: "He who does one commandment has gotten him one advocate (פרקליט, παράκλητος), and he who has committed one transgression has gotten him one accuser (קטיגור, κατήγορος). Repentance and good works are as a shield in the face of punishment." In the days of His flesh Jesus was God's Advocate with men. He told the Eleven in the Upper Room that, though He was going away, God would not be left without an Advocate on the earth to plead His cause and win men to faith (John xvi. 16, 17). The Holy Spirit has come in the room of Jesus, and still from age to age performs the office of God's Advocate with men. Nor has the advocacy of Jesus ceased. He is our Advocate in Heaven, pleading our cause with God. The history of redemption is thus a progressive economy of grace: (1) the O.T. dispensation, when God was conceived as remote in high Heaven; (2) that of the Incarnation, when He revealed Himself as a Father and, by the advocacy of His Eternal Son, made His appeal to the children of men; (3) that of the Holy Spirit, under which we live in the enjoyment of a double advocacy—our Glorified Redeemer's, who "maketh intercession for us" (Rom. viii. 34) in the Court of Heaven (*cf.* Christina Rossetti's *Verses*, p. 41: "Day and night the Accuser"), and the Holy Spirit's down here, wooing us to faith by His gracious importunities. **δίκαιον,** Rothe: "Only the righteous One, the guiltless, the One that is separate from sin, can be the Advocate with God for sinners, in general the Mediator of salvation, and make His friendship for us prevalent with God, because only such a one has access to God and fellowship with God (Heb. vii. 26; 1 Peter iii. 18; John xvi. 8, 10)". "What better advocate could we have for us, than He that is appointed to be our judge?" (Jer. Taylor, *The Great Exemplar*, I. i. 3).

Ver. 2. Our Advocate does not plead that we are innocent or adduce extenuating circumstances. He acknowledges our guilt and presents His vicarious

ἡμῶν· οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου [g] τοῦ κόσμου. 3. Καὶ [h] ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν, ἐὰν [i] τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν. 4. ὁ λέγων,[1] "Ἔγνωκα αὐτόν," καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν, ψεύστης ἐστί, καὶ [k] ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν· 5. ὃς δ' ἂν [l] τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον, ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ

g John i. 29, iii. 16.
h John xiii. 35.
i John xiv. 15, 21, xv. 10; Rev. xii. 17, xiv. 12; Matt. xxviii. 20; 2 Cor. vii. 19.
k i. 6, 8.
l John viii. 51, 52, 55, xiv. 23, xv. 20, xvii. 6; Rev. iii. 8.

[1] λεγων οτι ℵAB, edd.

work as the ground of our acquittal. He stands in the Court of Heaven **ἀρνίον ὡς ἐσφαγμένον** (Rev. v. 6) and the marks of His sore Passion are a mute but eloquent appeal: "I suffered all this for sinners, and shall it go for naught?" **περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου**, *pro totius mundi* (Vulgate), "for *the sins* of the whole world". This is grammatically possible (*cf.* Matt. v. 20), but it misses the point. There are *sins*, special and occasional, in the believer; there is *sin* in the world; it is sinful through and through. The Apostle means "for our sins and that mass of sin, the world". *Cf.* Rothe: "Die 'Welt' ist ihrem Begriff zufolge überhaupt sündig, ein Sündenmasse, und hat nicht blos einzelne Sünden an sich". The remedy is commensurate with the malady. Bengel: "Quam late patet peccatum, tam late *propitiatio*".

Observe how the Apostle classes himself with his readers: "*we* have," "*our* sins"—a rebuke of priestcraft. *Cf.* Aug.: "But some one will say: 'Do not holy men pray for us? Do not bishops and prelates pray for the people?' Nay, attend to the Scriptures, and see that even the prelates commend themselves to the people. For the Apostle says to the common folk 'withal praying for us'. The Apostle prays for the folk, the folk for the Apostle. We pray for you, brethren; but pray ye also for us. Let all the members pray for one another, let the Head intercede for all."

Vv. 3-6. The Proof of our Interest in Christ's Propitiation and Advocacy. "And herein we get to know that we know Him—if we observe His commandments. He that saith 'I know Him,' and observeth not His commandments, is a liar, and in this man the Truth is not; but whosoever observeth His Word, truly in this man the love of God hath been carried to its end. Herein we get to know that we are in Him; he that saith he abideth in Him is bound, even as the Lord (**ἐκεῖνος**) walked, himself also so to walk." The Apostle foresees a question which may be raised: "How can I be assured that Christ is all this to *me*—*my* Propitiation, *my* Advocate? And how can I be assured that I have an abiding interest in Him?" He answers: (1) We attain to personal and conscious acquaintance with Christ by observance of His commandments (3-5*a*); (2) we attain to assurance of abiding union with Him by "walking even as He walked" (5*b*, 6).

Ver. 3. The principle is that it is not enough to understand the theory; we must put it into practice. *E.g.*, what makes an artist? Not merely learning the rules of perspective and mixture of colours, but actually putting one's hand to brush and canvas. First attempts may be unsuccessful, but skill comes by patient practice. *Cf.* Rembrandt's advice to his pupil Hoogstraten: "Try to put well in practice what you already know; and in doing so you will, in good time, discover the hidden things which you inquire about'. To know about Christ, to understand the doctrine of His person and work is mere theory; we get to know Him and to know that we know Him by practice of His precepts. **γινώσκω** (*cognosco*) is to **οἶδα** (*scio*) as **γίνομαι** (*fio*) to **εἰμί** (*sum*). **ἐγνώκαμεν**, *cognovimus*, "we have got to know," *i.e.* "we know". **τηρεῖν**, "keep a watchful eye upon". *Cf.* Matt. xxvii. 36: **καὶ καθήμενοι ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ.**

Ver. 4. **μὴ τηρῶν**, in classical Greek a gentle hypothesis, merely suggesting a possible case; but in later Greek **μή** is the regular negative with participles. It was an actual error, else the Apostle would hardly have spoken so emphatically about it. **ψεύστης**, see note on i. 6. **ἀλήθεια**, see note on i. 8.

Ver. 5. **ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ**, "the love of God," is ambiguous like אַהֲבַת יְהוָֹה, *amor Dei*, *l' amore di Dio*, *l'amour de Dieu*, *die Liebe Gottes*. It might be objective genitive, "love for God," "die Liebe zu Gott" (Rothe). But the believer's love for God is never perfected in this life. The genitive is subjective (*cf.* iv. 9), *amor Dei erga hominem*, *per Christum nobis reconciliatus* (Bengel),

[m] ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ τετελείωται. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ [n] ἐσμεν.[1] 6. ὁ λέγων [o] ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν, [p] ὀφείλει, καθὼς [q] ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησε, καὶ αὐτὸς οὕτω [2] [r] περιπατεῖν. 7. ἀδελφοί,[3] οὐκ ἐντολὴν [s] καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαιάν, [t] ἣν εἴχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιά ἐστιν ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.[4] 8. πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν

m iv. 12, 17, 18; Luke xiii. 32; John iv. 34, v. 36, xvii. 4, 23; Heb. ii. 10, x. 1, 14, xi. 40.
n 2 Cor. v. 17.
o John xv. 4-7.
p iii. 16, iv. 11; 3 John 8; John xiii. 14; Matt. xxiii. 16, 18; Luke xvii. 10; Rom. xv. 1; Heb. v. 12.
q *Cf.* comm.
r Eph. v. 2; Col. ii. 6.
s Matt. xiii. 52, xxvi. 28, 29, xxvii. 60; Mark i. 27.
t John xiii. 34, xv. 12; Mark xii. 29-31.

[1] Punct. **ἐσμεν·** WH, Nest.

[2] **και αυτος ουτως** ℵCKP, Syr^ph, Cop., Arm., Tisch., Nest.; om. **ουτως** AB, Vg., Sah., Aeth., Aug., WH.

[3] **αγαπητοι** ℵABCP, Syr^vg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Arm., Aug., edd.

[4] **απ αρχης** om. ℵABCP, many minusc., Syr^vg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.

and the idea is that the redeeming love of God has attained its end in the man who observes His Word. *Cf.* Isa. liii. 11. St. Augustine understands "the love of God" as His love for sinners, a forgiving love like that of Jesus when He prayed on the Cross "Father, forgive them". "What is the perfection of love? It is both to love one's enemies and to love them in order that they may be brethren." By cultivating a love like this we get to know that we know Him. **ἐν τούτῳ** (*b*) points forward to **ὁ λέγων, κ.τ.λ.**, introducing a second assurance. It is not enough to know Him; we must be sure of continuing in fellowship with Him, of "abiding in Him" to the end. This assurance comes by "walking even as He walked"; *i.e.* the conformation of our lives to His is an evidence of our abiding interest in Him, our vital union with Him. We get like Him by imitating Him, and our likeness to Him is an irrefragable evidence to ourselves and the the world that we are His, as a son's likeness to his father proves their relationship. **ὀφείλει**, "is bound," "ist schuldig" (Rothe), of *moral obligation*. The claim (**λέγων**) must be honourably attested. **αὐτὸς** in this section refers grammatically to Jesus Christ vv. 1, 2). The change of pronoun (**ἐκεῖνος**) does not imply a change of person, since here as in iii. 3, 5, 7, 16, iv. 17, **ἐκεῖνος** is not a mere pronoun. It is used like *ille*, and signifies "that great One," "the Master". *Cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 12, 13. **περιπατεῖν**, see note on i. 6. Aug.: "Perhaps He admonishes us to walk in the sea. Far from it! He admonishes us to walk in the way of righteousness."

Vv. 7-11. A New Meaning in an Old Commandment. "Beloved, it is no new commandment that I am writing to you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye heard. Again, it is a new commandment that I am writing to you—a thing which is true in Him and in you, because the darkness is passing away and the light, the true light, is already shining. He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother is in the darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is no stumbling-block in his way; but he that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not where he is going, because the darkness hath blinded his eyes."

St. John has lately discovered the supremacy of Love in the Christian revelation (see Introd. pp. 249 f.). His imperfect realisation of this has been the defect of his teaching hitherto, and he would now repair it: "It is not a new commandment that I am writing to you; it is part of the Gospel which I have been preaching to you all along. But I have never adequately understood it, and therefore it is new to your ears as it is to my heart."

Ver. 7. **ἀγαπητοί**, St. John's favourite style (*cf.* iii. 2, 21, iv. 1, 7, 11). About to enjoin love, he begins by loving. **καινός**, "novel," "new *in kind*" (*novus*) as distinguished from **νέος**, "new *in time*" (*recens*). **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**, here not as in i. 1, but "from the beginning of your Christian life". **ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιά**, *cf.* i. 2: **τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον.**

Ver. 8. **πάλιν**, "again," *i.e.* in another sense, from another point of view, not in itself but in our recognition of it, "it is a new commandment". **ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθές**, in apposition to **ἐντολήν**—"a thing which is true," *viz.*, the paramount

u i. 5-7. v Ver. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 31. w John i. 9. x John i. 5, v. 35; Rev. i. 16, viii. 12, xviii. 23, xxi. 23. y iv. 20.

ὑμῖν· ὅτι [u]ἡ σκοτία [v]παράγεται, καὶ [w]τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἤδη [x]φαίνει. 9. [y]ὁ λέγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν, ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν ἕως ἄρτι. 10. [z]ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει, καὶ [a]σκάνδαλον ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.[1] 11. ὁ δὲ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, [b]ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστί, καὶ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ περιπατεῖ, καὶ οὐκ οἶδε [c]ποῦ ὑπάγει, ὅτι ἡ σκοτία ἐτύφλωσε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.

z i. 5-7; Ps. xxxvi. 9. a Johann. only here and Rev. ii. 14; *σκανδαλίζειν* John vi. 61, xvi. 1. b John iii. 8, viii. 14, xii. 35, xiii. 36, xiv. 5, xvi. 5. c John xi. 9, 10, xiv. 35, 36; Is. vi. 10 (John xii. 40).

[1] **εν αυτω ουκ εστιν** BKLP, WH, Nest.; **ουκ εστιν εν αυτω** ℵAC, Tisch., WH (marg).

necessity of Love. This truth, though unperceived, is contained in the revelation of Jesus Christ (**ἐν αὐτῷ**) and proved in the experience of believers (**ἐν ὑμῖν**). It is a fact that hatred of one's brother clouds the soul and shuts out the light. "I know this," says the Apostle, "because the darkness is passing away and the light, the true light, is already shining," *i.e.* my eyes are getting accustomed to the light of the Gospel-revelation, and I have seen this truth which at first was hidden from me. Adjectives in -**ινός** denote the material of which the thing is made; and **ἀληθινός** is used of the real as opposed either to the type (*cf.* John vi. 32, xv. 1; Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24) or to the counterfeit (*cf. Symb. Nic.:* **Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ** "very God of very God," *i.e.* the real God as opposed to false gods, idols, which were "things of naught"). The opposite of **τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν** is, on the one hand, the dim light of the Jewish Law (the type) and, on the other, the false light of human speculation (the counterfeit).

Ver. 9. He says and perhaps thinks he is in the light, but he has never seen the light; it has never shone on him. **ἀδελφόν**, on the lips of Jesus a fellow-man (*cf.* Matt. v. 45; Luke xv. 30, 32), in the apostolic writings a fellow-Christian (*cf.* v. 1-2, 16)—one of the apostolic narrowings of the Lord's teaching. *Cf.* "neighbour"—with the Rabbis, a fellow-Jew; with Jesus, a fellow-man (*cf.* Luke x. 25-37). There is no contradiction between this passage and Luke xiv. 26. The best commentary on the latter is John xii. 25.

Ver. 10. **ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει**: he does not merely catch glimpses of the light but "abideth in it," being of one mind with God, the common Father, who "is light" (i. 5). **σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ**, "there is no occasion of stumbling, nothing to trip him up and make him fall, in his case,"—an echo of John xi. 9, 10. Another interpretation, less agreeable to the context but more consonant with the common use of **σκάνδαλον** (*cf.* Matt. xiii. 41, xviii. 7; Rom. xiv. 13), is: Because he is winsome and gracious, there is in him no stumbling-block to others, nothing to deter them from accepting the Gospel. The love of the primitive Christians impressed the heathen. *Cf.* Tert. *Apol.* 39: "Vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant: ipsi enim invicem oderunt; et ut pro alterutro mori sint parati: ipsi enim ad occidendum alterutrum paratiores erunt". *Ep. ad Diogn.* 1: **καὶ τίνα φιλοστοργίαν ἔχουσι πρὸς ἀλλήλους**. This spirit disappeared, and in view of the bitter controversies of the 4th century the Pagan historian Ammianus avowed that "the enmity of the Christians toward each other surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man". Another interpretation takes **αὐτῷ** as neuter: "There is no occasion of stumbling in it," *i.e.*, in the light. *Cf.* John xi. 9.

Ver. 11. St. John recognises no neutral attitude between "love" and "hatred". Love is active benevolence, and less than this is hatred, just as indifference to the Gospel-call amounts to rejection of it (*cf.* Matt. xxii. 5-7). Observe the climax: "in the darkness is, and in the darkness walketh, and knoweth not where he is going". **ἐτύφλωσεν**, aor. of the *indefinite past*, where we would use the perf. (*cf.* Moulton, *Gram. of N. T. Gk.*, i. pp. 135 ff.). The penalty of living in the darkness is not merely that one does not see, but that one goes blind. The neglected faculty is atrophied. *Cf.* the mole, the *crustacea* in the subterranean lakes of the Mammoth Caves of Kentucky.

Observe how St. John emphasises and elaborates the old-new commandment "Love thy brother," reiterating it, putting it negatively and positively.

Vv. 12-17. The Appeal of Experience. "I am writing to you, little children, because your sins have been forgiven you for His name's sake; I am writing to you, fathers, because ye have got to know Him that it is from the beginning;

12. γράφω ὑμῖν, τεκνία, ὅτι ἀφέωνται ὑμῖν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι [d] διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. 13. Γράφω ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν [e] ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. γράφω ὑμῖν, [f] νεανίσκοι, ὅτι [g] νενικήκατε [h] τὸν [1] πονηρόν. γράφω [2] ὑμῖν, [i] παιδία, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα. 14. Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, πατέρες, ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν [3] ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς. Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, νεανίσκοι, ὅτι [k] ἰσχυροί ἐστε, καὶ [l] ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει, καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν

d Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 9; John xv. 21; Rev. ii. 3.
e i. 1.
f Matt. xix. 20, 22; Acts, ii. 17.
g John xvi. 33; Rom. xii. 21.
h iii. 12, v. 18, 19; John xvii. 15; Matt. v. 37, vi. 13, xiii. 19, 38.
i Ver. 18, iii. 17 (v.l.).
k Eph. vi. 10.
l i. 10 reff.

[1] το ℵ.

[2] γραφω K, Vg., Aug.; εγραψα ℵABCLP, Syr$^{vg\ ph}$, Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

[3] το B.

I am writing to you, young men, because ye have conquered the Evil One. I wrote to you, little ones, because ye have got to know the Father; I wrote to you, fathers, because ye have got to know Him that is from the beginning; I wrote to you, young men, because ye are strong, and the Word of God abideth in you, and ye have conquered the Evil One. Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world. If any one loveth the world, the love of the Father is not in him; because everything that is in the world—the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the braggart boast of life—is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world is passing away and the lust of it, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."

The Apostle has been setting forth searching truths and is about to make an exacting claim; and here he pauses and with much tenderness reassures his readers: "I am not addressing you as unbelievers or casting doubt upon the sincerity of your faith. On the contrary, it is because I am assured thereof that I am writing this letter to you and wrote the Gospel which accompanies it".

Ver. 12. **τεκνία,** all the Apostle's readers, his customary appellation (see n. on ii. 1). **ἀφέωνται**, perf., the Doric form of **ἀφεῖνται**. **τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,** the character, mind, purpose of God revealed in Christ. "The name of God" is "whatsoever there is whereby he makes himself known" (*Westm. Larg. Catech.*).

Ver. 13. He now subdivides **τεκνία** into **πατέρες**, *i.e.*, mature believers with a long and ever-deepening (**ἐγνώκατε**) experience behind them, and **νεανίσκοι,** who, though **ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός** is strong within them, have conquered the Evil One by the aids of grace—an evidence of the reality of their interest in Christ. **ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς,** as in i. 1. The ancient interpreters took **τεκνία, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι** as a threefold classification, according to age (Aug., Athan.) or according to Christian experience, **κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον** (Euth. Zig.); but the order would then be either **τεκνία, νεανίσκοι, πατέρες** or **πατέρες, νεανίσκοι, τεκνία.** According to the variant **γράφω ὑμῖν, παιδία, τεκνία** is a general appellation subdivided into **πατέρες, νεανίσκοι, παιδία.** Ver. 14 should begin with **ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, παιδία.** The aor. **ἔγραψα** is most simply and reasonably explained as a reference to the Apostle's Gospel (see Introd. p. 246). Having assured them of his present conviction of the sincerity of their faith, he now goes on to assure them that he had entertained a like opinion when he wrote the Gospel for their instruction. His tone is much like that of 2 Pet. i. 12. Other explanations: (1) The reference is to a former epistle (*cf.* 3 John 9)—a gratuitous and unnecessary hypothesis. (2) The Apostle resumes after a pause whether in composition or in thought, and reiterates what he "has written". (3) An emphatic form of expression, like "we decree and have decreed". (4) Calvin, reading **γράφω ὑμῖν, παιδία,** regards **πατέρες . . . πονηρόν** as an interpolation. This is to cut the knot instead of untying it. **παιδία,** a general appellation for all the Apostle's readers, practically identical with **τεκνία.** Strictly **τεκνία** carries the idea of relationship by *birth-regeneration; cf.* Aug.: "*Quia remittuntur vobis peccata per nomen ejus*, et regeneramini in novam vitam, ideo filii". **παιδία,** on the other hand, are merely "children," *pueri* (Aug.), *infantes* (Vulg.), and the distinction is **ὅτι ἐγνώκατε τὸν Πατέρα.** All men are children of God, believers are children who "have got to know the Father".

Ver. 14. The Apostle gives the same reason as before for writing to the fathers, as though there could be none

m James iv. 4. | n Rom. xiii. 14; Gal. v. 16. 24; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Peter ii. 11; 2 Peter ii. 10, 18; 2 Peter ii. 14; Mark iv. 19.

πονηρόν. 15. μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ· [m] ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς [1] ἐν αὐτῷ· 16. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, [n] ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ ἡ [o] ἀλαζονεία [2] τοῦ [p] βίου, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλ᾽ [3] [q] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστί. 17. καὶ ὁ κόσμος [r] παράγεται, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ [s] ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

o James iv. 16; Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2 (ἀλαζών). p Luke viii. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 4. q iv. 5; John viii. 23, xv. 19. r Ver. 8 reff. s John iv. 34; Matt. vii. 21, xxiv. 39; 1 Peter iv. 2.

[1] του πατρος ℵBKLP, Syr vg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Arm., Aug., edd.; του θεου AC, several minusc., Aeth.; του θεου και πατρος, several minusc.

[2] αλαζονεια B³K; αλαζονια ℵAB*LP, edd. [3] αλλ ℵAKL; αλλα BC, edd.

greater. He gives the same reason also for writing to the young men, but he amplifies it: they have the strength of youth, but it is disciplined by the indwelling Word, and therefore they have conquered.

Ver. 15. He is dealing with believers who have a large experience of the grace of Christ, and on this fact he proceeds to base an appeal, a call to further advancement and higher attainment: "Love not the world". Yet God "loved the world" (John iii. 16). Observe that the Apostle does not say that the world is evil. It is God's world, and "God saw every thing that He had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. i. 31). His meaning is: "The things in the world are transient. Do not set your affection on them, else you will sustain a bitter disappointment. The world is a good and beautiful gift of God, to be used with joy and gratitude; but it is not the supreme end, it is not the home of our souls". "Let the Spirit of God be in thee," says St. Augustine, "that thou mayest see that all these things are good; but woe to thee if thou love created things and forsake the Creator! . . . If a bridegroom made a ring for his bride and, when she got it, she were fonder of the ring than of the bridegroom who made the ring for her, would not an adulterous spirit be detected in the very gift of the bridegroom, however she might love what the bridegroom gave? . . . God gave thee all those things: love Him who made them. There is more which He would fain give thee, to wit, Himself who made these things". Again: "There are two loves—of the world and of God. If the love of the world inhabit, there is no way for the love of God to enter. Let the love of the world retire and that of God inhabit, let the better get room. . . . Shut out the evil love of the world, that thou mayest be filled by the love of God. Thou art a vessel, but thou art still full; pour out what thou hast, that thou mayest get what thou hast not". ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Πατρός, like ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 5), either (1) "love for the Father," in antithesis to ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον, or (2) "the love which the Father feels for us". In fact the one implies the other. The sense of the Father's love for us awakens in us an answering love for Him. *Cf.* iv. 19.

Ver. 16. ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, not object. gen. (Aug.: "desiderium earum rerum quæ pertinent ad carnem, sicut cibus et concubitus, et cætera hujusmodi,") but subject.: "the lust which the flesh feels, which resides in the flesh". *Cf.* ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν. ἀλαζονία, vain pretension, claiming what one really has not. *Def. Plat.*: ἕξις προσποιητικὴ ἀγαθοῦ ἢ ἀγαθῶν τῶν μὴ ὑπαρχόντων. Suid.: ἀλαζόνας τοὺς ψεύστας ἐκάλουν, ἐπεὶ λέγειν ἐπαγγέλλονται περὶ ὧν μὴ ἴσασιν. Theophr. *Char.* vi.: προσδοκία τις ἀγαθῶν οὐκ ὄντων. ζωή, the vital principle (*vita qua vivimus*), βίος, the outward life (*vita quam vivimus*) or livelihood (*victus*). There is here a summary of all possible sins, exemplified in the temptations of Eve (Gen. iii. 1-6) and our Lord (Matt. iv. 1-11). *Cf.* Aug.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on Matt. iv. 1. (1) "The lust of the flesh": *cf.* "The tree was good for food"; "Command that these stones become loaves". (2) "The lust of the eyes": *cf.* "It was a delight to the eyes"; "Cast thyself down"—a spectacular display. (3) "The braggart boast of life": *cf.* "The tree was to be desired to make one wise": "All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them".

Ver. 17. An explanation, especially of ἡ ἀλαζονία τοῦ βίου. To set one's affection on the things in the world is "braggart boasting"; for they are not ours, they are transient. *Cf.* Mohammed: "What have I to do with the

18. [t] Παιδία, [u] ἐσχάτη [v] ὥρα ἐστί· καὶ καθὼς [w] ἠκούσατε ὅτι [1] ὁ [2] [x] ἀντίχριστος [y] ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν· [z] ὅθεν

t Ver. 13 reff. u John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, xi. 24; Acts ii. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Tim. iii. 1; James v. 1; 1 Peter i. 5; 2 Peter iii. 3. v John v. 28. w Matt. xxiv. 5, 24. x Ver. 22, iv. 3; 3 John 7. y John iv. 25. z Acts xxvi. 19; Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, ix. 18.

[1] οτι אBCKP, Syr^vg ph, Vg., Cop., Aug., edd.; om. AL, several minusc.

[2] ο א^cAKL; om. א*BC, Arm., edd.

comforts of this life? The world and I—what connection is there between us? Verily the world is no otherwise than as a tree unto me: when the traveller hath rested under its shade, he passeth on." Aug. on iv. 4: "Mundus iste omnibus fidelibus quærentibus, patriam sic est, quomodo fuit eremus populo Israel". **αὐτοῦ**, subjective genitive like **σαρκός** and **ὀφθαλμῶν**. **τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ**, alone permanent amid the flux of transitory things. *Cf.* Aug.: "Rerum temporalium fluvius trahit: sed tanquam circa fluvium arbor nata est Dominus noster Jesus Christus. Assumpsit carnem, mortuus est, resurrexit, ascendit in cœlum. Voluit se quodammodo circa fluvium temporalium plantare. Raperis in praeceps? tene lignum. Volvit te amor mundi? tene Christum."

Vv. 18-29. A Warning against Heretical Teaching. "Little ones, it is the last hour; and, as ye heard that Antichrist is coming, even now have many antichrists arisen; whence we recognise that it is the last hour. From our company they went out, but they were not of our company; for, if they had been of our company, they would have abode in our fellowship; but the purpose of it was that it may be manifested that they all are not of our company. And *ye* have a chrism from the Holy One, and ye all know. I did not write to you because ye did not know the Truth, but because ye know it and because every lie is not of the Truth. Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist—he that denieth the Father and the Son. Every one that denieth the Son neither hath he the Father; he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also. As for you, that which ye heard from the beginning, let it abide in you. If that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning, ye also in the Son and in the Father will abide. And this is the promise which He Himself promised us—the Life, the Eternal Life. These things I wrote to you regarding them that would lead you astray. And as for you, the chrism which ye received from Him abideth in you, and ye have no need that any one should teach you; but, as His chrism is teaching you regarding all things, and is true and is not a lie, and even as it taught you, abide in Him. And now, little children, abide in Him, that, if He be manifested, we may have boldness and not be shamed away from Him at His advent. If ye know that He is righteous, recognise that every one also that doeth righteousness hath been begotten of Him."

A heresy had arisen in the bosom of the Church (see Introd. pp. 248 f.). It was a fatal heresy, a denial of the possibility of the Incarnation, and therefore of the relation of fatherhood and sonship between God and man. St. John's emphatic condemnation of it was justified, but his apprehension was groundless. He shared the prevailing expectation of the imminence of the Second Advent (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 11, xv. 51; Phil. iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 15 *sqq.*; Heb. x. 25; James v. 8; 1 Peter iv. 7; Rev. i. 1, 3, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 10, 12, 20), and saw in the heresy an evidence that the end was at hand. It was rather an evidence that the Gospel was winning its way. The era of simple and unquestioning faith in the apostolic testimony was past, and men were beginning to enquire and reason. A heresy has the same use in theology as a mistaken hypothesis in science: it provokes thought and leads to a deeper understanding. What seemed to the Apostle the pangs of dissolution were in reality "growing pains".

Ver. 18. Aug.: "Pueros alloquitur, ut festinent crescere, quia novissima hora est. . . . Proficite, currite, crescite, novissima hora est". Ver. 28 puts it beyond doubt that **ἐσχάτη ὥρα** means "the end of the world," and rules out various attempts which have been made to give it another reference and absolve the Apostle from the current misconception: (1) Aug. says vaguely: "the last hour is of long duration, yet it is the last" (*novissima hora diuturna est; tamen novissima est*). And Calv.: "Nothing any longer remains but that Christ should appear for the redemption of the world. . . . He calls that 'the last time' in which all things are being so completed that nothing is left except the last revelation of Christ". (2) Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on

γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν. 19. [a] Ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον,[1] ἀλλʼ οὐκ ἦσαν [b] ἐξ ἡμῶν· εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν,[2] μεμενήκεισαν ἂν [c] μεθʼ ἡμῶν· ἀλλʼ [d] ἵνα [e] φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν. 20. Καὶ ὑμεῖς [f] χρίσμα [3] ἔχετε ἀπὸ [g] τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ [h] οἴδατε πάντα.[4] 21. οὐκ ἔγραψα

a Acts xv. 24, xx. 30. b John iii. 1. c Matt. i. 23, xxvi. 29, 38, 58, 69; Acts i. 26. d 1 Cor xi. 19. e John iii. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 3. f Ver. 27. g Cf. Comm. h 1 Cor. ii. 15.

[1] εξηλθον ℵKLP; εξηλθαν ABC, edd.

[2] ησαν εξ ημων ℵAKLP, Tisch.; εξ ημων ησαν BC, WH, Nest.

[3] χρίσμα WH; χρῖσμα Tisch., Nest.; *cf.* *v.* 27.

[4] παντα ACKL, Syr[vg] (understanding πάντα ἄνθρωπον) [ph], Vg., Cop., Aeth., Arm.; παντες ℵBP, Sah., edd.

John xxi. 22, compares אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים *i.e.*, "the last times of the Jewish city, nation, and dispensation," and remarks: "Gens ista vergit jam quam proxime in ruinam, cum enatus jam sit ultimus et summus apex infidelitatis, apostasiæ et nequitiæ". (3) Beng. with unwonted ineptitude: The advanced age of St. John and his contemporaries in contrast to his "little children". "*Ultima*, non respectu omnium mundi temporum: sed in antitheto *puerulorum* ad *patres*, et ad *juvenes*". (4) Westcott: "a last hour," *i.e.*, "a period of critical change". This is possible but improbable. The omission of the def. art. in the pred. is regular. Ἀντίχριστος (anarthrous) is a proper name. Nowhere in N.T. but in the Johannine Epp. It may mean (1), on the analogy of ἀντιφιλόσοφος, ἀντικάτων, ἀντικείμενος, ἀντίθεσις, "adversary of Christ," *Widerchrist* (Luth.); *cf.* Orig. *C. Cels.* vi. 45: τὸν τούτῳ κατὰ διάμετρον ἐναντίον, Tert. *De Praescript. Hær.*: "antichristi, Christi rebelles," Aug.: "Latine Antichristus contrarius est Christo"; (2), on the analogy of ἀντιβασιλεύς, ἀνθύπατος (*proconsul*), "antipope," a "rival of Christ," usurping His name, a ψευδόχριστος (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 24 = Mark xiii. 22); *cf.* Aristoph. *Eq.* 1038 *sq.*: ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ λέοντός εἰμί σοι. / καὶ πῶς μʼ ἐλελήθης Ἀντιλέων γεγενημένος; St. John seems to combine both ideas. The heresy arose in the bosom of the Church and claimed to be an enlightened Christianity; yet, while calling themselves Christians, Cerinthus and his followers were adversaries of Christ. Wetst.: "Qui se pro Christo gerit, ideoque ei contrarius est". ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί, the exponents and representatives of the antichristian movement were a numerous party. γεγόνασιν, "have arisen," in contrast to the true Christ who "was in the beginning". *Cf.* the contrast between the Word and the Baptist in John i. 1, 6.

Ver. 19. *Cf.* Aug.: "Sic sunt in corpore Christi quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus: sic et mali quando exeunt, tunc Ecclesia relevatur. Et dicit quando eos evomit atque projicit corpus: Ex me exierunt umores isti, sed non erant ex me. Quid est, non erant ex me? Non de carne mea præcisi sunt, sed pectus mihi premebant cum inessent". ἵνα, sc. ἐξῆλθαν or γέγονε τοῦτο—a frequent Johannine ellipse: *cf.* John i. 8, ix. 3, xiii. 18, xv. 25.

Ver. 20. An expression of confidence in his readers: they will not be led astray; they have received "a chrism," the enlightening grace of the Holy Spirit, "which He poured forth upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour" (Tit. iii. 6). Baptism was called χρῖσμα in later days (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xl. 4) because of the rite of baptismal anointing (*cf.* Tert. *De Bapt.* 7: "Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione de pristina disciplina, qua ungi oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant"; Aug.: "Unctio spiritalis ipse Spiritus sanctus est, cujus sacramentum est in unctione visibili"); but there is no reference here to this rite, which was of a later date and was derived from our passage. χρῖσμα is suggested by ἀντίχριστοι. "They are ἀντίχριστοι, you are χριστοί." *Cf.* Ps. cv. (civ. LXX) 15: μὴ ἅψησθε τῶν χριστῶν μου. τοῦ Ἁγίου, not the Holy Spirit. St. John has τὸ Πνεῦμα in Epp. and Rev., but never τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. Either (1) Christ (*cf.* Rev. iii. 7) or (2) God the Father (*cf.* Acts x. 38; Heb. i. 9). The latter is preferable. The Spirit παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (John xv. 26)—from (ἀπό) the Father through (διά) Christ (*cf.* Tit. iii. 6).

Ver. 21. ἔγραψα, "I wrote," may refer to the Gospel, which is an exposition of the Incarnation, ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔνσαρκος οἰκονομία (*cf.* note on ver. 14); but more probably "aor. referring to the moment just past" (Jebb on Soph. *O.T.* 337). The aor. is appro-

ὑμῖν, [i] ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι πᾶν ψεῦδος [k] ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστι.[1] 22. Τίς ἐστιν ὁ [l] ψεύστης, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς [m] οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν. 23. [n] πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱόν, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει.[2] 24. Ὑμεῖς οὖν[3] ὃ ἠκούσατε [o] ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω. ἐὰν ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ ὃ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε, [p] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ μενεῖτε. 25. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν [q] ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν, τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον. 26. ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν [r] πλανώντων ὑμᾶς. 27. Καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ χρίσμα[4] ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἐν ὑμῖν μένει,[5] καὶ οὐ [s] χρείαν ἔχετε ἵνα τις διδάσκῃ ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ᾽ ὡς [t] τὸ[6] αὐτὸ[7] χρίσμα[8] διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀληθές ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι

i 2 Peter 12.
k Ver. 16.
l ii. 4.
m Luke xx. 27; Gal. v. 7.
n iv. 15; John v. 23, xv. 23.
o Ver. 7.
p John xv. 7, 23.
q Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 1; Heb. iv. 1.
r i. 8 reff.
s Heb. v. 12.
t John xiv. 26; xvi. 13; Gal. i. 12; Heb. viii. 11 (Jer. xxxi. 34).

[1] εστιν edd.

[2] Add ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει ℵABCP, many minusc., Syrvg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.

[3] ουν om. ℵABCP, Syrph, Vg., Arm., edd.

[4] χαρισμα B.

[5] μενει εν υμιν ℵABCP, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

[6] αλλ ως το ℵACKLP, Vg., Sah., edd.; αλλα το B, Aeth.

[7] αυτο AKL, Cop.; αυτου ℵBCP, Syrvg ph, Vg., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.

[8] πνευμα ℵ*, Cop., Aeth.

priate. No sooner has he spoken of the antichrists than he hastens to reiterate his assurance of confidence in his readers. **τὴν ἀλήθειαν**, see note on i. 8. **ἐκ**, of parentage (*cf.* iii. 8-10). His readers had only to be reminded of their experience (**οἴδατε**), and it would keep them from being led astray. An experience is an anchor to the soul in time of storm. "Tell me," said the dying Cromwell to a minister, "is it possible to fall from grace?" "No, it is not possible." "Then I am safe, for I know that I was once in grace" (Morley's *Oliver Cromwell*, V. x.).

Ver. 22. **ψεύστης**, *cf.* n. on i. 6. The Cerinthian distinction between Jesus and the Christ was a denial of the possibility of the Incarnation, *i.e.*, of the filial relation of man to God. **οὐκ** in dependent clause after **ἀρνεῖσθαι** is a common Gk. idiom, not unknown in English; *cf.* Shakespeare, *Comedy of Errors*, IV. ii. 7: "He denied you had in him no right".

Ver. 23. Since the Father is manifested and interpreted in the Son. *Cf.* John i. 18, xiv. 9.

Ver. 24. **ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς**, as in ver. 7. The significant iteration of **μένειν** is lost in A.V. ("abide . . . remain . . . continue"). **ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ Πατρί**: observe the order. The Son is the manifestation of the Father; through Him we reach the Unseen Father (*cf.* John xiv. 9).

Ver. 25. **ἐπαγγελία**, *repromissio*, "promise"; only here in the Johannine writings (see note on i. 5). **αὐτός**, *i.e.*, the Father. God is the Promiser, and His promises are made in Christ (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 20).

Ver. 26. **ἔγραψα**, see note on ver. 21. **τῶν πλανώντων**, the heretical teachers. Pres. partic., "are leading astray" but unsuccessfully.

Ver. 27. The ground of the Apostle's confidence in his readers. They need not be taught but only reminded. **ἀλλ᾽ ὡς, κ.τ.λ.**, a single sentence with one apodosis. Vulg. makes it a double sentence with two apodoses: "as His chrism is teaching you regarding all things, it is indeed true and is not a lie; and even as it taught you, abide in Him". Reading **ἀλλά**, translate: "ye have no need that any one should teach you, but His chrism is teaching you . . . a lie; and even as, etc." **διδάσκει**, of the continued teaching by the grace of the Spirit; **ἐδίδαξεν**, of the illumination at the hour of conversion. **μένετε**, plainly imperat. in next ver., can hardly be indicat. here ("ye are abiding"). The reading **μενεῖτε** ("ye shall abide") would express the Apostle's confidence in the steadfastness of his

ψεῦδος · καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, μενεῖτε[1] ἐν αὐτῷ. 28. [u] Καὶ νῦν, τεκνία, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ · ἵνα ὅταν[2] [v] φανερωθῇ, ἔχωμεν[3] [w] παρρησίαν, καὶ μὴ [x] αἰσχυνθῶμεν ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ [y] παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. 29. [z] ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστι, [a] γινώσκετε ὅτι[4] πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται.

III. 1. [a] Ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν[5] ἡμῖν ὁ πατήρ, ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ [b] κληθῶμεν[6] · διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς, ὅτι

u John xvii. 5.
v i. 2; John i. 31, xxi. 1, 14; Col. iii. 4; 1 Peter v. 4.
w iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14; Eph. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16, x. 19.
x Mark viii. 38; Rev. iii. 18. y Matt. xxiv. 3, 27, 39; 1 Cor xv. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13.
z Phil. ii. 1. a John xv. 18. a Matt. viii. 27; Mark xiii. 1; Luke i. 29, vii. 39; 2 Peter iii. 11.
b Matt. v. 9, xxiii. 7, 8, 9, xxvii. 8; Luke i. 32, 35; John i. 43.

[1] μενειτε KL; μενετε ℵABCP, many minusc., Syrvg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.

[2] οταν KL, Syrvg ph, Vg., Aug.; εαν ℵABCP, Cop., Sah., Arm., edd.

[3] εχωμεν ℵ*KL; σχωμεν ℵcBCP, edd.

[4] οτι BKL, Syrph, Cop., Aeth., Arm., Aug., WH; οτι και ℵACP, Syrvg, Vg., Sah., Tisch., Nest.

[5] δεδωκεν ℵABCKP, edd.; εδωκεν AL.

[6] κληθωμεν και εσμεν ℵABCP, Syrvg, Vg. (*et simus*), Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

readers, like "England expects every man to do his duty". *Cf.* Matt. v. 48: **ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι.** **ἐν αὐτῷ**, *in eo* (Vulg.), "in Him," *i.e.*, in Christ and therefore in God (*cf.* ver. 24). According to Aug., "in it," *i.e.*, the chrism, *unctio* (*permanete in ipsa*).

Ver. 28. **καὶ νῦν**, continuing and reinforcing the exhortation. **ἐὰν φανερωθῇ**: the uncertainty is not in the manifestation but in the time of it, and this is the reason for steadfast abiding in Him. *Cf.* unwritten saying of Jesus: **ἐφ᾽ οἷς γὰρ ἂν εὕρω ὑμᾶς, φησὶν, ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.** **σχῶμεν**, aor. marking the suddenness of the crisis. **παρρησία**, properly "freedom of speech" (*cf.* Mark viii. 2; John vii. 13, xvi. 29, xviii. 20; Acts ii. 29, iv. 29, 31, xxviii. 31); then "confidence," "boldness," especially before God (*cf.* Heb. iv. 16; 1 John iii. 21, iv. 17, v. 14), the attitude of children to their father in contrast with that of slaves to their master (*cf.* Sen. *Ep.* xlvii.: "Infelicibus servis movere labra ne in hoc quidem ut loquantur licet. Virga murmur omne compescitur: . . . nocte tota jejuni mutique perstant"). **καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν**, in contrast to **σχῶμεν παρρησίαν.** **παρουσία**, frequent in N.T. but only here in the Johannine writings. Not simply "presence" but "arrival," "advent" (*adventus*); *cf.* Luke xiii. 1: **παρῆσαν**, Matt. xi. 50, John xi. 28.

Ver. 29. In view of the preceding verse **δίκαιος** must refer to Christ (*cf.* ii. 1), and it is equally certain that **ἐξ αὐτοῦ** refers to the Father, since "begotten of Christ" (*cf.* Tennyson s "our fair father Christ") is not a Scriptural idea. The abrupt transition evinces St. John's sense of the oneness of the Father and the Son (*cf.* ver. 24; John x. 30). **γινώσκετε**, *scitote* (Vulg.), rather *cognoscite* (Calv.), "get to know," "recognise" (see note on ver. 3); perceive the blessed inference, appropriate your birthright. It enfeebles the sentence to take the verb as indicat.

CHAPTER III. Vv. 1-3. Our Present Dignity and Our Future Destiny. "See what unearthly love the Father hath given us, in order that we may be styled 'children of God'; and so we are. It is for this reason that the world doth not recognise us, because it did not recognise Him. Beloved, now are we children of God, and it was not yet manifested what we shall be. We know that, if it be manifested, we shall be like Him, because we shall see Him even as He is. And every one that hath this hope resting on Him purifieth himself even as the Lord is pure."

Ver. 1. St. John has been speaking of the salvation which Jesus has brought—His Propitiation and Advocacy, and he sees and would have his readers see in it an amazing expression of the love of God. *Cf.* John iii. 16. **ποταπός** (**ποδαπός**), properly *cujas*, "of what country," though approximating in late Greek to **ποῖος**, *qualis*, "of what sort" (*cf.* Moulton, *Gram. of N.T. Gk.*, i. p. 95), retains something of its proper and original signification. The love of God in Christ is foreign to this world: "from what far realm? what unearthly love?" *Cf.* Matt. viii. 27: "What unearthly personage?" 2 Peter iii. 11: "How other-worldly". **ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.**, the purpose of this amazing

[c] οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν. 2. ἀγαπητοί, νῦν [d] τέκνα Θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὔπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα· οἴδαμεν δὲ [1] ὅτι [e] ἐὰν φανερωθῇ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθώς ἐστι. 3. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην [f] ἐπ' αὐτῷ, [g] ἁγνίζει ἑαυτόν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος [h] ἁγνός ἐστι.

c John i. 26, xvi. 3, xvii. 25. d Rom. viii. 16, 17. e Col. iii. 4; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 21; Exod. xxxiv. 29. f 1 Tim. iv. 10; Acts xxiv. 15; Col. iv. 27; Ps. lxxviii. 7, cxlvi. 5. g John xi. 55; Acts xxi. 24; James iv. 8; 1 Peter i. 22. h 2 Cor. xi. 2; 1 Tim. v. 22.

[1] δε om. ℵABCP, Syr^ph, Vg., Sah., Arm., edd.

gift; a wise, holy love, concerned for our highest good; not simply that we may be saved from suffering and loss but "in order that we may be styled 'children of God'". And we have not only the name but the character: "so we are". Vulg. and Aug. give *simus*, as though reading **ὦμεν** for **ἐσμὲν**: "that we should be styled and be". *Cf.* Aug.: "Nam qui vocantur et non sunt, quid illis prodest nomen ubi res non est? Quam multi vocantur medici, qui curare non norunt? quam multi vocantur vigiles, qui tota nocte dormiunt?" **διὰ τοῦτο**, not anticipative, of **ὅτι**, but retrospective: "for this reason," *viz.*, because we are children of God. **ὅτι** explains the inference: "(and no wonder) because it did not recognise Him," *i.e.* the Father as revealed in His Son (*cf.* note on ii. 29). We must accept what our high dignity as children of God involves in a world alienated from God. On **ὁ κόσμος** see note on ii. 15. *Cf.* Aug.: "Jam cum auditis mundum in mala significatione, non intelligatis nisi dilectores mundi. . . . Ambulabat et ipse Dominus Jesus Christus, in carne erat Deus, latebat in infirmitate. Et unde non est cognitus? Quia omnia peccata arguebat in hominibus. Illi amando delectationes peccatorum non agnoscebant Deum: amando quod febris suadebat, injuriam medico faciebant."

Ver. 2. Having spoken of our present dignity, the Apostle goes on to speak of our future destiny. The Incarnation manifested our standing as children of God, but "it was not yet manifested what we shall be". The aorist **ἐφανερώθη** (*cf.* **ἔγνω** in previous verse) refers to the historic manifestation in Jesus Christ. The N.T. says nothing definite about the nature of our future glory. With our present faculties we cannot conceive it. It must be experienced to be understood. Jesus simply assures us of the felicity of the Father's House, and bids us take His word for it (*cf.* John xiv. 2). **ἐὰν φανερωθῇ**, "if (*cf.* note on ii. 28) it may be manifested," taking up **οὔπω ἐφανερώθη**. This obvious connection is decisive against the rendering "if He shall be manifested" (*cf.* ii. 28; Col. iii. 4). **ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.**: What we shall be was not manifested, but this we know that we shall be like Him. And how do we know it? From His promise that "we shall see Him even as He is" (*cf.* John xvii. 24). The argument is two-fold: (1) Vision of God implies likeness to Him in character and affection (*cf.* Matt. v. 8); (2) the vision of God transfigures (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 18), even in this life.

"Ah! the Master is so fair,
  His smile so sweet to banished men,
That they who meet it unaware
  Can never rest on earth again."

And how will it be when we "see Him face to face" (1 Cor. xiii. 12)? St. Augustine expresses much of the Apostle's thought in a beautiful sentence: "Tota vita Christiani boni sanctum desiderium est".

Ver. 3. The duty which our destiny imposes. **ἐπ' αὐτῷ**, "resting on Him," *i.e.*, on God as Father. *Cf.* Luke v. 5: **ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου**, "relying on Thy word". **ἐκεῖνος**, Christ; see note on ii. 6. **ἁγνός** also proves that the reference is to Christ. As distinguished from **ἅγιος**, which implies absolute and essential purity, it denotes purity maintained with effort and fearfulness amid defilements and allurements, especially carnal. *Cf.* Plat. *Def.*: **ἁγνεία εὐλάβεια τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἁμαρτημάτων· τῆς θεοῦ τιμῆς κατὰ φύσιν θεραπεία.** Suid.: **ἐπίτασις σωφροσύνης.** God is called **ἅγιος** but never **ἁγνός**. Christ is **ἁγνός** because of His human experience. The duty of every one in view of his appearing before God, his presentation to the King, is **ἁγνίζειν ἑαυτόν**, like the worshippers before the Feast (John xi. 55), like the people before the Lord's manifestation at Sinai (Exod xix. 10-11, LXX). It is his own work, not God's, or rather it is his and God's. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 12-13. Aug.: "Videte quemadmodum non abstulit liberum arbitrium, ut diceret, *castificat semetipsum*. Quis nos castificat nisi Deus? Sed Deus te nolentem non castificat. Ergo quod adjungis voluntatem tuam Deo, castificas teipsum."

4. Πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ [i] τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ· καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν [k] ἡ ἀνομία. 5. καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος [l] ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν [1] [m] ἄρῃ· καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι. 6. πᾶς ὁ [n] ἐν αὐτῷ μένων, [o] οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων, οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν, οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. 7. Τεκνία,[2] μηδεὶς πλανάτω [p] ὑμᾶς·

i Matt. vii. 23, xiii. 41; Heb. x. 17 (Jer. xxxi. 34). k John i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 56. l ii. 28 reff. m John i. 29; Col. ii. 14. n ii. 6 ref. o Rom. vi. 14. p i. 8 reff.

[1] αμαρτιας ημων ℵCKL, Syr[vg], Vg., Sah.; om. ημων ABP, Syr[ph], Cop., Aeth., Arm., Tert. (*de Pudic.* 19), Aug., edd.

[2] τεκνια ℵBKL, edd.; παιδια ACP, WH (marg.).

Vv. 4-12. The Obligation of our Dignity as Children of God. "Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness; and sin is lawlessness. And ye know that He was manifested that He might take away the sins; and sin in Him there is not. Every one that abideth in Him doth not keep sinning; every one that keepeth sinning hath not seen Him nor got to know Him. Little children, let no one lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous; he that doeth sin is of the Devil, because from the beginning the Devil keepeth sinning. To this end was the Son of God manifested, that He might undo the works of the Devil. Every one that hath been begotten of God doeth not sin, because His seed in him abideth; and he cannot keep sinning, because of God he hath been begotten. Herein are manifest the children of God and the children of the Devil: every one that doeth not righteousness is not of God, and he that loveth not his brother. Because this is the message which ye heard from the beginning, that we love one another. Not as Cain was of the Evil One and slew his brother. And wherefore did he slay him? Because his works were evil, but his brother's righteous."

Vv. 4-8. The Incompatibility of Sonship with Continuance in Sin.

Ver. 4. ὁ ποι. τὴν ἁμ., the converse of ὁ ποι. τὴν δικ. (ii. 29). νόμος, the revelation of God's will, the Father's requirement of His children, an expression of the true law of their nature. ἡ ἁμ. ἐστ. ἡ ἀν.: the article in both subject and predicate make "sin" and "lawlessness" convertible and co-extensive terms.

Ver. 5. The purpose of the Incarnation was to "take away the sins"—atone for the sins of the past and prevent sins in the future. αἴρειν, properly "lift up and carry away" (*cf.* Mark vi. 29; John ii. 16), but the idea of expiation is involved since it is "the Lamb of God" that "taketh away the sins". ἐκεῖνος, see note on ii. 6. ἁμαρτία, "sin," *i.e.* the sinful principle; see note on i. 8.

Ver. 6. This seems a stark contradiction of i. 8-ii. 2. (1) St. Augustine first limits the statement: "In quantum in ipso manet, in tantum non peccat," and then narrows the idea of "sin" by defining it as "not loving one's brother" (vers. 10). (2) St. Bernard (*De Nat. et Dign. Am. Div.* vi.) compares Rom. vii. 17, 20: "secundum hoc quod natus est ex Deo, id est secundum interioris hominis rationem, in tantum non peccat, in quantum peccatum quod corpus mortis foris operatur, odit potius quam approbat, semine spiritualis nativitatis quo ex Deo natus est eum interius conservante". (3) Romanists limit "sin" to "mortal sin". (4) Many commentators say that St. John is thinking only of the ideal. All these simply explain away the emphatic declaration. There is really no contradiction, and the Apostle's meaning appears when account is taken of the terms he employs with accurate precision. In the earlier passage he says that there is indwelling sin in the believer. The sinful principle (ἁμαρτία) remains, and it manifests its presence by lapses from holiness—occasional sins, definite, isolated acts of sin. This is the force of the aorists, ἁμάρτητε, ἁμάρτῃ in ii. 1. Here he uses the present ἁμαρτάνειν (varied by ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) with the implication of *continuance in sin*. The distinction between present and aorist is well exemplified by Matt. vi. 11: δὸς σήμερον as contrasted with Luke xi. 3: δίδου τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, and Matt. xiv. 22: ἐμβῆναι . . . καὶ προάγειν. The distinction was obvious to St. John's Greek readers, and they would feel no difficulty when he said, on the one hand: ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ, Παράκλητον ἔχομεν, and, on the other: πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν. The believer may fall into sin but he will not walk in it. "Hath not seen Him," because he is "in the darkness" (*cf.* i. 5-7).

Ver. 7. An affectionate warning against Nicolaitan Antinomianism (*cf.* note on i. 6-7). The Apostle cuts away vain pretences by a sharp principle: a

ὁ [q] ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, δίκαιός ἐστι, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος [r] δίκαιός ἐστιν. 8. ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, [s] ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν· ὅτι [t] ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει. εἰς τοῦτο [u] ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα [v] λύσῃ [w] τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου. 9. πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος [x] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει· καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται. 10. ἐν τούτῳ [y] φανερά ἐστι τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου. Πᾶς ὁ μὴ [z] ποιῶν δικαιοσύνην, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. 11. ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ [a] ἀγγελία ἣν [b] ἠκούσατε ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· 12. οὐ καθὼς [c] Κάϊν ἐκ [d] τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν, καὶ [e] ἔσφαξε τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ

q ii. 29, ver. 10.
r ii. 1 reff.
s iv. 7.
t John viii. 44.
u ii. 28 reff.
v *Cf.* comm.
w Matt. xi. 2; John vii. 7, ix. 3, 4, x. 37; Rom. xiii. 12; Gal. v. 19.
x iv. 7, v. 18.
y 1 Cor. iii. 13. xi. 19; Gal. v. 19.
z Ver. 7.
a i. 5.
b ii. 7; John xiii. 34, xv. 12.
c Gen. iv. 8.
d ii. 13 reff.
e Rev. v. 6, 9, 12, xiii. 3, 8, xviii. 24.

righteous character expresses itself in righteous conduct. Christ (**ἐκεῖνος**) is the type. He was "the Son of God," and if we are "children of God," we must be like Him.

Ver. 8. **ὁ ποι. τὴν ἁμ.**, an emphatic and interpretative variation of **ὁ ἁμαρτάνων**—"he that makes sin his business or practice". **ἐκ** of parentage (*cf.* vers. 9); "hoc est, ex patre diabolo" (Clem. Alex.). **ἀπ᾽ ἀρχ.**, a vague phrase. In i. 1 "ere time began"; in ii. 7, iii. 11, "from the beginning of your Christian life". Here "from the beginning of his diabolic career"; "a quo peccare cœpit incontrovertibiliter in peccando perseverans" (Clem. Alex.). **λύσῃ**, "loose," metaphorically of "loosening a bond," "relaxing an obligation" (Matt. v. 19; John v. 18), "pulling to pieces" (John ii. 19).

Ver. 9. The Reason of the Impossibility of a Child of God continuing in Sin. The germ of the divine life has been implanted in our souls, and it grows—a gradual process and subject to occasional retardations, yet sure, attaining at length to full fruition. The believer's lapses into sin are like the mischances of the weather which hinder the seed's growth. The growth of a living seed may be checked temporarily; if there be no growth, there is no life. This is the distinction between **ἐάν τις ἁμάρτῃ** and **ὁ ἁμαρτάνων**. Alexander in Speaker's Comm. understands: "His seed," *i.e.*, whosoever is born of God (*cf.* Isa. liii. 10, lxvi. 22), "abideth in Him," *i.e.*, in God. This is Pauline but not Johannine. "He cannot keep sinning," as the seed cannot cease growing.

Vv. 10-12. The Evidence of Divine Sonship, *viz.*, Human Brotherhood.

Ver. 10. The Apostle reiterates the "old commandment" (ii. 7-11) as not only the paramount duty of believers but the evidence of their divine sonship. He has said that the evidence lies in "doing righteousness," and now he defines **ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην** as **ἀγαπᾶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ**. See note on ii. 9. The "righteousness" of the Pharisees consisted in ritual observance, that of Jesus in love. **δίκαιος** had the meaning "kind," "sweetly reasonable". See Hatch, *Ess. in Bib. Gk.*, p. 50 ff. On Matt. i. 19 St. Chrysostom remarks: **δίκαιον ἐνταῦθα τὸν ἐνάρετον ἐν ἅπασι λέγει. ἔστι μὲν γὰρ δικαιοσύνη καὶ τὸ μὴ πλεονεκτεῖν· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ καθόλου ἀρετή. . . . δίκαιος οὖν ὤν, τούτεστι χρηστὸς καὶ ἐπιεικής.**

Ver. 11. **ἵνα** ecbatic, expressing not the aim but simply the substance of the message. *Cf.* John xvii. 3. See Moulton's *Gram. of N.T. Gk.*, p. 206; Moulton's *Winer*, p. 425.

Ver. 12. **οὐ καθὼς, κ.τ.λ.**, a loose, almost ungrammatical expression, analogous to John vi. 58. Were there no **οὐ**, ver. 11 might be regarded as a parenthesis: "he that loveth not his brother, even as Cain was, etc.". The phrase is elliptical: "We must not hate our brethren, even as Cain was, etc.". **τοῦ πον.**, see note on ii. 18. **ἔσφαξεν**, a strong word, "slaughtered," "butchered," properly by cutting the throat (*jugulare*), like an ox in the shambles.

Vv. 13-24. The Secret of Assurance. "Wonder not, brethren, if the world hateth you. *We* know that we have migrated out of the domain of death into the domain of life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not abideth in the domain of death. Everyone that

ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια. 13. μὴ[1] θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοί μου,[2] εἰ [f] μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. 14. Ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι [g] μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ [h] θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν, [i] ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς· ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφόν,[3] μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. 15. πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ,[4] [k] ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστί· καὶ οἴδατε ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἐν αὐτῷ[5] μένουσαν. 16. Ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην,[6] ὅτι [l] ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [m] τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκε· καὶ ἡμεῖς [n] ὀφείλομεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς τιθέναι.[7] 17. ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἔχῃ τὸν [o] βίον τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ [p] θεωρῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ

f John xv. 18, 19; Matt. v. 11.
g John v. 24.
h Matt. iv. 16.
i iv. 19.
k Only here and John viii. 44 in N.T.
l ii. 6.
m John x. 11, 15, 17, 18, xiii. 37, 38, xv. 13.
n ii. 6 reff.
o Mark xii. 44; Luke viii. 43; xv. 12, 30.
p John xvii. 24, xx. 6, 12, 14; Matt. xxvii. 55, xxviii. 1; Mark v. 15, 38; Luke x. 18.

[1] μη ABCKL, Syrph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aug., WH, Nest.; και μη ℵC*P, Syrvg, Aeth., Arm., Tisch.

[2] μου om. ℵABCP, Vg., Arm., Aug., edd.

[3] τον αδελφον om. ℵAB, Vg., Arm., Aug., edd.

[4] εαυτου B.

[5] εαυτω ℵACLP, Tisch., WH (marg.); αυτω BK, WH, Nest.

[6] την αγαπην του θεου one minusc., Vg.

[7] θειναι ℵABCP, edd.

hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that every murderer hath not life eternal abiding in him. Herein have we got to know love, because He laid down His life for us; and we are bound to lay down our lives for the brethren. But whosoever hath the world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need and locketh up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? Little children, let us not love with word nor with the tongue, but in deed and truth. Herein shall we get to know that we are of the Truth, and in His presence shall assure our heart, whereinsoever our heart may condemn us, because greater is God than our heart, and He readeth everything. Beloved, if the heart condemn not, we have boldness toward God, and whatever we ask we receive from Him, because we observe His commandments and do the things that are pleasing in His sight. And this is His commandment, that we believe the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love one another, even as He gave a commandment to us. And he that observeth His commandments in Him abideth and He in him; and herein we get to know that He abideth in us—from the Spirit which He gave us."

Ver. 13. It is natural that the world (see notes on ii. 15, iii. 1) should hate those whose lives contradict its maxims and condemn its practices. St. John frequently addresses his readers as **τεκνία** and **ἀγαπητοί**, here only as **ἀδελφοί**. The term suits the context, where he enforces love of the brethren. It is no wonder if the world hate us, and its judgment is not decisive. Nevertheless our business is not to be hated by the world, but to commend Jesus to it and win it. We must not impute to the world's hostility to goodness the consequences of our own unamiability or tactlessness. "It is not martyrdom to pay bills that one has run into one's self" (Geo. Eliot).

Ver. 14. **ἡμεῖς** emphatic: "Whatever the world may say, *we* know". The test is not its hatred but our love. **μεταβεβήκαμεν**, "have migrated". The word is used of transition from one place to another (John vii. 3, xiii. 1), of passing from one form of government to another (Plat. *Rep.* 550 D), of the transmigration of souls (Luc. *Gall.* 4).

Ver. 15. An echo of the teaching of Jesus. See Matt. v. 21-22 and *cf.* Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, pp. 96-98.

Ver. 16. **τὴν ἀγάπην**, "the thing called 'love'". The love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord is the perfect type. Till the world saw that, it never knew what love is. **ἐκεῖνος**, Christ; see note on ii. 6. **ἡμεῖς** emphatic, "we on our part". **ὀφείλομεν**, see note on ii. 6.

Ver. 17. Love must be practical. It is easy to "lay down one's life": martyrdom is heroic and exhilarating; the difficulty lies in doing the little things, facing day by day the petty sacrifices and self-denials which no one notices and no one applauds. **τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου**, "the livelihood of the world"; see note on ii. 16. **θεωρῇ**, *of a moving spectacle; cf.* Matt. xxvii. 55. **κλείσῃ**, *schliesst;* the metaphor is locking the chamber of the heart instead of flinging

[q] χρείαν ἔχοντα, καὶ [r] κλείσῃ τὰ [s] σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, [t] πῶς ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐν αὐτῷ; 18. τεκνία μου,[1] μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν [u] λόγῳ μηδὲ[2] γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ[3] καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. 19. Καὶ[4] ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν[5] ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐσμέν, καὶ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας[6] ἡμῶν· 20. ὅτι[7] [v] ἐὰν καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία, ὅτι[8] μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ Θεὸς[9] τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γινώσκει

q Mark ii. 25; Eph. iv. 28.
r Matt. xxiii. 14, xxv. 10; Luke iv. 25; John xx. 19, 26.
s Luke i. 78; 2 Cor. vi. 12; Phil. i. 8, ii. 1.
t iv. 20; James ii. 15, 16.
u James i. 22, 23, 25.
v Mark vi. 23 (ὅ, τι ἐάν).

[1] μου om. ℵABCP, Syrph, Arm., Aug., edd.

[2] μηδε τη ABCKL, edd.

[3] εν εργω ℵABCLP, Arm., edd.

[4] και ℵCKLP, Syrvg, Sah., Aeth., Arm., Tisch.; om. AB, Syrph, Vg., Cop., Aug., WH, Nest.

[5] γνωσομεθα ℵABCP, Cop., Sah., Arm., edd.

[6] τας καρδιας ℵA²CKLP, Syrph, Vg., Cop., Arm., Tisch.; την καρδιαν A*B, Syrvg, Sah., Aeth., Aug., WH, Nest.

[7] Punct. ημων ο τι.

[8] οτι om. A, several minusc., Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug.

[9] κυριος C.

it wide open and lavishing its treasures. σπλάγχνα, רַחֲמִים, *viscera*, "the inward parts," viewed by the ancients as the seat of the affections. *Cf.* Col. iii. 12: σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ. ἡ ἀγ. τ. Θ., "love for God" (objective genitive), inspired by and answering to the love which God feels (subjective genitive). *Cf.* note on ii. 5.

Ver. 18. Observe the transition from instrumental dative to preposition ἐν: "not with word and the tongue but in the midst of deed and truth"—not in empty air but amid tangible realities. *Cf.* Bunyan, *Good News*: "Practical love is best. Many love Christ with nothing but the lick of the tongue." Sheridan, *Sch. for Scand.* v. i.: "He appears to have as much speculative benevolence as any private gentleman in the kingdom, though he is seldom so sensual as to indulge himself in the exercise of it".

Vv. 19-20. A *crux interpretum*. Read τὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν ὅ, τι ἐάν (*i.e.* ἄν), and take the subsequent ὅτι as "because". The foregoing exhortation may have awakened a misgiving in our minds: "Am I loving as I ought?" Our failures in duty and service rise up before us, and "our heart condemns us". So the Apostle furnishes a grand reassurance: "Herein shall we get to know that we are of the Truth, and in His presence shall assure our heart, whereinsoever our heart may condemn us, because, etc.". The reassurance is two-fold: (1) The worst that is in us is known to God (*cf.* Aug.: *Cor tuum abscondis ab homine; a Deo absconde si potes*), and still He cares for us and desires us. Our discovery has been an open secret to Him all along. (2) He "readeth everything"—sees the deepest things, and these are the real things. This is the true test of a man: Is the deepest that is in him the best? Is he better than he seems? His failures lie on the surface: is there a desire for goodness deep down in his soul? Is he glad to escape from superficial judgments and be judged by God who "readeth everything," who sees "with larger other eyes than ours, to make allowance for us all"? *Cf.* F. W. Robertson, *Lett.* lvi.: "I remember an anecdote of Thomas Scott having said to his curate, who was rather agitated on having to preach before him, 'Well, sir, why should you be afraid before me, when you are not afraid before God?' But how very easy it was to answer! He had only to say, God is not jealous, nor envious, nor censorious; besides, God can make allowances". So Browning:—

"Thoughts hardly to be packed
Into a narrow act,
Fancies that broke through language and
escaped;
All I could never be,
All, men ignored in me,
This, I was worth to God, whose wheel
the pitcher shaped."

ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, and what matter how we appear ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Matt. vi. 1.)? πείσομεν, "persuade," *i.e.* pacify, win the confidence, soothe the alarm, of our heart. *Cf.* Matt. xxviii. 14. Otherwise: "we shall persuade our heart . . . that greater is God". But

w ii. 28 reff. x John xiv. 13, 14, xv. 7, 16, xvi. 23. y John viii. 29. z Luke xii. 6, xv. 10, 18, xvi. 15; John xx. 30; Rom. iii. 20. a John vi. 29, xv. 17. b iv. 13; Rom. viii. 9. a Rom. ii. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 13, xi. 28; Gal. vi. 4; 1 Thess. v. 21.

πάντα. 21. ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν[1] μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν,[2] [w] παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, 22. καὶ [x] ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν παρ'[3] αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν, καὶ [y] τὰ ἀρεστὰ [z] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν. 23. καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν[4] τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, [a] καθὼς ἔδωκεν ἐντολὴν ἡμῖν. 24. καὶ ὁ τηρῶν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν, [b] ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος οὗ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν.

IV. 1. Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ παντὶ πνεύματι πιστεύετε, ἀλλὰ [a] δοκιμάζετε

[1] ημων ℵCKL, Syr[vg ph], Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Tisch.; om. AB, several minusc., Aug., WH, Nest.

[2] ημων ℵAKL, Syr[vg ph], Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Tisch.; om. BC, one minusc., WH, Nest.

[3] απ ℵABC, edd.

[4] πιστευσωμεν BKL, WH, Nest.; πιστευωμεν ℵAC, Tisch., WH (marg.).

how can love for the brethren yield this inference? **γινώσκει πάντα,** "readeth every secret". *Cf.* John ii. 25. A quite different and less satisfying sense is got by punctuating **τὴν καρδίαν ἡμῶν. ὅτι ἐάν, κ.τ.λ.** The second **ὅτι** is then a difficulty and has been dealt with in three ways: (1) It has been ignored as redundant: "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater, etc." (A.V. fortified by the omission of the participle in some inferior MSS.). (2) An ellipse has been assumed —either of the substantive verb: "because if our heart condemns us, (it is) because God, etc." (Alford), or of **δῆλον** (Field, who compares 1 Tim. vi. 7): "it is plain that God, etc.". (3) **ὅτι** has been conjecturally emended into **ἔτι** (Steph., Bez.): "still greater is God, etc.".

Vv. 21-22. **παρρησίαν,** see note on ii. 28. **ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν,** though not always in the form we expect or desire; the answer may be different from but it is always better than our prayer. St. Augustine draws a distinction between the hearing of prayer "ad salutem" and "ad voluntatem," comparing the experience of St. Paul (2 Cor. xii. 7-9): "Rogasti, clamasti, ter clamasti: ipsum semel quod clamasti audivi, non averti aures meas a te; novi quid faciam; tu vis auferri medicamentum quo ureris; ego novi infirmitatem qua gravaris. Ergo iste ad salutem exauditus est, ad voluntatem non est exauditus. . . . Tu morbum confitearis, ille medicamentum adhibeat." *Cf.* Juan de Avila: "Go to prayer rather to hearken than to speak. Bend humbly and lovingly before God, expecting." **τηροῦμεν,** see note on ii. 3.

Ver. 23. *Cf.* our Lord's summary of the commandments in Matt. xxii. 34-40 = Mark xii. 28-31, and observe the apostolic narrowing of **τὸν πλησίον σου** (*cf.* Luke x. 29-37) to **ἀλλήλους,** *i.e.* **τοὺς ἀδελφούς** (see note on ii. 9). **τῷ ὀνόματι,** see note on ii. 12.

Ver. 24. **τὰς ἐντ. αὐτ.,** "the commandments of God," resuming ver. 22. *Cf.* iv. 15. **ἐκ,** the assurance is begotten of the Spirit; see note on ii. 21. **οὗ** for **ὅ,** by attraction to the case of the antecedent (*cf.* Luke ii. 20; Rev. xviii. 6). **ἔδωκεν,** "gave," *i.e.,* when first we believed. For the thought *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, 14; also Rom. viii. 15, 16.

CHAPTER IV.—Vv. 1-6. The Spirit of Truth and the Spirit of Error. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are from God; because many false prophets have gone forth into the world. Herein ye get to know the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth Jesus as Christ come in flesh, is from God; and every Spirit which confesseth not Jesus, is not from God. And this is the spirit of the Antichrist, whereof ye heard that it is coming, and now it is in the world already. *Ye* are from God, little children, and have conquered them, because greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world. *They* are from the world; therefore from the world they talk, and the world hearkeneth to them. *We* are from

τὰ πνεύματα, εἰ [b] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν· ὅτι πολλοὶ [c] ψευδοπροφῆται [d] ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 2. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκετε [1] τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ· πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ [e] ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, [2] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι. 3. καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμολογεῖ [3] τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν [4] ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, [5] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστι· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι [f] ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν

b Ver. 2-6. *Cf.* comm.
c Matt. vii. 15, xxiv. 11, 24; Luke vi. 26; Acts xiii. 6.
d ii. 19; 3 John 7; John xiii. 3, xvi. 27, 28, 30, xvii. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 36.
e John ix. 22; 2 John 7.
f ii. 18 reff.

[1] γινωσκετε ℵ[c]ABCL, Syr[ph], Cop., Sah., Aeth., edd.; γινωσκεται K, Syr[vg], Vg., Aug.—an itacism.

[2] εληλυθοτα ℵACKL, edd.; εληλυθεναι B, Vg., WH (marg.).

[3] μη ομολογει all Gk. MSS. and all versions except Vg.; λυει Socr. *H. E.* vii. 32 (of Nestorius): αὐτίκα γοῦν ἠγνόησεν ὅτι ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ Ἰωάννου ἐγέγραπτο ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἀντιγράφοις ὅτι πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστι. ταύτην γὰρ τὴν διάνοιαν ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων περιεῖλον οἱ χωρίζειν ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἀνθρώπου βουλόμενοι τὴν θεότητα· διὸ καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ ἑρμηνεῖς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐπεσημήναντο, ὥς τινες εἶεν ῥαδιουργήσαντες τὴν ἐπιστολήν, λύειν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ἄνθρωπον θέλοντες. Iren. III. xvii. 8: *et omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum, non est ex Deo*. Orig. *in Matth. Comm. Ser.* 65 (Lomm. iv. p. 360). Vg.: *omnis spiritus qui solvit Iesum*. Aug.: *omnis spiritus qui solvit Christum* (after quoting *omnis spiritus qui non confitetur Jesus Christum in carne venisse*).

[4] Χριστον om. AB, Syr[vg ph], Vg., Cop., Aeth., Arm., Iren., Orig., Socr., edd.; κυριον ℵ.

[5] ἐν σαρκι εληλυθοτα om. AB, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., edd.

God; he that is getting to know God hearkeneth to us; one who is not from God, hearkeneth not to us. From this we get to know the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error."

1. The Apostle has just said that the Spirit begets in us the assurance that God abideth in us. And this suggests a warning. The Cerinthian heresy also had much to say about "the spirit". It boasted a larger spirituality. Starting with the philosophical postulate of an irreconcilable antagonism between matter and spirit, it denied the possibility of the Incarnation and drew a distinction between Jesus and the Christ (see Introd., p. 249). Its spirit was not "the Spirit of Truth" but "a spirit of error," and thus the necessity arises of "proving the spirits". δοκιμάζειν, of "proving" or "testing" a coin (νόμισμα). If it stood the test, it was δόκιμον (*cf.* 2 Cor. x. 18); if it was found counterfeit (κίβδηλον), it was ἀδόκιμον (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Cor. xiii. 5-7). *Cf.* Jer. vi. 30 LXX: ἀργύριον ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον . . . ὅτι ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτοὺς Κύριος. ἐκ, here of *commission*, not *parentage*; "from God," as His messengers. *Cf.* John i. 24; xviii. 3; Soph., *O.C.* 735-737: ἀπεστάλην . . . οὐκ ἐξ ἑνὸς στείλαντος. πολλοί: Cerinthus had a large following. ἐξεληλ. εἰς τ. κόσμ., a monstrous reversal of John xvii. 18. They went forth from the Church into the world not to win but to deceive it.

2. The Test of the Spirits. γινώσκετε, as in ii. 29, may be either indicat. ("ye recognise") or, like πιστεύετε, δοκιμάζετε, imperat. ("recognise"). The former seems preferable. ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, "confesseth Jesus as Christ come in flesh," an accurate definition of the doctrine which the Cerinthian heresy denied. The argument is destroyed by the false variant ἐληλυθέναι, "confesseth that Jesus Christ hath come," *confitetur Jesum Christum in carne venisse* (Vulg.)

Ver. 3. The Test negatively expressed. Omit Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα. τὸν Ἰησοῦν, "the aforementioned Jesus," "Jesus as thus described". μή makes the statement hypothetical: "every spirit, if such there be, which doth not confess". The variant λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, *solvit Jesum* (Vulg., Aug.), "dissolveth" or "severeth Jesus," *i.e.*, separates the divinity and the humanity, aptly defines the Cerinthian heresy. It was much appealed to in later days against Nestorius. The ecclesiastical historian Socrates (see crit. note) says it was the primitive reading, and was altered by "those who wished to separate the deity from the man of the Incarnation". St. Augustine, defining heresy as schism due to lack of brotherly love, comments: "Ille venit

τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη. 4. Ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστε, τεκνία, καὶ [g] νενικήκατε αὐτούς·[1] ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν ἢ [h] ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. 5. Αὐτοὶ [i] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσί· διὰ τοῦτο [k] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦσι, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν ἀκούει. 6. ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμεν· ὁ γινώσκων τὸν Θεόν, ἀκούει ἡμῶν· [l] ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. Ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς [m] πλάνης. 7. Ἀγαπητοί, [n] ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν, [o] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται, καὶ γινώσκει

g John xvi. 33. h John xiv. 30. i ii. 16 reff. k John iii. 31, viii. 44. l John viii. 43, 47. m i. 8 reff; Matt. xxvii. 64; Eph. iv. 14; James v. 20. n ii. 7, iii. 11. o ii. 29, iii. 9.

[1] **αυτους** Aug. *eum.*, *i.e.*, *Antichristum.*

colligere, tu venis solvere. Distringere vis membra Christi. Quomodo non negas Christum in carne venisse, qui disrumpis Ecclesiam Dei, quam ille congregavit?" On the Antichrist see note on ii. 18. **ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται,** "which ye have heard that it is coming"—the regular Greek idiom. *Cf.* Luke iv. 34: **οἶδά σε τίς εἶ.**

Ver. 4. **ὑμεῖς** emphatic (*cf.* ii. 20, 27, iii. 14), as contrasted with the deluded world. The faithful are God's delegates (**ἐκ**), bearing their Master's commission and continuing His warfare (John xx. 21), and they have shared His victory (**νενικήκατε**). **αὐτούς,** *i.e.*, the false prophets (ver. 1). *Eum* (Vulg.); "Quem nisi Antichristum?" (Aug.). **ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν,** *i.e.*, God (*cf.* iii. 24); **ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,** *i.e.*, **ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου** (John xii. 31. xiv. 30).

Ver. 5. **αὐτοὶ** (as opposed to **ὑμεῖς**) **ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσίν,** as its delegates, messengers, representatives, and as such **ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου λαλοῦσιν. λαλεῖν,** not "speak" (**λέγειν**), but "talk," with a suggestion of prating (*cf.* John iv. 42). **ἀκούειν** takes accus. of the thing heard, genit. of the person from whom it is heard. *Cf.* Luke v. 1; Acts i. 4 (where both are combined). The world listens to those who speak its own language.

Ver. 6. Conversely, those who are getting to know God, understand the language of His messengers and listen to it. **ἐκ τούτου,** *i.e*, from their hearkening or not hearkening. Men's attitude to the message of the Incarnate Saviour ranks them on this side or on that—on God's side or the world's. Of course St. John does not ignore St. Paul's **ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ** (Eph. iv. 15). The message may be the truth and be rejected, not because of the hearers' worldliness, but because it is wrongly delivered—not graciously and winsomely. *Cf.* Rowland Hill's anecdote of the preaching barber who had made a wig for one of his hearers—badly made and nearly double the usual price. When anything particularly profitable escaped the lips of the preacher, the hearer would observe to himself: "Excellent! This should touch my heart; but oh, the wig!" **τῆς ἀληθείας,** see note on i. 8. **τὸ πν. τῆς πλάνης,** "the spirit that leadeth astray".

Vv. 7-21. The Blessedness of Love. "Beloved, let us love one another, because love is of God, and every one that loveth of God hath been begotten and is getting to know God. He that loveth not did not get to know God, because God is love. Herein was manifested the love of God in us, because His Son, His only-begotten, hath God commissioned into the world, that we may get life through Him. Herein is the love, not that *we* have loved God, but that *He* loved us and commissioned His Son as a propitiation for our sins.

"Beloved, if it was thus that God loved us, we also are bound to love one another. God—no one hath ever yet beheld Him: if we love one another, God abideth in us and His love is perfected in us. Herein we get to know that we abide in Him and He in us, because of His Spirit He hath given us. And we have beheld and testify that the Father hath commissioned the Son as Saviour of the world. Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, God in him abideth and he in God. And we have got to know and have believed the love which God hath in us.

"God is love, and he that abideth in love in God abideth, and God in him abideth. Herein hath love been perfected with us—so that we may have boldness in the Day of Judgment—because, even as He is, we also are in this world. Fear there is not in love, but the perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth hath not been perfected in love. *We* love because *He* first loved *us*. If one say,

τὸν Θεόν· 8. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν, [p] οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν Θεόν· ὅτι [q] ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν. 9. Ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν [r] μονογενῆ [s] ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ Θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα [t] ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ. 10. ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, [u] οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήσαμεν[1] τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀπέστειλε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ [v] ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. 11. ἀγαπητοί, εἰ [w] οὕτως ὁ Θεὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, [x] καὶ ἡμεῖς [y] ὀφείλομεν ἀλλήλους

p ii. 3. 4, iii. 23.
q iv. 16.
r John i. 14, 18, iii. 16, 18.
s Matt. x. 40; John iii. 17, xx. 21.
t John iii. 16.
u Ver. 19.
v ii. 2 reff.
w John iii. 16.
x Rom. xiii. 8; Matt. xviii. 33; Rom. xv. 7; Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13.
y ii. 6 reff.

[1] ηγαπησαμεν ℵcKL, Tisch., WH (marg.)—an assimilation to the other aors.; ηγαπηκαμεν B, WH, Nest.

'I love God,' and hate his brother, he is a liar. For he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, God whom he hath not seen, he cannot love. And this commandment have we from Him, that he that loveth God love also his brother."

Ver. 7. St. John reiterates the "old commandment" (ii. 7-11). It is so all-important that he cares not though his readers be tired of hearing it. *Cf.* the anecdote which St. Jerome relates on Gal. vi. 10: "Beatus Joannes Evangelista cum Ephesi moraretur usque ad ultimam senectutem, et vix inter discipulorum manus ad Ecclesiam deferretur, nec posset in plura vocem verba contexere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas nisi hoc: Filioli, diligite alterutrum. Tandem discipuli et fratres qui aderant, tædio affecti quod eadem semper audirent, dixerunt: Magister, quare semper hoc loqueris? Qui respondit dignam Joanne sententiam: Quia præceptum Domini est, et si solum fiat, sufficit." Love is the divine nature, and those who love have been made partakers of the divine nature (2 Peter i. 4); and by the practice of love they "get to know God" more and more.

Ver. 8. Conversely, a stranger to love is a stranger to God. **οὐκ ἔγνω**, "did not get to know," *i.e.*, at the initial crisis of conversion. On **μὴ** see note on ii. 4.

Ver. 9. The Incarnation is a manifestation of the love of God because it is a manifestation of the divine nature, and the divine nature is love. **ἐν ἡμῖν**, "in our souls"—an inward experience. *Cf.* Gal. i. 16: **ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. μονογενῆ**, *cf.* Luke vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38. St. John applies the term exclusively to Jesus. It carries the idea of preciousness; *cf.* LXX Pss. xxii. 20, xxxv. 17, where יְחִידָתִי, "my dear life," is rendered **τὴν μονογενῆ μου. ἀπέσταλκεν**, "hath sent as an **ἀπόστολος**" (*cf.* Heb. iii. 1). An apostle is not simply *nuntius*, but *nuntius vices mittentis gerens. Cf. Bab. Ber.* 34, 2: "Apostolus cujusvis est sicut ipse a quo deputatur". The perf. is used here because the influence of the Incarnation is permanent. **ζήσωμεν**, ingressive or inceptive aor. *Cf.* Luke xv. 24, 32; Rev. xx. 4, 5. **ἵνα ζήσωμεν** reconciles **ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη** with **ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη** (i. 2). The Incarnation manifested the love of God, and the love was manifested that we might get life. Eternal Life is not future but present: we get it here and now. *Cf.* John xvii. 3. Amiel: "The eternal life is not the future life; it is life in harmony with the true order of things—life in God".

Ver. 10. The love which proves us children of God is not native to our hearts. It is inspired by the amazing love of God manifested in the Incarnation—the infinite Sacrifice of His Son's life and death. Aug.: "Non illum dileximus prius: nam ad hoc nos dilexit, ut diligamus eum." **ἀπέστειλεν**: the aor. is used here because the Incarnation is regarded as a distinct event, a historic landmark.

Having inculcated love, the Apostle indicates two incentives thereto: (1) God's love for us imposes on us a moral obligation to love one another (11-16a); (2) If we have love in our hearts, fear is cast out (16b-18).

Ver. 11. Here, as in John iii. 16, **οὕτως** may denote either the extent or the manner of God's love—"to such an extent," going such a length (*cf.* Rom. viii. 32); "in such a manner," righteously, not by a facile amnesty but by a propitiation. **ὀφείλομεν**: see note on ii. 6. *Noblesse oblige.* If we are God's children, we must have our Father's spirit. *Cf.* Matt. v. 44-48. Thus we requite His love. Aug.: "*Petre*, inquit, *amas me?* Et ille dixit: *Amo. Pasce oves meas*" (John xxi. 15-17).

ἀγαπᾶν. 12. Θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε [z] τεθέαται · ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, [a] ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ [b] τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν.[1] 13. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ μένομεν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι [c] ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν.

14. Καὶ ἡμεῖς [d] τεθεάμεθα, καὶ [e] μαρτυροῦμεν ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκε τὸν υἱὸν [f] σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου. 15. [g] ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. 16. Καὶ ἡμεῖς [h] ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχει ὁ Θεὸς [i] ἐν ἡμῖν. ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστί, καὶ ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, [k] ἐν τῷ Θεῷ μένει, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν αὐτῷ.[2]

17. Ἐν τούτῳ [b] τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἵνα [l] παρρησίαν ἔχωμεν [m] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως, ὅτι [n] καθὼς ἐκεῖνός ἐστι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ. 18. φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη [o] ἔξω βάλλει τὸν [p] φόβον, ὅτι ὁ φόβος [q] κόλασιν [r] ἔχει · ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ [b] τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. 19. [s] ἡμεῖς ἀγαπῶ-

z i. 1 ref.; John i. 18.
a Ver. 16, iii. 24.
b ii. 5 reff.
c iii. 24 reff.
d i. 1 ref.
e i. 2 reff.
f John iii. 17, iv. 42.
g Matt. xvi. 16, 17.
h John vi. 69.
i Ver. 9.
k Ver. 12.
l ii. 28 reff.
m Matt. x. 15, xi. 22, 24, xii. 36; 2 Peter ii. 9, iii. 7.
n John xx. 21.
o Matt. v. 13, xiii. 48; Luke xiv. 35.
p Rom. viii. 15; Heb. ii. 15.
q Matt. xxv. 46.
r James i. 4.
s Ver. 10.

[1] εν ημιν εστιν ℵB, edd.

[2] εν αυτω μενει ℵBKL, Syrph, Cop., Sah., Arm., Aug., Tisch., WH (brack.), Nest.

Ver. 12. "God—no one hath ever yet beheld Him". By and by "we shall see Him even as He is" (iii. 2), but even now, if we love, we are no strangers to Him: He abides and works in us. **τετελειωμένη**, "carried to its end"; see note on ii. 5.

Ver. 13. *Cf.* iii. 24. The argument is that God would not have granted us this priceless gift if he were not in intimate relation with us and had not a steadfast purpose of grace toward us.

Ver. 14. The apostolic testimony (*cf.* i. 1-3). **ἡμεῖς**, either the editorial "we" or "I and the rest of the Apostles who were eye-witnesses". **ἀπέσταλκεν**, see note on ver. 9.

Ver. 15. **ὁμολογήσῃ**, aor. of a definite confession born of persuasion. Such a conviction implies fellowship with God.

Ver. 16. **ἡμεῖς**, here "you and I," we believers. Observe the three stages: (1) "get to know" (**γινώσκειν**), (2) "believe" (**πιστεύειν**), (3) "confess" (**ὁμολογεῖν**). **ἐν ἡμῖν**, see note on ver. 9.

Another incentive to love: it casts out fear. **τῇ ἀγάπῃ**, "the love just mentioned". *Cf.* **τὸν φόβον, ὁ φόβος** (ver. 18).

Ver. 17. **τετελείωται**, *cf.* ver. 12. **μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν**: love is a heavenly visitant sojourning with us and claiming observance. Love has been "carried to its end" when we are like Jesus, His visible representatives. **ὅτι** resumes **ἐν τούτῳ**, **ἵνα . . . κρίσεως** being parenthetical: "herein . . . because" (iii. 16, iv. 9, 10). **παρρησίαν**, see note on ii. 28. **ἐκεῖνος**, see note on ii. 6. **ἐστιν**, "is," not **ἦν**, "was". Jesus is in the world unseen, and our office is to make Him visible. We are to Him what He was to the Father in the days of His flesh—"Dei inaspecti aspectabilis imago".

Ver. 18. Bern.: "Amor reverentiam nescit". **φόβος**, the opposite of **παρρησία**. **κόλασιν ἔχει**, "implies punishment," the portion of slaves. The portion of slaves is punishment (**κόλασις**) and their spirit fear; the portion of sons is chastisement (**παιδεία**) and their spirit boldness (**παρρησία**). *Cf.* Heb. xii. 7, Clem. Alex.: "Perfectio fidelis hominis caritas est". Aug.: "Major charitas, minor timor; minor charitas, major timor". Bengel has here one of his untranslatable comments: "Varius hominum status: sine timore et amore; cum timore sine amore; cum timore et amore; sine timore cum amore".

Ver. 19. **ἀγαπῶμεν** has no accus. The thought is that the amazing love of God in Christ is the inspiration of all the love that stirs in our hearts. It awakens within us an answering love—a grateful love for Him manifesting itself in love for our brethren (*cf.* ver. 11). The insertion of **αὐτόν** is a clumsy and unnecessary gloss. Neither should **οὖν** be inserted and **ἀγαπῶμεν** taken as hortat. subjunctive. Vulg.: "Nos ergo diligamus Deum, quoniam Deus prior dilexit nos".

μεν αὐτόν,[1] ὅτι αὐτὸς[2] πρῶτος ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. 20. [t] Ἐάν τις εἴπῃ, "Ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν Θεόν," καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῇ, [u] ψεύστης ἐστίν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν ἑώρακε, τὸν Θεὸν [v] ὃν οὐχ ἑώρακε, πῶς δύναται ἀγαπᾶν;[3] 21. καὶ [w] ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν [a] ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,[4] ἵνα ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν Θεόν, ἀγαπᾷ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

V. 1. Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι [a] Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, [b] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται· καὶ [c] πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν γεννήσαντα ἀγαπᾷ καὶ[5] τὸν γεγεννημένον[6] ἐξ αὐτοῦ. 2. [d] ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅταν τὸν Θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν.[7] 3. [e] αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς

t ii. 9, iii. 17 reff.
u i. 6 reff.
v Ver. 12 reff.
w ii. 7 reff.
a iv. 15 ref.
b iii. 9 reff.
c 1 Peter i. 22, 23.
d 1 Cor. xiii. 4, 5.
e John xiv. 15, 23, 24.

[1] αυτον om. AB, Aeth., Aug., edd.; τον θεον ℵ, Syr vg ph, Vg., Cop., Arm.

[2] αυτος ℵBKL, Syr vg ph, Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.; ο θεος A, Vg.

[3] ου δυναται αγαπαν ℵB, Syr ph, Sah., edd. [4] απο του θεου A, Vg.

[5] αγαπα και ℵAKLP, Syr vg ph, Vg., Aeth., Arm., Tisch.; om. και B, Sah., Aug., WH, Nest.

[6] το γεγεννημενον ℵ.

[7] τηρωμεν ℵKLP—an assimilation to τηρωμεν in v. 3; ποιωμεν B, Syr vg ph, Vg. Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Aug., edd.

Ver. 20. Lest the vagueness of the objectless ἀγαπῶμεν encourage false security, St. John reiterates the old test: Love for the invisible Father is manifested in love for the brother by our side, the image of the Father. *Cf.* Whittier:—

> "Not thine the bigot's partial plea,
> Nor thine the zealot's ban;
> Thou well canst spare a love of thee
> Which ends in hate of man".

ψεύστης, see note on i. 6.

Ver. 21. The Old Commandment. *Cf.* ii. 7-11.

CHAPTER V.—Vv. 1-5. What makes the Commandments of God easy? "Every one that hath faith that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God; and every one that loveth Him that begat loveth him that hath been begotten of Him. Herein we get to know that we love the children of God, whenever we love God, and do His commandments. For this is the love of God, that we should observe His commandments; and His commandments are not heavy, because everything that hath been begotten of God conquereth the world. And this is the conquest that conquered the world—our faith. Who is he that conquereth the world but he that hath faith that Jesus is the Son of God?"

Vv. 1-2. A reiteration of the doctrine that love for God = love for the brethren. Where either is, the other is also. Love for God is the inner principle, love for the brethren its outward manifestation. The argument is "an irregular Sorites" (Plummer):—

> Every one that hath faith in the Incarnation is a child of God;
> Every child of God loves the Father;
> ∴ every one that hath faith in the Incarnation loves God.
> Every one that hath faith in the Incarnation loves God;
> Every one that loves God loves the children of God;
> ∴ every one that hath faith in the Incarnation loves the children of God.

These are the two commandments of God, the fundamental and all-embracing Christian duties—*love God* and *love the brotherhood*. And faith in the Incarnation (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός) is an inspiration for both.

πιστεύων corresponds to πίστις (ver. 4). The lack of a similar correspondence in English is felt here as in many other passages (*e.g.*, Matt. viii. 10, 13; ix. 28, 29). Latin is similarly defective: "omnis qui *credit*," "*fides* nostra".

Ver. 3. ἡ ἀγ. τ. Θεοῦ, here objective genitive; contrast ii. 5. ἵνα ecbatic (see

f Matt. xi. 28-30.
g i. 1; John iii. 6.
h Ver. i. ref.
i John xvi. 33.
k Ver. 1 ref.
l Heb. ix. 11, 12.
m John xix. 34.

αὐτοῦ τηρῶμεν· καὶ [f] αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν. 4. ὅτι[1] [g] πᾶν τὸ [h] γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, νικᾷ τὸν κόσμον· καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν [i] ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν.[2] 5. τίς ἐστιν[3] ὁ νικῶν τὸν κόσμον, εἰ μὴ ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι [k] Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς[4] τοῦ Θεοῦ;

6. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν [l] δι' [m] ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος,[5] Ἰησοῦς ὁ[6]

[1] Punct. εισιν, οτι edd. [2] ημων ℵABKP, Vg., edd.; υμων L, Aeth.

[3] τις εστιν AL, Vg., Sah., Tisch., Nest.; τις εστι δε B, WH (δε brack.); Syr[vg] *quis enim*, Aeth. *et quis*.

[4] ο χριστος ο υιος two minusc., Arm.

[5] και αιματος BKL, Syr[vg], Vg., Tert. (*de Bapt.*, 16: *venerat enim per aquam et sanguinem, sicut Ioannes scripsit*), edd.; add. και πνευματος ℵAP, many minusc., Syr[ph], Cop., Sah.

[6] ο om. ℵABL, Arm., edd.

Moulton's *Gram. of N. T. Gk.*, i. pp. 206-9), where the classical idiom would require τὸ ἡμᾶς τηρεῖν. *Cf.* John xvii. 3; Luke i. 43. τὰς ἐντ., the two commandments—"love God" and "love one another" (*cf.* iii. 23, where see note; iv. 21). καὶ αἱ ἐντ., κ.τ.λ.: *cf.* Herm. *Past. M.* xii. 4, § 4: οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς χείλεσιν ἔχοντες τὸν κύριον, τὴν δὲ καρδίαν αὐτῶν πεπωρωμένην, καὶ μακρὰν ὄντες ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ἐκείνοις αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὗται σκληραί εἰσι καὶ δύσβατοι. Aug. *In Joan. Ev. Tract.* xlviii. 1: "Nostis enim qui amat non laborat. Omnis enim labor non amantibus gravis est."

Ver. 4. The reason why "His commandments are not heavy". Punctuate οὐκ εἰσίν, ὅτι πᾶν, κ.τ.λ. The neut. (πᾶν τὸ γεγ.) expresses the universality of the principle, "drückt die unbedingte Allgemeinheit noch stärker aus als 'Jeder, der aus Gott geboren ist'" (Rothe). *Cf.* John iii. 6. τὸν κόσμον, the sum of all the forces antagonistic to the spiritual life. "Our faith" conquers the world by clinging to the eternal realities. "Every common day, he who would be a live child of the living has to fight the God-denying look of things, to believe that, in spite of their look, they are God's, and God is in them, and working his saving will in them" (Geo. MacDonald, *Castle Warlock*, xli.). St. John says first "is conquering" (νικᾷ) because the fight is in progress, then "that conquered" (ἡ νικήσασα) because the triumph is assured.

Ver. 5. St. John says: "Everything that hath been begotten of God conquereth the world". But he has already said: "Every one that hath faith that Jesus is the Christ hath been begotten of God" (ver. 1). So now he asks: "Who is he that conquereth the world but he that hath faith that Jesus is the Son of God?" ("Son of God" being synonymous with "Christ," *i.e.*, "Messiah". *Cf.* John xi. 27, xx. 31). His doctrine therefore is that faith in the Incarnation, believing apprehension of the wonder and glory of it, makes easy the commandments of God, *i.e.*, love to God and love to one another. The remembrance and contemplation of that amazing manifestation drive out the affection of the world and inflame the heart with heavenly love. "What else can the consideration of a compassion so great and undeserved, of a love so free and in such wise proved, of a condescension so unexpected, of a gentleness so unconquerable, of a sweetness so amazing—what, I say, can the diligent consideration of these things do but deliver utterly from every evil passion the soul of him that considers them and hale it unto them in sorrow, exceedingly affect it, and make it despise in comparison with them whatsoever can be desired only in their despite?" (Bern. *De Dilig. Deo*). "There is no book so efficacious towards the instructing of a man in all all virtue and in abhorrence of all sin as the Passion of the Son of God" (Juan de Avila). "Fix your eyes on your Crucified Lord, and everything will seem easy to you" (Santa Teresa).

Vv. 6-8. The Threefold Testimony to the Incarnation. "This is He that came through water and blood, Jesus Christ; not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood. And it is the Spirit that testifieth, because the Spirit is the Truth. Because three are they that

Χριστός· οὐκ [n] ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ [1] τῷ αἵματι· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι [o] τὸ μαρτυροῦν ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν [p] ἡ [q] ἀλήθεια. 7. ὅτι τρεῖς [2] εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Πατήρ, ὁ Λόγος, καὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα· καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. 8. καὶ τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ,[3] τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ

n iii. 18.
o Phil. ii. 13.
p iii. 4 reff.
q i. 6 reff.

[1] και εν ABLP, edd. [2] οι τρεις ℵ.

[3] εν τω ουρανω . . . εν τη γη a Latin interpolation, certainly spurious. (1) Found in no Gk. MS. except two late minuscules—162 (Vatican), 15th c., the Lat. Vg. Version with a Gk. text adapted thereto; 34 (Trin. Coll., Dublin), 16th c. (2) Quoted by none of the Gk. Fathers. Had they known it, they would have employed it in the Trinitarian controversies (Sabellian and Arian). (3) Found in none of the early versions—in Vg. but not as it left the hands of St. Jerome. (4) Quoted by no Latin writer until Priscillian (close of 4th c.). *Apparet igitur . . . verba quae de tribus testibus caelestibus dici solent nullam prorsus fidem, auctoritatem nullam habere, nec a gravi libidinis aut imprudentiae crimine liberari posse eos qui etiamnum, falsa quippe pietate ducti, libris sacris obtrudi patiuntur. . . . Error vero longe est gravissimus, si qui, quod de sancta trinitate ecclesia Christi praecepit, a verbis illis Johanni obtrusis vel maxime pendere opinati sunt* (Tisch.).

testify—the Spirit and the water and the blood, and the three are for the one end."

St. John has said that faith in the Incarnation makes the commandments easy, and now the question arises: How can we be assured that the Incarnation is a fact? He adduces a threefold attestation: the Spirit, the water and the blood. His meaning is clear when it is understood that he has the Cerinthian heresy (see Introd. pp. 248 f.) in view and states his doctrine in opposition to it. Cerinthus distinguished between Jesus and the Christ. The divine Christ descended upon the human Jesus at the Baptism, *i.e.*, He "came through water," and left him at the Crucifixion, *i.e.*, He did not "come through blood". Thus redemption was excluded; all that was needed was spiritual illumination. In opposition to this St. John declares that the Eternal God was incarnate in Jesus and was manifested in the entire course of His human life, not only at His Baptism, which was His consecration to His ministry of redemption, but at His Death, which was the consummation of His infinite Sacrifice: "through water and blood, not in the water only but in the water and in the blood".

Ver. 6. **οὗτος**, *i.e.*, this Jesus who is the Son of God, the Messiah whom the prophets foretold and who "came" in the fulness of the time. **ὁ ἐλθών**, not **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**. His Advent no longer an unfulfilled hope but an historic event. **διά**, of the *pathway* or *vehicle* of His Advent. **Ἰησοῦς Χριστός**, "Jesus Christ," one person in opposition to the Cerinthian "dissolution" (**λύσις**) of Jesus and Christ (see note on iv. 3). **ἐν**: He not only "came through" but continued "in the water and in the blood," *i.e.*, His ministry comprehended both the Baptism of the Spirit and the Sacrifice for sin. Perhaps, however, the prepositions are interchangeable; *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 4-8; Heb. ix. 12, 25. **ἡ ἀλήθ.**: Jesus called Himself "the Truth" (John xiv. 6), and the Spirit came in His room, His *alter ego* (vv. 16-18).

Vv. 7-8. The Water (the Lord's consecrated Life) and the Blood (His sacrificial Death) are testimonies to the Incarnation, but they are insufficient. A third testimony, that of the Spirit, is needed to reveal their significance to us and bring it home to our hearts. Without His enlightenment the wonder and glory of that amazing manifestation will be hidden from us. It will be as unintelligible to us as "mathematics to a Scythian boor, and music to a camel". **τρεῖς οἱ μαρτυροῦντες**, masculine though **Πνεῦμα, ὕδωρ**, and **αἷμα** are all neuter, because agreeing **κατὰ σύνεσιν** with **τὸ Πνεῦμα**—a testimony, the more striking because involuntary, to the personality of the Spirit. **εἰς τὸ ἕν**, "for the one end," *i.e.* to bring us to faith in the Incarnation (**ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ**). This was the end for which St. John wrote his Gospel (John xx. 31). There is no reference in the Water and the Blood either to the effusion of blood and water from the Lord's pierced side (John xix. 34) or to the two Sacraments.

r John xi. 52, xvii. 23. s John v. 31-37, viii. 18. t John v. 26; Heb. viii. 16, x. 16 (Jer. xxxi. 33). u i. 10. v i. 2; John v. 26. w John iii. 36; 1 Cor. iii. 21-23.

αἷμα· καὶ οἱ τρεῖς [r] εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν. 9. Εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν· ὅτι αὕτη ἐστὶν [s] ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν [1] μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. 10. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν [t] ἐν ἑαυτῷ·[2] ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ Θεῷ,[3] [u] ψεύστην πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἣν μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ Θεὸς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. 11. Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία ὅτι ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός· καὶ [v] αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν. 12. [w] ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱόν, ἔχει τὴν ζωήν· ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει.

[1] ην KLP; οτι אAB, Vg. (*testimonium Dei, quod majus est, quoniam testificatus est*), Cop., Sah., Arm., edd. Punct. ο τι.

[2] εαυτω א; αυτω ABKLP; αὐτῷ Tisch., WH (marg.), Nest.; αὑτῷ WH.

[3] τω θεω אBKLP, Syr[vg], Cop., edd.; τω υιω A, Syr[ph], Vg.

Vv. 9-12. Our attitude to the Threefold Testimony. "If we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater, because this is the testimony of God—what He hath testified concerning His Son. He that believeth in the Son of God hath the testimony in himself. He that believeth not God hath made Him a liar, because he hath not believed in the testimony which God hath testified concerning His Son. And this is the testimony, that God gave us life eternal; and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God the life hath not."

Ver. 9. According to the Jewish law threefold testimony was valid (Deut. xix. 15; *cf.* Matt. xviii. 16; John viii. 17-18). Read (as in iii. 20) **ὅ, τι μεμαρτύρηκεν**, "what He hath testified concerning His Son," *i.e.* the testimony of His miracles and especially His Resurrection (Rom. i. 4). The variant **ἣν** is a marginal gloss indicating the relative (**ὅ, τι**), not the conjunction (**ὅτι**). The latter is incapable of satisfactory explanation. The alternatives are: (1) "Because the testimony of God is this—the fact that He hath testified," which is meaningless and involves an abrupt variation in the use of **ὅτι**. (2) "Because this is the testimony of God, because, I say, He hath testified," which is intolerable. The Apostle appeals here to his readers to be as reasonable with God as with their fellow men. *Cf.* Pascal: "Would the heir to an estate on finding the title-deeds say, 'Perhaps they are false'? and would he neglect to examine them?"

Ver. 10. A subtle and profound analysis of the exercise of soul which issues in assured faith. Three stages: (1) "Believe God" (**πιστεύειν τῷ Θεῷ**, *credere Deo*), accept His testimony concerning His Son, *i.e.*, not simply His testimony at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 17) but the historic manifestation of God in Christ, the Incarnation. God speaks not by words but by acts, and to set aside His supreme act, and all the forces which it has set in operation is to "make Him a liar" by treating His historic testimony as unworthy of credit. (2) "Believe in the Son of God" (**πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ**, *credere in Filium Dei*), make the believing self-surrender which is the reasonable and inevitable consequence of contemplating the Incarnation and recognising the wonder of it. (3) The Inward Testimony (**τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὑτῷ**, *testimonium in seipso*). "Fecisti nos ad te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te" (Aug.). The love of Jesus satisfies the deepest need of our nature. When He is welcomed, the soul rises up and greets Him as "all its salvation and all its desire," and the testimony is no longer external in history but an inward experience (*cf.* note on iv. 9: **ἐν ἡμῖν**), and therefore indubitable. These three stages are, according to the metaphor of Rev. iii. 20, (1) hearing the Saviour's voice, (2) opening the door, (3) communion.

Ver. 11. The Testimony of the Incarnation. *Cf.* i. 2. **ἔδωκεν**, "gave," aorist referring to a definite historic act, the Incarnation.

Ver. 12. **μή** with the participle does not necessarily make the case hypothetical (*cf.* note on ii. 4). St. John would have

13. Ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύητε[2] εἰς τὸ [x] ὄνομα [y] τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 14. Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ [z] παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι [a] ἐάν τι αἰτώμεθα κατὰ [b] τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ἀκούει ἡμῶν· 15. καὶ [c] ἐὰν οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν, ὃ ἂν[3] αἰτώμεθα, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ [d] αἰτήματα ἃ ᾐτήκαμεν παρ'[4] αὐτοῦ. 16. Ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ [e] ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς

x ii. 12 reff., iii. 23.
y John xx. 31.
z ii. 28 reff.
a iii. 21; John xiv. 13, xvi. 23.
b Matt. vi. 10; Luke xxii. 42.
c Cf. 1 Thess. iii. 8 (ἐὰν στήκετε).
d Luke xxiii. 24; Phil. iv. 6.
e ii. 25; Mark iv. 41; John vii. 24; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Col. ii. 19; 1 Peter iii. 14.

[1] τοις πιστευουσιν εις το ονομα του υιου του θεου KLP; om. ℵAB, Syr vg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

[2] και ινα πιστευητε KLP; τοις πιστευουσιν ℵ*B, Syr vg ph, edd.; οι πιστευοντες ℵcA.

[3] εαν ℵLP, edd. [4] παρ AKLP; απ ℵB, edd.

only too many actual instances before him in those days of doctrinal unsettlement.

Vv. 13-21. The Epistle is finished, and the Apostle now speaks his closing words. "These things I wrote to you that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even to you that believe in the name of the Son of God. And this is the boldness which we have toward Him, that if we request anything according to His will, He hearkeneth to us. And if we know that He hearkeneth to us whatever we request, we know that we have the requests which we have made from Him. If any one see his brother sinning a sin not unto death, he shall make request, and he will give to him life, even to them that are sinning not unto death. There *is* a sin unto death; not concerning that do I say that he should ask. Every sort of unrighteousness is sin, and there is a sin not unto death. We know that every one that hath been begotten of God doth not keep sinning, but the Begotten of God observeth him, and the Evil One doth not lay hold on him. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the Evil One. And we know that the Son of God hath come, and hath given us understanding that we may get to know the True One; and we are in the True One, in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the True God and Life Eternal. Little children, guard yourselves from the idols."

Ver. 13. The purpose for which St. John wrote his Gospel was that we might believe in the Incarnation, and so have Eternal Life (xx. 31); the purpose of the Epistle is not merely that we may have Eternal Life by believing but that we may *know that we have it*. The Gospel exhibits the Son of God, the Epistle commends Him. It is a supplement to the Gospel, a personal application and appeal. **ἔγραψα**, "I wrote," looking back on the accomplished task. **εἰδῆτε**, "know," not **γινώσκητε**, "get to know". Full and present assurance.

Ver. 14. **παρρησία**, see note on ii. 28. As distinguished from **αἰτεῖν** the middle **αἰτεῖσθαι** is to pray *earnestly* as with a personal interest (see Mayor's note on James iv. 3). The distinction does not appear here, since **αἰτεῖν αἰτήματα** (cognate accusitive) is a colourless periphrasis for **αἰτεῖσθαι**. A large assurance: our prayers always heard, never unanswered. Observe two limitations: (1) **κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ**, which does not mean that we should first ascertain His will and then pray, but that we should pray with the proviso, express or implicit, "If it be Thy will". Matt. xxvi. 39 is the model prayer. (2) The promise is not "He granteth it" but "He hearkeneth to us". He answers in His own way.

Ver. 15. An amplification of the second limitation. "We have our requests" not always as we pray but as we would pray were we wiser. God gives not what we ask but what we really need. *Cf.* Shak., *Ant. and Cleop.* I. ii.:—

"We, ignorant of ourselves,
Beg often our own harms, which the wise powers
Deny us for our good; so find we profit,
By losing of our prayers".

Prayer is not dictation to God but **ἀνάβασις νοῦ πρὸς Θεὸν καὶ αἴτησις τῶν προσηκόντων παρὰ Θεοῦ** (Joan. Damasc. *De. Fid. Orthod.*, iii. 24). Clem. Alex.: "Non absolute dixit quod petierimus sed quod oportet petere".

Ver. 16. After the grand assurance

f Matt. xiii. 31-32; Heb. vi. 4-6. g iii. 4. h iii. 9. i John xvii. 15. k ii. 13 reff.

θάνατον, αἰτήσει, καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι μὴ πρὸς θάνατον. ἔστιν [f] ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον· οὐ περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα ἐρωτήσῃ· 17. [g] πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστί· καὶ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον. 18. Οἴδαμεν ὅτι [h] πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· ἀλλ' ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, [i] τηρεῖ ἑαυτόν,[1] καὶ [k] ὁ

[1] αυτον A*B, Vg. (*generatio Dei conservat eum*), edd.

that prayer is always heard, never unanswered, the Apostle specifies one kind of prayer, *viz.*, Intercession, in the particular case of a "brother," *i.e.* a fellow-believer, who has sinned. Prayer will avail for his restoration, with one reservation—that his sin be "not unto death". The reference is to those who had been led astray by the heresy, moral and intellectual, which had invaded the churches of Asia Minor (see Introd. pp. 248 f.) They had closed their ears to the voice of Conscience and their eyes to the light of the Truth, and they were exposed to the operation of that law of Degeneration which obtains in the physical, moral, intellectual, and spiritual domains. *E.g.*, a bodily faculty, if neglected, atrophies (*cf.* note on ii. 11). So in the moral domain disregard of truth destroys veracity. Acts make habits, habits character. So also in the intellectual domain. *Cf.* Darwin to Sir J. D. Hooker, June 17, 1868: "I am glad you were at the *Messiah*, it is the one thing that I should like to hear again, but I daresay I should find my soul too dried up to appreciate it as in old days; and then I should feel very flat, for it is a horrid bore to feel as I constantly do, that I am a withered leaf for every subject except Science". And so in the spiritual domain. There are two ways of killing the soul: (1) The benumbing and hardening practice of disregarding spiritual appeals and stifling spiritual impulses. *Cf. Reliq. Baxter*, I. i. 29: "Bridgnorth had made me resolve that I would never go among a People that had been hardened in unprofitableness under an awakening Ministry; but either to such as had never had any convincing Preacher, or to such as had profited by him". (2) A decisive apostasy, a deliberate rejection. This was the case of those heretics. They had abjured Christ and followed Antichrist. This is what Jesus calls **ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημία** (Matt. xii. 31-32 = Mark iii. 28-30). It inflicts a mortal wound on the man's spiritual nature. He can never be forgiven because he can never repent. He is "in the grip of an eternal sin (**ἔνοχος αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος**)". *Cf.* Heb. vi. 4-6. This is "sin unto death". Observe how tenderly St. John speaks: There is a fearful possibility of a man putting himself beyond the hope of restoration; but we can never tell when he has crossed the boundary. If we were sure that it was a case of "sin unto dea h," then we should forbear praying; but, since we can never be sure, we should always keep on praying. So long as a man is capable of repentance, he has not sinned unto death. "Quamdiu enim veniæ relinquitur locus, mors prorsus imperium nondum occupat" (Calv.). **δώσει**, either (1) "he (the intercessor) will give to him (the brother)," **τοῖς ἁμαρτ.** being in apposition to **αὐτῷ**, "to him, *i.e.* to them that, etc."; or (2) "He (God) will give to him (the intercessor) life for them that, etc." The former avoids an abrupt change of subject, and the attribution to the intercessor of what God does through him is paralleled by James v. 20.

Ver. 17. A gentle warning. "Principiis obsta." Also a reassurance. "You have sinned, but not necessarily 'unto death'."

Vv. 18-20. The Certainties of Christian Faith. St. John has been speaking of a dark mystery, and now he turns from it: "Do not brood over it. Think rather of the splendid certainties and rejoice in them."

Ver. 18. Our Security through the Guardianship of Christ. **οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει**, see note on iii. 6. The child of God may fall into sin, but he does not continue in it; he is not under its dominion. Why? Because, though he has a malignant foe, he has also a vigilant Guardian. **ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, *i.e.*, Christ. *Cf. Symb. Nic.*: **Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρός.** As distinguished from **γεγεννημένος** the aor. **γεννηθεὶς** refers to the "Eternal Generation". The rendering "he that is begotten of God (the regenerate man) keepeth himself (**ἑαυτόν**), *qui genitus est ex Deo, servat seipsum* (Calv.), is doubly objectionable: (1) It

πονηρὸς οὐχ [l] ἅπτε ται αὐτοῦ. 19. οἴδαμεν ὅτι [m] ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσμεν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος [n] ἐν [k] τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται. 20. οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ [o] ἥκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἵνα [p] γινώσκωμεν [1] τὸν [q] ἀληθινόν· καί ἐσμεν ἐν τῷ [q] ἀληθινῷ, ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ [q] ἀληθινὸς Θεός, καὶ [r] ἡ [2] ζωὴ αἰώνιος. 21. Τεκνία, [s] φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς [3] ἀπὸ τῶν [t] εἰδώλων. ἀμήν.[4]

l Luke vii. 14, 39; John xx. 17.
m iii. 8.
n Luke ii. 12, 16.
o John viii. 42.
p (-ομεν) 1 Cor. iv. 6; Gal. iv. 17.
q ii. 8. r i. 2. s Luke xii. 15; John xii. 25, xvii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14. t 1 Cor. x. 14; Eph. v. 5.

[1] γινωσκομεν ℵAB*LP, edd.—an itacism.

[2] η om. ℵAB, edd. [3] εαυτους ℵcAKP; εαυτα ℵ*BL, edd.

[4] αμην KLP, Vg.; om. ℵAB, Syrvg ph, Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd. A common ecclesiastical addition.

ignores the distinction between perf. and aor.; (2) there is no comfort in the thought that we are in our own keeping; our security is not our grip on Christ but His grip on us. Calvin feels this: "Quod Dei proprium est, ad nos transfert. Nam si quisque nostrum salutis suæ sit custos, miserum erit præsidium". Vulg. has *generatio Dei*, perhaps representing a variant **ἡ γέννησις τοῦ Θεοῦ**. **τηρεῖ**, see note on ii. 3. **ἅπτεται**, stronger than "toucheth," rather "graspeth," "layeth hold of". A reference to Ps. cv. (LXX civ.). 15: **μὴ ἅψησθε τῶν χριστῶν μου**, *Nolite tangere christos meos* (Vulg.).

Ver. 19. Our Security in God's Embrace. **ὁ κόσμος**: "Non creatura sed seculares nomines et secundum concupiscentias viventes" (Clem. Alex.). See note on ii. 15. **τῷ πονηρῷ**, masc. as in prev. vers. **κεῖται**, in antithesis to **οὐχ ἅπτεται**. On the child of God the Evil One does not so much as lay his hand, the world lies in his arms. On the other hand, the child of God lies in God's arms. *Cf.* Deut. xxxiii. 27. Penn, *Fruits of Solitude:* "If our Hairs fall not to the Ground, less do we or our Substance without God's Providence. Nor can we fall below the arms of God, how low soever it be we fall."

Ver. 20. The Assurance and Guarantee of it all—the fact of the Incarnation (**ὅτι ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἥκει**), an overwhelming demonstration of God's interest in us and His concern for our highest good. Not simply a historic fact but an abiding operation—not "came (**ἦλθε**)," but "hath come and hath given us". Our faith is not a matter of intellectual theory but of personal and growing acquaintance with God through the enlightenment of Christ's Spirit. **τὸν ἀληθινόν**, "the real" as opposed to the false God of the heretics. See note on ii. 8. **ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ**, as the world is **ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ**.

Ver. 21. *Filioli, custodite vos a simulacris* (Vulg.). The exhortation arises naturally. "This"—this God revealed and made near and sure in Christ—"is the True God and Life Eternal. Cleave to Him, and do not take to do with false Gods: guard yourselves from the idols." St. John is thinking, not of the heathen worship of Ephesus—Artemis and her Temple, but of the heretical substitutes for the Christian conception of God. **τεκνία** gives a tone of tenderness to the exhortation. **φυλάσσειν** is used of "guarding" a flock (Luke ii. 8), a deposit or trust (1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 12, 14), a prisoner (Acts xii. 4). **φυλάσσειν**, "watch *from within*"; **τηρεῖν** (see note on ii. 3), "watch *from without*". Thus, when a city is besieged, the garrison **φυλάσσουσι**, the besiegers **τηροῦσιν**. The heart is a citadel, and it must be guarded against insidious assailants from without. Not **φυλάσσετε**, "be on your guard," but **φυλάξατε**, aor. marking a crisis. The Cerinthian heresy was a desperate assault demanding a decisive repulse.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑ.[1]

1. [a] Ὁ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ[2] καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς, οὓς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ [b] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐγνωκότες [b] τὴν ἀλήθειαν, 2. διὰ [b] τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν [c] μένουσαν[3] ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ [d] μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· 3. ἔσται[4] μεθ' ἡμῶν[5] [e] χάρις,

a 3 John i; 1 Tim. v. 1, 17, 19; Heb. xi. 2; 1 Peter v. 1.
b John xvii. 17, 19.
c 1 John ii. 4, 14, 24, 27, iii. 9.
d 1 John iv. 17.
e 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.

[1] ιωαννου β̄ ℵ; ιωανου β̄ B; επιστολη ιωαννου β̄ P, 96; ιωαννου καθολικη δευτερα 99; ιωαννου επιστολη καθολικη β̄ K, 101, 106; του αγιου αποστολου ιωαννου του θεολογου επιστολη δευτερα L; του αυτου αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου επιστολη δευτερα 95; επιστολη δευτερα ιωαννου του επι στηθους 4.

[2] τη εκλεκτη κυρια 73; εκλεκτη τη κυρια 31; εκλεκτη τη και κυρια Aeth.; Κυρίᾳ Syr[vg ph], Tisch.; Ἐκλέκτῃ Κυρίᾳ WH (marg.).

[3] μενουσαν ℵBKLP, Vg., edd.; ενοικουσαν A.

[4] εσται δε 15, 36, Euth. Zig.

[5] ημων ℵBLP, Syr[bo], Sah., Aeth., edd.; υμων K, Vg. (*sit vobiscum gratia*), Cop., Syr[ph].

THE SECOND EPISTLE.

Vv. 1-3. The Address. "The Elder to elect Kyria and her children, whom I love in Truth, and not I alone but also all that have got to know the Truth, because of the Truth that abideth in us; and with us it shall be for ever. Yea, there shall be with us grace, mercy, peace from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father in Truth and love."

Ver. 1. **ὁ πρεσβύτερος**, see Introd. pp. 251 ff. **ἐκλεκτῇ Κυρίᾳ**, see Introd. pp. 254 f. **οὓς**, *constructio* **κατὰ σύνεσιν**, because **τὰ τέκνα** were or included sons, not "weil an Gemeindeglieder gedacht ist" (Holtzmann). **ἐγώ**: according to the Greek idiom, when a man speaks of himself in the third person, he passes immediately to the first. *Cf.* Plat. *Euthyphr.* 5 A: **οὐδέ τῳ ἂν διαφέροι Εὐθύφρων τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων, εἰ μὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα πάντα ἀκριβῶς εἰδείην.** Soph. *Aj.*, 864-65. The construction is found in loose English; *cf.* Thackeray, *Barry Lyndon*, chap. xviii.: "I was a man who never deserved that so much prosperity should fall to my share". **ἐν ἀληθείᾳ** (see note on 1 John i. 8) defines the Elder's love for Kyria as fellowship in Christian knowledge and faith, in view perhaps of heathen accusations of licentiousness. His affection for her and her family was not merely personal; it was inspired by her devotion to the common cause and was shared by all the Christians in his extensive **διοίκησις**. *Cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 18: **οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. τὴν ἀλήθειαν**, "the Truth just mentioned".

Ver. 2. **μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν**, not merely apprehended by the intellect but welcomed by the heart. **μεθ' ἡμῶν**, *nobiscum*, *bei uns*, as our guest and companion.

Ver. 3. **ἔσται μεθ' ἡμῶν**, not a wish (1 Peter i. 2; 2 Peter i. 2) but a confident assurance. **χάρις**, the well-spring in the heart of God; **ἔλεος**, its outpourings; **εἰρήνη**, its blessed effect. They are evangelical blessings: (1) not merely "from God" but "from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father" who has interpreted Him and brought Him near, made Him accessible; (2) not merely "in Truth," enlightening the intellect, but "in love," engaging the heart.

ἔλεος, εἰρήνη παρὰ Θεοῦ πατρός, καὶ παρὰ Κυρίου [1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρός, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ.

4. [f] Ἐχάρην λίαν ὅτι εὕρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου [g] περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς ἐντολὴν ἐλάβομεν [2] παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. 5. καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία,[3] [h] οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφω [4] σοι καινήν,[5] ἀλλὰ ἣν εἴχομεν [6] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. 6. καὶ [i] αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα [g] περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. [k] αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ

f Matt. ii. 10; Mark xiv. 11; Luke xxiii. 8; John xx. 20.
g 1 John i. 6, 7. ii. 6, 11.
h 1 John ii. 7. iii. 11, 23.
i 1 John v. 3 reff.
k 1 John iii. 23.

[1] κυριου ℵKLP, Syrph, Cop., Arm.; om. AB, several minusc., Syrbo, Vg. (*a Christo Jesu*), Aeth., edd.

[2] ελαβον ℵ. [3] Κυρια Tisch.

[4] γραφω several minusc., Aeth., Arm.; γραφων ℵABKLP, Vg., edd.

[5] γραφων σοι καινην BKLP, WH, Nest.; καινην γραφων σοι ℵA, Tisch.

[6] ειχομεν BKLP; ειχαμεν ℵA, edd.

Observe the high tribute which the Elder pays to Kyria: (1) He testifies to the esteem in which she is held; (2) he recognises her as a fellow-worker as though she were a fellow-apostle—the three-fold "us," not "you"; (3) he is about to speak of the danger from heretical teaching, but he has no fear of her being led astray: "You and I are secure from the deceiver. The Truth abideth in us; with us it shall be for ever; yea, there shall be with us grace, mercy, peace."

Ver. 4. The Occasion of the Epistle. "I was exceedingly glad because I have found some of thy children walking in Truth, even as we received commandment from the Father."

ἐχάρην, of a glad surprise (*cf.* Mark xiv. 11). He had been too often disappointed in lads like these (see Introd., p. 14). They had profited by the nurture of their godly home, the best equipment for the battle of life. "No man should ever leave money to his children. It is a curse to them. What we should do for our children, if we would do them the best service we can, is to give them the best training we can procure for them, and then turn them loose in the world without a sixpence to fend for themselves" (Cecil John Rhodes). **εὕρηκα**, "I have found". He sits down at once and writes to Kyria. How glad she would be that her lads, far away in the great city were true to their early faith! **ἐκ τῶν τέκνων**, "some of thy children" (a tenderer word than "sons," **υἱῶν**), "members of thy family," not implying that others had done ill; the lads who had come to Ephesus. **περιπατοῦντας, κ.τ.λ.**, *ambulantes in veritate*, *die in der Wahrheit wandeln*, "ordering their lives according to the precepts of the Gospel". See note on 1 John i. 6.

Vv. 5-6. The Comprehensive Commandment. "And now I ask thee, Kyria, not as writing a new commandment to thee but the one which we had from the beginning, that we love one another. And this is love—that we walk according to His commandments; this is the commandment, even as ye heard from the beginning—that we should walk in love."

These counsels are just a summary of the doctrines expounded at large in the first Epistle. There is here a sort of reasoning in a circle: The commandment is Love; Love is walking according to His commandments; His commandments are summed up in one—Love.

Ver. 5. **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**, "from the beginning of our Christian life". See note on 1 John ii. 7.

Ver. 6. **ἡ ἀγάπη**, "the love just referred to". **περιπ. κατὰ τὰς ἐντ. αὐτ.**, regulating our lives by their requirements; **περιπ. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ** (ver. 4), keeping within the limits of the Christian revelation and not straying beyond them —not **προάγοντες** (ver. 9). **αὐτῇ**, *i.e.*, "love," not "the commandment" (Vulg.: *Hoc est mandatum, ut . . . in eo ambuletis*). **περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀγάπῃ** is synonymous with **περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**, since Love is Truth in practice. *Cf.* the story of R. Hillel: A mocking Gentile promised to become a proselyte if he would teach him the whole Law while he stood on one foot—a gibe at the multitudinous precepts, reckoned at 613. "What is hateful to thyself," said the Rabbi, "do not to thy neighbour. This is the whole Law; the rest is commentary." *Yalk. Chad.*, lix. 2; "qui justum cibat frusto,

l 1 John i. 8. m 1 John iv. 1 reff. n 1 John iv. 2. o 1 John ii. 18 reff. p Mark xiii. 9. q Matt. x. 41, 42, xx. 8; James v. 4. r Matt. ii. 9, xiv. 22; Mark x. 32; 1 Tim. v. 24 (προάγων). s 1 Tim. ii. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 14. t 1 John ii. 22, 23.

ἐντολή,[1] καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατῆτε· 7. ὅτι πολλοὶ [l] πλάνοι [m] εἰσῆλθον[2] εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἱ μὴ [n] ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ [l] πλάνος καὶ ὁ [o] ἀντίχριστος. 8. [p] βλέπετε ἑαυτούς, ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσωμεν ἃ εἰργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ [q] μισθὸν πλήρη ἀπολάβωμεν.[3] 9. πᾶς ὁ [r] παραβαίνων,[4] καὶ μὴ [s] μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει· ὁ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,[5] οὗτος καὶ [t] τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει.

[1] εστιν η εντολη ℵLP; η εντολη εστιν ℵBK, edd.

[2] εισηλθον KLP; εξηλθον ℵAB, Syr^bo, Vg., Sah., Arm., Iren. (III. xvii. 8), edd. (-αν A, Tisch., WH).

[3] απολεσωμεν απολαβωμεν KLP; απολεσητε απολαβητε ℵ* (απολησθε) AB, Syr^vg ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Iren., edd.; ειργασαμεθα BKLP, Syr^ph (marg.), Sah.; ηργ-B*, WH, Nest.; ειργασασθε ℵA, Syr^bo ph, Vg., Cop., Aeth., Arm., Iren., Tisch.

[4] παραβαινων KLP, Syr^bo ph, Vg. (*qui recedit*), Cop., Arm.; προαγων ℵAB, Sah., Aeth., edd.

[5] του χριστου KLP, Cop., Aeth.; om. ℵAB, Syr^ph, Vg., Sah., Arm., edd.

perinde est acsi totum Pentateuchum servasset".

Vv. 7-8. A Warning against Heretical Teaching. "Because many deceivers went forth into the world—even they that confess not Jesus as Christ coming in flesh. This is the deceiver and the Antichrist. Look to yourselves, that ye may not lose what we wrought, but receive a full wage."

Ver. 7. **ὅτι** explaining **ἐρωτῶ σε**: "I ask you to obey the old commandment because seducers are at work". **ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον,** see note on 1 John iv. 1. **οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες,** a definite and well-known sect. See note on 1 John ii. 4. **ἐληλυθότα** (1 John iv. 2) of the Advent, **ἐρχόμενον** of the continous manifestation of the incarnate Christ. *Cf.* John i. 14, where **σὰρξ ἐγένετο** corresponds to **ἐληλυθότα** and **ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν** to **ἐρχόμενον**.

Ver. 8. **μισθόν,** *cf.* Matt. xx. 8; James v. 4. St. John here addresses not only Kyria but her family and "the Church in her house". He views them as his fellow-labourers in the Lord's vineyard: "We have worked together (**ἠργασάμεθα**): see that you do not forfeit the reward of your labour. Get a full wage. Be not like workmen who toward the close of the day fall off, doing their work badly or losing time, and get less than a full day's pay." **ἀπολέσητε . . . ἠργασάμεθα . . . ἀπολάβητε**: "We have been fellow-workers thus far, and I mean to be faithful to the last; see that you also be so". Their danger lay in taking up with false teaching and losing the comfort of the Gospel in its simplicity and fulness.

Ver. 9. Progress in Theological Thought. "Every one that 'progresseth' and abideth not in the teaching of the Christ hath not God; he that abideth in the teaching—this man hath both the Father and the Son."

ὁ προάγων: the Cerinthians (see Introd. pp. 248 f.) boasted of their enlightenment. They were "progressives," "advanced thinkers". **τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,** the teaching which recognises Jesus as the Christ (see note on 1 John iv. 1-2), *i.e.* the Messiah, the Saviour. **Θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει,** *i.e.* according to His true nature as the Father manifested in the Son (**καὶ τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱόν**). It is necessary not merely to believe in God but to believe in Him "through Christ" (1 Peter i. 21).

St. John does not here condemn theological progress, which is a necessity of living and growing faith. A doctrine is a statement of Christian experience, and since there is always more in Christ than we have ever experienced, our doctrines can never be adequate or final. Theology is to God's revelation in Grace as Science is to His revelation in Nature; and just as Science is always discovering more of the wonders of the First Creation, so Theology is always entering more deeply into the glory of the New Creation and appropriating more of the treasures which are hidden in Christ. Even the inspired Apostles did not comprehend all His fulness. Each saw only so much as was revealed to him, and declared only so

10. [u] εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει, μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν εἰς οἰκίαν, καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε· 11. ὁ [v] γὰρ λέγων [1] αὐτῷ χαίρειν, [v] κοινωνεῖ [w] τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.

u 2 Thess. iii. 6.
v 1 John i. 3, 6, 7; 1 Tim. v. 22.
w 1 John iii. 12.

[1] ο γαρ λεγων KLP, Iren. (I. ix. 3); ο λεγων γαρ ℵAB, edd.

much as he saw. Each approached the infinite wonder along the lines of his temperament and experience. St. John saw in it a revelation of Eternal Life; St. Paul the Reconciliation of sinners to God, the satisfaction of humanity's long desire and the completion of its long discipline under the Law; the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews the rending of the Veil and the opening of free Access to God. St. John does not condemn theological progress; he defines its limits: "abide in the teaching of the Christ". (1) We must never break with the past; the new truth is always an outgrowth of the old. A theology which is simply old is dead; a theology which is simply new is false (*cf.* Matt. xiii. 52). (2) We must maintain "the teaching of the Christ". Jesus is the Saviour, and no interpretation of Christianity is true which eliminates Redemption or obscures the glory of the Cross.

Vv. 10-11. Treatment of Heretical Teachers. "If any one cometh unto you and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and bid him not farewell. For he that biddeth him farewell hath fellowship with his works, his evil works."

Ver. 10. **φέρει**, not "endureth" (*cf.* Rom. ix. 22; Heb. xii. 20), but "bringeth" as a precious boon (*cf.* Rev. xxi. 24, 26). **εἰς οἰκίαν** (*cf.* Mark ii. 1; iii. 19), *zu Hause; cf.* "to church," "to town," "to market," "to bed". See Moulton's *Winer*, pp. 148 ff. **χαῖρε**, like *ave, salve*, was used of both the salutation at meeting and the farewell at parting. The former is its prevailing use in N.T., but here, as in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, the latter. "Zum Abschied, wenn der Abgewiesene weiter ziehen muss" (Holtzmann).

Ver. 11. **κοινωνεῖ**, *cf.* 1 John i. 3. An unholy **κοινωνία**. **τοῖς ἔργ. αὐτ. τοῖς πον.**, *cf.* 1 John i. 2: **τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον**. The adjective is an emphatic afterthought.

This counsel recalls the story of St. John's behaviour to Cerinthus (see Introd. p. 249), and it was cited by Irenæus (I. ix. 3) as inculcating intolerance of heretics. If so, it is certainly an unChristian counsel, contrary to the spirit and teaching of our Lord (*cf.* Mark ix. 38-39; Luke ix. 51-56; Matt. xiii. 28-29). Heretics are our fellow-creatures; Jesus died for them also, and our office is to win them. If we close our doors and our hearts against them, we lose our opportunity of winning them and harden them in their opposition. There are two thoughts which may well teach us forbearance and humility: (1) The patience of the Lord. A Jewish fable tells how Abraham thrust an aged wayfarer from his tent because he asked no blessing on his food and avowed himself a fire-worshipper. And the Lord said: "I have suffered him these hundred years, although he dishonoured Me; and couldst not thou endure him for one night?" (2) The mystery of the things of God and the blindness of our intellects. "Illi," says St. Augustine (*Contra Epistolam Manichæi*, 2), "in vos sæviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficile caveantur errores". This counsel of the Apostle must be read in the light of local circumstances. There was need of caution and discrimination in receiving the itinerant "apostles and prophets" who went from church to church, lest they should prove "false apostles" (**ψευδαπόστολοι**) and "false prophets" (**ψευδοπροφῆται**). See *Didache*, xi.-xii., where the test is given: **οὐ πᾶς ὁ λαλῶν ἐν πνεύματι προφήτης ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἔχῃ τοὺς τρόπους Κυρίου.** It is not until the second century that there is any appearance of buildings set apart for worship. The primitive **ἐκκλησίαι** met in private houses (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2); and when St. John warns Kyria against "receiving into her house" a heretical teacher, it is not showing him hospitality that he forbids, but affording him an opportunity to unsettle the faith of the brethren. She must neither let him pervert "the church in her house" nor send him on his way to a neighbouring church with the recommendation of her confidence and goodwill. This is expressed, though somewhat vaguely, by Clem. Alex.: "Hoc in hujusmodi non est inhumanum, sed nec conquirere vel condisputare cum talibus admonet qui non valent intelligibiliter divina tractare, ne per eos traducantur a doctrina veri-

x 3 John 14. y 1 John i. 4 reff. z Ver. 1.

12. Πολλὰ ἔχων ὑμῖν γράφειν, οὐκ ἠβουλήθην[1] διὰ χάρτου καὶ μέλανος· ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω ἐλθεῖν[2] πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ [z] στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλῆσαι, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν[3] ᾖ [y] πεπληρωμένη.[4] 13. ἀσπάζεταί σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς [z] ἐκλεκτῆς. ἀμήν.[5]

[1] εβουληθην ℵABKLP, edd. [2] γενεσθαι ℵAB, Syr^p^h, Vg., edd.

[3] ημων ℵKLP, Tisch., WH (marg.), Nest.; υμων AB, Vg., WH.

[4] η πεπληρωμενη AKLP; πεπληρωμενη η ℵB, edd.

[5] αμην om. ℵABP, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

tatis, verisimilibus inducti rationibus. Arbitror autem, quia et orare cum talibus non oportet, quoniam in oratione quæ fit in domo, postquam ab orando surgitur, salutatio gaudii est et pacis indicium."

Vv. 12-13. The Conclusion. "Though I have many things to write to you, I would not by paper and ink; but I hope to get to you, and talk face to face, that our joy may be fulfilled. The children of thine elect sister salute thee."

Ver. 12. Explanation of the brevity of the letter. ὑμῖν, *i.e.*, Kyria, her children, and the church in her house. γράφειν connected ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with ἔχων and ἐβουλήθην. χάρτης, a sheet of papyrus, like those exhumed at Oxyrhynchus (see Deissmann, *New Light on the New Test.*, pp. 12 ff.), the common material for letter-writing. μέλαν, *atramentum;* in N. T. only here, 3 John 13, 2 Cor. iii. 3. γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς (*cf.* John x. 35; Acts x. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3, xvi. 10): he was planning a visitation (see Introd. p. 247). στόμα πρὸς στόμα, "mouth answering mouth"; *cf.* LXX. Num. xii. 8; Jer. xxxii. (xxxix.), 4.

Why would he not write all that was in his mind? It was a deliberate decision ere he took pen in hand: this is the force of οὐκ ἐβουλήθην. His heart was full, and writing was a poor medium of communication (Beng.: "Ipsa scribendi opera non juvat semper cor affectu sacro plenum"); he was an old man, and writing was fatiguing to him (Plummer). The reason is deeper. The "many things" which he had in his mind, were hard things like his warning against intercourse with heretics, and he would not write them at a distance but would wait till he was on the spot and had personal knowledge. It is easy to lay down general principles, but their application to particular cases is a delicate task, demanding knowledge, sympathy, charity. (1) The sight of people's faces appeals to one's heart and softens one's speech. (2) When one meets with people and talks with them, one's judgment of them and their opinions is often modified. Writing from Ephesus, St. John might have condemned a teacher in a neighbouring town whose teaching he knew only by report; but perhaps, if he met the man and heard what he had to say, he might discover that there was nothing amiss, at all events nothing which called for excommunication. Dr. Dale of Birmingham was at first inclined to look with disfavour on Mr. Moody. He went to hear him, and his opinion was altered. He regarded him ever after with profound respect, and considered that he had a right to preach the Gospel, "because he could never speak of a lost soul without tears in his eyes". St. John shrank from hasty condemnation that there might be no after-regret—ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν πεπληρωμένη ᾖ.

Ver. 13. See Introd. pp. 254 f.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ.

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ ΤΡΙΤΗ.[1]

1. [a] Ὁ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΣ Γαΐῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ, ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ [b] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. 2. Ἀγαπητέ, περὶ πάντων εὔχομαί σε [c] εὐοδοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, καθὼς [c] εὐοδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχή. 3. [d] ἐχάρην γὰρ[2] λίαν, ἐρχομένων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαρτυρούντων σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καθὼς σὺ [e] ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς. 4. [f] μειζοτέραν τούτων οὐκ ἔχω χαράν,[3] ἵνα ἀκούω τὰ

a 2 John 1 reff.
b 2 John 1 ref.
c 1 Cor. xvi. 2.
d 2 John 4.
e 2 John 4.
f 1 John i. 4.

[1] ιωαννου γ̅ ℵ; ιωανου γ̅ B; ιωαννου επιστολη γ̅ C, many minusc.; ιωαννου επιστολη καθολικη γ̅ 101, 106; επιστολη τριτη του αγιου αποστολου ιωαννου L; του αυτου αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου επιστολη τριτη 95; επιστολη του αγιου αποστολου και ηγαπημενου προς γαΐον ιωαννου 4.

[2] γαρ ABCKLP, Syr[bo ph], Cop., WH, Nest.; om. ℵ, Vg., Sah., Aeth., Arm., Tisch.

[3] χαραν ℵACKLP, Tisch., WH (marg.), Nest.; χαριν B, Vg., Cop., WH.

THE THIRD EPISTLE.

Vv. 1-4. Address and Commendation. "The Elder to Gaius the beloved, whom I love in Truth. Beloved, in all respects I pray that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth. For I was exceedingly glad when brethren would come and testify to thy Truth, even as thou walkest in Truth. A greater gladness than this I have not—that I should hear of my children walking in the Truth."

Ver. 1. ὁ πρεσβύτερος, see Introd. pp. 251 ff. ἐγώ, see note on 2 John i. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, see note on 2 John i.

Ver. 2. *Cf.* Law, *Ser. Call*, chap. vii.: "Flavia would be a miracle of piety, if she was but half as careful of her soul as she is of her body. The rising of a pimple on her face, the sting of a gnat, will make her keep her room for two or three days, and she thinks they are very rash people that do not take care of things in time." Penn, *Fruits of Solitude*: "He is curious to wash, dress and perfume his Body, but careless of his Soul. The one shall have many Hours, the other not so many Minutes." περὶ πάντων, *de omnibus*, with εὐοδοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, not *præ omnibus*, "above all things". The latter use is epic (*e.g.*, Hom. *Il.* i. 287: περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων), and prosperity and health were not the *summa bona* in the Apostle's estimation. εὐοδοῦσθαι, "prosper" in worldly matters. Trouble tests character. "A good knight is best known in battle, and a Christian in the time of trouble and adversity"; and Gaius had stood the test. The hostility of Diotrephes, probably a well-to-do member of the Church, had lessened his maintenance (εὐοδοῦσθαι) and affected his health (ὑγιαίνειν), yet St. John has only admiration for the spirit he has manifested and commendation for the part he has played.

Ver. 3. ἐχάρην, see note on 2 John 4. ἐρχομένων, repeatedly, not on one particular occasion (ἐλθόντων). The itinerant brethren (*die reisenden Brüder*) were always at work, going out from Ephesus on their missions and returning with their reports. *Cf. vv.* 5-6. See Introd. p. 247.

Ver. 4. *Cf.* Senec. *Ep.* xxxiv.: "Si agricolam arbor ad fructum perducta delectat, si pastor ex fœtu gregis sui capit voluptatem, si alumnum suum nemo aliter intuetur quam adulescentiam illius

[g] ἐμὰ τέκνα ἐν[1] ἀληθείᾳ περιπατοῦντα. 5. Ἀγαπητέ, πιστὸν ποιεῖς ὃ ἐὰν [h] ἐργάσῃ[2] εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ εἰς τοὺς[3] [i] ξένους, 6. οἳ ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ [k] ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας· οὓς [l] καλῶς ποιήσεις [m] προπέμψας [n] ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ. 7. ὑπὲρ γὰρ [o] τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐξῆλθον[4]

g 1 Tim. i. 2; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Philem. 10; Gal. iv. 19.
h Matt. xxvi. 10.
i Heb. xiii. 1. k 1 John iii. 22 reff. l 2 Peter i. 19. m Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11; 2 Cor. i. 16. n 1 Thess. ii. 12; Col. i. 10. o Acts v. 40, 41; 1 Peter iv. 14, 16.

[1] εν ℵC²KLP; εν τη ABC*, edd.

[2] εργαση ℵBCKLP, edd.; εργαζη A, Vg. (*quidquid operaris*).

[3] εις τους KLP; τουτο ℵABC, Vg., Syrbo ph, Vg., Cop., Sah., Aeth., Arm., edd.

[4] εξηλθαν ℵB, edd.

suam judicet: quid evenire credis his qui ingenia educaverunt, et quæ tenera formaverunt adulta subito vident?" *Ev. sec. Heb.* (quoted by Jerome on Eph. v. 4): "Et numquam, inquit (Dominus), læti sitis nisi cum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate". **μειζοτέραν**, a double compar.; *cf.* **ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ** (Eph. iii. 8); our "lesser"; Germ. *mehrere*. **τούτων**: this use of the plur. (**ταῦτα**) rather than the sing. (**τοῦτο**) is common. See Moulton's *Winer*, p. 201. **ἵνα**, epexegetic of **τούτων**. *Cf.* Luke i. 43 and see note on 1 John iii. 11. **τέκνα** implies that Gaius was a convert of St. John. *Cf.* marg. note.

Vv. 5-8. The Duty of Entertaining Itinerant Preachers. "Beloved, it is a work of faith that thou art doing in thy treatment of the brethren, strangers withal. They testified to thy love before the Church; and thou wilt do well in speeding them on their way worthily of God. For it was for the sake of the Name that they went forth, taking nothing from the Gentiles. We therefore are bound to undertake for such, that we may prove fellow-workers with the Truth."

A company of *reisende Brüder* had returned to Ephesus, and in reporting of their mission at a meeting of the Church had made special mention of the hospitality of Gaius. The Apostle commends him and bids him continue his good offices.

Ver. 5. The adjective **πιστός** is either act., "believing" (*cf.* John xx. 27), or passive, "worthy to be believed," "trustworthy" (*cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 2). It is passive here, and it is well explained by Œcumenius as equivalent to **ἄξιον πιστοῦ ἀνδρός**. The peculiarity is that, by a sort of hypallage, the adjective is transferred from the subjective to the objective. Transitive: "Thou makest whatever thou workest on the brethren a believing act, a work of faith". It was not mere hospitality but a religious service. Westcott's rendering: "thou makest sure whatsoever thou doest" gives **πιστόν** an unexampled and indeed impossible meaning. **ποιεῖς**, aor. of habitual and constant hospitality; **ἐργάσῃ**, aor. of each particular act. **καὶ τοῦτο**, "and that to"; more commonly **καὶ ταῦτα** (*cf.* Heb. xi. 12).

Ver. 6. On the anarthrous **ἐκκλησίας**, see note on 2 John 10. **καλῶς ποιήσεις** has the sense of "please" in the Oxyrhynchus Papyri; *e.g.*, 300, 3-6: **ἔπεμψά σοι διὰ τοῦ καμηλείτου Ταυρείνου τὸ πανάριον, περὶ οὗ καλῶς ποιήσεις ἀντιφωνήσασά μοι ὅτι ἐκομίσου**, "I sent you the bread-basket by the cameleer Taurinus; please let me have word again that you got it". **προπέμψας**: when a Rabbi visited a town, it was customary on his departure to escort him on his way (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on Matt. v. 41). The gracious usage was observed in the primitive Church, and it appears to have included the furnishing of provision for the journey (*cf.* Tit. iii. 13). *Cf.* Hom. *Od.* xv., 74: **χρὴ ξεῖνον παρεόντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν**, "welcome the coming, speed the parting guest". **ἀξίως τοῦ Θεοῦ**, "in a manner worthy of God," *i.e.* (1) "Since they are God's representatives (John xiii. 20), *weil ihr Evangelistenwerk Gottes Werk ist* (Holtzm.), treat them as you would treat God"; (2) "Since you are God's representatives, treat them as God would treat them".

Ver. 7. **τοῦ Ὀνόματος**, sc. of Jesus (*cf.* Acts v. 40, 41). There is perhaps a reference to this verse in Ignat. *ad Eph.* vii. 1: **εἰώθασι γάρ τινες δόλῳ πονηρῷ τὸ ὄνομα περιφέρειν, ἄλλα τινὰ πράσσοντες ἀνάξια Θεοῦ**. *Cf.* iii. 1: **δέδεμαι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι**. **ἐξῆλθαν**, sc. from Ephesus, the seat of the Apostle and therefore the headquarters of the Church in Asia Minor. *Cf.* Introd. p. 247. **μηδέν**, see note on 1 John ii. 4. Winer (Moulton's Winer, p. 463, note 1) draws a distinction, perhaps too fine, between **λαμβάνειν παρά τινος** and **λαμβάνειν ἀπό τινος**.

[p] μηδὲν λαμβάνοντες [q] ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν.[1] 8. ἡμεῖς οὖν [r] ὀφείλομεν ἀπολαμβάνειν [2] τοὺς τοιούτους, ἵνα [s] συνεργοὶ [t] γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. 9. Ἔγραψα [3] τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἀλλ' ὁ [u] φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρεφὴς οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. 10. διὰ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἔλθω, [v] ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖ, λόγοις πονηροῖς [w] φλυαρῶν ἡμᾶς· καὶ μὴ ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις, οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους [x] κωλύει, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας [y] ἐκβάλλει. 11. Ἀγαπητέ, [z] μὴ

p Acts xx. 35; 1 Cor. ix. 12-15.
q 1 John v. 15.
r 1 John ii. 6 reff.
s Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21; 1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 23.
t Matt. v. 45.
u Cf. Matt. xx. 27. v John xiv. 26; 2 Tim. ii. 14; Tit. iii. 1. w 1 Tim. v. 13. x Mark ix. 38, 39. y John ix. 34. z Rom. xii. 9; Ps. xxxvii. 27.

[1] εθνων KLP; εθνικων ℵABC, edd.
[2] απολαμβανειν KLP; υπολαμβανειν ℵABC*, edd.
[3] εγραψα: add τι ℵABC, Cop., Sah., Arm., edd.

The former would have been used here had the Gentiles "*proferred* an acknowledgment; the latter implies *exaction*. The missionaries might have accepted maintenance (Matt. x. 10), but like St. Paul they waived their right, "that they might cause no hindrance to the Gospel of Christ" (1 Cor. ix.).

Ver. 8. **ἡμεῖς**, emphatic in contrast to the Gentiles. **ὀφείλομεν**, of moral obligation. See note on 1 John ii. 6. **ὑπολαμβάνειν**, *suscipere*, "receive hospitably" (*cf.* **ὑποδέχεσθαι**), "take under one's protection". Observe the *Wortspiel*—**λαμβάνοντες, ὑπολαμβάνειν. συνεργοὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ**: a division of labour. If we cannot preach the Gospel ourselves, we may help others to do it. William Carey, comparing his missionary enterprise to the exploration of a mine, said: "I will go down if you will hold the ropes".

Vv. 9-10. Churlishness of Diotrephes. "I wrote something to the Church, but Diotrephes, who loveth pre-eminence over them, doth not receive us. Therefore, if I come, I shall call to remembrance his works which he doeth, prating about us with evil words; and, not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren and them that would he preventeth and casteth out of the Church."

"Der Zweck des 3. Briefes liegt in der Empfehlung der Gastfreundschaft gegen wandernde Glaubensboten" (Holtzm.).

Ver. 9. **ἔγραψά τι**, a brief letter of commendation, **συστατικὴ ἐπιστολή** (2 Cor. iii. 1), introducing and authorising a company of itinerant brethren, probably those referred to in *v.* 5. **φιλοπρωτεύειν**, "love to be first, to be chief" (**ἅπαξ λεγόμενον**). The noun is **φιλοπρωτεία** and the adj. **φιλόπρωτος** (Polyb., Plut). **προάγειν** (2 John 9) and **φιλοπρωτεύειν** denote two tempers which disturbed the Christian life of Asia Minor—intellectual arrogance and personal aggrandisement. **αὐτῶν** refers **κατὰ σύνεσιν** to **ἐκκλησίᾳ**. **οὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς**, "doth not receive me in the person of my delegates" (*cf.* Matt. x. 40), *i.e.*, "disowneth my authority".

Ver. 10. **ἐὰν ἔλθω**: the aged Apostle with his failing strength can only "hope" (*cf.* ver. 14) to undertake the journey. **ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα**, not "remind him of his works" (contrast the "work" of Gaius in ver. 5), but "bring his works to remembrance," by reciting them at a meeting of the Church. St. John does not threaten excommunication or any sort of discipline, but simply that he will state the facts and let them speak for themselves. A terrible reckoning, like that of the Day of Judgment (*cf.* Rev. xx. 12)—to hear a recital of all one's passionate speeches and inconsiderate actions. Contrast St. Paul's threats (1 Cor. iv. 21; 2 Cor. x. 11, xiii. 1-3). St. John deserved to be called "the Apostle of Love". **φλυαρεῖν** (*nugari, verschwatsen*), of foolish chattering. Suid.: **φλύαρος· φλήναφος καὶ λῆρος καὶ μάταιος λόγος.** The chatter of Diotrephes was not only foolish but malevolent (**λόγοις πονηροῖς**). **μὴ ἀρκ.**, see note on 1 John ii. 4. **οὔτε . . . καί**, *cf.* John iv. 11. **κωλύει, ἐκβάλλει**, pres. implying not that he actually did it but that he tried to do it. **ἐκβάλλει**, here not of literal ejection (*cf.* John ii. 15 = Matt. xxi. 12 = Mark xi. 15) but of excommunication from the fellowship of the congregation.

Vv. 11, 12. Testimony to Demetrius. "Beloved, do not imitate what is bad but what is good. He that doeth what is good is of God; he that doeth what is bad hath not seen God. To Demetrius testimony hath been borne by all and by the Truth itself; yea, and we testify, and thou knowest that our testimony is true."

[a] μιμοῦ τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν. ὁ ἀγαθοποιῶν, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν· [b] ὁ δὲ[1] κακοποιῶν, οὐχ ἑώρακε τὸν Θεόν. 12. Δημητρίῳ [c] μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας· [d] καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ οἴδατε[2] ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρία ἡμῶν ἀληθής ἐστι.

13. Πολλὰ εἶχον γράφειν,[3] ἀλλ' οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου σοι γράψαι·[4] 14. ἐλπίζω δὲ εὐθέως ἰδεῖν σε,[5] καὶ [e] στόμα πρὸς στόμα λαλήσομεν. 15. [f] Εἰρήνη σοι. ἀσπάζονταί σε οἱ [g] φίλοι. ἀσπάζου τοὺς [g] φίλους [h] κατ' ὄνομα.

a Heb. xiii. 7.
b 1 John iii. 6.
c Heb. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39.
d John xix. 35, xxi. 24.
e 2 John 12.
f Matt. x. 13; Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19, 21, 36; 1 Peter v. 14.
g John xi. 11; Acts xxvii. 3.
h John x. 3.

[1] ο δε L, Cop., Aeth., Arm.; ο ℵABCKP, Syrph, Vg., Sah., edd.
[2] οιδατε KLP, Syrbo ph, Aeth.; οιδας ℵABC, Vg., Cop., Sah., Arm.
[3] γραφειν KLP; γραψαι σοι ℵABC, edd.
[4] γραψαι KLP; γραφειν ℵABC, edd.
[5] ιδειν σε ℵKLP; σε ιδειν ABC, edd.

Ver. 11. A warning against evil example. The pres. participles **ἀγαθοποιῶν, κακοποιῶν** denote *continuance in and practice of* good or bad. See note on 1 John iii. 6. **ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, "a child of God" (*cf.* 1 John iii. 10). Observe the gentleness of the Apostle: the natural antithesis of **ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ** would be **ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου** (1 John iii. 8), but he says **οὐχ ἑώρακεν τὸν Θεόν.**

Ver. 12. Application of the warning against evil example: Do not imitate Diotrephes, but imitate Demetrius. Demetrius was probably the bearer (*Ueberbringer*) of the epistle. There is no reason for identifying him with Demetrius the silversmith of Ephesus (Acts xix. 24). B. Weiss (*Einleit.*), supporting the ecclesiastical interpretation of 2 John (see Introd. p. 254) and finding a reference to it in 3 John 9, regards Demetrius as the recipient (*Empfänger*) of the former—a member of the Church and a striking contrast to his fellow-member Diotrephes. But evidently he was a stranger to Gaius and needed introduction and commendation. St. John gives him a threefold testimony: (1) that of the whole community at Ephesus (**ὑπὸ πάντων**); (2) that of "the Truth" (see note on 1 John i. 8): he fulfilled the requirements of the Gospel and exemplified its saving power; (3) that of the Apostle and his colleagues at Ephesus (**ἡμεῖς**): he has long been honoured by his community as an embodiment of the Truth (**μεμαρτύρηται**), and the Apostle testifies this when he is going among strangers ignorant of his past (**μαρτυροῦμεν**). **καὶ . . . δὲ**, see note on 1 John i. 3. **οἶδας ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.**: because St. John knew him so well. Demetrius belonged to the Church of Ephesus and was probably a convert of the Apostle.

Vv. 13-15. The Conclusion. "I had many things to write to thee, but I am not minded to be writing to thee by pen and ink. However, I hope presently to see thee, and we shall talk face to face. Peace to thee! The friends salute thee. Salute the friends by name."

Cf. 2 John, 12-13. The similarity of the conclusions suggests that the two epistles were written at the same time. The Apostle meditated a visitational circuit (see Introd. p. 247) in the course of which he would see both Kyria and Gaius.

Ver. 13. **γράψαι**, aor. of the complete composition in the Apostle's mind; **γράφειν**, pres. of the process of putting it on paper. **κάλαμος** (in full **κάλαμος γραφεύς**), a reed-pen, as distinguished from **γραφεῖον**, a sharp-pointed *stilus* for writing on waxed tablets. Plutarch (*Dem.*, 29, 3) says that Demosthenes, when meditating and writing, was accustomed to bite his **κάλαμος**.

Ver. 15. **εἰρήνη σοι**, *pax tibi*, the Jewish greeting, שָׁלוֹם לָךְ (Jud. vi. 23, xix. 20), **οἱ φίλοι**, those at Ephesus; **τοὺς φίλους**, those with Gaius. St. John knew all "by name," and would have named them had space permitted. He had the true shepherd's heart (*cf.* John x. 3, the only other place where **κατ' ὄνομα** occurs in N.T.). Ignat., *ad Smyrn.*, xiii. 2: **ἀσπάζομαι Ἄλκην, τὸ ποθητόν μοι ὄνομα, καὶ Δάφνον, τὸν ἀσύγκριτον καὶ εὔτεκνον, καὶ πάντας κατ' ὄνομα.**

THE GENERAL EPISTLE

OF

JUDE.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

Relation of the Second Epistle of Peter to the Epistle of Jude.[1]

THE general resemblance between the two Epistles will be apparent from the marginal references to my text. I propose here to compare them throughout, stating the reasons which have led me to believe that the epistle of Jude was known to the author of 2 Peter, not *vice versa.*[2]

To begin with, both style themselves servants of Jesus Christ and address themselves to those who in some way belong to God and to Jesus Christ, desiring that peace might be multiplied upon them. We notice here certain differences occasioned by the difference of the writers. J. marks his identity by naming his brother James; P. claims apostleship. J. adds the prayer for mercy and and love to that for peace; P. who is about to speak more fully of love immediately, omits it here, and changes ἔλεος into the wider χάρις. J. defines his readers as "the called who have been beloved by God the Father and kept safe in Jesus Christ"; P. defers the notion of "calling" to the third and tenth verses, and dwells here on God's free gift of faith (τοῖς λαχοῦσιν πίστιν) as characteristic of his readers. He adds two remarkable phrases (1) that, through the justice of our God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, this faith is (2) equally privileged with that of the writer (whether we are to regard him as representing the Apostles, or the Jews, as seems to me more probable), and he emphasises this equality of Jew and Gentile by the unique use of his own double name, the Hebrew "Symeon" added to the Greek "Peter," suggesting that his sympathies embrace both. We may compare with this the friendly reference to St. Paul in iii. 15, and the association of Silvanus with the writer in 1 Peter.

[1] For the justification of the readings and interpretations adopted in the following chapters, see critical and explanatory notes.

[2] In what follows P. stands for 2 Peter, J. for Jude.

After this greeting J. turns at once to the immediate occasion for his letter. He had been preparing, he says, to write on the subject which is of highest interest to all Christians, *viz.*, salvation,[1] when news reached him of a new danger threatening the Church, against which he felt bound to warn his readers. It seems hardly possible to suppose that this note of alarm could have come to him through P., who writes in a much more leisurely way, not feeling it necessary at once to plunge into controversy and supply his readers with weapons for the defence of the faith. In fact the latter begins with the very subject which J. had felt himself obliged to omit, or at least to postpone to the end of his Epistle (ver. 20), *viz.* the doctrine of salvation. Thus we seem to lose sight of J. until the beginning of the second chapter of P., but we shall see that in the intervening passage of P. there is frequent recurrence to thoughts which are found in the former epistle.

After speaking generally of the blessings in store for man through the goodness of God, P. goes on (i. 5) to speak of the corresponding duty on man's part. We are to use every effort to build up the Christian life in its seven-fold completeness on the rock of faith. Towards the end of J. we find words which may very possibly have suggested to P. this idea of the seven ascending tiers rising on the foundation of faith and culminating in love (J. ver. 20), ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει . . . ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε. The phrase σπουδὴν πᾶσαν of P. i. 5 occurs also in J. ver. 3. The mention of εὐσέβεια in P. i. 3, 6, 7 may be due to the prevalence of ἀσέβεια so often deplored by J. The verses which follow (i. 8-11) dwell on the importance of the cultivation of these virtues or graces. "Their continued growth will tend to make us not unfruitful (*cf.* J. ver. 12) in regard to that knowledge of God, out of which they grow. Their absence causes blindness, or at least limits us to narrow earthly views, and makes us forgetful of the baptismal cleansing from the sins of our old life. Remember that it is not enough simply to have been baptised. We have to make sure the calling and election of which baptism was the seal. If you are diligent in doing this, you will never stumble, but will have a glorious entry into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Here too we find connecting links with the later verses of J. "Eternal life" is the goal in J. ver. 21, "the eternal kingdom," in P. i. 11. The οὐ μὴ πταίσητε and the πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of P. remind us of J.'s summing up in ver. 24, "God our Saviour is able to *keep us without*

[1] The word κοινήν here may have suggested to P. his phrase ἰσότιμον πίστιν.

stumbling and to set us *before His glory* without blemish *in exceeding joy* ".

P. continues (i. 12-15), " I know that you are established in this truth, but it will be always my care to remind you of it, as I am indeed bound to do, whilst I continue in this earthly habitation. Even after I leave it, as our Lord Jesus Christ has warned me that I must soon do, I hope to bequeath to you a legacy which will enable you to make mention of these things after my departure." We have here an echo of J. ver. 5, " I desire to put you in remembrance, though ye know all things," *i.e.*, as it is explained afterwards, though you are familiar with the examples of judgment contained in the O.T., including the punishment of the angels who sinned. P. addressing Gentiles, who could hardly be expected to be familiar with a narrative resting mainly on Jewish tradition, gives the phrase a more fitting application in reference to the general moral and religious teaching which precedes.

The connexion between the two Epistles is most conspicuous in the second chapter of P. In both, this section begins with a short Introduction (J. ver. 4, P. ii. 1-3), describing in general terms the innovators against whom the readers are warned. They steal into the Church, they deny the only Master (δεσπότην), their lives are impure, the verdict of heaven has long been pronounced against them. To this P. prefixes a clause to connect the new subject with that of the preceding chapter. The gift of prophecy was liable to misuse under the old dispensation (of which he presently quotes Balaam as an example, *cf.* P. ii. 15, 16, and J. ver. 11). Corresponding to this in the new dispensation will be the abuse of teaching (*cf.* James iii. 1-12); and these false teachers will introduce destructive heresies and bring on themselves swift destruction. [The word ἀπώλεια does not occur in J., but in the next verse he says that the Lord τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.] P. adds the Pauline epithet ἀγοράσαντα before δεσπότην. He foretells that many will follow the loose living of these teachers and that thus the way of truth (Ps. cxix. 30) will be evil spoken of (Isa. lii. 5). He speaks of their covetousness (*cf.* J. ver. 11 on Balaam) and of their glozing words. While J. denounces οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (where the reference in τοῦτο is obscure), P. has the fine phrase οἷς τὸ κρίμα οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει. On the other hand we lose J.'s τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, for which perhaps ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς (P. ii. 19) was intended as an equivalent, *cf.* Gal. v. 13, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί.

Then follow (J. vv. 5-7) three examples of judgment taken from the O.T.: Israel in the Wilderness, the offending angels, the sin of Sodom, which are repeated in P. ii. 4-9, except that the Deluge takes the place of the punishment of Israel. Why was this change made? Probably because the destruction of the world by water and the destruction of Sodom by fire were recognised types of Divine vengeance (Lk. xvii. 26-29), and also because P. is about to speak of the Deluge below (iii. 5-7) to show that there is nothing incredible in the destruction of the existing universe by fire. Moreover he had already referred to the case of Israel (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) in comparing the false prophets of the O.T. with the false teachers of the N.T. Perhaps, too, he wished to keep the chronological order in his three examples. It has been suggested in the note on τὸ δεύτερον that, in speaking of the destruction of Israel after their falling back into unbelief, J. may have had in his mind the question of the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. There is perhaps a similar reference in P. i. 9, λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν as well as in P. ii. 20. With regard to P.'s triplet, it is to be noticed that it is given in a far more animated form than that of J., being used as a protasis to an apodosis applying the same principles to the persons addressed, εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἐφείσατο κ.τ.λ. Of the angels P. says merely that they sinned, J. dwells on their pristine dignity, and follows the book of Enoch in making their sin to consist partly in the fall from their high estate, and partly in their going after σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, as the men of Sodom did afterwards τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις, J. ver. 7. If P. had J. before him, these omissions are natural; if J. wrote after P., he would scarcely have gone out of his way to insert particulars so derogatory to the angelic nature. As to their punishment, they are reserved, in both epistles, for judgment under darkness in chains.

It is interesting to compare what is said in the two Epistles about the two missionaries of the antediluvian world. In J. ver. 14 Enoch, the seventh from Adam, appears simply as the denouncer of vengeance to come: in P. Noah is a preacher of righteousness and he is the eighth saved. In my edition of 2 Peter I have suggested that the writer may have intended a mystical opposition between the two numbers; and, I think, this is confirmed by the way in which the number 8 is introduced in 1 P. iii. 20 (κιβωτοῦ) εἰς ἣν ὀλίγοι, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὀκτὼ ψυχαί, διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. The ark is here regarded as a symbol of the Church. What was the writer's motive in adding that it contained only a few, and further that these few, on being reckoned up, were found to amount to 8? Must he not have in-

tended to signify that, while the visible Church consisted of a mere "remnant," a "little flock," yet these few represented all who share the Resurrection of Christ, "the general assembly and church of the first-born," which would be continually recruited not only from the living, but also from the dead by the ever-present, ever-active Spirit of Christ (1 P. iii. 19)? In the account of Sodom P. (ii. 6) differs from J. in laying stress on Lot's protest against surrounding wickedness, and on the mercy shown towards him, just as he had done before in regard to Noah (hereby illustrating the duty of the faithful under the present stress); and the moral he draws from the two stories is that "God knows how to deliver the godly from trial, as well as to keep the wicked under chastisement for the day of judgment". P. alone gives details as to the destruction of Sodom (τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν), while J. speaks of its present state as a warning to future ages. As regards this warning P.'s ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν is better expressed than J.'s rather confused πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι. In ver. 8 J. turns to the libertines and declares that they are guilty of like sins with these sinners of the old world: they defile the flesh, make light of authority and rail at "glories" (as the men of Sodom did towards the angels), and this they do because they are still buried in a carnal sleep (*cf.* Eph. v. 14). These men (ver. 10, οὗτοι δέ) rail at things beyond their ken, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction.[1] P. (ii. 10) combines part of J.'s description of the men of Sodom, who went ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας (for which he substitutes ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους) with J.'s condemnation of the libertines as despising authority,[2] and predicates both characteristics of the wicked, whom God keeps under chastisement for the day of judgment. Then turning to the libertines he exclaims against them as "headstrong and shameless (τολμηταί, *cf.* ἐτόλμησεν, J. ver. 9) men that shrink not from railing at glories" (ii. 10). In ii. 12 he goes on, as J. does in ver. 10, with a οὗτοι δέ, "these are like brute beasts". Apparently he wants to bring out more fully the force of J.'s ὅσα φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται by the periphrasis γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἅλωσιν καὶ φθοράν and ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν φθαρήσονται. That is, while J. simply states that the libertines are destroyed through

[1] For the connexion between the darkened heart which refuses to know God, and the indulgence in the vilest lusts, see Rom. i. 21-28.

[2] It will be noticed that, while J. couples κυριότητα and δόξας as belonging to the same category, P. only names the abstract word κυριότητα here, and introduces δόξας later on as a concrete example.

their indulgence in their animal instincts, P. draws out the comparison to the brute beasts, "which are born mere creatures of instinct, with a view to capture and slaughter," and then adds that the libertines will share their fate, since they mock at that higher world which is beyond their ken. Here there can be no doubt that P.'s language is far more obscure than that of J. Even J. is not quite clear. The true antithesis would have been "they rail at what transcends the senses, they admire what appeals to the senses and appetites" (and yet these are the causes of their ruin). Is it possible that P., writing with an imperfect recollection of J., understood ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται to mean "perish among them," *i.e.*, among the brutes?

We have now to consider the very curious verse interposed between J. vv. 8 and 10, P. ii. 10 and 12. In J. it runs: "Michael, the archangel, when he was disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, did not venture to bring a judgment of railing, but said, 'the Lord rebuke thee'": in P. "whereas angels, though greater in power and might, do not venture to bring against them a railing judgment before the Lord". The former is a little difficult, but with the help of the *Assumptio Mosis* we can understand that, if the chief of the archangels abstained from using any contemptuous expression against Satan, and contented himself with making his appeal to God, much more should frail and sinful mortals abstain from slighting language about the powers of the invisible world. What, however, is to be made of P? Standing by itself, it is merely a riddle, for which the answer is to be found in J. That is to say, P. wrote with J.'s sentence in his mind, but for some reason or other chose to eliminate the points essential for its intelligibility. What was his reason? The same, I think, which led him to omit the details as to the fall of the angels, which are mainly derived from the Book of Enoch, in ii. 4, and the reference to the preaching of Enoch below. He objects, that is, to make use of these apocryphal writings, and generalises the story by dropping the proper names and by twice changing a singular into a plural (ἄγγελοι, αὐτῶν). So, too, a vague παρὰ Κυρίῳ takes the place of ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, and the vagueness is increased by the use of the indeterminate αὐτῶν and by the omission of the object of the comparative μείζονες. In fact the sentence is meaningless except to one who was already acquainted with its parallel in J., though it may perhaps be true, as Dr. Bigg suggests, that P. felt himself justified in his generalisation by the remembrance of an obscure passage in the Book of Enoch.

I go on to J. ver. 11, "Woe to them, for they have followed in

the steps of Cain, and been carried away in the error of Balaam for gain, and lost themselves in the rebellion of Korah. These are sunken rocks in your love-feasts, where they join your feast without any feeling of religious reverence, caring only for their own enjoyment. They are clouds without water, scudding before the wind; trees without fruit in the fruit-bearing season, twice dead, torn up by the roots; raging waves foaming out their own shame; wandering stars for which the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever." This passage corresponds to P. ii. 13-17, but, in the latter, the order is considerably altered and there are various additions and omissions. Balaam (who is also prominent in the Apocalypse ii. 14) is the only one of the old hæresiarchs referred to, but his story is given at more length in ii. 15 16: "They (the libertines) have wandered from the straight path, following the path of Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness and was convicted of his error by the dumb ass, which spoke with human voice and stayed the prophet's madness". Here P. clenches the comparison made before (ii. 1) between the false prophet of the O.T. and the false teacher of the N.T., and brings out again the motive of covetousness (see above ii. 3 and ii. 15). Has he any special reason for introducing the story of the ass rebuking the prophet? We may compare other passages in which God is represented as choosing the foolish things of this world to confound the wise (1 Cor. i. 27, Ps. viii. 2), or in which men are called upon to learn a lesson from animals, as Isa. i. 3, Jer. viii. 7, Prov. vi. 6, Job xii. 7. Possibly P. may be thinking of the scorn entertained for simple believers by those who called themselves Gnostics (see below ii. 18).

J. ver. 12 appears with some remarkable alterations in P. ii. 13, σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν. Here σπίλοι and ἀπάταις are substituted for σπιλάδες and ἀγάπαις in J. Some editors read ἀγάπαις with B, but the addition of αὐτῶν suits much better with ἀπάταις. J. speaks of ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν. It was natural of course that the wolves should seek to find their way into the sheep-folds; but can we suppose that the faithful would enter the love feasts of the libertines? Moreover the change of an original ἀγάπαις to ἀπάταις by a copyist is hardly conceivable, while the reverse change to suit J. is most natural. But how are we to account for the disappearance of the important—we might almost call it the indispensable word—ἀγάπη? In my edition of 2 P., p. cxcv., I have suggested that ἀγάπην was the original reading, instead of ἡδονήν, in the earlier part of this verse (ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν); where my explanatory note shows how hard it is to make a satis-

factory distinction between ἡδονήν and τρυφήν. On the other hand ἀγάπην gives exactly the sense required "thinking that revelling in the daytime makes an ἀγάπη," as may be seen from the quotations from Clement given in the passage referred to (*cf.* too Rom. xiii. 13). I account for ἡδονήν by supposing that it was a marginal gloss on τρυφήν. The word ἀπάτη is often joined with τρυφή, as shown in the explanatory note, and it is wanted here to explain how the libertines managed to gain admission to the love-feasts of the Church. We have next to ask why σπιλάδες should have been changed to σπίλοι. The former word is a daring metaphor even among the metaphors which accompany it in J., but quite out of place here, and P. substitutes for it the similar sounding σπίλος found in Eph. v. 27, of which the derivatives ἄσπιλος and σπιλόω occur elsewhere in P. and J. Are we to suppose that P. intentionally replaced J.'s words by others of similar sound, in order not to startle people who were already familiar with them? or was it the unconscious action of the mind, calling up similar sounds, as in rhyming or alliteration? The latter seems to me the more probable explanation.

P. returns to J.'s metaphors in ii. 17, where he splits up νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι into two, πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι and ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι, perhaps because he regarded J.'s expression as superfluous, and also because he thus provides distinct pictures of present disappointment (the well) and future uncertainty (the cloud). He omits the fruitless trees, the stormy waves and wandering stars as unsuited to his purpose, but inappropriately appends to his last metaphor, the clause in which J. describes the doom of the wandering stars, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται. Of course the gender shows that P. intends this clause to apply to the persons whom he has just figuratively described, as it is indeed applied by J. himself in ver. 6, but it loses the aptness which it has in J. ver. 13, and thus supplies another convincing proof of the priority of J. How could the latter have had the patience to gather the scattered fragments out of P. in order to form the splendid cluster of figures in vv. 12, 13? We have still to consider the insertion in P. (ii. 13), ἀδικούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, which commences the loose series of participles ending in ii. 15. If the participle is omitted, this phrase recalls J. ver. 11, τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν, and is repeated again in ii. 15; but ἀδικούμενοι is difficult. Apparently P. intends his paradoxical phrase to correspond to J.'s οὐαί: the libertines are miserable, because they are, as they think, "robbed of (or 'robbed as') the reward of their iniquity". The following participles gave a striking and powerful description of the evil influence which these men exercise over

unstable souls, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος καὶ ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, δελεάζοντες ψυχὰς ἀστηρίκτους (*cf.* γεγεννημένα εἰς ἅλωσιν, ii. 12), καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας ἔχοντες, κατάρας τέκνα. Perhaps P. may intend this partly to take the place of J.'s fine figure κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.

In vv. 14, 15 J. gives the prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, which simply announces the future judgment on impious deeds and words. To this P. makes no direct reference, but, as I have before suggested, it may have been one reason for speaking of Noah as the eighth. In ver. 16 (perhaps taken from the *Assumption of Moses*) J. goes on to describe the libertines as "murmuring and discontented, walking after their own lusts, whose mouth λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, and who flatter others for the sake of advantage". To the same effect P. (ii. 18) speaks of them as uttering ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος, by which they seduce through the lusts of the flesh those who were just escaping from heathen error. In ii. 19-22 P. is mostly independent of J., but I have already noticed that ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι may be an echo of J. ver. 4, χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν. He continues, εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, words which recall what he had said in i. 4, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς, . . . διὰ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως . . . τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, and goes on to give an impressive warning against the dangers of backsliding, in which he borrows from J. ver. 3, ὑποστρέψαι ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς, concluding with the proverb of the dog and the sow returning to their foulness after being cleansed from it.

In the third chapter of P. we go back again to J. The readers are addressed as ἀγαπητοί in P. iii. 1 as in J. ver. 17. In both, they are bidden to remember the words of the Apostles, warning them against mockers who should come in the last days, walking after their own lusts. To this P. adds (iii. 1, 2) "This is the second letter I am writing to you, and in both I stir up your sincere mind by calling on you to remember the command of the Lord and Saviour spoken by your Apostles". Since in i. 16, he had used the phrase ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν παρουσίαν, it would seem that P. must himself be included among "your Apostles". He further bids them "remember the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets," recurring in this to what he had said in i. 19. What are we to understand by the allusion to a previous letter? Our first thought is naturally of 1 P. But is there anything in it which would answer to the description here given? Many have denied this, because they thought that the contents of the prophecy, as given in J. ver. 18, were

included in P.'s reference to an earlier Epistle. J. there says, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κ.τ.λ., that is, he asserts that the words quoted by him were words which were often in the mouth of the Apostles. On the other hand P. makes a clear separation between iii. 2 and iii. 3 by inserting the phrase τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες, which he had previously used in i. 20, not to introduce a particular prophecy, but to lay down how prophecy was to be understood. The reference to a former letter is therefore restricted by P. to iii. 2, bidding the readers pay heed to the words of the prophets and the apostles. If we turn now to 1 P. i. 10-12, περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν . . . προφῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες . . . οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς, ὑμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (*cf.* 1 P. i. 16), we shall find an exact correspondence to what is stated here. The words τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων (J. ver. 17, P. iii. 2) remind us of J. ver. 4, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα (though no doubt the immediate reference there is to the prophecy of Enoch) and of P. ii. 3, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ. In citing the prophecy, P. adds the emphatic ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ, which may be compared with ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται of ii. 12, and with the reiterated ἀσεβεῖς of J. ver. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι of J. vv. 16 and 18.

In iii. 4, P., omitting J.'s somewhat obscure ver. 19, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, goes on to specify in what the mockery of the ἐμπαῖκται consisted. They said that the promise of the coming of Christ (to which P. had borne witness in i. 16) remained unfulfilled, and that the world was not liable to the catastrophic changes predicted as accompaniments of the final judgment. There is a little awkwardness in P.'s wording, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως following ἀφ' ἧς ἐκοιμήθησαν, but it is a very natural blending of two objections. I cannot think that if J. had known this verse, which gives so much point to the preceding prophecy, he would have refrained from inserting it. P. gives a double answer in iii. 5-10: (*a*) as the world was created out of water by the word of God, so, owing to[1] the same word, it was destroyed through water, and will be destroyed again by fire on the day of judgment (*cf.* Jude vv. 6, 7, P. ii. 3, 4, 9); (*b*) God is not limited to days and years. If He waits, it is from His long-suffering patience, because He desires that all should repent and be saved. We may compare this with P.'s use of the O.T. types of judgment to point out proofs of mercy in the case of Noah and Lot (ii. 5, 7), in contrast with the severer tone of J. vv. 5-7. In iii. 10

[1] Reading δι' ὅν, for which see my edition of 2 P.

P. bids his readers make a practical use of the knowledge that the Lord is about to come unexpectedly. "Do not be blind to the symptoms of the breaking up of the frame of nature (perhaps a reference to volcanic eruptions and earthquakes). Make ready for the coming of the day of God by the practice of holiness and piety. Look forward to the fulfilment of the promise of the reign of righteousness in a new earth and heaven."

At this point J. and P. again come together in J. ver. 20 and P. iii. 14, both commencing a new section with ἀγαπητοί. J.'s exhortation to his readers "to build themselves up on their most holy faith and keep themselves in love" has been already used by P., as we have seen, in i. 5-7. His reference to the Spirit's help in prayer may be compared with P. i. 20 on the inspiration of the prophets. His phrase in ver. 21, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον is taken up in the προσδοκῶντας of P. iii. 12 and προσδοκῶμεν of iii. 13, and again in iii. 14, while the goal εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον may be compared wlth εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν in P. i. 11. P. inserts ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι (*cf.* 1 P. i. 19) from J.'s ἀμώμους in ver. 24, and in contrast to his own σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι in ii. 13, and to J.'s ἐσπιλωμένον in ver. 23. ἐν εἰρήνῃ looks back to J. ver. 2 and P. i. 2. While in vv. 22, 23 we have J.'s stern rule for the treatment of backsliders, P. gives utterance again (iii. 15) to the more hopeful view of iii. 9, and claims for it the inspired support of Paul. "Yet Paul's letters, wise and good as they are, offer some difficulties, which have been misunderstood and perverted, like the rest of the Bible,[1] by the unlearned and unstable to their own destruction." The word σωτηρία in iii. 15 reminds us that J. had originally intended to write περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (ver. 3) and that his purpose is apparently carried out to a certain extent in these last verses from 20 onwards. In ver. 24 J. begins an Ascription partly borrowed from St. Paul, addressed "to Him who is able to *keep His people* free from *stumbling* (*cf.* P. i. 10) and present them before His glory in exceeding joy" (*cf.* P. i. 11). P. bids his readers, "knowing these things beforehand (see above i. 12, iii. 2) to be on their guard, that they may not be led away by the *error* (J. ver. 11, P. ii. 18) of the wicked (P. ii. 7, *cf.* J. ver. 23, ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ), and so fall from their own steadfastness" (*cf.* P. i. 12, ii. 14, iii. 16). J.'s ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει soars higher than the lesson which P. here inculcates: it may be compared, as we have seen, with the πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγηθήσεται of i. 11. P. continues his exhortation in iii. 18, αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει, for which

[1] For the justification of this rendering see explanatory notes in my edition of 2 P.

we may compare χάρις πληθυνθείη in i. 2 and ταῦτα πλεονάζοντα in i. 8, also J. ver. 4. The Ascription in P. is much simpler than that in J., being addressed to our Saviour Jesus Christ, while J.'s is addressed μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ | τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. P. has δόξα only, while J. has the full liturgical form, δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, καὶ ἐξουσία. P. has καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, while J. has πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, concluding with ἀμήν, which is omitted in P. by W.H. after Cod. B. *Cf.* A. J. Wilson, *J. of Theol. Stud.* vol. viii. 75 on Emphasis in N.T.

To sum up: What do we find to be the main points in which the two Epistles agree, what the points in which they differ? Both agree in making faith, which is itself the gift of God (P. i. 1, λαχοῦσιν πίστιν), the foundation of the Christian life (J. vv. 3, 20, P. i. 1, 5): both agree that its commencement lies in the divine call (J. ver. 1, P. i. 3, 10). The call was sealed in baptism for the forgiveness of sin (J. ver. 5 in connexion with 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, P. i. 9), but we have to make our calling sure through good works (P. i. 10), to build ourselves up on the foundation of the faith (J. ver. 20, P. i. 5-7), to keep ourselves in the love of God by praying with the help of the Holy Spirit (J. ver. 20), looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (which shall be fully revealed) in the life eternal (J. ver. 21). God our Saviour is able to keep us without stumbling and to present us before His glory unblemished in joy (J. vv. 24, 25). P. does not expressly mention prayer, and he lays more stress on personal effort than J. in the words "give diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in His sight" iii. 14, "beware lest ye fall from your steadfastness, grow in grace" iii. 17, 18. So in i. 5-8 he bids his readers add all diligence to supply "in your faith energy, in your energy knowledge," etc., and goes on in ver. 10 to say "if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied to you the entrance into the eternal kingdom". At the same time he ascribes to the divine power "all that pertains to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him who called us by the manifestation of His own goodness". That manifestation has been to us the guarantee of most blessed promises, through which we are enabled to become partakers of the divine nature (P. i. 3, 4).

The broad distinction between the two Epistles may be said to be that, while J. is throughout occupied with the denunciation of evil-doers, except in vv. 1-3 and 20-25, P.'s denunciations are mainly confined to a portion of chapter ii., and that the latter dwells more upon the mercy of God as shown even in his punishments.

The conclusion I have drawn from the above comparison of the two Epistles as to the priority of J., is confirmed by the general opinion of modern critics, as by Neander, Credner, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Harnack, Bernhard Weiss, Abbott, Farrar, Salmon, above all by Dr. Chase in his excellent article on the "Second Epistle of St. Peter" in Hastings' *D. of B.* It is true some of the best authorities speak very doubtfully both of this priority and of the authenticity of 2 P. Thus Döllinger, who, in his *First Age of the Church*, had maintained the priority of 2 P., wrote to Dr. Plummer in the year 1879 that he could no longer hold this opinion (Plummer's *St. James* and *St. Jude* 1891, p. 400). See also Plummer's *St. Jude*, p. 268: "While admitting that the case is by no means proved, we may be content to retain the priority, as well as the authenticity of 2 Peter, as at least the best working hypothesis". And Hort is quoted by Dr. Sanday (*Inspiration*, p. 347) as saying that "If he were asked he should say that the balance of argument was against the epistle; and the moment he had done so he should begin to think that he might be wrong". On the other hand three of the most recent critics, Spitta in his Commentary on the two Epistles, 1885, Dr. Bigg in his *International Critical Commentary*, ed. 2, 1902, and the veteran Zahn in his *Einleitung in das N.T.*, ed. 3, 1906, have no hesitation in maintaining the priority and authenticity of 2 P. I proceed to consider the arguments which have been adduced by them or by others in favour of that view.[1]

(1) Assuming the genuineness of the two Epistles, it is easier, in a case of evident borrowing, to suppose that the borrower should be the comparatively obscure Jude, rather than Peter, the foremost of the Apostles.

(2) Jude seems to acknowledge his obligations to Peter in ver. 4 οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα . . . τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι and in vv. 17, 18 μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι, the former verse being regarded as an allusion to P.'s ii. 3 ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι . . . τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι . . . οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, the latter to P. iii. 2, 3 μνησθῆναι τῶν προειρημένων ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος, τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι.

[1] I agree with Dr. Bigg that it is superfluous to consider theories which suppose 2 P. to be made up of two independent epistles. Its unity, as shown in the earlier part of this chapter, forces itself on the mind of any careful reader.

(3) The priority of P. is confirmed by the prevailing use of the future tense in regard to the innovators, whereas J. uses the past or the present; *cf.* P. ii. 1 ἔσονται, παρεισάξουσιν, ii. 2 ἐξακολουθήσουσιν, βλασφημηθήσεται, ii. 3 ἐμπορεύσονται, with J. ver. 4 παρεισεδύησαν, ver. 8 μιαίνουσιν, ver. 10 βλασφημοῦσιν and the aorists in ver. 11.

Dealing with these objections in order, we may concede that, if both Epistles are genuine, we should rather have expected the borrowing to be on the side of the more obscure. Yet the probability is not one that can be pressed. Milton and Handel borrowed from men much inferior to themselves; Isaiah borrows from Micah, and 1 P. from James. If on the other hand we find reason to believe that 2 P. was not written by the Apostle, the objection only amounts to this, that, though St. Peter himself had borrowed from James in 1 P., an admirer of St. Peter could not have borrowed from Jude in 2 P. With regard to obj. (2), I have pointed out in my note that the word πάλαι in J. ver. 4 cannot refer to P., but must be understood of the prophecy of Enoch, quoted in J. ver. 15, in which the word ἀσεβεῖς (which sums up the judgment in ver. 4), occurs no less than four times (if we include the cognate verb and abstract noun). I have also pointed out that J. in ver. 17 refers not to any one writer, but to the oral teaching of the Apostles, and that P. in iii. 2 does not profess to utter any new prophecy, but simply adds to what Jude had said, that the teaching of the Apostles rested upon the authority of Christ, and that it was in agreement with the teaching of the prophets. As regards obj. (3), the difference of tense, P. is not consistent in his use of the future. We have the pres. in ii. 10 τρέμουσιν, ii. 17 εἰσίν, ii. 18 δελεάζουσιν, iii. 5 λανθάνει, from which we should conclude that the innovators had already begun their work, if not among those to whom he writes, yet among other churches, to which J. may have addressed himself. If the former Epistle is a product of the second century, the writer may have used the future tense to give it verisimilitude, while falling at times into the present from inadvertence.

(4) Spitta asks why, if P. is borrowing from J., he makes no reference to him, as he does to Paul? It might be enough to ask in reply, "Why, if J. borrows from P., does he make no definite acknowledgment of the fact"? But we have a parallel case, though no doubt on a smaller scale, in the unacknowledged borrowings from the Epistle of James in 1 Peter, on which see the Introduction to my edition of James, pp. xcviii to cii. The reason however for the mention of Paul in 2 P. is quite distinct from the acknowledgment of a debt. The libertines claimed his authority in behalf of their own views (*cf.* J. ver. 4), and it was necessary for P. to protest against this.

It would be endless to go into a minute examination of the parallel passages which have been cited to prove the priority of P. I have said all that I think need be said about them in the earlier part of this chapter and in the explanatory notes of my edition of 2 P. The impression which they leave on my mind is that in J. we have the first thought, in P. the second thought; that we can generally see a reason why P. should have altered J., but very rarely a reason why what we read in P. should have been altered to what we find in J. P. is more reflective, J. more spontaneous.

CHAPTER II.

The Epistle of Jude, Author, Style, Authenticity, Circumstances of Writing.—The name Judas (Ἰούδας) was naturally in very common use among the Jews at the time of the Christian era. It was dear to them as having been borne not only by the Eponymos of their tribe, but also by their great champion Judas the Maccabee. Two among the Twelve bore this name, Judas Iscariot, and the Judas not Iscariot (Jn. xiv. 22), who is also called Judas son of James (ὁ Ἰακώβου, Lk. vi. 16, Acts i. 13) and Thaddaeus (Mt. ix. 3, Mk. iii. 18, where some MSS. add Λεββαῖος). Besides these we meet with a Judas among the Brethren of the Lord (Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3), Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 37), Judas surnamed Barsabbas (Acts xv. 22), Judas of Damascus (Acts ix. 11). It is therefore not surprising that the writer should have added a note of identification, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου. The most famous James in the middle of the first century was the head of the Church at Jerusalem and brother of the Lord, who also begins his epistle by styling himself simply δοῦλος (Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Hence it seems probable that the addition was made, not merely for the purpose of identification, but, like the addition of ἀπόστολος δέ in Tit. i. 1, as giving a reason why his words should be received with respect, since he was brother of James and therefore one of the Brethren of the Lord. In my Introduction to the Epistle of St. James (pp. i-xlvii), I have endeavoured to show that the Brethren of the Lord were sons of Joseph and Mary, that they did not join the Church till after the Crucifixion, and that none of them was included among the Twelve.[1]

Other facts which we learn from the N.T. are (1) that Jude was probably either the youngest or the youngest but one of the Brethren of the Lord, as he is mentioned last among them in Mt. xiii. 55 οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσῆς καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας, and last but one in Mk. vi. 3 ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; (2) that the Brethren of the Lord (of course exclusive of James, who

[1] See ver. 17, where the writer appears to distinguish between the Apostles and himself.

remained stationary at Jerusalem) were engaged in missionary journeys like St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 5), but that they differed from him in the fact that they were married and were accompanied by their wives, and also, as we may suppose from Gal. ii. 9, Mt. x. 23, that their ministrations were mainly directed to the Jews. In my edition of James (p. cxv) I have argued that his Epistle was addressed to Jews of the eastern Diaspora and it seems not improbable that Jude, writing many years after his brother's death, may have wished to supply his place by addressing to the same circle of readers the warnings which he felt bound to utter under the perilous circumstances of the new age. His cousin Symeon, the son of his uncle Clopas, had succeeded to the bishopric of Jerusalem (Eus., *H.E.*, iii., 22, iv., 22, quoted in my edition of James pp. viii foll.), and is said to have been crucified A.D. 107 at the age of 120 [1] (*cf.* Hegesippus *ap.* Euseb., *H.E.*, iii., 32, ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν αἱρετικῶν κατηγοροῦσι τινὲς Συμεῶνος . . . ὡς ὄντος ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ. καὶ οὕτως μαρτυρεῖ ἐτῶν ὢν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν ἐπὶ Τραϊανοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ὑπατικοῦ Ἀττικοῦ).

Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii., 19) quotes again from Hegesippus an interesting story of the grandsons of Judas, "who were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose fears had been excited by the report he heard of them as descendants of David, and akin to the Messiah. When they were brought before him, he quickly ascertained that they were poor men, and that the kingdom they looked forward to was not of this world, and accordingly dismissed them as men of no importance, and ceased from his persecution of the Church. When they returned home, they received special honours, as having witnessed to the truth, and also as being kinsmen of the Lord. They lived till the time of Trajan."

In my Introduction to St. James I have pointed out that his Epistle bears marked traces of some characteristics which are found in the Lord Himself. I propose to call attention here to some resemblances and differences between the Epistles of the two brothers.

A. (1) Among the former we may note the tone of undoubting and unquestioned authority which pervades the two Epistles, combined with the personal humility of the writers. They do not arrogate to themselves that relationship which constituted the ground of the reverence with which they were regarded by their fellow-believers. They are simply servants of Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, to whose coming, as the righteous Judge, they look forward, whose power still manifests itself in works of mercy (James i. 1, ii. 1, v. 8, 9, 14); of Jesus Christ, who keeps His people safe to the end, through whom

[1] More probably under 95.

they hope for eternal life, to deny whom is the climax of impiety, in whom the Father is glorified for ever (Jude vv. 1, 4, 21, 25). They are sharers of a common salvation (Jude ver. 3), they need forgiveness of sin like other men (James iii. 2).

(2) Mental characteristics as exhibited in the two Epistles.

In my edition of James (p. ccxxix.) I have summed up the more general qualities of his style in the words "energy, vivacity, and as conducive to both, vividness of representation, meaning by the last that dislike of mere abstractions, that delight in throwing everything into picturesque and dramatic forms, which is so marked a feature in our Epistle". To a certain extent this is true also of Jude, as shown in his imaginative power and his frequent use of figurative speech. *Cf.* Jude ver. 8, where the innovators are spoken of as dreamers polluting the flesh; ver. 12, where they are compared (1) to sunken rocks on which those who meet them at the love-feasts run aground and perish, (2) to waterless clouds driven by the wind, (3) to trees which have to be rooted up, because they bear no fruit in the fruit-bearing season, (4) to wild waves foaming out their own shame on the shore, (5) to falling stars which are extinguished in everlasting gloom. In ver. 20 the faithful are bidden to build themselves up on their most holy faith; in ver. 23, to save sinners, snatching them from the fire; to hate the garment spotted by the flesh. In regard to St. James I further illustrated the quality of vividness by "the frequent reference to examples such as Abraham, Rahab, Job, Elijah". In the same way St. Jude gives animation to his warnings by reference to the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for their unbelief after being saved from Egypt; to the fallen angels who are reserved for the judgment in everlasting chains; to Sodom and the neighbouring cities, which sinned in the same way as the angels, and now suffer the penalty of eternal fire (vv. 5-7). Reverence for the powers of the unseen world is commended by the pattern of the archangel Michael, who, even in his dispute with the devil for the body of Moses, refused to bring a railing accusation, but committed the case to God (vv. 8, 9). Cain and Balaam and Korah are cited as the predecessors of the present disturbers of the Church (ver. 11). Enoch the seventh from Adam has left us his warning against such men (vv. 14, 15). "You have yourselves heard the same warning from the Apostles" (ver. 17).

(3) For moral strictness and stern severity in rebuking sin, the whole of this short Epistle may be compared with such passages as James ii. 19, iii. 15, iv. 1-v. 6. For noble and weighty expression we may compare vv. 20, 21, ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ

ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον and the final doxology, with the passages which I have selected from St. James in p. ccxxviii. The appealing ἀγαπητοί, which is thrice found in St. James, is also thrice repeated in Jude. The warning against Respect of Persons is found in James ii. 1-9 and in Jude ver. 16: that against a murmuring discontented spirit in James i. 13, iv. 1, v. 9, in Jude vv. 15, 16; that against the misuse of the tongue in James iii. 1-10, in Jude ver. 16: the charge to labour for the salvation of others in James v. 19, 20, in Jude vv. 22, 23.

For special details of the style of St. Jude see my larger edition, pp. xxvi-lxvi: one point which may be noticed here is his fondness for triplets. Thus in ver. 2 we find ἔλεος[1] καὶ εἰρήνη[2] καὶ ἀγάπη[3] πληθυνθείη. In ver. 4 "the men who were designed for this judgment" are described as ἀσεβεῖς[1], τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες[2] εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι[3]. In vv. 3-7 three examples of punishment are adduced, Israel in the wilderness, the angels who sinned, the overthrow of Sodom. In ver. 8 the libertines, σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. [In vv. 9, 10 we have two couplets οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν—ἀλλὰ εἶπεν: ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν—βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ—φθείρονται.] In ver. 11 we return to the triplet, Cain, Balaam, Korah. [In vv. 12, 13 we have a quintet of metaphors, hidden rocks, rainless clouds, dead trees, turbid waves, falling stars. In ver. 15 again two couplets ποιῆσαι κρίσιν—ἐλέγξαι, περὶ πάντων ὧν ἠσέβησαν—ὧν ἐλάλησαν.] In ver. 16 we return to the triplet πορευόμενοι—λαλοῦντες (disguised in the form καὶ τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα)—θαυμάζοντες. So in ver. 17, the word—the Apostles—the Lord. Ver. 18 does not admit of subdivision. Ver. 19 has the triplet ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. Vv. 20 and 21 have a double triplet, ἐποικοδομοῦντες—προσευχόμενοι—προσδεχόμενοι and πνεῦμα ἅγιον—Θεός—Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. Ver. 22 has the marked triplet οὓς μὲν—οὓς δὲ—οὓς δέ. Ver. 24 has a couplet, φυλάξαι—στῆσαι. Ver. 25 has a quartet δόξα, μεγαλωσύνη, κράτος, ἐξουσία, followed by the triplet πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ νῦν, καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, thus closing with a septet. Compare the stress laid on the fact that Enoch was *seventh* from Adam, ver. 14.

There are some traces of the triplet in St. James, as in i. 14, ἕκαστος πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας—εἶτα ἡ ἐπιθυμία τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποκύει θάνατον, ver. 19 ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι, βραδὺς εἰς ὀργήν, ii. 23 ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φίλος Θεοῦ ἐκλήθη, iii. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα

ἡ σπιλοῦσα, καὶ φλογίζουσα—καὶ φλογιζομένη, iv. 8, ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ—καθαρίσατε χεῖρας—ἁγνίσατε καρδίας, so iv. 9, v. 17, 18. Perhaps we may find a septet in the beautiful description of heavenly wisdom (iii. 17) πρῶτον μὲν ἁγνή, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστὴ ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος. But the distinctive mark of St. James's style is "paronomasia" passing at times into such a climax as we find in i. 14, 15 quoted above and in i. 3, 4, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ ἔργον τέλειον ἐχέτω, ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι. See pp. ccxxii f. of my edition.

Another characteristic which may be noted is the love of forcible antithesis as in J. ver. 10, ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. As regards vocabulary, the most striking resemblance is the occurrence of ψυχικός as opposed to πνευματικός, of which the earliest biblical example is in James iii. 15, but this had been adopted by Paul (1 Cor. ii. 10 foll.) before it was made use of by Jude.

B. (1) The differences between the two Epistles are hardly less marked: Jude evidently belongs to a much later period of Christian development. James, as I have endeavoured to show in the Introduction to his Epistle, wrote about the year 45 A.D. before any of the other canonical books was in existence, and his theological position is that of the early Church described in the opening chapters of the Acts. Jude is familiar with the writings of St. Paul. He is familiar with the terms σωτήρ and σωτηρία (vv. 3 and 25): in vv. 20, 21 he brings together the three Persons of the Trinity; he addresses those to whom he writes in Pauline language as κλητοί (ver. 1) and ἅγιοι (ver. 3), and uses forms of ascription and doxology closely resembling those which occur in St. Peter and St. Paul. Their "most holy faith" is a "tradition once delivered to the saints" (vv. 4, 20): they are bidden to "remember the words of the Apostles, how they told them that in the last time there should come scoffers" (vv. 17, 18). The error which he combats appears to be a misgrowth of St. Paul's teaching in regard to a salvation of free grace, "not of works, lest any man should boast" (ver. 4). Many of the features which he distinguishes are such as we find delineated in St. Paul's farewell to the Ephesian Church, and in some of his Epistles, especially those to Titus and Timothy.

(2) Another difference might seem to be Jude's repeated references to Pseudepigrapha such as the book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses (on which see the next chapter) and his readiness to give credence to fanciful legends such as the fall of the Watchers, and the contention for the body of Moses. Credulity of this kind seems to

be far apart from the strong practical sense of James. Yet there are signs that the latter was not unacquainted with rabbinical traditions. Spitta even goes so far as to trace most of his teaching to pre-Christian sources. I have argued against this view in ch. vii. 2 of my Introduction to his Epistle; but my notes on i. 8 (δίψυχος) and iv. 8, 9 ἁγνίσατε καρδίας, δίψυχοι· ταλαιπωρήσατε, suggest a connexion with an apocryphal writing quoted in Clem. Rom. i. 23 ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, ὅπου λέγει Ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι[1] and identified by Lightfoot and Spitta with *Eldad and Modad* (on which see Herm., *Vis.*, ii., 3), by Hilgenfeld with the *Assumption of Moses*. The phrase in iv. 14, ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστε πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, has been traced by some to another apocryphal quotation found in Clem. i. 17 ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ κύθρας, which Hilgenfeld also supposes to be taken from the *Assumption of Moses*. The phrase κόσμος ἀδικίας in James iii. 6 is found in Enoch xlviii. 7. The *Testaments of the Patriarchs*, which also contain quotations from Enoch (such as *Sim.* 5 ἑώρακα ἐν χαρακτῆρι γραφῆς Ἐνώχ, *Levi* 10 βίβλος Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου, *ib.* 14, ἔγνων ἀπὸ γραφῆς Ἐνὼχ ὅτι ἐπὶ τέλει ἀσεβήσετε, *ib.* 16, *Juda* 18, *Benj.* 9, *Zab.* 3, *Nepht.* 4. ἐν γραφῇ ἁγίᾳ Ἐνὼχ ὅτι . . . ποιήσετε κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀνομίαν Σοδόμων), furnish several parallels quoted in my note on James iv. 7 ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν. The words which immediately precede (ἐγγίσατε τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἐγγίσει ὑμῖν) are not unlike another quotation which occurs in Herm. *Vis.* ii. 3, ἐγγὺς Θεὸς τοῖς ἐπιστρεφομένοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰτ καὶ Μωδὰτ τοῖς προφητεύσασιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ. James has also been credited with a knowledge of the Sibylline writings on the ground of the phrase ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου which occurs in iii. 8 and also in Sib. *Prooem.* 71.

εἰσὶ θεοὶ μερόπων δηλήτορες[2] <οὗτοι> ἀβούλων,
τῶν δὴ κὰκ στόματος χεῖται θανατηφόρος ἰός.

But if there is borrowing, it is just as likely to be on the other side. The strange expression τροχὸς γενέσεως in iii. 6 is regarded as Orphic by some, but it seems to have been used by the Orphic writers in a different sense, *viz.* that of the endless changes of metempsychosis.

(3) Another difference which strikes one on reading the two epistles is that while the former is full of instruction for the present time, the bulk of the latter is made up of denunciations, which have very much lost their force. To a modern reader it is curious rather

[1] The quotation, as given more fully in Clem. Rom. ii. 11, contains the somewhat rare word ἀκαταστασία, which is also used by James iii. 16.

[2] MS. δολοητορες. Geffcken reads δόλῳ ἡγητῆρες.

than edifying, with the exception of the beginning and end (vv. 1, 2 and 20-25). This is no doubt to be explained by what is stated of the purport of the letter in ver. 3. It was called out by a sudden emergency, to guard against an immediate pressing danger, and was substituted for a treatise περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας which Jude had hoped to send (ver. 3), and which would probably have been more in the tone and spirit of vv. 20 f.

The Epistle of Jude was recognised as canonical in the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397 (Westcott on the Canon, p. 566), with which agree Jerome (Westcott, p. 580) and Augustine (*De Doctr. Christiana*, ii. 12). Jerome, however (*De vir. ill.* iv.), mentions that, owing to the use made of the apocryphal Enoch, the epistle of Jude *a plerisque reicitur*. So Eusebius *H.E.* ii. 23, "Not many old writers have mentioned the Epistle of James, nor yet the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the seven so-called Catholic Epistles, though we know that these have been publicly used with the rest in most churches." *Ib.* iii. 25, "Among the controverted books, which are nevertheless well known and recognised by most, we class the Epistle circulated under the name of James and that of Jude." Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386 A.D.) acknowledged both Jude and 2 P. In Asia Minor both Jude and 2 P. were recognised as canonical by Gregory Naz. (d. *c.* 391). In Alexandria Didymus (d. 394) wrote comments on the Catholic Epistles, especially defending Jude from the attacks made upon him as having made use of apocryphal books. Athanasius (d. 373) in his list of the books of the N.T. "agrees exactly with our own Canon" (Westcott, p. 520). Origen (*In Matt.* x. 17) says of Jude ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολήν, ὀλιγόστιχον μέν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐρρωμένων λόγων. In the same treatise (xvii. 30) he quotes Jude 6, adding words which signify that it was not universally received, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσοιτό τις ἐπιστολήν. Clement of Alexandria commented on Jude in his *Hypotyposes* (Eus. *H.E.* vi. 14)—the comment is still extant in the Latin translation—and quotes him by name (*Paed.* iii. 44, 45) with commendation, διδασκαλικώτατα ἐκτίθεται τὰς εἰκόνας τῶν κρινομένων. He quotes him again *Strom.* iii. 11, and, without naming him, in *Strom.* vi. 65. Tertullian (*De Cult. Fem.* 3) says "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet". It appears in the Muratorian Canon (*c.* 170 A.D.), "Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duae in catholicis habentur". Theophilus of Antioch (*ad Autol.* ii. 15) seems to allude to Jude 13 in the words quoted in my note on that verse. Athenagoras (*c.* 180) speaks (§ 24, p. 130 Otto) of the fallen angels in a manner which suggests acquaintance with

Jude ver. 6, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν. (Of the angels some) ἔμειναν ἐφ' οἷς αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν καὶ διέταξεν ὁ Θεός, οἱ δὲ ἐνύβρισαν καὶ τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ὑποστάσει καὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ, and he adds that he asserts this on the authority of the prophets, which may perhaps refer both to Enoch and Jude. The form of salutation in Jude 2 ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη is found in *Mart. Polyc. Inscr.* and Polyc. *ad Phil.* The earliest reference however to Jude is probably to be found in 2 Pet., which, as we have seen in the preceding Chapter I., is largely copied from him. There appears also to be an allusion to it in *Didache* ii. 7, οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ δὲ ὧν προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις, *cf.* Jude 22. Jude's epistle was included in the Old Latin Version, but not in the Peshitto.

The most important passage in Jude bearing upon the circumstances of its composition is ver. 17, where the readers are bidden to call to mind the words formerly spoken to them by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ (which would fit in with the suggestion that it was addressed to the Syrian churches) ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται, the latter words showing that these communications of the Apostles had now ceased, either by their death or by their removal from Jerusalem. Jude recognises that "the last time," of which they had preached, had now arrived. The long retrospect which these words imply agrees with the far-away note of ver. 3, παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει, as contrasted with such passages as Luke iv. 21 σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη, though we must not forget that the idea of a Christian tradition is familiar to St. Paul, and that there are other examples in the N.T. of the objective use of πίστις.

It has been argued that this epistle must have been written before 70, or it would have contained some reference to the destruction of Jerusalem among the other notable judgments of God. We may grant that this is what we should have expected, if the letter were written shortly afterwards, though even then it is a possible view that a patriotic Jew might shrink from any further allusion to so terrible a subject, beyond the reference to the destruction in the wilderness (ver. 5); but this difficulty is lessened if we suppose the date of the Epistle to be nearer 80 than 70.

CHAPTER III.

Use of Apocryphal Books by Jude.—Clement of Alexandria in his *Adumbrationes* (Dind. vol. iii. p. 483), after quoting Jude 9, "Quando Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans altercabatur de corpore Moysis," remarks "hic confirmat *Assumptionem Moysis*," *i.e.*, here the writer corroborates the *Assumption of Moses*; and again, in commenting on ver. 14, "Prophetavit autem de his septimus ab Adam Enoch," he adds "His verbis prophetam (*al.* prophetiam) comprobat".

The Hebrew original of the book of Enoch[1] is now lost. It was translated into Greek, of which only a few fragments remain, and this was again translated into Ethiopic, probably about 600 A.D. A copy of the last was found in Abyssinia in 1773 by Bruce, the famous traveller, and an English version was published by Abp. Laurence in 1821, followed by the Ethiopic text in 1838. The composite nature of the book is generally recognised. The latest editor, R. H. Charles, who is my authority for what follows, divides it into five sections and recognises many interpolations in these. He considers that the larger portion of the book was written not later than 160 B.C., and that no part is more recent than the Christian era. It exercised an important influence on Jewish and Christian literature during the centuries which followed being used by the author of the *Assumption of Moses* (written about the Christian era), also by the writers of the *Book of Jubilees*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Mr. Charles traces its influence in the N.T. not merely in the epistles of St. Jude and the two epistles of St. Peter, but above all, in the Apocalypse; also in the Acts, and the epistle to the Hebrews, in some of the epistles of St. Paul, and in the Gospels. It is quoted three times (twice as Scripture) in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, is referred to, though not named, in Justin and Athenagoras, is cited by Irenæus, iv. 16. 2: "Enoch . . . cum esset homo, legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis judicii Dei, quoniam angeli

[1] On which see Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, vol. iii. pp. 54-73.

quidem deciderunt in terram in judicium" (En. xiv. 7). Tertullian quotes it as Scripture, calling Enoch the oldest of the prophets (*Idol.* xv., *Apol.* xxii.). He allows that its canonicity was denied by some, "quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur," and also because it was thought that, if it were a genuine writing of Enoch, it must have perished in the Deluge. He considers, however, that it should be received, because of its witness to Christ, and because it has the testimony of the Apostle Jude. It is twice quoted in Clement's *Ecl. Proph.* (Dind. iii. pp. 456, 474) as well as in *Strom.* iii. 9. Origen speaks doubtfully of the authority of Enoch: *cf. C. Celsum*, v. 54, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πάνυ φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνὼχ βιβλία, and *In Johannem*, vi. 25, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνὼχ γέγραπται, εἴ τῳ φίλον παραδέχεσθαι ὡς ἅγιον τὸ βιβλίον, also *In Num. Hom.* xxviii. 2, *De Princ.* i. 3. 3. Hilary (*Comm. in Psalm.* cxxxii. 3) writes: "Fertur id, de quo etiam nescio cuius liber extat, quod angeli concupiscentes filias hominum, cum de caelo descenderent, in montem Hermon convenerant". Jerome says that the doubts entertained as to the epistle of St. Jude arose from his quoting an apocryphal book as an authority (*De Vir. Ill.* iv), "quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia, a plerisque reicitur". *Cf.* also *Comm. in Ps.* cxxxii. 3 and *Comm. in Titum*, i. 12. Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xv 23. 4) and Chrysostom (*Hom. in Gen.* vi. 1) speak of the story of the angels and the daughters of men as a baseless fable. Still more severe is the condemnation passed on the book of Enoch with other apocryphal writings in *Const. Apost.* vi. 16. 2, as φθοροποιὰ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθρά.

Mr. Charles has also edited the *Assumption of Moses* (1897), which he regards as a composite work made up of two distinct books, the *Testament* and the *Assumption* of Moses.[1] "The former was written in Hebrew between 7 and 29 A.D., and possibly also the latter. A Greek version of the entire work appeared in the first century A.D. Of this only a few fragments have been preserved. The Greek version was translated into Latin not later than the fifth century" (pp. xiii., xiv.). "The book preserved in the incomplete Latin version, first published by Ceriani in 1861, is in reality a Testament and not an Assumption." "The editing of the two books in one was probably done in the first century, as St. Jude draws upon both in his epistle" (pp. xlvii and l.). Thus Jude ver. 9[2] is derived from the

[1] *Cf.* Schürer, pp. 73-83.

[2] See note on this, and add to the illustrative passages there quoted a scholium printed for the first time in James' *Test. of Abraham*, p. 18: ὁ διάβολος ἀντεῖχεν θέλων ἀπατῆσαι, λέγων ὅτι Ἐμόν ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα, ὡς τῆς ὕλης δεσπόζων· καὶ ἤκουσεν τὸ Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος, τούτεστιν ὁ Κύριος ὁ πάντων τῶν πνευμάτων

Assumption, Jude 16 from the *Testament* (p. lxii.). On the latter Charles compares οὗτοί εἰσι γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν with *Ass. M.* vii. 7, *quaerulosi*, vii. 9, et manus eorum et mentes *immunda tractantes et os eorum loquetur ingentia*, v. 5, *erunt illis temporibus mirantes personas . . . et accipientes munera* (MS. acceptiones munerum). He identifies the ἐμπαῖκται of Jude 18 with the *homines pestilentiosi* of *Ass. M.* vii. 3, and calls attention to the frequent recurrence of the word ἀσεβεῖς in the former (vv. 4, 15, 18) and *impii* in the latter: see vi. 1, facient facientes impietatem, vii. 3, pestilentiosi et impii, *ib.* 7, ix. 3, xi. 17.

Again there appears to be a reminiscence of the *Testaments of the Patriarchs*,[1] where the sin of the Watchers is connected with that of Sodom: cf. *Test. Nepht.* 3, ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ἀστέρες οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἔθνη πλανηθέντα καὶ ἀφέντα κύριον ἠλλοίωσαν τάξιν αὐτῶν . . . ἐξακολουθήσαντες πνεύμασι πλάνης. Ὑμεῖς μὴ οὕτως . . . ἵνα μὴ γένησθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἥτις ἐνήλλαξεν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως καὶ Ἐγρήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὓς κατηράσατο Κύριος ἐπὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, *Test. Aser* 7, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος. There seems to be more than a casual coincidence between these passages and Jude 6, 7 and 13, ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν . . . ὡς Σόδομα . . . τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας πρόκειται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου . . . ἀστέρες πλανῆται.

We have seen how this use of apocryphal books was viewed by the early Christian writers. They were at first disposed to think that a book stamped with the approval of St. Jude must be itself inspired. Later on, the feeling changed: the authority of St. Jude was no longer sufficient to save the apocryphal writing: on the contrary the prejudice against the Apocrypha and its "blasphemous fables" (Chrys. *Hom.* 22 *in Gen.*) led many to doubt the authority of St. Jude: see above quotation from Jerome, who argues that the approval of the Apostle need not be supposed to extend to the whole of the book of Enoch, but only to the verses quoted by him. So Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xv. 23, 4): "Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab

δεσπόζων· ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι βουλόμενος ὁ Θεὸς δεῖξαι ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἔνθενδε ἀπαλλαγήν, ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς ἀνθιστάμενοι <ἦσαν> δαίμονες πορευομέναις τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω πορείαν, τοῦτο οὖν συνεχώρησεν ὁρᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως ταφῆς· ἐβλασφήμει γὰρ καὶ ὁ διάβολος κατὰ Μωσέως, φονέα τοῦτον καλῶν διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον· ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, μὴ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν, εἴρηκεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος ὁ Θεός, διάβολε. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐψεύσατο ὁ Θεὸς εἰσαγαγὼν τὸν Μωσῆν ἔνθα ὤμοσεν αὐτὸν μὴ εἰσελθεῖν.

[1] An edition has lately been brought out by Charles.

Adam negare non possumus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat" (although the book as a whole has been justly excluded from the Canon).

Some modern writers have endeavoured to avoid the necessity of allowing that an apocryphal writing is quoted as authoritative in the Bible, by the supposition that the words quoted may have come down by tradition and have been made use of by the inspired writer, independently of the book from which he is supposed to quote, or that they were uttered by immediate inspiration without any human assistance, or again, that the book of Enoch may be subsequent to that of Jude, and have borrowed from it. But the careful investigation of many scholars, as summed up by Charles, can leave little doubt in any candid mind as to the proximate dates, both of Enoch and of the Assumption. St. Jude does not put forward his account of the burial of Moses or the preaching of Enoch, as though it were something unheard of before. As regards the libertines described in the latter book, he uses the phrase προγεγραμμένοι, implying that he refers to a written prophecy. None of the early Fathers find a difficulty in supposing him to refer to a book which was not included in the Canon. Jews of that time were accustomed to accept rabbinical explanations or additions to Scripture as having authority. Thus St. Paul accepts the story of the Rock which followed the Israelites in their wanderings (1 Cor. x. 4), gives the names of the magicians who withstood Moses before Pharaoh (2 Tim. iii. 8), recognises the instrumentality of angels in the giving of the Law (Gal. iii. 19, *cf.* Heb. ii. 2, Acts vii. 53). So, too, Stephen speaks of Moses as learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Acts vii. 2); the author of the epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 37) alludes to the tradition as to the death of Isaiah (see Charles' *Ascension of Isaiah*, pp. xlv. foll.), and James (v. 17) limits the drought predicted by Elijah to 3½ years.

CHAPTER IV.

The Story of the Fallen Angels.—St. Jude (vv. 5-8) introduces as examples of the divine wrath against those who had sinned after receiving favours from God (1) the Israelites who perished in the wilderness for unbelief after they had been saved from Egypt; (2) the angels who abandoned their original office and habitation, being led away by fleshy lusts, and are now kept in chains under darkness till the day of judgment; (3) the people of Sodom, who inhabited a land like the garden of the Lord (Gen. xiii. 10), who were rescued from Chedorlaomer by Abraham (Gen. xiv. 16, 17), and yet sinned after the fashion of the angels, and are now a warning to all, suffering the punishment of eternal fire. A similar account is given in 2 Pet. ii.4-9 where it is said (1) that God spared not the angels who sinned, but hurled them into Tartarus, to be detained there in chains (or pits) of darkness until the final judgment; (2) that He brought a flood on the world of the ungodly, while he spared Noah; (3) that He destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, while he delivered righteous Lot; in all three cases punishing impurity and rebellion.

As is shown in the explanatory notes, this account of the Fall of the Angels is taken directly from the book of Enoch, which is itself an expansion from Jewish and Gentile sources of the strange narrative contained in Gen. vi. 1-4: "It came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the ground and daughters were born unto them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose. . . . The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them: the same were the mighty men which were of old, the men of renown" (R.V.). ἐγένετο ἡνίκα ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄνθρωποι πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ θυγατέρες ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτοῖς, ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὅτι καλαί εἰσιν ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὧν ἐξελέξαντο . . . οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνο, ὡς ἂν εἰσεπορεύοντο οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐγέννωσαν ἑαυτοῖς, ἐκεῖνοι ἦσαν οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀπ' αἰῶνος, οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ὀνομαστοί (LXX). That the version ἄγγελοι

gives the true force of the original is evident from the other passages in which the phrase "sons of God" occurs, Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7, Dan. iii. 25, 28, Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 6. It has been suggested that the phrase μετ' ἐκεῖνο may be a marginal note having reference to Num. xiii. 33, where the Nephilim are mentioned as a gigantic race, "in whose eyes the spies were as grasshoppers," inhabiting a part of Canaan at the time of the Exodus. The translation γίγαντες implies not only superhuman size, but also superhuman insolence and impiety. According to Greek mythology they were children of Heaven and Earth, who rose up in insurrection against the Gods and were hurled down to Tartarus or buried beneath the mountains. This resemblance is noted by Josephus in the passage quoted below.

It is evident that the passage in Gen. vi. is a fragment unconnected either with what precedes or follows. Driver says of it: "We must see in it an ancient Hebrew legend . . . the intention of which was to account for the origin of a supposed race of prehistoric giants, of whom no doubt (for they were 'men of name') Hebrew folk-lore told much more than the compiler of Genesis has deemed worthy of preservation". Ryle (*Early Narratives of Genesis*, pp. 91-95) speaks of it as "an extract from a very early legend which gives an alternative explanation of the Fall, in which woman is again tempted by one of higher race".

The story was variously commented on by later Jewish writers, most of whom supposed that the Nephilim were the offspring of the intercourse between the angels and the daughters of men, and that they were destroyed in the Flood.

The Fall of the Angels is largely treated of in the collection of treatises which goes under the name of the Book of Enoch. The earliest portion of the book is considered by the latest editor, Mr. R. H. Charles, to have been written in the first quarter of the second century B.C. Two hundred of the angels, or watchers, Ἐγρήγοροι as they are called in the Greek versions of Dan. iv. 13 by Aquila and Symmachus, conspired together under the leadership of Semjaza (elsewhere called Azazel, as in Enoch, chapters viii. and ix.) and descended on Mount Hermon in the days of Jared, father of Enoch (vi.). There they took to themselves human wives whom they instructed in magic and various arts, and begot giants, who afterwards begot the Nephilim: *cf.* viii., οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἐτέκνωσαν Ναφηλείμ . . . μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἤρξαντο οἱ γίγαντες κατεσθίειν τὰς σάρκας τὰς ἀνθρώπων (like Polyphemus). Complaint having been made of the sin and misery thus introduced into the world, Raphael is sent down from heaven to bind Azazel hand and foot and shut him up in darkness till the judgment day, when he

will be cast into eternal fire. Gabriel is at the same time sent to slay the giants (x. 9): the watchers will be bound under the hills for seventy generations, and then be confined for ever in the abyss of fire: the spirits of the slain giants become demons. In chap. xix., however, the demons are represented as existing before the fall of the watchers.

The prevailing demonology of the Book of Enoch is thus summed up by Dr. Charles (*Enoch*, p. 52). The angelic watchers who fell from lusting after the daughters of men have been imprisoned in darkness from the time of their fall. The demons are the spirits which proceeded from the souls of the giants who were their offspring. They work moral ruin on earth without hindrance till the final judgment. Satan is the ruler of a counter kingdom of evil. He led astray the angels and made them his subjects. He also tempted Eve. The Satans can still appear in heaven (as in Job). They tempt to evil, they accuse the fallen, they punish the condemned. In portions however of the Book of Enoch there is no mention of a Satan or Satans, but the angels are led astray by their own chief Azazel, or as he is sometimes called Semjaza (*En.* ix., x., xiii., liv.). Of the *Secrets of Enoch*, which is supposed to date from about the Christian era, Dr. Charles says:[1] "It is hard to get a consistent view of the demonology of the book: it seems to be as follows: Satan, one of the archangels, seduced the watchers of the fifth heaven into revolt in order to establish a counter kingdom to God. Therefore Satan or the Satans were cast down from heaven and given the air for their habitation. Some however of the Satans or Watchers went down to earth and married the daughters of men." Compare xviii. 3, "These are the Grigori, who with their prince Satanail rejected the holy Lord, and in consequence of these things they are kept in great darkness".

In chap. liv. there appears to be an attempt to connect the two different stories of the Fall: the guilt of the Watchers is said to have consisted in their becoming subject to Satan, who was either identified with the Serpent, as in Apoc. xii. 9, καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην—ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν; or else was supposed to have made use of the Serpent as his instrument, as in the *Assumption of Moses* quoted by Orig. *De Princip.* iii. 2. 1 (Lomm. vol. xxi. p. 303): "In Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in *Asc. Mosis* (cujus libelli meminit apostolus Judas) Michael Archangelus cum diabolo disputans de cor-

[1] See his note on pp. 36, 37.

pore Mosis ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstitisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae".[1]

The history of the gradual development of the belief in regard to Satan, as exhibited in the Bible, will be found in any of the Dictionaries of the Bible. Beside the attempt to harmonise the two Fall-stories by making Satan the cause of both, an attempt was made to arrive at the same result by ascribing to Satan or the Serpent the same motive which led to the fall of the angels. In Wisdom ii. 24 we read "By the envy of the devil death entered into the world". This envy is explained in rabbinical writings sometimes as occasioned by the dignity of Adam and his lordship over the creation, but more frequently by Satan's desire for Eve:[2] *cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 8, οὐδὲ ἐλυμήνατό μου τὰ ἁγνὰ τῆς παρθενίας λυμεὼν ἀπάτης ὄφις. Sometimes again his fall is ascribed to the less ignoble motive of pride, as in the pseudepigraphic Life of Adam: "When God created Adam, He called upon the angels to adore him as His image. . . . Satan however refused, and on being threatened with the wrath of God said that he would exalt his throne above the stars of heaven" (Isa. xiv. 13). In other writings (*Life of Adam, Secrets of Enoch*) Satan refuses to worship God Himself, "entertaining the impossible idea that he should make his throne higher than the clouds over the earth, and should be equal in rank to [God's] power".[3]

There can be little doubt that the story of the punishment of the angels took its colouring from two passages of Isaiah, the fine imaginative description of the mighty king of Babylon, under the figure of the morning star, entering the realm of Hades (ch. xiv.) and what appears to be an account of the punishment of guardian angels for their neglect of the nations committed to their charge (ch. xxiv. 21 f.), "It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison and after many days shall they be visited."

St. Jude's allusion to this story is merely parenthetical, to illustrate the law of judgment. He appears not to recognise any con-

[1] Cf. Tennant, *The Fall and Original Sin*, pp. 245, 246.

[2] See Tennant, pp. 152 foll.; Thackeray, *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*, pp. 50 foll.; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus*, i. p. 165, ii. 753 foll. In the latter passage the rabbis are quoted to the effect that the angels generally were opposed to the creation of man, and that the demons were the offspring of Eve and male spirits, and Adam and female spirits, especially Lilith.

[3] See Tennant, pp. 199, 201, 206.

nection between the Fallen Angels and Satan. The former are suffering imprisonment in darkness till the final judgment: the latter was apparently able to confront the archangel on equal terms, when contending for the body of Moses. So the continued activity and even the authority of Satan and his angels in this world are asserted both in the O.T., as in Job i. 6 and Zech. iii. 1, 2, and in the N.T. as in James iv. 7, 1 P. v. 8, Eph. 6, 11, 12 (we have to stand against the wiles of the devil, . . . our warfare is not against flesh and blood, but) πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see Lightfoot on Col. ii. 15. In 2 Cor. iv. 4 Satan is spoken of as the god, in John xii. 31 and xvi. 11 as the prince of this world. He is the tempter and accuser of the brethren, and did not shrink even from assailing the Son of God Himself (Mt. iv. 3).

The above account of the Fall of the Angels was that usually accepted, with slight variations, both among Jews and Christians till towards the close of the fourth century A.D.

Julius Africanus is said to be the only one of the ante-Nicene Fathers who enunciated the view which afterwards prevailed, *viz.*, that "the sons of God were the descendants of Seth, and the daughters of men descendants of Cain ".[1] See the quotation in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. p. 241, where he also gives the alternative explanation εἰ δὲ ἐπ' ἀγγέλων νοοῖτο τοῦτο, τοὺς περὶ μαγείας καὶ γοητείας . . . ἐσχολακότας συνιέναι χρὴ τῶν μετεώρων ταῖς γυναιξὶ τὴν γνῶσιν δεδωκέναι. Eusebius (*Pr. Ev.* v. 4, 11, 12) still keeps to the old view and compares the narrative of Gen. 6 to the stories of the Titans and Giants of Greek mythology. So Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* ii. 14: "Deus ne fraudibus suis diabolus, cui ab initio terrae dederat potestatem, vel corrumperet vel disperderet homines, quod in exordio rerum fecerat, misit angelos ad tutelam cultumque generis humani . . . Itaque illos cum hominibus commorantes dominator ille terrae fallacissimus consuetudine ipsa paullatim ad vitia pellexit et mulierum congressibus inquinavit . . . sic eos diabolus ex angelis Dei suos fecit satellites," etc. So Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* i. 2): "Angeli quibus caelum sedes erat, speciosarum forma virginum capti . . . naturae suae originisque degeneres . . . matrimoniis se mortalibus miscuerunt." Julian, like Celsus, used this belief as a ground for attacking Christianity. Cyril of Alexandria, in his reply (ix. p. 296) repudiates the belief as altogether unworthy, and injurious to morality, since men plead the angels' sin as excuse for their own, and adopts the interpretation of "sons of God" previously

[1] It is also found in the apocryphal *Conflict of Adam and Eve* of uncertain date, on which see the art. "Adam, Books of," in the *D. of Christ. Biog.* i. 36 foll.

given by Africanus. Chrysostom deals at length with the subject in his 22nd homily on Genesis. He calls the old interpretation blasphemous, and holds that it is precluded by the words of Christ, that "in the resurrection men shall be like angels, neither marrying nor given in marriage". Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xv. 23) thinks it cannot be denied "Silvanos et Faunos, quos vulgo incubos vocant . . . mulierum appetisse ac peregisse concubitum. . . . Dei tamen angelos sanctos nullo modo sic labi potuisse crediderim, nec de his dixisse Apostolum Petrum . . . sed potius de illis qui primum apostatantes a Deo cum diabolo principe suo ceciderunt," unless we are rather to understand this of the children of Seth. A little later Philastrius (*Haer.* 107) goes so far as to condemn the old opinion as a heresy.

The sympathies of Christians in the present day must assuredly be with those who endeavoured to eliminate from the Scriptures all that might seem to be dishonouring to God and injurious to men. But the methods employed with this view were often such as we could not now accept. For instance, the allegorical method borrowed from the Stoics by Philo, and adopted from him by many of the Fathers, is too subjective and arbitrary to be of any value in getting rid of moral difficulties. We have replaced this now by the historical method, first enunciated by our Lord, when he contrasted the spirit of the Gospel with that of the old Dispensation.[1] There is a continuous growth in the ideal of conduct as set before us in the Bible. Much that was commanded or permitted in the days of Abraham or Moses or David is forbidden to those who have received the fuller light of Christianity. So, what it was found possible for men to believe about God Himself and about the holy angels, is impossible for us now. The words put into the mouth of God in Gen. iii. 22, and in xi. 6, 7, we feel to be inconsistent with any true idea of the power and wisdom and love of God, and only suitable to a very low state of human development. So also for the story of the fall of the angels. But is it a satisfactory explanation of the latter to suppose that "sons of Seth" are meant by "sons of God"? Ryle (*Early Narratives of Genesis*, 91-95) points out that "there is nothing in the context to suggest this, no sign that the Sethites were distinguished for piety: they are not even exempted from the charge of general wickedness which brought on the Flood". Equally untenable is the Jewish explanation that "sons of God" are the nobles. I think no one who has studied with any care the recent investigations as to the origin of the book of Genesis, of which Driver's *Book of Genesis* may be taken as a specimen, can doubt that it contains much which is unhistoric, though full of moral and spiritual

[1] *Cf.* Matt. v. 21-48, xix. 8; Luke ix. 54-56.

teaching. The pre-Abrahamic narrative shows many resemblances to the Babylonian records, but in general the motive has been changed and purified.[1] Thus Driver says (p. lxiii.): "It is impossible, if we compare the early narratives of Genesis with the Babylonian narratives, from which in some cases they seem plainly to have been ultimately derived . . . not to perceive the controlling operation of the Spirit of God, which has taught these Hebrew writers . . . to take the primitive traditions of the human race, to purify them from their grossness and their polytheism, and to make them at once the foundation and the explanation of the long history that is to follow." Of the particular passage in question, however, Driver says (p. 83): "As a rule, the Hebrew narrators stripped off the mythological colouring of the piece of folklore which they record; but in the present instance it is still discernible".[2]

[1] Tennant, 20, 21, 41.

[2] For further information on this subject see Suicer's *Thesaurus* under ἄγγελος, and Ἐγρήγορος, Hasting's *D. of B.* under "Angel," "Demon," "Fall," "Flood"; *Encycl. of B. Lit.* under "Angel," "Demon," "Deluge," "Nephilim," "Satan"; Maitland's *Eruvin* (Essays iv.-vi.), where the literal interpretation is defended; Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctr.* § 52 and § 132.

CHAPTER V.

Notes on the Text of the Epistle of Jude.—The Epistle of Jude is contained in the uncials ℵABCKLP. It is omitted in the Peshitto, but included in the later Syriac versions,[1] the Philoxenian and Harkleian, here distinguished as syr^p and syr^h. In citing the Egyptian versions I have used the notation *Boh.*, now commonly employed, instead of the less distinctive *Copt.*, employed by Tischendorf. The only other point which it may be well to mention is that, as in the Epistle of James, the symbol + is appended in the Critical Notes to signify that the reading in question is found in other authorities besides those previously mentioned. In discussing the readings I start with that of WH.

If we may judge from the number of "primitive errors" suspected by WH in the short Epistle of Jude, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these twenty-five verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels. I notice below some passages where the text presents special difficulties.

Ver. 5. ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ἅπαξ πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. I quote Tregelles' notes with additions from Tischendorf in round brackets, only changing the notation of the Egyptian and Syriac versions to prevent confusion, and correcting the citations in accordance with more recent collations.

εἰδότας *add.* "ὑμᾶς ℵKL. 31 syrr., *om.* ABC² 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Arm.," and so Tisch.

In point of fact however B reads εἰδότας ὑμᾶς, as any one may convince himself by looking at Cozza-Luzi's photographic reproduction. Also Dr. Gwynn reports that *h* and all the MSS. of *p* give the same reading, though he adds that the pleonastic idiom of the Syriac would lead the translators to supply the pronoun even if wanting in the Greek. The preponderance of authority is therefore

[1] See Dr. Gwynn's *Later Syriac Versions*, published in 1909.

in favour of this latter reading. The repeated ὑμᾶς emphasises the contrast between the readers ("to remind you, *you* who know it already") and the libertines previously spoken of. The repetition here may be compared with the repeated ὑμῖν of v. 3.

ἅπαξ *ante* πάντα ABCL. 13. 31. Vulg. *Ante* ὅτι K. *Ante* λαὸν . (Syrr.) Arm. *Ante* ἐκ γῆς Αἰγ. Clem. 280 (and 997) Did. Cassiod. ὅτι κύριος σώσας τὸν λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγ. ἅπαξ Sah., ὅτι ἅπαξ κύριος σώσας λαὸν αὐτοῦ Boh. *Om.* ἅπαξ Lucif. 28. [ἅπαξ is so placed in Syrr. as to be connected with σώσας "when he had once saved them," G.]

παντα ABCℵ 13 Vulg. Syr^h. Boh. Arm. Aeth. Lucif. [In the *App.* to WH (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that this may be a primitive error for πάντας (*cf.* 1 John ii. 20) found in Syr^p.[1]], τοῦτο 31 KL. Sah.

ὅτι] *add.* ὁ C.[2] KL. 31. Arm. Clem. 280. *Om.* ABℵ 13.

κύριος] ℵCKL. Syr^h. Θεὸς C.[2] Tol. Syr^p Arm. Clem. Lucif. Ἰησοῦς AB 13 Vulg. Boh. Sah. Aeth. [In *App.* to WH. (*Sel. Readings*, p. 106) it is suggested that there may have been some primitive error, "apparently ΟΤΙΚ̅Ϲ̅ (ὅτι Κύριος), and ΟΤΙΙ̅Ϲ̅ (ὅτι' Ιησους) for ΟΤΙΟ (ὅτι ὁ)".]

γῆς] *om.* Syr^p.

It appears to me that the true reading of the passage is ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα, ὅτι Κύριος ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. I see no difficulty in πάντα, which gives a reason for the use of the word ὑπομνῆσαι, "I need only *remind you*, because *you* already *know all* that I have to say". It was easy for the second ὑμᾶς to be omitted as unnecessary, and then the word ἅπαξ might be inserted in its place partly for rhythmical reasons; but it is really unmeaning after εἰδότας: the knowledge of the incidents, which are related in this and the following verses, is not a knowledge for good and all, such as the faith spoken of in ver. 3. On the other hand, ἅπαξ is very appropriate if taken with λαὸν σώσας (a people was saved out of Egypt once for all), and it prepares the way for τὸ δεύτερον. For the reading πάντας I see no reason. Can it be assumed that *all* who are addressed should be familiar with the legends contained in the Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, to which allusion is made in what follows? It is surely much more to the point for the writer to say, as he does again below (ver. 17), that he is only repeating what is *generally* known, though it need not be known to every individual. As to Hort's suggestion on the word κύριος, that the original was ὅτι ὁ (λαὸν σώσας), I think the fact of the variants is better explained by Spitta, who considers that the abbreviations Ι̅Ϲ̅, Κ̅Ϲ̅, Θ̅Ϲ̅ might easily be confused, if the first letter was faintly written, and that

[1] "This is an error: the two best MSS. of *p* represent πάντα." G.

the mention of τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ Κύριον 'Ι. Χ. in the preceding verse would naturally lead a later copyist to prefer ΙC, a supposition which is confirmed by Cramer's *Catena*, p. 158, εἴρηται γὰρ πρὸ τούτων περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἴη ἀληθινὸς θεὸς οὗτος ὁ μόνος δεσπότης ὁ κύριος 'Ι. Χ., ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τὸν λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωσέως. Spitta himself however holds that ΘC is the true reading, as it agrees with the corresponding passage in 2 Peter ii. 4, ὁ Θεὸς ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, and with Clement's paraphrase (*Adumbr.* Dind. iii. p. 482): "Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit". There is no instance in the New Testament of the personal name "Jesus" being used of the pre-existent Messiah, though the official name "Christ" is found in 1 Cor. x. 4, 9, in reference to the wandering in the wilderness. But in the second and later centuries this distinction was less carefully observed. Thus Justin M. (*Dial.* 120), speaking of the prophecy in Genesis xlix. 10, says that it does not refer to Judah, but to Jesus, τὸν καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγαγόντα, and this use of the name was confirmed by the idea that the son of Nun was a personification of Christ (see Justin, *Dial.* 75; Clem. Al. 183; Didymus, *De Trin.* 1. 19, 'Ιούδας καθολικῶς γράφει, ἅπαξ γὰρ κύριος 'Ιησοῦς λαὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου σώσας κ.τ.λ.; Jerome, *C. Jov.* 1. 12; Lact. *Inst.* 4. 17, "Christi figuram gerebat ille Jesus, qui cum primum Auses vocaretur, Moyses futura praesentiens jussit eum Jesum vocari"). In the explanatory note I have stated my reasons for considering that the article before μή did not belong to the original text.

Ver. 12. οὗτοί εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες. The article here is omitted by ℵK and many inferior MSS. with vg. (but not syrr. or sah. or boh.), and some of the patristic quotations. I agree with Dr. Chase in thinking that it is out of place here, as in ver. 5 above. There is not only the difficulty of construction (οἱ . . . σπιλάδες), but the very bold assumption that the signification of σπιλάδες will be at once apparent. If we omit the article, ἀφόβως should be attached to συνευωχ. as by Ti. In syrr. it is joined with ποιμαίνοντες.

Ver. 19. οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

ἀποδιορίζοντες *add.* ἑαυτούς C vulg. syrr. *Om.* ℵABKL 13, etc.

Schott, B. Weiss, and Huther-Kühl suppose the words ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες to be spoken by, or at least to express the feeling of οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες: "welche Unterscheidungen machen, *sc.* zwischen Psychikern und Pneumatikern, wobei dann der Verfasser diese Unterscheidungen in seiner drastischen Weise sofort zu ihren Ungunsten

umkehrt". This explanation seems to me to give a better sense than the gloss approved by Spitta, οἱ τὰ σχίσματα ποιοῦντες; for one cause of the danger which threatens the Church is that the innovators do not separate themselves openly, but steal in unobserved (παρεισεδύησαν, ver. 4), and take part in the love-feasts of the faithful, in which they are like sunken rocks (ver. 12); and, secondly, it is by no means certain that the word ἀποδιορίζω could bear this sense. ἀφορίζω is used in Luke vi. 22 of excommunication by superior authority, which of course would not be applicable here. On the other hand, it seems impossible to get the former sense out of the Greek as it stands. Even if we allowed the possibility of such a harsh construction as to put ψυχικοί in inverted commas, as the utterance of the innovators (and should we not then have expected the contrast ψυχικοί, πνευματικοί?), still we cannot use the same word over again to express Jude's "drastic" retort. This difficulty would be removed if we supposed the loss of a line to the following effect after ἀποδιορίζοντες:—

> ψυχικοὺς ὑμᾶς (or τοὺς πιστοὺς) λέγοντες, ὄντες αὐτοὶ
> ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

The opposition of ψυχικοί to πνευματικοί is familiar in the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist. The Church is carnal, the sect spiritual. So the Valentinians distinguished their own adherents as *pneumatici* from the *psychici* who composed the Church. These were also technical terms with the Naassenes and Heracleon (see my notes on James iii. 15), and were probably borrowed by the early heretics from St. Paul, who uses them to distinguish the natural from the heavenly body (1 Cor. xv. 44), and also to express the presence or absence of spiritual insight (1 Cor. ii. 14 f.) ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ, μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν . . . ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει πάντα. The innovators against whom St. Jude writes seem to have been professed followers of St. Paul (like the Marcionites afterwards), abusing the doctrine of Free Grace which they had learnt from him (ver. 4 τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν), professing a knowledge of the βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ (1 Cor. ii. 10), though it was really a knowledge only of τὰ βάθεα τοῦ Σατανᾶ (Apoc. ii. 24), and claiming to be the true δυνατοί and πνευματικοί, as denying dead works and setting the spirit above the letter. This explains the subsequent misrepresentation of St. Paul as a heresiarch in the Pseudo-Clementine writings.

Vv. 22, 23. (Text of Tischendorf and Tregelles) καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα. (Text of WH. and

B. Weiss) καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα. In *App.* to WH. it is added, "Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first ἐλεᾶτε an interpolation" (*Sel. Readings*, p. 107).

22 ἐλέγχετε AC 13. Vulg. Boh. Arm. Aeth. (Eph. Theophyl. Oec. *Comm.* Cassiod.). ἐλεᾶτε ℵBC² Syrh. ἐλεεῖτε KLP (Theophyl. Oec. *txt.*), ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε (hic) Syrp. Clem. 773.

διακρινομένους ABCℵ. 13. Vulg. Syrr. Boh. Arm. Clem. 773, διακρινόμενοι KLP +.

23. οὓς δὲ (1st) ℵACKLP 13 Vulg. Syrh. Boh. Arm. *Om.* B., δὲ Syrp. Clem

σώζετε ℵABC 13 Vulg. Boh. Arm. Aeth., ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε KLP +, ἐλεεῖτε Clem. 773 (quoted below), ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ Syrp. ἐκ πυρὸς ℵABCKLP 13 Arm., ἐκ τοῦ π. Boh. *Om.* σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες Syrp.

ἁρπάζοντες οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ ABℵ 13. Vulg., Arm., *om.* ἁρπάζοντες Boh., ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ C. Syrh, ἁρπάζοντες KLP +.

Tischendorf makes the matter clearer by giving the consecutive text of versions and quotations as follows: Vulg. *Et hos quidem arguite judicatos, illos vero salvate de igne rapientes, aliis autem miseremini in timore.* Ar^e^. *Et quosdam corripite super peccatis eorum, et quorundam miseremini cum fuerint victi, et quosdam salvate ex igne et liberate eos.* Ar^p^. *Et signate quosdam cum dubitaverint orbos* (?) *et salvate quosdam territione, abripite eos ex igne.* Aeth. *quoniam est quem redarguent per verbum quod dictum est* (Aeth^p.p.^. *propter peccatum eorum*), *et est qui et servabitur ex igne et rapient eum, et est qui servabitur timore et poenitentia.* Arm. *Et quosdam damnantes sitis reprehensione, et quosdam salvate rapiendo ex igne, et quorundam miseremini timore judicando* (*? indicando*). Cassiodor. 142 *Ita ut quosdam dijudicatos arguant, quosdam de adustione aeterni ignis eripiant, nonnullis misereantur errantibus et conscientias maculatas emundent, sic tamen ut peccata eorum digna execratione refugiant.* Mr. Horner states that vv. 22, 23 are omitted in Sah. He translates Boh. as follows: καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ τοῦ πυρός (*al. om.* τοῦ), οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε (*al.* φέρετε) ἐν φόβῳ. Commentaries of Theophylact and Oecumenius, κἀκείνους δέ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδιΐστανται ὑμῶν—τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι—ἐλέγχετε, τουτέστι φανεροῦτε τοῖς πᾶσι τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν· εἴτε δὲ πρὸς ἴασιν ἀφορῶσι, μὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν ἐλέῳ προσλαμβάνεσθε, σώζοντες ἐκ τοῦ ἠπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρός· προσλαμβάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου.

In all these it will be observed that three classes are distinguished as in the text of Tregelles and Tischendorf, and in A, οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, and ℵ, οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς

δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. We should draw the same conclusion from the seeming quotation in *Can. Apost.* vi. 4 (οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ) οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ (οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου), which occurs also, with the omission of the cause οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις in the Didaché ii. 7.

Two classes only are distinguished in the following: Syrp. *Et quosdam de illis quidem ex igne rapite; cum autem resipuerint, miseremini super eis in timore*, representing καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. Syrh. *et hos quidem miseremini resipiscentes, hos autem servate de igne rapientes in timore*, representing καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. (*Adumbr.*) *quosdam autem salvate de igne rapientes, quibusdam vero miseremini in timore*,[1] representing οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 773, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεεῖτε, implying that he was acquainted with two different recensions. With these we may compare the texts of B, followed by WH. and B. Weiss, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινομένους σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ, of C, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους, οὓς δὲ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες ἐν φόβῳ, and of KLP, καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες.

St. Jude's predilection for triplets, as in vv. 2, 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in vv. 5-7, and of sin in v. 11, is *prima facie* favourable to the triple division in this passage. Supposing we take A and א to represent the original, consisting of three members, *a b c*, we find B complete in *a* and *c*, but confused as to *b*. As it stands, it gives an impossible reading; since it requires οὓς μέν to be taken as the relative, introducing the subordinate verb ἐλεᾶτε, depending on the principal verb σώζετε; while οὓς δέ, on the other hand, must be taken as demonstrative. WH suggest that ἐλεᾶτε has crept in from below. Omitting this, we get the sense, "Some who doubt save, snatching them from fire; others compassionate in fear". It seems an easier explanation to suppose that ἐλεᾶτε was written in error for ἐλέγχετε and οὓς omitted in error after διακρινομένους. The latter phenomenon is exemplified in the readings of Syrp. and Clem. *Str.* 773. The texts of C and KLP are complete in *a* and *b*, but insert a phrase from *c* in *b*. The most natural explanation here seems to be that the duplication of ἐλεᾶτε in *a* and *c* (as in א) caused the omission of

[1] The paraphrase continues, *id est ut eos qui in ignem cadunt doceatis ut semet ipsos liberent.* (It would seem that this clause has got misplaced and should be inserted after *rapientes.*) *Odientes, inquit, eam, quae carnalis est, maculatam tunicam; animae videlicet tunica macula* (read *maculata*) *est, spiritus concupiscentiis pollutus carnalibus.*

the second ἐλεᾶτε, and therefore of the second οὓς δέ. The reading διακρινόμενοι in KLP was a natural assimilation to the following nominative ἁρπάζοντες, and seemed, to those were not aware of the difference in the meaning of the active and middle of διακρίνω, to supply a very appropriate thought, viz., that discrimination must be used; treatment should differ in different cases.

The real difficulty however of the triple division is to arrive at a clear demarcation between the classes alluded to. "The triple division," says Hort (*App.* p. 107), "gives no satisfactory sense"; and it certainly has been very diversely interpreted, some holding with Kühl that the first case is the worst and the last the most hopeful: "Die dritte Klasse . . . durch helfendes Erbarmen wieder hergestellt werden können, mit denen es also nicht so schlimm steht, wie mit denen, welchen gegenüber nur ἐλέγχειν zu üben ist, aber auch nicht so schlimm, wie mit denen, die nur durch rasche, zugreifende That zu retten sind"; while the majority take Reiche's view of a climax: "a dubitantibus minusque depravatis . . . ad insanabiles, quibus opem ferre pro tempore ab ipsorum contumacia prohibemur". My own view is that Jude does not here touch on the case of the heretical leaders, of whom he has spoken with such severity before. In their present mood they are not subjects of ἔλεος, any more than the Pharisees condemned by our Lord, as long as they persisted in their hostility to the truth. The admonition here given by St. Jude seems to be the same as that contained in the final verses of the Epistle written by his brother long before: ἐάν τις ἐν ὑμῖν πλανηθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἐπιστρέψῃ τις αὐτόν, γινώσκετε ὅτι ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου. The first class with which the believers are called upon to deal is that of doubters, διακρινόμενοι, men still halting between two opinions (*cf.* James i. 6), or perhaps we should understand it of disputers, as in Jude 9. These they are to reprove and convince (*cf.* John xvi. 8, 9, ἐλέγξει περὶ ἁμαρτίας ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ). Then follow two classes undistinguished by any special characteristic, whose condition we can only conjecture from the course of action to be pursued respecting them. The second class is evidently in more imminent danger than the one we have already considered, since they are to be saved by immediate energetic action, snatching them from the fire; the third seems to be beyond human help, since the duty of the believers is limited to trembling compassion, expressing itself no doubt in prayer, but apparently shrinking from personal communication with the terrible infection of evil. We may compare with this St. Paul's judgment as to the case of incest in the Church of Corinth (1 Cor. v. 5), and the story told about Cerinthus and St. John.

ΙΟΥΔΑ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

1. ᾿ΙΟΥΔΑΣ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου, τοῖς[1] ἐν

[1] τοις θεῳ . . . και εν Ιησου conj. H (*Sel. Read.* p. 106).

Vv. 1, 2.—*Salutation.* Jude a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James, to those who have received the divine calling, beloved of the Father, kept safe in Jesus Christ. May mercy, peace and love be richly poured out upon you!

1. **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.** The same phrase is used by St. James in the Inscription to his epistle, also by St. Paul in Rom. and Phil. In 1 Pet. the phrase used is **ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ.**, in 2 Pet. **δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος.** It is, I think, a mistake to translate **δοῦλος** by the word "slave," the modern connotation of which is so different from that of the Greek word (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 5). There is no opposition between **δουλεία** and **ἐλευθερία** in the Christian's willing service. It only becomes a **δουλεία** in the opposed sense, when he ceases to love what is commanded and feels it as an external yoke.

ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου. *Cf.* Tit. i. 1, **δοῦλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰ. Χ.** See Introduction on the Author.

τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς. On the readings see Introduction on the text. The easier reading of some MSS., **ἡγιασμένοις** for **ἠγαπημένοις**, is probably derived from 1 Cor. i. 2, **ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** There is no precise parallel either for **ἐν Θεῷ ἠγ.** or for **Χριστῷ τετ.** The preposition **ἐν** is constantly used to express the relation in which believers stand to Christ: they are incorporated in Him as the branches in the vine, as the living stones in the spiritual temple, as the members in the body of which He is the head. So here, "beloved as members of Christ, reflecting back his glorious image" would be a natural und easy conception. Lightfoot, commenting on Col. iii. 12, **ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι,** says that in the N.T. the last word "seems to be used always of the objects of God's love," but it is difficult to see the propriety of the phrase, "Brethren beloved by God in God". **Ἠγαπημένοι** is used of the objects of *man's* love in Clem. *Hom.* ix. 5, **τῶν αὐτοῖς ἠγαπημένων τοὺς τάφους ναοῖς τιμῶσιν,** and the cognate **ἀγαπητοί** is constantly used in the same sense (as below ver. 3), as well as in the sense of "beloved of God". If, therefore, we are to retain the reading, I am disposed to interpret it as equivalent to **ἀδελφοί,** "beloved by us in the Father," *i.e.*, "beloved with **φιλαδελφία** as children of God," but I think that Hort is right in considering that **ἐν** has shifted its place in the text. See his *Select Readings*, p. 106, where it is suggested that **ἐν** should be omitted before **Θεῷ** and inserted before **Ἰησοῦ,** giving the sense "to those who have been beloved by the Father, and who have been kept safe in Jesus from the temptations to which others have succumbed," **ἠγαπημένοις** being followed by a dative of the agent, as in Nehem. xiii. 26, **ἀγαπώμενος τῷ Θεῷ ἦν.**

κλητοῖς is here the substantive of which **ἠγαπημένοις** and **τετηρημένοις** are predicated. We find the same use in Apoc. xvii. 14 (**νικήσουσιν**) **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ κ. ἐκλεκτοὶ κ. πιστοί,** in St. Paul's epistles, as in Rom. i. 6, **ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,** 1 Cor. i. 24, **κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον . . . αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς Χριστὸν Θεοῦ δύναμιν.** We have many examples of the Divine calling in the Gospels, as in the case of the Apostles (Matt. iv. 21, Mark i. 20) and in the parables of the Great Supper and the Labourers in the Vineyard. This idea of calling or election is derived from the O.T. See Hort's n. on 1 Pet. i. 1 **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς**: "Two great forms of election are spoken of in the O.T., the choosing of Israel, and the choosing of single

Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις[1] καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς. 2. ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη.

3. Ἀγαπητοί, πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς

[1] ηγαπημενοις AB ℵ; ηγιασμενοις KLP.

Israelites, or bodies of Israelites, to perform certain functions for Israel. . . . The calling and the choosing imply each other, the calling being the outward expression of the antecedent choosing, the act by which it begins to take effect. Both words emphatically mark the present state of the persons addressed as being due to the free agency of God. . . . In Deuteronomy (iv. 37) the choosing, by God is ascribed to His own love of Israel: the ground of it lay in Himself, not in Israel. . . . As is the election of the ruler or priest within Israel for the sake of Israel, such is the election of Israel for the sake of the whole human race. Such also, still more clearly and emphatically, is the election of the new Israel." For a similar use of the word "call" in Isaiah, *cf.* ch. xlviii. 12, xliii. 1, 7. The chief distinction between the the "calling" of the old and of the new dispensation is that the former is rather expressive of dignity ("called by the name of God"), the latter of invitation; but the former appears also in the N.T. in such phrases as James ii. 7, τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, and 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα . . . λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν. The reason for St. Jude's here characterising the called as beloved and kept, is because he has in his mind others who had been called, but had gone astray and incurred the wrath of God.

Ver. 2. For the Salutation see my note on χαίρειν, James i. 1, and Hort's excellent note on 1 Pet. i. 2, χάρις . . . πληθυνθείη. We find ἔλεος and εἰρήνη joined in Gal. vi. 16, and with the addition of χάρις in 1 Tim. i. 2, 2 Tim. i. 2, 2 John 3. The mercy of God is the ground of peace, which is perfected in the feeling of God's love towards them. The verb πληθυνθείη occurs in the Salutation both of 1 Peter and 2 Peter and in Dan. vi. 25 (in the letter of Darius), εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πληθυνθείη, *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 12, ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους. Ἀγάπη (= the love of God) occurs also in the final salutation of 2 Cor. ἡ χάρις τ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in Eph. εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου Ἰ. Χ. *Cf.* 1 John iii. 1, ἴδετε ποταπὴν ἀγάπην δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τέκνα Θεοῦ κληθῶμεν, where Westcott's n. is "The Divine love is infused into them, so that it is their own, and becomes in them the source of a divine life (Rom. xiii. 10). In virtue of this gift they are inspired with a love which is like the love of God, and by this they truly claim the title of children of God as partakers in His nature, 1 John iv. 7, 19." The same salutation is used in the letter of the Smyrnaeans (*c.* 156 A.D.) giving an account of the martyrdom of Polycarp, ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. πληθυνθείη. The thought of ἔλεος and ἀγάπη recurs again in ver. 21.

Vv. 3, 4.—*Reasons for Writing.* He had been intending to write to them on that which is the common interest of all Christians, salvation through Christ, but was compelled to abandon his intention by news which had reached him of a special danger* threatening the Gospel once for all delivered to the Church. His duty now was to stir up the faithful to defend their faith against insidious assaults, long ago foretold in ancient prophecy, of impious men who should change the doctrine of God's free grace into an excuse for licentiousness, and deny the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Ver. 3. ἀγαπητοί occurs in vv. 17 and 20, also in 2 Pet. iii. 1, 8, 14, 17, 1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 12 and James. It is common in the Epistles of John and of Paul, sometimes with μου attached, as in 1 Cor. x. 14, Phil. ii. 12, and is often joined to ἀδελφοί, especially in James. The ἀγάπη of ver. 2 leads on to the ἀγαπητοί here. They are themselves ἀγαπητοί because the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts.

πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενος. For πᾶσαν, see my n. on James i. 2, and *cf.* 2 Pet. i. 5, σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες, i. 15, σπουδάσω ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι, also Isocr. *Orat.* v. p. 91 *b*, πᾶσαν τὴν σπουδὴν περὶ τούτου

* For this see the Introduction on Early Heresies.

κοινῆς ἡμῶν[1] σωτηρίας ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι[2] ὑμῖν παρακαλῶν ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει.

[1] κοινης ημων] κ. υμων boh.; om. ημων KLP + ; σωτηριας] add. και ζωης ℵ.
[2] γραψαι] γραφειν ℵ.

ποιεῖσθαι, Plato, *Euthyd.* 304 *e*, περὶ οὐδενὸς ἀξίων ἀναξίαν σπουδὴν ποιοῦνται. Jude was busy on another subject, when he received the news of a fresh danger to the Church, which he felt it his duty to meet at once. Whether he lived to carry out his earlier design, and whether it was of the nature of a treatise or of an epistle, we know not. It is noteworthy that there is a similar allusion in 2 Peter iii. 1 to an earlier letter now lost. Compare Barn. iv. 9, πολλὰ δὲ θέλων γράφειν . . . γράφειν ἐσπούδασα.

κοινῆς σωτηρίας. *Cf.* Tit. i. 4, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, Ign. *Eph.* i., ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ ἐλπίδος with Lightfoot's n., Jos. *Ant.* 10. 1. 3 (Hezekiah besought Isaiah to offer sacrifice) ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας. Bede explains as follows: "omnium electorum communis est salus, fides, et dilectio Christi". Jude puts on one side the address he was preparing on the main principles of Christianity (probably we may take vv. 20 and 21 as a sample of what this would have been) and turns to the special evil which was then threatening the Church.

ἀνάγκην ἔσχον γράψαι. *Cf.* Luke xiv. 18, ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, Heb. vii. 27, *al.*, also Plut. *Cato Mi.* 24, ἀνάγκην ἔσχεν ἐκβαλεῖν ἀσχημονοῦσαν τὴν γυναῖκα. There is a similar combination of γράφειν and γράψαι in 3 John 13. The aor. γράψαι, contrasted with the preceding pres. γράφειν, implies that the new epistle had to be written at once and could not be prepared for at leisure, like the one he had previously contemplated. It was no welcome task: "necessity was laid upon him".

ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. "To contend *for* the faith," almost equivalent to the ἀγώνισαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας in Sir. iv. 28, see 1 Tim. vi. 12, ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, and εἰς ὃ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος, Col. i. 29. We may compare ἐπαμύνειν, ἐπαναπαύειν νόμῳ, Rom. ii. 17 and Clem. *Strom.* iii., p. 553, ἐπαγωνιζόμενος τῇ ἀθέῳ δόξῃ. It is possible (as is shown by the following examples) for spiritual blessings, once given, to be lost, unless we use every effort to maintain them. The redemption from Egypt was a fact, as baptism into the name of Christ is a fact, but, unless it is borne in mind and acted upon, the fact loses its efficacy.

τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει. The word πίστις here is not used in its primary sense of a subjective feeling of trust or belief, but in the secondary sense of the thing believed, the Truth or the Gospel, as in ver. 20 below, Gal. i. 23, ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτε νῦν εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν ἥν ποτε ἐπόρθει, also Gal. iii. 23, Phil. i. 27, συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, where see Lightfoot, Acts vi. 7. In the same way ἐλπίς is used in a concrete sense for the object or ground of hope (as in Col. i. 5, τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν, 1 Tim. i 1, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν, Tit. ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα), and φόβος for the object of fear, Rom. xiii. 3, 1 Pet. iii. 14.

ἅπαξ. Used here in its classical sense "once for all," as below ver. 5, and in Heb. vi. 4, τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, *ib.* ix. 26, 27, x. 2, 1 Pet. iii. 18. This excludes the novelties of the Libertines, *cf.* Gal. i. 9. The later sense "on one occasion" is found in 2 Cor. xi. 25, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, 1 Thess. ii. 18, καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν.

παραδοθείσῃ. *Cf.* Philo M. i. 387, πιστεύει τοῖς ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσι. The Christian tradition is constantly referred to by the Fathers, as by Clem. Al. *Str.* vii. where we read of ἡ ἀληθὴς παράδοσις (p. 845), ἡ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ π. (p. 890), ἡ θεία π. (p. 896), ἡ πάντων τῶν ἀποστόλων π. (p. 900), αἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ π. (p. 901), and even in the N.T. as in 1 Cor. xi. 2, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, 2 Thess. ii. 15, 1 Tim. vi. 20, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον. For an account of the gradual formation of the Creed, see A. E. Burn's *Introduction to the Creeds*, ch. ii., 1899, and compare the comment in my larger edition, p. 61 f.

τοῖς ἁγίοις. Used generally of Christians who were consecrated and called to be holy, as in 1 Cor. i. 2, Phil. i. 1, where see Lightfoot. The word contains an appeal to the brethren to stand fast against the teaching and practice of the Libertines.

4. **παρεισεδύησαν**[1] γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέν-

[1] παρεισεδυησαν B, WH; παρεισεδυσαν ℵACKLP + Ti., Treg.

Ver. 4. *Nature of the Threatened Danger.* It is stealthy; it is serious enough to have been predicted long ago; its characteristic is impiety, showing itself in the antinomian misuse of the Gospel of God's free grace, and in the denial of God and Christ.

Ver. 4. **παρεισεδύησαν γάρ τινες ἄνθρωποι.** For this form which is found in B and adopted by WH, Veitch cites **διεκδυῆναι** in Hippocr. i. 601, and compares **ἐφύην, ἐρρύην.** The aor. is here used with the perfect force, as in ver. 11 **ἐπορεύθησαν**, etc. *cf.* Blass, *Gr.* p. 199, my edition of St. James, p. ccii., and Dr. Weymouth there cited. The verb occurs in Demades 178, **ἄδικος παρεισδύνων λόγος εἰς τὰς τῶν δικαστῶν γνώμας οὐκ ἐᾷ συνορᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν**, Clem. Al. p. 659, **ὅπως εἰς τὴν τῶν αἰνιγμάτων ἔννοιαν ἡ ζήτησις παρεισδύουσα ἐπὶ τὴν εὕρεσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναδράμῃ**, D. Laert. ii. 142, **λαθραίως παρεισδὺς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα**, Plut. *M.* p. 216 B, **τὰ ἀρχαῖα νόμιμα ἐκλυόμενα ἑώρα, ἄλλα δὲ παρεισδυόμενα μοχθηρά**, other examples in Wetst. The noun **παρείσδυσις** occurs in Barn. ii. 10, iv. 9, **ἀντιστῶμεν ἵνα μὴ σχῇ παρείσδυσιν ὁ μέλας**, Clem. Al. p. 189, **ἀκροσφαλὴς ἡ τοῦ οἴνου παρείσδυσις.** Similar compounds are **παρεισφέρω** in 2 Pet. i. 5, **παρεισάγω** in 2 Pet. ii. 1, **παρείσακτος** in Gal. ii. 4, **διὰ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ὑμῶν**, Rom. v. 20, 2 Macc. viii. 1 **παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας**, so **παρεισέρπω, παρεισπέμπω, παρεισπίπτω.** The earliest prophecy of such seducers comes from the lips of Jesus Himself, Matt. vii. 15, **προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες**, *cf.* Acts xx. 29, 30, and Introduction on the Early Heresies in the larger edition.

οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα. "Designated of old for this judgment." *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 3, **οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ.** The word **πάλαι** precludes the supposition that the second epistle of Peter can be referred to.* The allusion is to the book of Enoch quoted in vv. 14, 15. In ver. 18 below the same warning is said to have been given by the Apostles. The phrase **οἱ προγ.** is in apposition to **τινες ἄνθρωποι**, *cf.* Gal. i. 7 with Lightfoot's n., Luke xviii. 9, **εἶπεν δὲ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς.** For **προγ.**, *cf.* Rom. xv. 4, **ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη.** The word is intended to show that they are already doomed to punishment as enemies of God. As such they are to be shunned by the faithful, but not to be feared, because, dangerous as they may seem, they cannot alter the Divine purpose. Dr. Chase compares Hort's interesting note on 1 Peter ii. 8, **εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐτέθησαν.** By "this" Spitta understands "that judgment which I am now about to declare," *i.e.*, the condemnation contained in the word **ἀσεβεῖς** used by some ancient writer. Zahn however remarks that **οὗτος** usually refers to what precedes, and he would take **τοῦτο** here (with Hofmann) as referring to **παρεισεδύησαν.** Better than this logical reference to some preceding or succeeding word is, I think, Bengel's explanation "the now impending judgment," *Apostolo iam quasi cernente pœnam.*

ἀσεβεῖς. This word may be almost said to give the keynote to the Epistle (*cf.* vv. 15, 18) as it does to the Book of Enoch.

τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν. With this we may compare 1 Peter ii. 16, **μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν**, 2 Peter ii. 19, **ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι**, iii. 16, **δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς στρεβλοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν**, Rom. iii. 1, 2, 5-8 (If man is justified by free grace and not by works, then works are unnecessary), *ib.* vi. 1, 15, viii. 21, 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23 f., John viii. 32-36, Gal. v. 13, **ὑμεῖς ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε· μόνον μὴ τὴν**

* Zahn, it is true, following Schott and others, argues in favour of this reference, holding that **πάλαι** may be equivalent to "lately"; and the word is of course very elastic in meaning; but unless the contrast makes it clear that the reference is to a recent past, I think we are bound to assign to the word its usual force, especially here, where it stands first, giving the tone as it were to what follows, and is further confirmed and explained by **ἕβδομος ἀπὸ 'Αδάμ** in ver. 14.

τες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην[1] καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν

[1] δεσποτην] add. θεον KLP, syrr. +.

ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί. For μετατιθέντες see Gal. i. 6, for ἀσέλγειαν 2 Peter ii. 2, πολλοὶ ἐξακολουθήσουσιν αὐτῶν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις, *ib.* ii. 7, 18, 1 Peter iv. 3, and Lightfoot on Gal. v. 19, "A man may be ἀκάθαρτος and hide his sin: he does not become ἀσελγής until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek the word ἀσέλγεια generally signifies insolence or violence towards another. . . . In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality . . . *cf.* Polyb. xxxvii. 2, πολλὴ δέ τις ἀσέλγεια καὶ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῷ συνεξηκολούθει. Thus it has much the same range of meaning as ὕβρις". On the meaning of χάρις see Robinson, *Ephes.* p. 221 f. The form χάριν is used elsewhere in the N.T., except in Acts xxiv. 27.

τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. So 2 Peter ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι. On the denial of God and Christ see 1 John ii. 22, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, Tit. i. 16, Θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι, Matt. x. 33, ὅστις ἂν ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου, *ib.* xxvi. 70 (Peter's denial). Such denial is one of the sins noticed in the book of Enoch, xxxviii. 2: "When the Righteous One shall appear . . . where will be the dwelling of the sinners and where the resting-place of those who have denied the Lord of Spirits?" *Ib.* xli. 2, xlv. 2, xlvi. 7, xlviii. 10: "They will fall and not rise again . . . for they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed".

Two questions have been raised as to the meaning of the text, (1) is τ. μόνον δεσπότην to be understood of the Son, (2) what is the force of ἀρνεῖσθαι? The objection to understanding δεσπότης of our Lord is that in every other passage in the N.T., where δεσπότης occurs, except in 2 Peter ii. 1 (on which see n.), it is spoken of God the Father; that, this being the case, it is difficult to understand how Christ can be called τὸν μόνον δεσπότην. It seems to me a forced explanation to say that the phrase μόνος δεσπότης has reference only to other earthly masters. No Jew could use it in this connexion without thinking of the one Master in heaven. Again μόνος is elsewhere used of the Father only, as in John v. 44, τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε, xvii. 3, ἵνα γινώσκωσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεον Rom. xvi. 27, μόνῳ σόφῳ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Tim. i. 17, τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων . . . μόνῳ Θεῷ τιμὴ κ. δόξα, *ib.* vi. 15, 16, ὁ μακάριος κ. μόνος δυνάστης ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν, and by Jude himself, below 25, μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰ. Χ., τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, δόξα. Wetst. quotes several passages in which Josephus speaks of God as ὁ μόνος δεσπότης. On the other hand, the phrase, so taken, seems to contradict the general rule that, where two nouns, denoting attributes, are joined by καί, if the article is prefixed to the first noun only, the second noun will then be an attribute of the same subject. In the present case, however, the second noun (κύριον) belongs to the class of words which may stand without the article, see Winer, pp. 147-163. A similar doubtful case is found in Tit. ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χ. Ἰ. ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς, where also I should take τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ to refer to the Father. Other examples of the same kind are Eph. v. 5, οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ (where Alf. notes "We cannot safely say here that the same Person is intended by Χ. κ. Θεοῦ merely on account of the omission of the art.; for (1) any introduction of such a prediction regarding Christ would here be manifestly out of place, (2) Θεός is so frequently anarthrous that it is not safe to ground any such inference on its use here)," 2 Thess. i. 12, ὅπως ἐνδοξασθῇ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 1 Tim. v. 21 (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 1), διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων, which Chrysostom explains μάρτυρα καλῶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ; 2 Peter i. 1, ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, where see my n. The denial of the only Master and our Lord Jesus Christ may be implicit, shown by their conduct, though not asserted in

Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. 5. Ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας πάντα,[1] ὅτι[2] Κύριος[3] ἅπαξ λαὸν[4] ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτε-

[1] **υμας παντα** ℵKL 31 syrr. Clem. Theoph. Oecon. +; **υμας απαξ παντα** B; **απαξ παντα** AC² 13 vulg. + Ti. Treg. WH; **απαξ παντας** H. (*Sel. Read.* p. 106).

[2] **ὅτι** ℵAB syr^h; add. **ὁ** C²KL syr^p.

[3] **κυριος** ℵCKL syr^h; **Ιησους** AB +; **θεος** C² syr^p, Clem.

[4] **απαξ λαον** ℵ, 68, tol., syrr., boh. (**οτι απαξ Ιησ. λαον**) sah. arm. Did. Cassiod.; **λαον απαξ** Clem.; **λαον** ABCL, Ti., Treg., WH.

word, as in Tit. i. 16; but it is more naturally taken as explicit, as in 1 John ii. 22, where Westcott notes that a common gnostic theory was that "'the Aeon Christ' descended upon the man Jesus at His baptism and left Him before His passion. Those who held such a doctrine denied . . . the union of the divine and human in one Person . . . and this denial involves the loss of the Father, not only because the ideas of sonship and fatherhood are correlative, but because . . . it is only in the Son that we have the [full] revelation of God as Father." The phrase **τὸν μόνον δεσπότην** might also refer to the heresy attributed to Cerinthus by Hippolytus (*Haer.* vii. 33, x. 21) **οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ τὸν κόσμον γεγονέναι ἠθέλησεν ἀλλ' ὑπὸ δυνάμεώς τινος ἀγγελικῆς**, and Irenæus *Haer.* i. 26. See Introduction on Early Heresies in the large edition.

Vv. 5-13. *Illustrations of Sin and Judgment Derived from History and from Nature.* The judgment impending over these men is borne witness to by well-known facts of the past, and may be illustrated from the phenomena of nature. God showed His mercy in delivering the Israelites from Egypt, but that was no guarantee against their destruction in the wilderness when they again sinned by unbelief. The angels were blessed beyond all other creatures, but when they proved unfaithful to their trust they were imprisoned in darkness, awaiting there the judgment of the great day. The men of Sodom (lived in a land of great fertility, they had received some knowledge of God through the presence and teaching of Lot, they had been lately rescued from captivity by Abraham, yet they) followed the sinful example of the angels, and their land is still a prey to the fire, bearing witness to the eternal punishment of sin. In spite of these warnings the heretics, who are now finding their way into the Church, persist in their wild hallucinations, giving themselves up to the lusts of the flesh, despising authority, and railing at angelic dignities. They might have been taught better by the example of the archangel Michael, of whom we are told that, when disputing with the devil about the body of Moses, he uttered no word of railing, but made his appeal to God. These men however rail at that which is beyond their knowledge, while they surrender themselves like brute beasts to the guidance of their appetites, and thus bring about their own destruction, following in the wake of impious Cain, of covetous Balaam, and rebellious Korah. When they take part in your love-feasts they cause the shipwreck of the weak by their wantonness and irreverence. In greatness of profession and smallness of performance they resemble clouds driven by the wind which give no rain; or trees in autumn on which one looks in vain for fruit, and which are only useful for fuel. By their confident speaking and brazen assurance they seem to carry all before them; yet like the waves bursting on the shore, the deposit they leave is only their own shame. Or we might compare them to meteors which shine for a moment and are then extinguished for ever.

Ver. 5. **ὑπομνῆσαι δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, εἰδότας ὑμᾶς πάντα.*** *Cf.* 2 Pet. i. 12, **διὸ μελλήσω ὑμᾶς ἀεὶ ὑπομιμνήσκειν καίπερ εἰδότας**, *ib.* i. 13, **διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὑπομνήσει**, *ib.* iii. 1, **διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν**, Rom. xv. 14, **πέπεισμαι δὲ ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης τῆς γνώσεως . . . τολμηροτέρως δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ὑμᾶς.** The word **εἰδότας** justifies **ὑπομνῆσαι**: they only need to be reminded of truths already known, so that it is unnecessary to write at length. The repeated **ὑμᾶς** contrasts the readers with the libertines of the former verse. The words in themselves might be taken ironically of persons professing (like the Corinthians) to "know all things," but

* On the readings see Introduction.

ρον [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, 6. ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητή-

the broad distinction maintained throughout the epistle between **ὑμεῖς** and **οὗτοι** (the Libertines) forbids such an interpretation. If we read **ἅπαξ πάντα** with some MSS., it suggests something of anxiety and upbraiding, which may be compared with the tone of St. Paul in writing to the Galatians. See, however, the following note for the position of **ἅπαξ**. Instead of **πάντα** some MSS. have **τοῦτο**. The former finds some support in Enoch i. 2, "I heard everything from the angels," xxv. 2, "I should like to know about everything," *Secrets of En.* xl. 1, 2, "I know all things from the lips of the Lord . . . I know all things and have written all things in the books," lxi. 2 (quoted by Chase in *Dict. of the Bible*). It should probably be understood of all that follows, including the historical allusions, implying that those addressed were familiar not only with the O.T. but with rabbinical traditions: so Estius "omnia de quibus volo vos commonere". Bede's note is "omnia videlicet arcana fidei scientes et non opus habentes recentia quasi sanctiora a novis audire magistris". In what follows he takes **ἅπαξ** with **σώσας**, "ita clamantes ad se de afflictione Aegyptia primo salvavit humiles, ut secundo murmurantes contra se in eremo prosterneret superbos. . . . Meminerimus illum sic per aquas baptismi salvare credentes, ut etiam post baptismum humilem in nobis requirat vitam."

ὅτι Κύριος, ἅπαξ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας, τὸ δεύτερον [τοὺς] μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν.] For text, see Introduction on Readings. Clement in his *Adumbrationes* gives the paraphrase "Quoniam Dominus Deus semel populum de terra Aegypti liberans deinceps eos qui non crediderunt perdidit".

τὸ δεύτερον has given rise to much discussion. According to the reading I have adopted, it contrasts the preceding *saving* with the following *destruction*. The deliverance from Egypt was the creation of a people once for all, but yet it was followed by the destruction of the unbelieving portion of the people, *i.e.* by all but Caleb and Joshua (Num. xiv. 27, 37). So in 1 Cor. x. we have the privileges of Israel allowed, and yet all was in vain because of their unbelief. There seems less force in the connection of **ἅπαξ** with **εἰδότας**: **ἤδη** would have been more suitable. For the opposition to **τὸ δεύτερον**, *cf.* Heb. ix. 28, **ὁ Χριστὸς ἅπαξ προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας ἐκ δευτέρου χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας ὀφθήσεται**, Theoph. *Autol.* ii. 26, **ἵνα τὸ μὲν ἅπαξ ᾖ πεπληρωμένον ὅτε ἐτέθη, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέλλῃ πληροῦσθαι μετὰ τὴν . . . κρίσιν**, Liban. *ap.* Wetst. **ἐμοὶ δὲ ἅπαξ ἀρκεῖ γέλωτα ὀφλεῖν, δεύτερον δὲ οὐκέτι.**

I am inclined to think that the article before **μή** is an intrusion, as it seems to be before **ἐν** in ver. 12. Omitting it, we can take **δεύτερον** with **μὴ πιστεύσαντας**, getting the sense: "In the 1st case of unbelief (in Egypt) * salvation followed; in the 2nd (in the wilderness) destruction," lit. "when they, a second time failed to believe, He destroyed them". If this was the original reading, it is easy to understand the insertion of **τούς** as facilitating the plural construction after **λαόν**. We may compare the solemn utterance in Heb. x. 26, **ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔτι περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία**, and the belief, apparently based upon it, in the early Church as to sin after baptism.

Ver. 6. **ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν . . . εἰς κρίσιν . . . τετήρηκεν.**] *Cf.* Clem. Al. *Adumbr.* "Angelos qui non servaverunt proprium principatum, scilicet quem acceperunt secundum profectum." This of course supplies an even more striking instance of the possibility of falling away from grace, *cf.* Bede, "Qui angelis peccantibus non pepercit, nec hominibus parcet superbientibus, sed et hos quoque cum suum principatum non servaverint, quo per gratiam adoptionis filii Dei effecti sunt, sed reliquerint suum domicilium, id est, Ecclesiae unitatem . . . damnabit". On the Fall of the Angels see Introduction and the parallel passages in 2 Pet. ii. 4, and in Enoch, chapters 6-10.

ἀρχήν.] Used of office and dignity, as in Gen. xl. 21 of the chief butler: here perhaps of the office of Watcher, though Spitta takes it more generally of the sovereignty belonging to their abode in heaven = **τὸν ἄνω κλῆρον** in Clem. Al. 650 P. The term **ἀρχή** is used of the evil angels themselves in Eph. vi. 12. *Cf.* Enoch xii. 4, of the Watchers (angels)

* *Cf.* Exod. ii. 14, iv. 1, v. 21, vi. 9, xiv. 11, 12.

ριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον[1] τετήρηκεν· 7. ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις, τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις[2] ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω

[1] ζοφον] add. αγιων αγγελων speculum, Luc., *cf.* H. (*S. R.* p. 106); αγριων αγγ. Clem. p. 280; add. "in Tartaro constrictos" Orig.

[2] τροπον τουτοις ℵABC; τουτοις τροπον KL.

who have *abandoned the high heaven and the holy eternal place* and defiled themselves with women, *ib.* xv. 3. Philo says of the fallen angels (M. i. p. 268), καλὸν μὴ λιποτακτῆσαι μὲν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ τάξεως, ἐν ᾗ τοὺς τεταγμένους πάντας ἀριστεύειν ἀνάγκη, αὐτομολῆσαι δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἄνανδρον ἡδονήν. So Just. M. *Apol.* ii. 5, οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν with Otto's n.

ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον. *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 2, τὸ οἰκ. τὸ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, and the quotation from Enoch in the last n. [For οἰκητήριον, *cf.* Enoch xv. 7 (the message of Enoch to the Watchers) "the spiritual have their dwelling in heaven" . . . ἡ κατοίκησις αὐτῶν ἔσται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Chase.]

εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφον τετήρηκεν. *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 4 σειροῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας, *ib.* ii. 9, ἀδίκους εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως κολαζομένους τηρεῖν, *ib.* iii. 7, τηρούμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κρίσεως . . . τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων, Joel ii. 31, ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος . . . πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, Apoc. vi. 17, ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, *ib.* xvi. 14, συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος. Enoch x. 5, ἐπικάλυψον αὐτῷ (Azazel) σκότος, καὶ οἰκησάτω ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, x. 12, δῆσον αὐτοὺς . . . μέχρι ἡμέρας κρίσεως αὐτῶν, *ib.* xxii. 11 (Gr. in Charles' *App.* C) μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας τῆς κρίσεως, *ib.* liv. 6, note on xlv. 1. So ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου 1 Cor. i. 8, 2 Pet. iii. 10 *al.*, ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα 2 Th. i. 10. On δεσμοῖς see En. liv. 3-5, "I saw how they made iron chains of immeasurable weight, and I asked for whom they were prepared, and he said unto me 'These are prepared far the hosts of Azazel'." *Cf.* δέσμιοι σκότους (Wisd. xvii. 2) of the plague of darkness.

ἀϊδίοις. The chains are called "everlasting," but they are only used for a temporary purpose, to keep them for the final judgment. It seems to be here synonymous with αἰώνιος in ver. 7. So too in the only other passages in which it occurs in the Bible, Wisdom vii. 26, ἀπαύγασμά ἐστι φωτὸς ἀϊδίου, and Rom. i. 20, ἡ ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης.

Ver. 7. ὡς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὰς πόλεις. The 3rd example of Divine judgment differs from the two others, as it tells only of the punishment, not of the fall from grace. Hence the difference of connexion ἀγγέλους τε. . . . ὡς Σόδομα. *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 6, πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν. The destruction was not limited to these two cities, but extended to all the neighbouring country (Gen. xix. 25, called Πεντάπολις in Wisd. x. 6), including the towns of Admah and Zeboim (Deut. xxix. 23, Hos. xi. 8). Zoar was spared at the request of Lot.

τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι. For the adverbial acc., *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 37, ὃν τρόπον ἐπισυνάγει ὄρνις τὰ νοσσία, 2 Macc. xv. 39, ὃν τρόπον οἶνος . . . ἀποτελεῖ, οὕτω καί, Luc. *Catapl.* 6 τεθνᾶσι τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον. "Like them," *i.e.* the fallen angels. The two judgments are similarly joined in *Test. Nepht.* 3, μὴ γένησθε ὡς Σόδομα, ἥτις ἐνήλλαξε τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῆς. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἐγρήγορες ἐνήλλαξαν τάξιν φύσεως αὐτῶν, οὓς κατηράσατο Κύριος. Others understand τούτοις of the libertines who are subsequently referred to as οὗτοι (vv. 8, 10, 12, 16, 19); but the beginning of ver. 8 (μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι) seems to distinguish between them and the preceding. The verb ἐκπ. occurs in Gen. xxxviii. 24 of Tamar, Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16, (μή ποτε) ἐκπορνεύσωσιν ὀπίσω τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν, Lev. xvii. 7, Hos. iv. 12, Ezek. xvi. 26, 28, 33.

ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἑτέρας. In the case of the angels the forbidden flesh (lit. "other than that appointed by God") refers to the intercourse with women; in the case of Sodom to the departure from the natural use (Rom. i. 27), what Philo calls ἀνόμους καὶ ἐκθέσμους μίξεις (*de Gig.* M i. p. 267), *cf.* Exod. xxx. 9, οὐκ ἀνοίσεις θυμίαμα ἕτερον. For the post-classical phrase *cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 10, τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ πορευομένους, Deut. iv. 3, ἐπορεύθη ὀπίσω Βεελφεγώρ, Jer. ii. 2, 3.

σαρκὸς ἑτέρας, πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι.
8. Ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μιαίνουσιν,

πρόκεινται δεῖγμα πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσαι. *Cf.* Enoch lxvii. 12, "this judgment wherewith the angels are judged is a testimony for the kings and the mighty," 2 Pet. ii. 6, **ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβέσιν τεθεικώς**, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11 **τύποι ἐγένοντο**, Heb. iv. 11 **ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας.** The present aspect of the Lacus Asphaltites was a conspicuous image of the lake of fire and brimstone prepared for Satan and his followers, Apoc. xix. 20, xx. 10, xxi. 8. It is questioned whether **πυρός** is governed by **δεῖγμα** or **δίκην**. If by **δίκην**, then the burning of Sodom is itself spoken of as still going on (eternal), and this is in accordance with Jewish belief as recorded in Wisd. x. 7 (**πῦρ Πενταπόλεως**) **ἧς ἔτι μαρτύριον τῆς πονηρίας καπνιζομένη καθέστηκε χέρσος**, Philo (*De Abr.* M. ii. xxi.), **μέχρι νῦν καίεται. τὸ γὰρ κεραύνιον πῦρ ἥκιστα σβεννύμενον ἢ νέμεται ἢ ἐντύφεται. πίστις δὲ σαφεστάτη τὰ δρώμενα, τοῦ γὰρ συμβεβηκότος πάθους σημεῖόν ἐστιν ὅ τε ἀναδιδόμενος ἀεὶ καπνὸς καὶ ὃ μεταλλεύουσι θεῖον**, *ib. V. Moys.* M. ii. p. 143. Some disallow this sense of **αἰώνιος** and think that it can only be used of hell-fire, as in 4 Macc. xii. 12 (the words of the martyr contrasting the fires of present torture with the eternal flames awaiting the persecutor), **ταμιεύεταί σε ἡ θεία δίκη πυκνοτέρῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ πυρί, καὶ βάσανοι εἰς ὅλον τὸν αἰῶνα οὐκ ἀνήσουσί σε.** For an examination of the word see Jukes, *Restitution of all Things*, p. 67 n. and *cf.* Jer. xxiii. 39, 40, Ezek. xvi. 53, 55 (on the restoration of Sodom), xlvii. 1-12 (a prophecy of the removal of the curse of the Dead Sea and its borders), Enoch. x. 5 and 12, where the **εἰς αἰῶνα** of the former verse is equivalent to seventy generations in the latter, also ver. 10 where **ζωὴ αἰώνιος** is reckoned at 500 years. As the meaning of **δεῖγμα** is made clear by the following participial clause, it seems unnecessary to take it with **πυρός** in the sense of "an example or type of eternal fire," which would escape the difficulty connected with **αἰωνίου**, but leaves **δίκην ὑπέχουσαι** (for which *cf.* Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1, 8, 2, Macc. iv. 48) a somewhat otiose appendage. In the book of Enoch (lxvii. 4 foll.) the angels who sinned are said to be imprisoned in a burning valley (Hinnom, ch. 27) in which there was a great swelling of waters, accompanied by a smell of sulphur; and "that valley of the angels burned continually under the earth". Charles notes on this that "the Gehenna valley here includes the adjacent country down to the Dead Sea. A subterranean fire was believed to exist under the Gehenna valley."

Ver. 8. **ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι.** Notwithstanding these warnings the libertines go on in similar courses.

ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μιαίνουσιν. Compare Acts ii. 17 (a quotation from Joel ii. 28), **οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται**, of those that see visions: and so Spitta (holding that Jude copied from 2 Peter), would render it here, prefixing the article to make it correspond with the **ψευδοπροφῆται** and **ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι** of 2 Peter ii. 1. Those who take the opposite view (*viz.* that 2 Peter was copied from Jude) will see nothing to justify the article. The word is used by Isa. lvi. 10 in connexion with the words **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ εἰδότες** (see ver. 10 below), **ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι κοίτην φιλοῦντες νυστάξαι**, which Delitsch explains "instead of watching and praying to see divine revelations for the benefit of the people, they are lovers of ease, talkers in their sleep.

Bengel explains "Hominum mere naturalium indoles graphice admodum descripta est. Somnians multa videre, audire, etc. sibi videtur." And so Chase, "they live in an unreal world of their own inflated imaginations," comparing the conjectural reading of Col. ii. 18, **ἀέρα κενεμβατεύων.** This accords with ver. 10: in their delusion and their blindness they take the real for the unreal, and the unreal for the real. The verb is used both in the active and middle by Aristotle, *Somm.* i. 1, **πότερον συμβαίνει ἀεὶ τοῖς καθεύδουσιν ἐνυπνιάζειν, ἀλλ' οὐ μνημονεύουσιν**; *Probl.* 30, 14, 2, **οἱ ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι ἱσταμένης τῆς διανοίας, καὶ καθ' ὅσον ἠρεμεῖ, ὀνειρώττουσιν**, *cf.* Artem. *Oneir*, i. 1. Some interpret of polluting dreams (*cf.* Lev. 15); but the word **ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι** is evidently intended to have a larger scope, covering not merely **μιαίνουσιν** but **ἀθετοῦσιν** and **βλασφημοῦσιν**. We must also interpret **μιαίνω** here by the **ἀσέλγειαν** of ver. 4, the **ἐκπορνεύσασαι** and **σαρκὸς ἑτέρας** of ver. 7. This wide sense appears in Tit. i. 15, **τοῖς**

κυριότητα[1] δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. 9. Ὁ δὲ

[1] κυριοτητα]—τητας ℵ Orig.

μεμιασμένοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις.

κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. On first reading one is inclined to take the words κυριότης and δόξαι simply as abstractions. The result of indulgence in degrading lusts is the loss of reverence, the inability to recognise true greatness and due degrees of honour. This would agree with the description of the libertines as sharing in the ἀντιλογία of Korah, as κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης, as γογγυσταί uttering hard speeches against God. When we examine however the use of the word κυριότης and the patristic comments, and when we consider the reference to the archangel's behaviour towards Satan, and the further explanation in ver. 10, where the σάρκα of ver. 8 is represented by ὅσα φυσικῶς ἐπίστανται, and the phrase κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν by ὅσα οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, we seem to require a more pointed and definite meaning, not simply "majesty," but "the divine majesty," not simply "dignities," but "the angelic orders". *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 10, Eph. i. 21 (having raised him from the dead and set him on his right hand) ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος, Col. i. 16, ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι, where Lightfoot considers that the words are intended to be taken in their widest sense, including bad and good angels, as well as earthly dignities. In our text, however, it would seem that the word should be understood as expressing the attribute of the true κύριος, *cf. Didache*, iv. 1 (honour him who speaks the word of God), ὡς κύριον, ὅθεν γὰρ ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ κύριός ἐστιν, Herm. *Sim*, v. 6, 1, εἰς δοῦλον τρόπον οὐ κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα. The verb ἀθετέω has God or Christ for its object in Luke x. 16, John xii. 48, 1 Thess. iv. 8, etc. We have then to consider how it can be said that the libertines (οὗτοι) "despise authority" in like manner to the above-mentioned offenders. For the former we may refer to ver. 4, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἀρνούμενοι, for the latter to the contempt shown by the Israelites towards the commandments of God. So the desertion of their appointed station and abode by the angels showed their disregard for the divine ordinance, and the behaviour of the men of Sodom combined with the vilest lusts an impious irreverence towards God's representatives, the angels (Gen. xix. 5). *Cf.* Joseph. *Ant.* i. 11. 2, εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἦσαν ὑβρισταὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβεῖς, and *Test. Aser.* 7, where the sin of Sodom is expressly stated to have been their behaviour towards the angels, μὴ γίνεσθε ὡς Σόδομα ἥτις ἠγνόησε τοὺς ἀγγέλους Κυρίου καὶ ἀπώλετο ἕως αἰῶνος.

δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν. *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 10, τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες. The only other passage in the N.T. in which the plural occurs is 1 Peter i. 11, where the sense is different. Dr. Bigg compares Exod. xv. 11, τίς ὅμοιός σοι ἐν θεοῖς, Κύριε; τίς ὅμοιός σοι; δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις, θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις. Clement's interpretation of this and the preceding clause is as follows: (*Adumbr.* 1008) "dominationem spernunt, hoc est solum dominum qui vere dominus noster est, Jesus Christus . . . majestatem blasphemant, hoc est angelos". The word δόξα in the singular is used for the Shekinah, see my note on James ii. 1. This suggests that Clement may be right in supposing the plural to be used for the angels, who are, as it were, separate rays of that glory. Compare Philo's use of the name λόγοι for the angels as contrasted with the divine Λόγος. In Philo, *Monarch.* ii. p. 18 the divine δόξα, is said to consist of the host of angels, δόξαν δὲ σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τάς σε δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις. See *Test. Jud.* 25, Κύριος εὐλόγησε τὸν Λευί, ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ προσώπου ἐμέ, αἱ δυνάμεις τῆς δοξης τὸν Συμεών, also Luke ix. 26, where it is said that "the Son of Man will come in His own glory and in the glory of the Father and of the holy angels".* Ewald, *Hist. Isr.* tr. vol. viii. p. 142, explains ἡ κυριότης of the true Deity, whom they practically deny

* There is much said of the glory of the angels in *Asc. Isaiae*, pp. 47, 49 f. ed. Charles.

Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος, ὅτε[1] τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος διελέγετο περὶ τοῦ Μωυσέως σώματος, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασ-

[1] ο δε Μιχαηλ . . . οτε ACKL, ℵ; οτε Μιχ. . . . τοτε B.

by their dual God; **αἱ δόξαι** as the angels, whom they blaspheme by supposing that they had created the world in opposition to the will of the true God, whereas Michael himself submitted everything to Him. This last clause would then be an appendage to the preceding, with special reference to the case of the Sodomites (*cf.* John xiii. 20). There may also be some allusion to the teaching or practice of the libertines. If we compare the mysterious reference in 1 Cor. xi. 10, **διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους**, which is explained by Tertullian (*De Virg. Vel.* 7) as spoken of the fallen angels mentioned by Jude, "propter angelos, scilicet quos legimus a Deo et caelo excidisse ob concupiscentiam feminarum," we might suppose the **βλασφημία**, of which the libertines were guilty, to consist in a denial or non-recognition of the presence of good angels in their worship, or of the possibility of their own becoming **κοινωνοὶ δαιμονίων**; or they may have scoffed at the warnings against the assaults of the devil, or even at the very idea of "spiritual wickedness in high places". So understood, it prepares us for the strange story of the next verse.

Ver. 9. **ὁ δὲ Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος.** The term **ἀρχ.** occurs in the N.T. only here and in 1 Thess. iv. 16. The names of seven archangels are given in Enoch. The story here narrated is taken from the apocryphal *Assumptio Mosis*, as we learn from Clem. *Adumbr. in Ep. Judae*, and Orig. *De Princ.* iii. 2, 1. Didymus (*In Epist. Judae Enarratio*) says that some doubted the canonicity of the Epistle because of this quotation from an apocryphal book. In Cramer's *Catena* on this passage (p. 163) we read **τελευτήσαντος ἐν τῷ ὄρει Μωυσέως, ὁ Μιχαὴλ ἀποστέλλεται μεταθήσων τὸ σῶμα, εἶτα τοῦ διαβόλου κατὰ τοῦ Μωυσέως βλασφημοῦντος καὶ φονέα ἀναγορεύοντος διὰ τὸ πατάξαι τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ βλασφημίαν ὁ ἄγγελος, Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι ὁ Θεὸς, πρὸς τὸν διάβολον ἔφη.** Charles in his edition of the *Assumption* thus summarises the fragments dealing with the funeral of Moses: (1) Michael is commissioned to bury Moses, (2) Satan opposes his burial on two grounds: (*a*) he claims to be the lord of matter (hence the body should be handed over to him). To this claim Michael rejoins, "The Lord rebuke thee, for it was God's spirit which created the world and all mankind". (*b*) He brings the charge of murder against Moses (the answer to this is wanting). The story is based upon Deut. xxxiv. 6 (R.V.), "he buried him (*mg.* he was buried) in the valley . . . but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day". Compare the vain search for Elijah (2 Kings ii. 16, 17). Further details in Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8, 48), **νέφους αἰφνίδιον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ στάντος ἀφανίζεται κατά τινος φάραγγος. γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις τεθνεῶτα, δείσας μὴ δι' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι τολμήσωσιν εἰπεῖν**, Philo i. p. 165, and Clem. Al. (*Str.* vi. § 132, p. 807) where it is said that Caleb and Joshua witnessed the assumption of Moses to heaven, while his body was buried in the clefts of the mountain. See comment in the larger edition, pp. 74-76.

διακρινόμενος. Here used in the sense of "disputing," as in Jer. xv. 10, **ἄνδρα διακρινόμενον πάσῃ τῇ γῇ**, Joel iii. 2, Acts xi. 2. See my note on James i. 6 and below ver. 22.

διελέγετο. *Cf.* Mark ix. 34, **πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελέχθησαν, τίς μείζων.**

οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενεγκεῖν βλασφημίας. I take **βλασφημίας** to be *gen. qualitatis*, expressed by the adjective **βλάσφημον** in 2 Peter: see below on ver. 18, James i. 25, **ἀκροατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς**, ii. 4 **κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν**, iii. 6, **ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας**, also 2 Peter ii. 1, **αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας**, ii. 10, **ἐπιθυμίᾳ μιασμοῦ**. For **ἐπενεγκεῖν** see Plat. *Legg.* ix. 856 **προδόσεως αἰτίαν ἐπιφέρων**, *ib.* 943, **τιμωρίαν ἐπιφ.** The word occurs elsewhere in N.T. only in Rom. iii. 5. Field (*On Translation of N.T.* p. 244) compares Acts xxv. 18 **οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν**, Diod. xvi. 29, **δίκην ἐπήνεγκαν κατὰ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν**, *ib.* xx. 10, **κρίσεις ἀδίκους ἐπιφέροντες**, xx. 62, **φοβηθεὶς τὰς ἐπιφερομένας κρίσεις**, tom. x. p. 171 ed. Bip. **ἐπήνεγκαν κρίσιν περὶ ὕβρεως**, and

φημίας, ἀλλὰ εἶπεν Ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος.[1] 10. Οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται, ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. 11. οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ

[1] κυριος] ὁ θεος ℵ.

translates "durst not bring against him an accusation of blasphemy"; but surely that is just what he does in appealing to God. Besides such a statement would be altogether beside the point. The verse is introduced to show the guilt attached to speaking evil of dignities, *i.e.* of angels. If Michael abstained from speaking evil even of a fallen angel, this is appropriate; not so, if he simply abstained from charging the devil with speaking evil of Moses.

κρίσις, like **κρίνω**, has the two meanings of judgment and of accusation, *cf.* Lycurg. 31 where **οἱ συκοφαντοῦντες** are distinguished from **τῶν δικαίως τὰς κρίσεις ἐνισταμένων**.

ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος. These words occur in the vision of Zechariah (iii. 1-10) where the angel of the Lord replies to the charges of Satan against the high priest Joshua with the words **ἐπιτιμήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοί, διάβολε, καὶ ἐπιτιμήσαι Κύριος ἐν σοί, ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ**. They were no doubt inserted as appropriate by the author of the *Ass. Mos.* in his account of the controversy at the grave of Moses. We may compare Matt. xvii. 18, **ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς**.

Ver. 10. **οὗτοι δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἴδασιν βλασφημοῦσιν**. The libertines do the contrary of what we are told of the respect shown by the angel even towards Satan: they speak evil of that spiritual world, those spiritual beings, of which they know nothing, *cf.* 2 Peter ii. 12. The common verb **βλασφ.** shows that the **δόξαι** of ver. 8 are identical with **ὅσα οὐκ οἴδασιν** here. For the blindness of the carnal mind to all higher wisdom *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 7-16, a passage linked with our epistle by the distinction between the **ψυχικοί** and **πνευματικοί** and by the words **λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν, ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἔγνωκεν· εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν**. See too John viii. 19, 1 Tim. vi. 4, **τετύφωται μηδὲν ἐπιστάμενος**. For the form **οἴδασιν** see my ed. of St. James, p. clxxxiii.

ὅσα δὲ φυσικῶς ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα ἐπίστανται. This stands for **σάρκα** in ver. 8 and is explained by **ἀσέλγειαν** in ver. 4, **ἐκπορνεύσασαι** in ver. 7, **μιαίνουσιν** in ver. 8, **κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι** in ver. 16.

φυσικῶς, "by instinct," so Dion. L. x. 137, **φυσικῶς καὶ χωρὶς λόγου**. Alford cites Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 3, 9, **μάχην ὁρῶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους φύσει ἐπισταμένους, ὥσπερ γε καὶ τἄλλα ζῷα ἐπίσταταί τινα μάχην ἕκαστα οὐδὲ παρ' ἑνὸς ἄλλου μαθόντα ἢ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως**.

ἐν τούτοις φθείρονται. The natural antithesis here would have been "these things they admire and delight in". For this Jude substitutes by a stern irony "these things are their ruin". *Cf.* Phil. iii. 19, where speaking of the enemies of the Cross the apostle says: **ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν**, Eph. iv. 22, **ἀποθέσθαι . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας**.

Ver. 11. **οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν**. For the use of the aorist see note on ver. 4, **παρεισεδύησαν**: for the phrase *cf.* Blass, *Gr.* p. 119, and 2 Peter ii. 15, **ἐξακολουθήσαντες τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Βαλαάμ**. The phrase **οὐαί**, so common in Enoch, especially in cc. 94 to 100, and in the Gospels and Apocalypse, occurs in the epistles only here and in 1 Cor. ix. 16. The woe is grounded on the fate which awaits those who walk in the steps of Cain, Balaam and Korah. In 2 Peter Balaam is the only one referred to of the three leaders of wickedness here named by Jude. Cain, with Philo, is the type of selfishness (M. 1 p. 206), **πᾶς φίλαυτος ἐπίκλησιν Καὶν εὕρηκεν** (quoted by Schneckenb. p. 221); he is named as a type of jealous hate in 1 John iii. 11, 12, **ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. οὐ καθὼς Καὶν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν καὶ ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια**, of unbelief in Heb. xi. 4, **πίστει πλείονα θυσίαν Ἄβελ παρὰ Καὶν προσήνεγκεν τῷ Θεῷ**, *cf.* Philo, *De Agric.* 1 M. 300 f., and Targ. Jer. on Gen. iv. 7, cited by Schneckenburger, in which Cain is represented as saying "non est judicium, nec judex, nec est aliud saeculum, nec dabitur merces bona justis, nec ultio sumetur de improbis." etc. There seems no reason why we should not regard Cain here as symbolising the absence both of faith

τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν, καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν,

and of love, *cf.* 1 John iii. 23. Euthym. Zig. gives an allegorical explanation, **καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοκτόνοι εἰσί, δι' ὧν διδάσκουσι τὰς τῶν ἀπατωμένων ψυχὰς ἀποκτείνοντες.** Cain and Korah are said to have been objects of special reverence with a section of the Ophite heresy, which appears to have been a development of the Nicolaitans (Epiphan. *Pan.* i. 3, 37, 1, **οἱ Ὀφῖται τὰς προφάσεις εἰλήφασιν ἀπὸ τῆς Νικολάου καὶ Γνωστικῶν καὶ τῶν πρὸ τούτων αἱρέσεων**). They held that the Creator was evil, that the serpent represented the divine Wisdom, that Cain and his successors were champions of right (Epiphan. *ib.* 38, 1, **οἱ Καιανοί φασι τὸν Καὶν ἐκ τῆς ἰσχυροτέρας Δυνάμεως ὑπάρχειν καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν αὐθεντίας,** and boast themselves to be of kin to Cain, **καὶ τῶν Σοδομιτῶν καὶ Ἠσαῦ καὶ Κορέ,** see too Iren. i. 51, Clem. *Str.* vii. § 108.)

τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν. Every word in this clause is open to question. The passive of **ἐκχέω**, to "pour out," is used to express either the onward sweeping movement of a great crowd, or the surrender to an overpowering motive on the part of an individual = *effusi sunt,** as in Sir. xxxvii. 29, **μὴ ἐκχυθῇς ἐπ' ἐδεσμάτων,** *Test. Reub.* 1, **πορνείᾳ ἐν ᾗ ἐξεχύθην,** Clem. Al. *Str.* ii. p. 491, **εἰς ἡδονήν, τράγων δικήν, ἐκχυθέντες καθηδυπαθοῦσιν,** Plut. *V. Ant.* 21, **εἰς τὸν ἡδυπαθῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον βίον ἐκκεχυμένος.** Such an interpretation seems not quite consistent with **μισθοῦ,** which implies cool self-interest. That covetousness, **αἰσχροκέρδεια,** was a common motive with false teachers is often implied or asserted by St. Paul and St. Peter in the passages quoted below: and this, we know, was the case with Balaam; but would it be correct to say either of him or of his followers, here condemned by St. Jude, that they ran greedily into (or "in") error for reward? Perhaps we should understand it rather of a headstrong will breaking down all obstacles, refusing to listen to reason or expostulation, as Balaam holds to his purpose in spite of the divine opposition manifested in such diverse ways. Then comes the difficulty, how are we to understand the dative **πλάνῃ**, and what is the reference in the word? Should we take **πλάνῃ** as equivalent to **εἰς πλάνην** (Winer, p. 268)? This is the interpretation given by Lucifer p. 219, "vae illis quoniam in seductionem B. mercede effusi sunt," but it is a rare use of the dative, and it seems more natural to explain **πλάνῃ** by the preceding **ὁδῷ** (dative of the means or manner), which is used in the same collocation in 2 Peter ii. 15. What then are we to understand by "they were hurried along on the line of Balaam's error"? What was his error? From Num. xxii., xxv. 1-3, and xxxi. 16, Neh. xiii. 2, **Μωαβῖται ἐμισθώσαντο ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν Βαλαὰμ καταράσασθαι,** Jos. *Ant.* iv. 6, 6, we learn that B. was induced by Balak's bribe to act against his own convictions and eventually to tempt Israel to fornication. This then is the error or seduction by which he leads them astray.† In rabbinical literature Balaam is a sort of type of false teachers (Pirke Aboth, v. 29, with Taylor's n.). Some suppose the name Nicolaitan (Apoc. ii. 6) to be formed from the Greek equivalent to Balaam = "corrupter of the people"; see however the passages quoted from Clem. Al. in the Introduction on Early Heresies. In Apoc. ii. 14 we read of some in Pergamum that held the teaching of Balaam, **ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι.** There is no hint to suggest that the innovators, of whom Jude speaks, favoured idolatry, but they may have prided themselves on their enlightenment in disregarding the rule of the Apostolic Council as to the use of meats offered to idols (*cf.* 1 Cor. 8), and perhaps in burning incense in honour of the Emperor, see Ramsay, *Expositor* for 1904, p. 409, and July, pp. 43-60. On the other hand, Jude continually charges them with moral laxity, and we may suppose that this was combined with claims to prophetic power, and with the covetousness which is often ascribed to the false teachers of the early Church, as in 1 Thess. ii. 3 f., where

* I do not think the marginal reading in the R.V., "cast themselves away," is tenable.

† Zahn understands **πλάνη** in an active, not a passive sense, as the ruling principle of the **πλάνος** Balaam, not as the error into which others fell through his seductions. I do not think Jude discriminated between these meanings: **πλάνη** covers both.

καὶ τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. 12. οὗτοί εἰσιν[1] [οἱ]

[1] ουτοι εισιν] add. (ex. v. 16) γογγυσται—πορευομενοι ℵ C².

Paul asserts of his own ministry that it was οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ . . . οὔτε γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ κολακείας ἐγενήθημεν, οὔτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας, οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9, διακόνους μὴ διλόγους, μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ προσέχοντας, μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς, ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει, Tit. i. 7, 11 διδάσκοντες ἃ μὴ δεῖ κέρδους χάριν, 1 Peter v. 2. For the gen. μισθοῦ *cf.* Winer, p. 258, Plat. *Rep.* ix. 575 B, μισθοῦ ἐπικουροῦσιν, 1 Cor. vii. 23, τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε.

On the whole I understand the passage thus: Balaam went wrong because he allowed himself to hanker after gain and so lost his communion with God. He not only went wrong himself, but he abused his great influence and his reputation as a prophet, to lead astray the Israelites by drawing them away from the holy worship of Jehovah to the impure worship of Baal Peor. So these false teachers use their prophetical gifts for purposes of self-aggrandisement, and endeavour to make their services attractive by excluding from religion all that is strenuous and difficult, and opening the door to every kind of indulgence. See the notes and comments on the parallel passages of 2 Peter in my edition of that Epistle.

τῇ ἀντιλογίᾳ τοῦ Κορὲ ἀπώλοντο. For Korah's sin see Num. xvi. 1 f. and compare, for the same rebellious spirit in the Christian Church, 3 John, 9, 10 (of Diotrephes), Tit. i. 10, 11. εἰσὶ πολλοὶ ἀνυπότακτοι . . . οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν, *ib.* i. 16; *ib.* iii. 10, 11, 1 Tim. i. 20 (among those who have made shipwreck of the faith mention is made of Hymenaeus and Alexander) οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν, *ib.* vi. 3-6, 2 Tim. ii. 16-18, ὁ λόγος αὐτῶν ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει, ὧν ἐστιν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Φίλητος, οἵτινες περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἠστόχησαν, *ib.* ii. 25, iv. 14, where the opposition of Alexander the coppersmith is noted; but especially iii. 1-9, which presents a close parallel to our passage, referring to a similar resistance to Moses in the case of the apocryphal Jannes and Jambres. For ἀντιλογία see Heb. xii. 3, ἀναλογίσασθε τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιλογίαν. It is used as a translation of Meribah in Num. xx. 13 *al.* and (in relation to Korah) in *Protev. Jac.* 9, μνήσθητι ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς Δαθάν, Κωρέ, καὶ Ἀβειράμ, πῶς ἐδιχάσθη ἡ γῆ καὶ κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τὴν ἀντιλογίαν αὐτῶν.

Rampf draws attention to the climax contained in these examples. The sin of Cain is marked by the words ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδῷ, that of Balaam the gentile prophet by ἐξεχύθησαν πλάνῃ, that of the Levite Korah by ἀπώλοντο ἀντιλογίᾳ.

Ver. 12. οὗτοί εἰσιν [οἱ] ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι. Dr. Chase quotes Zech. i. 10 f., Apoc. vii. 14, Enoch xlvi. 3, *Secrets of Enoch*, vii. 3 xviii. 3, xix. 3, etc., for the phrase οὗτοί εἰσιν, adding that it was probably adopted by St. Jude from apocalyptic writings, for which he clearly had a special liking. On the early history of the Agape, see my Appendix C to Clem. Al. *Strom.* vii. The parallel passage in 2 Peter (on which see n.) has two remarkable divergencies from the text here, reading ἀπάταις for ἀγάπαις and σπῖλοι for σπιλάδες. There has been much discussion as to the meaning of the latter word. It is agreed that it is generally used of a rock in or by the sea, and many of the lexicographers understand it of a hidden rock, ὕφαλος πέτρα, see Thomas Mag., σπιλάς, Ἀττικῶς· ὕφαλος πέτρα, Ἕλληνες, Etymol. M., σπιλάδες . . . αἱ ὑπὸ θάλασσαν κεκρυμμέναι πέτραι, ὅθεν καὶ ὕφαλος ἄνθρωπος λέγεται ὁ κεκρυμμένος καὶ πανοῦργος, *ib.* κατασπιλάζοντες, κατακρύπτοντες, ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑφάλων πετρῶν, αἵτινες ὑπὸ ὕδατος καλυπτόμεναι τοῖς ἀπρούπτως προσπελάζουσι κίνδυνον ἐπιφέρουσι (both cited by Wetst.). The same explanation is given by the scholiast on Hom. *Od.* v. 401-405, καὶ δὴ δοῦπον ἄκουσε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσι θαλάσσης . . . ἀλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλῆτες ἔσαν σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε. See Plut. *Mor.* 101 B, εὐδία σπιλάδος, which Wytt. translates "tranquillitas maris caecam rupem tegentis," *ib.* 476 A, Oecumenius on this passage, αἱ σπιλάδες τοῖς πλέουσιν ὀλέθριοι, ἀπροσδοκήτως ἐπιγενόμεναι (? -νοις). and ἐξαίφνης, ὥσπερ σπιλάδες, ἐπάγοντες αὐτοῖς τὸν ὄλεθρον τῶν ψυχῶν. Wetst. also quotes Heliod. v. 31, θαλάσσῃ προσεικάσας ἂν τοὺς ἄνδρας αἰφνιδίῳ σπιλάδι κατασεισθέντας. The compound κατασπιλάζω joined with the parallel case

ἐν ταῖς[1] ἀγάπαις[2] ὑμῶν[3] σπιλάδες, συνευωχούμενοι ἀφόβως,[4]

[1] οι εν ταις] om. οι ℵ K vulg. Luc. Theophl. Oecon. +, Chase.

[2] αγαπαις ℵ BKL syrr. sah. boh. + ; απαταις AC.

[3] υμων] αυτων A vulg. syr^p +.

[4] συνευωχουμενοι, αφοβως syrr., Treg., WH; συνευωχ. αφοβως, Ti.

of ὕφαλος justifies, I think, this sense of σπιλάς, which is rejected by most of the later commentators.* *Cf.* also the use of ναυαγέω in 1 Tim. i. 19. *Scopulus* is used in a similar metaphoric sense, see Cic. *in Pis.* 41 where Piso and Gabinius are called "geminae voragines scopulique reipublicae". Others take σπιλάδες in the very rare sense of "spots," or "stains," like σπίλοι in 2 Peter. The only example of this sense seems to be in Orph. *Lith.* 614, but Hesych. gives the interpretation σπιλάς, μεμιασμένοι. I agree with Bp. Wordsworth and Dr. Chase in thinking that the metaphor of the sunken rocks is more in harmony with the context.

How are we to account for the gender in οἱ . . . σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι? Are we to suppose the gender of σπιλάς was changed or forgotten in late Greek (*cf.* Winer, pp. 25, 38, 73, 76)? If so, the forgetfulness seems to have been confined to this author. Or is this a *constructio ad sensum*, the feminine being changed to masculine because it is metaphorically used of men (Winer, pp. 171, 648, 660, 672), *cf.* Apoc. xi. 4, οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου ἑστῶτες and B's reading παραφερόμενοι below? Or may we take σπιλάδες as expressing a complementary notion in apposition to συνευωχούμενοι? The last seems the best explanation though I cannot recall any exact parallel. An easier remedy would be to omit the article (with K and many versions), as suggested by Dr. Chase in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, ii. p. 799*b*, translating: "these are sunken rocks in your love-feasts while they feast with you".

συνευωχούμενοι. Is used in the parallel passage of 2 Peter with a dat. as in Luc. *Philops* 4, Jos. *Ant.* iv. 8, 7.

ἀφόβως ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες. If we take σπιλάδες as complementary to συνευωχούμενοι, it is better to take ἀφόβως with ποιμ.: if we omit the article and take σπιλάδες to be the predicate, συνευωχούμενοι will be an epexegetic participle, which will require strengthening by ἀφόβως. Generally ἀφ. is used in a good sense, but we find it used, as here, of the want of a right fear in Prov. xix. 23, φόβος Κυρίου εἰς ζωὴν ἀνδρί, ὁ δὲ ἄφοβος κ.τ.λ., *ib.* xv. 16, κρεῖσσον μικρὰ μερὶς μετὰ φόβου Κυρίου ἢ θησαυροὶ μεγάλοι μετὰ ἀφοβίας, Sir. v. 5, περὶ ἐξιλασμοῦ μὴ ἄφοβος γίνου, προσθεῖναι ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις. The phrase ἑαυτοὺς ποιμ. recalls Ezek. xxxiv. 8, ἐβόσκησαν οἱ ποιμένες ἑαυτούς, τὰ δὲ πρόβατά μου οὐκ ἐβόσκησαν, but there does not seem to be any reference to spiritual pastors in Jude; and ποιμαίνω has probably here the sense "to fatten, indulge," as in Prov. xxviii. 7, ὃς δὲ ποιμαίνει ἀσωτίαν, ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, *ib.* xxix. 3, ὃς δὲ ποιμαίνει πόρνας, ἀπολεῖ πλοῦτον, Plut. *Mor.* 792 B, Ἄτταλον ὑπ' ἀργίας μακρᾶς ἐκλυθέντα κομιδῇ Φιλοποίμην ἐποίμαινεν ἀτεχνῶς πιαινόμενον. We may compare 1 Cor. xi. 27 f., James v. 5, 1 Tim. v. 6.

νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι. The character of the innovators is illustrated by figures drawn from the four elements, air, earth, sea, heaven (αἰθήρ). Spitta points out the resemblance to a passage in Enoch (chapters ii.-v.), which follows immediately on the words quoted below, vv. 14, 15. The regular order of nature is there contrasted with the disorder and lawlessness of sinners. "I observed everything that took place in the heaven, how the luminaries . . . do not deviate from their orbits, how they all

* Dr. Bigg denies this meaning on the strength mainly of two quotations, Hom. *Od.* iii. 298, ἀτὰρ νῆάς γε ποτὶ σπιλάδεσσιν ἔαξαν κύματα, where, he says, the σπιλάδες are identical with λισσὴ αἰπειά τε εἰς ἅλα πέτρη of 293; and Anthol. xi. 390, φασὶ δὲ καὶ νήεσσιν ἁλιπλανέεσσι χερείους τὰς ὑφάλους πέτρας τῶν φανερῶν σπιλάδων. In both of these I think the word refers to the breakers at the bottom of the cliffs: in the latter it is said that hidden rocks are more dangerous than visible reefs. Compare Diod. iii. 43, ὄρος δὲ ταύτῃ παράκειται κατὰ μὲν τὴν κορυφὴν πέτρας ἀποτομάδας ἔχον καὶ τοῖς ὕψεσι καταπληκτικάς, ὑπὸ δὲ τὰς ῥίζας σπιλάδας ὀξείας καὶ πυκνὰς ἐνθαλάττους.

ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες, νεφέλαι ἄνυδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων παραφερόμεναι,[1]

[1] παραφερομενοι B.

rise and set in order, each in its season, and transgress not against their appointed order. . . . I observed and saw how in winter all the trees seem as though they were withered and shed all their leaves. . . . And again I observed the days of summer . . . how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit. . . . And behold how the seas and the rivers accomplish their task. But as for you, ye have not continued steadfast; and the law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled . . . and have slanderously spoken proud and hard words (below ver. 15, περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ) with your impure mouths against his greatness." For the metaphor *cf.* Eph. iv. 14. In the parallel passage of 2 Peter the first figure is broken into two, πηγαὶ ἄνυδροι, ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλαυνόμεναι. Perhaps the writer may have thought that there was an undue multiplication of causes; if the clouds were waterless, it was needless to add that they were driven past by the wind. We find the same comparison in Prov. xxv. 14: "As clouds and wind without rain, so is he that boasteth himself of his gifts falsely". [The LXX is less like our text, suggesting that Jude was acquainted with the original Hebrew. C.] For the use of ὑπό with ἀνέμων see my note on James iii. 4.

δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα. φθινοπωρινός is an adjective derived from τὸ φθινόπωρον, which is itself, I think, best explained as a compound of φθίνουσα ὀπώρα (*cf.* φθίνοντος μηνός), meaning the concluding portion of the ὀπώρα. This latter word is, according to Curtius, compounded of ὀπ-, connected with ὀπίσω, ὄπισθεν, and ὥρα = "the later prime". We find ὥρα used by itself both for the spring with its flowers and, more rarely, for the summer with its fruits, as in Thuc. ii. 52, ὥρα ἔτους. Perhaps from this double use of the word may have come the ambiguity in the application of ὀπώρα, of which Ideler says that "it originally indicated, not a season separate from and following after the summer, but the hottest part of the summer itself, so that Sirius, whose heliacal rising took place (in the age of Homer) about the middle of July, is described as ἀστὴρ ὀπωρινός *Il.* v. 5). In early times it would seem that the Greeks, like the Germans (Tac. *Germ.* 26), recognised only three seasons—winter, spring, summer, and that the last was indifferently named θέρος or ὀπώρα: compare Arist. *Aves* 709, πρῶτα μὲν ὥρας φαίνομεν ἡμεῖς ἦρος, χειμῶνος, ὀπώρας, with Aesch. *Prom.* 453, ἦν δ' οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς οὔτε χείματος τέκμαρ οὔτ' ἀνθεμώδους ἦρος οὔτε καρπίμου θέρους βέβαιον. But though ὀπώρα was thus used strictly for the dog-days, when the fruit ripened, it was also vaguely used for the unnamed period which ensued up to the commencement of winter. Thus Hesiod (*Op.* 674) μηδὲ μένειν οἶνόν τε νέον καὶ ὀπωρινὸν ὄμβρον καὶ χειμῶν' ἐπιόντα: and ὀπώρα appears as a definite season by the side of the others in a line of Euripides, qnoted by Plutarch (*Mor.* 1028 F), from which it appears that he assigned four months each to summer and winter, and two to spring and ὀπώρα:—

φίλης τ' ὀπώρας διπτύχους ἦρος τ' ἴσους

(where the epithet φίλης deserves notice). It is said that the author of the treatise *De Diaeta* (c. 420 B.C.), which goes under the name of Hippocrates, was the first to introduce a definite term (φθινόπωρον or μετόπωρον) for the new season, the word ὀπώρα being reserved for the late summer, according to the definition of Eustath. on *Il.* v. 5, ὀπώρα ὥρα μεταξὺ κειμένη θέρους καὶ τοῦ μετ' αὐτὴν μετοπώρου. And so we find it used by Aristotle (*Meteor.* ii. 5), αἱ χάλαζαι γίνονται ἔαρος μὲν καὶ μετοπώρου μάλιστα, εἶτα καὶ τῆς ὀπώρας, χειμῶνος δὲ ὀλιγάκις, and by Theophrastus (περὶ Σημείων, 44), ἐὰν τὸ ἔαρ καὶ τὸ θέρος ψυχρὰ γίνηται, ἡ ὀπώρα γίνεται καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον πνιγηρόν.

There is a good deal of inconsistency about the exact limits of the seasons, as is natural enough when we remember that they were first distinguished for purposes of agriculture and navigation, as we see in Hesiod's *Works and Days.* Each season brings its own proper work, and the farmer or merchant is reminded of the return of the season by various signs, the rising and setting of stars, especially of the Pleiades and Arcturus, the sun's passage through the signs of

δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθέντα, 13. κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας, ἀστέρες

the zodiac, the reappearance of the birds, etc. A more strictly accurate division was made by the astronomers, who distinguished between the various kinds of rising and setting of the stars, and divided the year into four equal parts by the solstices and equinoxes. In the year 46 B.C. Julius Caesar introduced his revised calendar, which assigned definite dates to the different seasons. Thus spring begins *a.d. vii. id. Feb.* (Feb. 7), summer *a.d. vii. id. Mai.* (May 9), autumn *a.d. iii. id. Sext.* (Aug. 11), winter *a.d. iv. id. Nov.* (Nov. 10).

To turn now to the commentators, I may take Trench as representing their view in his *Authorised Version*, p. 186, ed. 2, where he says, "The **φθινόπωρον** is the late autumn . . . which succeeds the **ὀπώρα** (or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth) and which has its name **παρὰ τὸ φθίνεσθαι τὴν ὀπώραν**, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits. . . . The deceivers of whom St. Jude speaks are likened to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone."

I have stated above what I hold to be the origin of the word **φθινόπωρον**. Trench's explanation is ambiguous and unsuited to the facts of the case, as will be seen from the criticisms in Lightfoot's *Fresh Revision*, p. 135: "In the phrase 'autumn-trees without fruit' there appears to be a reference to the parable of the fig-tree. . . . At all events the mention of the season when fruit might be expected is significant." He adds in a note, "Strange to say, the earliest versions all rendered **φθινοπωρινά** correctly.* Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I cannot but think the right turn to the expression, 'Trees with out frute at gadringe (gathering) time,' *i.e.* at the season when fruit was looked for. I cannot agree with Archbishop Trench, who maintains that 'Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation,' and himself explains **φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα** as 'mutually completing one another, *without leaves, without fruit*'. Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wycliffe has 'hervest trees without fruyt,' and the Rheims version 'trees of autumne unfruiteful'. The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives 'corrupt trees and without frute'. . . . The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, 'trees withered (**φθίνειν**) at fruite gathering (**ὀπώρα**) and without fruite,' which is explained in the margin, 'Trees withered in autumne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth'."

The correctness of the interpretation, given by Lightfoot alone among modern commentators, is confirmed by a consideration of the context. The writer has just been comparing the innovators, who have crept into other Churches, to waterless clouds driven past by the wind. Just as these disappoint the hope of the husbandman, so do fruitless trees in the proper season of fruit. If **φθινοπωρινά** were equivalent to **χειμερινά**, denoting the season when the trees are necessarily bare both of leaves and fruit, how could a tree be blamed for being **ἄκαρπον**? It is because it might have been, and ought to have been a fruit-bearing tree, that it is rooted up.

δὶς ἀποθανόντα ἐκριζωθεντα. Schneckenburger explains, "He who is not born again is dead in his sins (Col. ii. 13), he who has apostatised is twice dead," *cf.* Apoc. xxi. 8, Heb. vi. 4-8, 2 Peter ii. 20-22. So the trees may be called doubly dead, when they are not only sapless, but are torn up by the root, which would have caused the death even of a living tree.

Ver. 13. **κύματα ἄγρια θαλάσσης ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν αἰσχύνας.** *Cf.* Cic. *Ad Herenn.* iv. 55, *spumans ex ore scelus.* The two former illustrations, the reefs and the clouds, refer to the specious professions of the libertines and the mischief they caused; the third, the dead trees, brings out also their own miserable condition; the fourth and fifth give a very fine description of their lawlessness and shamelessness, and their eventual fate. The phrase **ἄγρια κύματα** is found in Wisdom xiv. 1. The rare word **ἐπαφρίζω** is used of the sea in Moschus v. 5. It refers to the seaweed and other refuse borne on the crest of the waves and thrown up on the beach, to which are

* This agreement is probably owing to their dependence on the Vulgate "*arbores auctumnales infructuosae*".

πλανῆται[1] οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται. 14. Ἐπροφήτευσεν[2] δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἑνὼχ λέγων

[1] πλανηται οις ζοφος σκοτους B.

[2] επροφητευσεν B[1]; επροφ. B[3]; προεπροφ. ℵ; προεφ. ACKL al.

compared the overflowings of ungodliness (Ps. xvii. 4), the ῥυπαρία καὶ περισσεία κακίας condemned by James i. 21, where see my note. The libertines foam out their own shames by their swelling words (ver. 16), while they turn the grace of God into a cloak for their licentiousness (ver. 4). We may compare Phil. iii. 19, ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν.

ἀστέρες πλανῆται. This is borrowed from Enoch (chapters xliii., xliv.) where it is said that some of the stars become lightnings and cannot part with their new form, *ib.* 80, "In the days of the sinners, many chiefs of the stars will err, and will alter their orbits and tasks, *ib.* 86, where the fall of the angels is described as the falling of stars, *ib.* 88, "he seized the first star which had fallen from heaven and bound it in an abyss; now that abyss was narrow and deep and horrible and dark . . . and they took all the great stars and bound them hand and foot, and laid them in an abyss," *ib.* xc. 24, "and judgment was held first upon the stars, and they were judged and found guilty and were cast into an abyss of fire"; also xviii. 14 f.

It would seem from these passages, which Jude certainly had before him, that πλανῆται cannot here have its usual application, the propriety of which was repudiated by all the ancient astronomers from Plato downwards. *Cf.* Cic. *N. D.* ii. 51, "maxime sunt admirabiles motus earum quinque stellarum quae falso vocantur errantes. Nihil enim errat quod in omni aeternitate conservat motus constantes et ratos," with the passages quoted in my notes on that book.

Some commentators take it as applying to comets; perhaps the quotations from Enoch 44 and 80 fit better with shooting-stars, ἀστέρες διάττοντες (Arist. *Meteor.* i. 4, 7) which seem to rush from their sphere into darkness; compare Hermes Trismegistus *ap.* Stob. *Ecl.* i. 478, κάτωθεν τῆς σελήνης εἰσὶν ἕτεροι ἀστέρες φθαρτοὶ ἀργοὶ . . . οὓς καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρῶμεν διαλυομένους, τὴν φύσιν ὁμοίαν ἔχοντες τοῖς ἀχρήστοις τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ζῴων, ἐπὶ ἕτερον δὲ οὐδὲν γίγνεται ἢ ἵνα μόνον φθαρῇ. For the close relationship supposed by the Jews to exist between the stars and the angels, see my note on James i. 17, φώτων. In this passage, however, the subject of the comparison is men, who profess to give light and guidance, as the pole-star does to mariners (ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, Phil. ii. 15), but who are only blind leaders of the blind, centres and propagators of πλάνη (ver. 11), destined to be swallowed up in everlasting darkness. *Cf.* Apoc. vi. 13, viii. 10, 12, ix. 1, xii. 4.

οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται. See the parallel in 2 Pet. ii. 17, and above ver. 6.

Vv. 14-16.—*The Prophecy of Enoch.* The ancient prophecy, to which reference has been already made, was intended for these men as well as for the prophet's own contemporaries, where he says "The Lord appeared, encompassed by myriads of his holy ones, to execute justice upon all and to convict all the ungodly concerning all their ungodly works, and concerning all the hard things spoken against Him by ungodly sinners". (Like them) these men are murmurers, complaining of their lot, slaves to their own carnal lusts, while they utter presumptuous words against God, and seek to ingratiate themselves with men for the sake of gain.

Ver. 14. ἐπροφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἑνώχ. "It was for these also (as well as for his own contemporaries) that the prophecy of Enoch was intended, far as he is removed from our time, being actually the sixth (by Hebrew calculation, seventh) descendant from Adam." For Enoch compare the allusions in Sir. xliv. 16, xlix. 14, Heb. xi. 5, Charles, *Introduction to Book of Enoch.* The prophecy is contained in En. i. 9 (Greek in Charles, *App. C.* p. 327), ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν τοῖς (? ταῖς) μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατα πάντων, καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων <τῶν> ἔργων αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. The phrase ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ is also found in En. lx. 8, "My grandfather was taken up, the seventh from Adam," *ib.* xciii. 3, "And Enoch began to recount from the books and spake: I was born the seventh in the

Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν[1] αὐτοῦ, 15. ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς[2] περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν[3] ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν[4] ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. 16. Οὗτοί εἰσιν

[1] αγιαις μυριασιν] μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων ℵ syr^p. sah. arm. +.

[2] παντας τους ασεβεις] add. αυτων KL, Ti. (*incuria?*); πασαν ψυχην ℵ, syr^p, sah.

[3] ασεβειας αυτων] om. ℵ sah. + ; [ασεβειας] αυτων Treg.

[4] σκληρων] add. λογων ℵC, Ti.

first week, while judgment and righteousness still tarried; and after me there will arise in the second week great wickedness," where Charles refers to *Jubilees*, 7. The genealogical order, as given in Gen. v. 4-20, is (1) Adam, (2) Seth, (3) Enos, (4) Cainan, (5) Mahalaleel, (6) Jared, (7) Enoch. It is probably the sacredness of the number 7 which led the Jewish writers to lay stress upon it in Enoch's case.

ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν Κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ. Charles' translation from the Aethiopic is "And lo! He comes with ten thousands of his holy ones to execute judgment upon them, and He will destroy the ungodly and will convict all flesh of all that the sinners and ungodly have wrought and ungodly committed against Him". For μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων *cf.* Heb. xii. 22, Ps. lxviii. 17, Deut. xxxiii. 2. For the use of ἐν denoting accompanying circumstances see Blass, *Gr. N. T.* tr. p. 118, and Luke xiv. 31, εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν ἀπαντῆσαι τῷ μετὰ εἴκοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτόν. The aorist here is the preterite of prophetic vision, as when Micaiah says, "I saw all Israel scattered," *cf.* Apoc. x. 7, xiv. 8.

Ver. 15. **ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων.** Follows exactly the Greek translation of Enoch given above, *cf.* Ael. *V. H.* ii. 6, Κρίτων ἔπειθεν αὐτὸν ἀποδρᾶναι καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ κρίσιν διαφθεῖραι. On the distinction between the active ποιεῖν κρίσιν "to execute judgment" (as in John v. 27) and the periphrastic middle = κρίνειν (as in Isocr. 48 D) see my notes on αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖσθαι, ἴδε and ἰδού (James iv. 3, *ib.* iii. 3).

ἐλέγξαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν. Shortened from the Greek Enoch quoted above.

ἀσεβεῖς. *Cf.* vv. 4, 18. The word thrice repeated in this verse runs through the epistle as a sort of refrain.

περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν. This is taken from Enoch xxvii. 2. Charles, p. 366 (To Gehenna shall come), πάντες οἵτινες ἐροῦσιν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν κατὰ Κυρίου φωνὴν ἀπρεπῆ καὶ περὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σκληρὰ λαλήσουσιν, *cf. ib.* v. 4, "The law of the Lord ye have not fulfilled, but . . . have slanderously spoken proud and hard words with your impure mouths against His greatness," *ib.* ci. 3, *al.*, Gen. xlii. 7, ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς σκληρά, 1 Kings xii. 13, ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν σκληρά, Mal. iii. 13-15.

Ver. 16. **οὗτοί εἰσιν γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι.** Charles thinks that we have here another case of borrowing from the *Assumption of Moses*, see his Introd. on Apocryphal Quotations. The word γογγυστής is used in the LXX, Exod xvi. 8, Num. xi. 1, 14-27, 29. The verb γογγύζω is found in John vii. 32 of the whispering of the multitude in favour of Jesus, but is generally used of smouldering discontent which people are afraid to speak out, as in 1 Cor. x. 10, of the murmurings of the Israelites in the wilderness; Matt. xx. 11 (where see Wetst.) of the grumbling of the labourers who saw others receiving a day's pay for an hour's labour; John vi. 41-43 of the Jews who took offence at the preaching of the Bread of Life. It is found in Epict. and M. Aur. but not in classical authors. γογγυσμός is used in 1 Peter iv. 9. See further in Phrynichus, p. 358 Lob. For the word μεμψίμοιρος see Lucian, *Cynic.* 17, ὑμεῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οὐδενὶ τῶν γιγνομένων ἀρέσκεσθε, καὶ παντὶ μέμφεσθε, καὶ τὰ μὲν παρόντα φέρειν οὐκ ἐθέλετε, τῶν δὲ ἀπόντων ἐφίεσθε, χειμῶνος μὲν θέρος εὐχόμενοι, θέρους δὲ χειμῶνα . . . καθάπερ οἱ νοσοῦντες, δυσάρεστοι καὶ μεμψίμοιροι ὄντες, and Theophr. *Char.* 17. It is used of the murmuring of the Israelites by Philo, *Vit. Mos.* i. 109 M. See other examples in Wetst. The same spirit is condemned in James i. 13.

γογγυσταί, μεμψίμοιροι, κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα, θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν.

17. Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 18. ὅτι

κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι. *Cf.* 2 Pet. iii. 3 and ii. 10, below ver. 18, and see my notes on James iv. 1, 2. Plumptre notes "The temper of self-indulgence recognising not God's will, but man's desires, as the law of action, is precisely that which issues in weariness and despair . . *cf.* Eccles. ii. 1-20".

τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ὑπέρογκα. See Enoch v. 4, quoted on ver. 15, also Enoch ci. 3, "ye have spoken insolent words against His righteousness," Ps. xii. 4, Ps. lxxiii. 8, Dan. vii. 8, **στόμα λαλοῦν μεγάλα** and ver. 20 of the little horn; compare above vv. 4, 8, 11, and James iii. 5 foll. In classical writers **ὑπέρογκα** is generally used of great or even excessive size, in later writers it is also used of "big" words, arrogant speech and demeanour, see Alford's note on 2 Pet. ii. 18 and Plut. *Mor.* 1119 B (Socrates), **τὴν ἐμβροντησίαν ἐκ τοῦ βίου καὶ τὸν τῦφον ἐξήλαυνε καὶ τὰς ἐπαχθεῖς καὶ ὑπερόγκους κατοιήσεις καὶ μεγαλαυχίας**, *ib.* 7 A, where **ἡ θεατρικὴ καὶ παρατράγῳδος λέξις** is styled **ὑπέρογκος** in contrast with **ἰσχνὴ λέξις**, Plut. *Vitae* 505 B, **τοῦ βασιλέως τὸ φρόνημα τραγικὸν καὶ ὑπέρογκον ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις εὐτυχίαις ἐγεγόνει.** It is found in 2 Peter ii. 18 and in Dan. xi. 36, **ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑψωθήσεται καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεόν, καὶ λαλήσει ὑπέρογκα.**

θαυμάζοντες πρόσωπα ὠφελίας χάριν. The phrase occurs with the same force in Lev. xix. 15, **οὐ μὴ θαυμάσῃς πρόσωπον**, Job xiii. 10, see my note on James ii. 1, **μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.**, and *cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 8, quoted above on ver. 11. As the fear of God drives out the fear of man, so defiance of God tends to put man in His place, as the chief source of good or evil to his fellows. For the anacoluthon (**τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ —θαυμάζοντες**) compare Col. ii. 2, **ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν εἰρήνῃ**, where a similar periphrasis (**αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν = ὑμεῖς**) is followed by a *constructio ad sensum*, also Winer, p. 716. Perhaps the intrusion of the finite clause into a participial series may be accounted for by a reminiscence of Ps. xvii. 10, **τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ἐλάλησεν ὑπερηφανίαν**, or Ps. cxliv. 8, 11, where a similar phrase occurs.

Vv. 17-19.—*The Faithful are bidden to call to mind the warnings of the Apostles.* The Apostles warned you repeatedly that in the last time there would arise mockers led away by their own carnal lusts. It is these that are now breaking up the unity of the Church by their invidious distinctions, men of unsanctified minds, who have not the Spirit of God. See Introduction on the Early Heresies in the larger edition.

Ver. 17. **ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων.** The writer turns again, as in ver. 20 below, to the faithful members of the Church (ver. 3) and reminds them, not now of primeval prophecy, but of warning words uttered by the Apostles. Some have taken this as a quotation by Jude from 2 Peter iii. 3, where the quotation is given more fully. But, there also, the words are referred back to a prior authority, "holy prophets" and "your Apostles". The words **ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῖν**, which follow, imply that the warning was spoken, not written, and that it was often repeated.

Ver. 18. **ἐπ' ἐσχάτου χρόνου ἔσονται ἐμπαῖκται.** The parallel in 2 Peter iii. 3 is **ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ἐμπαιγμονῇ ἐμπαῖκται**, where see note on the use of the article with **ἔσχατος**, *etc.* For **ἐπί**, *cf.* Arist. *Pol.* iv. 3, **ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων.**

The prophecy of this mocking, as a mark of the future trials of the Church, has not come down to us. An example of it in the very beginning of the Church is given in Acts ii. 13, **ἕτεροι χλευάζοντες ἔλεγον ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσί.** In the O.T. we have such examples as 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 (the summing up of the attitude of the Jews towards the prophets) **ἦσαν μυκτηρίζοντες τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντες τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαίζοντες ἐν τοῖς προφήταις αὐτοῦ**, Jer. xx. 8, **ἐγενήθη λόγος Κυρίου εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ εἰς χλευασμὸν πᾶσαν ἡμέραν.** *Cf.* also the mockery at the crucifixion, and the declaration in Matt. x. 25 f., **εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.** In 2

ἔλεγον ὑμῖν Ἐπ' ἐσχάτου[1] χρόνου[2] ἔσονται[3] ἐμπαῖκται κατὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι τῶν ἀσεβειῶν.[4] 19. Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες,[5] ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες.

[1] επ' εσχατου ℵB; οτι επ' εσχ. AC; [οτι] επ' εσχ. Treg.; ὅτι εν εσχατῳ KL P vulg. sah.

[2] χρονου BC; του χρονου ℵA; χρονῳ KL; τῳ χρονῳ P sah.; των χρονων boh. al.

[3] εσονται ℵBCKLP; ελευσονται ℵ²AC², sah. boh.

[4] των ασεβειων] οπισω ασεβειων syr^h; οπισω ασεβειας syr^p.

[5] αποδιοριζοντες] add. εαυτους C vulg.

Peter the purport of this mockery is explained to be the unfulfilled promise of the Parusia. Here we must gather its meaning from the account already given of the libertines. If they turned the grace of God into licentiousness, they would naturally mock at the narrowness and want of enlightenment of those who took a strict and literal view of the divine commandments: if they made light of authority and treated spiritual things with irreverence, if they foamed out their own shame and uttered proud and impious words, if they denied God and Christ, they would naturally laugh at the idea of a judgment to come. On the form ἐμπαίκτης and its cognates, see note on 2 Peter.

τῶν ἀσεβειῶν. I am rather disposed to take τῶν ἀσεβειῶν here as a subjective genitive, "lusts belonging to, or arising from their impieties," *cf.* Rom. i. 28, καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν. The position of the genitive is peculiar, and probably intended to give additional stress. We may compare it with James ii. 1, μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς δόξης, where some connect τῆς δόξης with κυρίου in a qualitative sense.

Ver. 19. **οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες.** "These are they that make invidious distinctions." See Introduction on the Text. The rare word ἀποδιορίζοντες is used of logical distinctions in Aristotle, *Pol.* iv. 43, ὥσπερ οὖν εἰ ζῴου προῃρούμεθα λαβεῖν εἴδη, πρῶτον ἂν ἀποδιωρίζομεν ὅπερ ἀναγκαῖον πᾶν ἔχειν ζῷον ("as, if we wished to make a classification of animals, we should have begun by setting aside that which all animals have in common") and, I believe, in every other passage in which it is known to occur: see Maximus Confessor, ii. p. 103 D, τὸ μὲν φυσικὸν ὥρισεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ γνωμικὸν ἀποδιώρισε, translated "naturali in eo (Christo) constituta voluntate, arbitrariam dispunxit," *ib.* p. 131 C, ὡς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτοῦ, μόνον τὸ ἐμπαθές, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ φυσικὸν ἀποδιορίσασθαι θέλημα, "quod dixerat hoc solum spectare ut libidinosam, non ut naturalem voluntatem a Salvatore eliminaret," Severus *de Clyst.* xxxii., xxv., ὅταν ταῦτα τὰ συμπτώματα ὄψῃ παρόντα, ἀποδιόριζε τὴν ὀργανικὴν νόσον ἐκ τῆς ὁμοιομεροῦς. The simple διορίζω is found in Lev. xx. 24, διώρισα ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν "I separated you from the nations," Job xxxv. 11; so ἀφορίζω Matt. xxv. 32, ἀφορίζει τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων, Acts xix. 9 (Paul left the synagogue) καὶ ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς, 2 Cor. vi. 17, ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, Luke vi. 22 (of excommunication) ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, Gal. ii. 12 (of Peter's withdrawal from the Gentiles) ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν.

ψυχικοί. Used of worldly wisdom in James iii. 15, where see note, distinguished from πνευματικός in 1 Cor. ii. 13-15, xv. 44, *cf.* the teaching of the Naassenes (*ap.* Hippol. p. 164) εἰς τὸν οἶκον θεοῦ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται ἀκάθαρτος οὐδείς, οὐ ψυχικός, οὐ σαρκικός, ἀλλὰ τηρεῖται πνευματικοῖς.

πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. The subjective negative may be explained as describing a class (such as have not) rather than as stating a fact in regard to particular persons; but the use of μή is much more widely extended in late than in classical Greek, *cf.* such phrases as ἐπεὶ μή, ὅτι μή. It is simplest to understand πνεῦμα here of the Holy Spirit, *cf.* Rom. viii. 9, ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, 1 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 40, 1 John iii. 24, iv. 13, and the contrast in ver. 20, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι. Others, *e.g.* Plumptre, prefer the explanation that "the false teachers were so absorbed in their lower sensuous nature that they no longer possessed, in any real sense of the word,

20. Ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι, 21. ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε[1] προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν

[1] τηρησατε] τηρησωμεν BC.

that element in man's compound being, which is itself spiritual, and capable therefore of communion with the Divine Spirit".

Vv. 20-23. *The Final Charge to the Faithful.*—Use all diligence to escape this danger. Make the most of the privileges vouchsafed to you. Build yourselves up on the foundation of your most holy faith by prayer in the Spirit. Do not rest satisfied with the belief that God loves you, but keep yourselves in His love, waiting for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ which leads us to eternal life. And do your best to help those who are in danger of falling away by pointing out their errors and giving the reasons of your own belief; and by snatching from the fire of temptation those who are in imminent jeopardy. Even where there is most to fear, let your compassion and your prayers go forth toward the sinner, while you shrink from the pollution of his sin.

Ver. 20. **ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί.** Contrasted with the libertines, as in ver. 17.

ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει. For the spiritual temple, *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 3-5; Col. i. 23; Eph. ii. 20-22, **ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, ὄντος ἀκρογωνιαίου αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ κ.τ.λ.**, 1 Cor. iii. 9-17, a passage which the writer may have had in his mind here and in ver. 23. Dr. Bigg compares Polyc. *Phil.* iii. "If ye study the epistles of the blessed apostle Paul, **δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν.** Add Clem. *Strom.* v. p. 644, **ἡ κοινὴ πίστις καθάπερ θεμέλιον ὑπόκειται.** Usually Christ is spoken as the foundation or corner-stone of the Church, and we should probably assign an objective sense to **τῇ πίστει** here, as in ver. 3 above (**ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ πίστει**). Otherwise it might be explained of that faculty by which we are brought into relation with the spiritual realities (Heb. xi. 1, **πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων**), that which is the introduction to all the other Christian graces, see note on 2 Pet. i. 5, and which leads to eternal life (1 Pet. i. 5, and 9. **κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν**). The faith is here called "most holy," because it comes to us from God, and reveals God to us, and because it is by its means that man is made righteous, and enabled to overcome the world (1 John v. 4, 5). *Cf.* 1 Pet. v. 9, **ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει.**

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι. These words, contrasted with **πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες** in ver. 19, show how they are to build themselves up upon their faith. I understand them as equivalent to James v. 16, **δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη**, where see note. Compare also Eph vi. 18, **διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι**, Rom. viii. 26, 27.

Ver. 21. **ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ τηρήσατε.** In ver. 1 the passive is used: those who are addressed are described as kept and beloved (*cf.* ver. 24, **τῷ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι**): here the active is used and emphasised by the unusual order of words; each is to keep himself in the love of God, *cf.* James, i. 27, **ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν**, Phil ii 12, **τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθαι· Θεὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν.** Again in ver. 2 the writer invokes the divine love and mercy on those to whom he writes: here they are bidden to take steps to secure these. Compare Rom. v. 5, **ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν**, *ib.* viii. 39, **πέπεισμαι ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ . . . οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ**, John xv. 9. **καθὼς ἠγάπησέν με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα, μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου.** The aor. imper. is expressive of urgency, see note on **ἡγήσασθε**, in James i. 2.

προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος. *Cf* Tit. ii. 13, **προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ.**, and 2 Pet. iii. 12, 13, 14. The same word is used of the Jews who were looking for the promised Messiah at the time of His first coming, Mark xv. 43, Luke ii. 25, 38.

εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Some connect this closely with the imperative **τηρήσατε**, but it seems to me to follow more natu-

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 22. Καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε[1] διακρινομένους,[2] 23. οὓς δὲ[3] σώζετε[4] ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες, οὓς δὲ

[1] ελεγχετε AC vulg. boh. arm. + ; ελεατε ℵBC²; ελεειτε KLP +.
[2] διακρινομενους ℵABC; διακρινομενοι KLP.
[3] ους δε (1) ℵACKLP; om. B. [4] σωζετε ℵABC; εν φοβῳ σωζετε KLP.

rally on the nearer phrase, **πρ. τὸ ἔλεος**: *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 37, **εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς . . . φρουρουμένους . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἑτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ.**

Ver. 22. **οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινομένους.** On the reading see the Introduction. For the form **ὅς μέν** instead of **ὁ μέν**, *cf.* Matt. xiii. 8, xxii. 5, Luke xxiii. 33, Acts xxvii. 44, Rom. xiv. 5, 1 Cor. vii. 7, xi. 21, 2 Cor. ii. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 20, not used in Heb., 1 and 2 Pet., James or John. The doubled **ὅς δέ** is found in Matt. xxi. 35, **ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ἐλιθοβόλησαν**, *ib* xxv. 15, **ᾧ μὲν ἔδωκεν πέντε τάλαντα, ᾧ δὲ δύο, ᾧ δὲ ἕν.** The use is condemned as a solecism by Thomas Magister and by Lucian, *Soloec.* 1, but is common in late Greek from the time of Aristotle, *cf.* Sturz. *Dial. Maced.* pp. 105 f. On the word **ἐλέγχω** (here wrongly translated "strafen," in the sense of excommunication, by Rampf), see *Const. Apost.* vii. 5, 3, **ἐλεγμῷ ἐλέγξεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου**, and Hare's excellent note L in his *Mission of the Comforter*, where he argues that the conviction wrought by the Spirit is a conviction unto salvation, rather than unto condemnation; and quotes Luecke as saying that "**ἐλέγχειν** always implies the refutation, the overcoming of an error, a wrong, by the truth and right. When this is brought before our conscience through the **ἔλεγχος**, there arises a feeling of sin, which is always painful: thus every **ἔλεγχος** is a chastening, a punishment." Compare Grote's life-like account of the Socratic Elenchus in his *Hist. of Greece*.

This verse seems to be referred to in *Can. Apost.* vi. 4, **οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις, περὶ ὧν δὲ προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου**, which is also found in the Didache ii. 7, with the omission of **οὓς δὲ ἐλεήσεις.** *Cf.* John xvi. 8, **ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως**, 1 Cor. xiv. 24, **ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων** (the effect of the prophets' teaching on an unbeliever), Tit. i. 13, **ἔλεγχε αὐτοὺς ἀποτόμως ἵνα ὑγιαίνωσιν ἐν τῇ πίστει**, *ib.* i. 9, **τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν**, 2 Tim. iv. 2 (the charge to Timothy) **ἔλεγξον, παρακάλεσον ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ**, Apoc. iii. 19, **ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω**, Eph. v. 13, **τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐλεγχόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτὸς φανεροῦται.** There is a tone of greater severity in the **ποιῆσαι κρίσιν καὶ ἐλέγξαι** of the 15th verse, but even there we need not suppose that the preacher is hopeless of good being effected. The point is of importance in deciding the mutual relations of the three cases here considered.

διακρινομένους. We should have expected a nominative here to correspond with **ἁρπάζοντες** and **μισοῦντες** in the following clauses, and so the *text. rec.* has **διακρινόμενοι**, wrongly translated in A.V., as if it were the active **διακρίνοντες**, "making a difference". This gives such a good sense that some commentators (*e.g.* Stier) have been willing to condone the bad Greek. It would have been better to alter the reading at once. Keeping the reading of the best MSS. we may either take the accusative as complementary to **ἐλέγχετε** (as we find in Plato, *Theaet.* 171 D, **ἐμὲ ἐλέγξας ληροῦντα**, Xen. *Mem.* 1, 7, 2, **ἐλεγχθήσεται γελοῖος ὤν**, Jelf. § 681), or simply as descriptive of the condition of the persons referred to. There is also a question as to the meaning we should assign to **διακρ.** Is it to be understood in the same sense as in James i. 6, ii. 4? In that case we might translate "convict them of their want of faith," taking the participle as complementary to the verb; or "reprove them because of their doubts". It seems more probable, however, that the meaning here is "convince them when they dispute with you," which we may compare with 1 Pet. iii. 15, **ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον . . . ἀλλὰ μετὰ πραΰτητος καὶ φόβου** (*cf.* **ἐν φόβῳ** below). So taken, this first clause would refer to intellectual difficulties to be met by quiet reasoning; the force of **διακρινόμενος** being the same as that in ver. 9, **τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρ.**, and in Socr. *E.H.* v. 5, **ὁ λαὸς εἶχεν ὁμόνοιαν καὶ οὐκέτι πρὸς ἀλλήλους διεκρίνοντο.**

Ver. 23. **σώζετε.** Here again a word

ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ,[1] μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα.

24. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς[2] ἀπταίστους[3] καὶ στῆσαι

[1] ους δε (2) ελεατε εν φοβῳ ℵAB; om. KLP; εν φοβῳ C.
[2] υμας ℵBCL vulg. syrr. boh.; ημας A; αυτους KP.
[3] απταιστους] add. και ασπιλους C.

which is strictly applicable to God is transferred to him whom God uses as His instrument, *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 11 and notes on τηρήσατε, ἐλέγχετε above, especially James v. 20, ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου.

ἐκ πυρὸς ἁρπάζοντες. The expression is borrowed from Amos iv. 11, κατέστρεψα ὑμᾶς καθὼς κατέστρεψεν ὁ Θεὸς Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα, καὶ ἐγένεσθε ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός, καὶ οὐδ᾽ ὥς ἐπεστρέψατε πρός με, λέγει Κύριος, and Zech. iii. 3, οὐκ ἰδοὺ οὗτος δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός; Both passages have further connexions with our epistle, the former from the reference to Sodom (see above ver. 7), the latter as following immediately on the words, ἐπιτιμήσαι σοι Κύριος quoted in ver. 9, and preceding a reference to filthy garments (see note below). In it the High Priest Joshua is a representative of Israel, saved like a brand from the captivity, which was the punishment of national sin. The image of fire is naturally suggested by the allusion to the punishment of Sodom in the passage of Amos, and of Korah (see above ver. 7) described in Num. xvi. 35, Ps. cvi. 18, ἐξεκαύθη πῦρ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν καὶ φλὸξ κατέφλεξεν ἁμαρτωλούς. The writer may also have had in mind St. Paul's description of the building erected on the One Foundation (see above ver. 20), which, he says, will be tried by fire, 1 Cor. iii. 13-15, ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον, ὁποῖόν ἐστιν, τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει . . . εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται, ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. Such an one may be spoken of as "a brand snatched from the fire," not however as here, saved from the fire of temptation, but as saved through the agency of God's purgatorial fire, whether in this or in a future life.

ἐλεᾶτε ἐν φόβῳ. The faithful are urged to show all possible tenderness for the fallen, but at the same time to have a fear lest they themselves or others whom they influence should be led to think too lightly of the sin whose ravages they are endeavouring to repair. *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 1, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, Phil. ii. 12, 1 Pet. i. 17, iii. 15. For the confusion of the contracted verbs in -έω and -άω in late Greek see Jannaris, § 850. § 854 f., Winer p. 104. The best MSS. read ἐλεᾷ in Prov. xxi. 26, and ἐλεῶντος Rom. ix. 16, but ἐλεεῖ in Rom. ix. 18.

μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐσπιλωμένον χιτῶνα. While it is the duty of the Christian to pity and pray for the sinner, he must view with loathing all that bears traces of the sin. The form of expression seems borrowed from such passages as Isa. xxx. 22, Lev. xv. 17, perhaps too from Zech. iii. 4, Ἰησοῦς ἦν ἐνδεδυμένος ἱμάτια ῥυπαρά. *Cf.* Apoc. iii. 4, οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, and *Apocal. Pauli* quoted by Spitta, ὁ χιτών μου οὐκ ἐρυπώθη. The derivatives of σπίλος are peculiar to late Greek: the only other examples of σπιλόω in Biblical Greek are James iii. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα . . . ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὅλον τὸ σῶμα and Wisd. xv. 4, εἶδος σπιλωθὲν χρώμασι διηλλαγμένοις. Compare for the treatment of the erring 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26, ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μήποτε δῴη αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος.

Vv. 24, 25. *Final Benediction and Ascription.* I have bidden you to keep yourselves in the love of God; I have warned you against all impiety and impurity. But do not think that you can attain to the one, or guard yourselves from the other, in your own strength. You must receive power from above; and that it may be so, I offer up my prayer to Him, who alone is able to keep you from stumbling, and to present you before the throne of His glory, pure and spotless in exceeding joy. To Him, the only God and Saviour, belong glory, greatness, might, and authority throughout all ages.

Ver. 24. τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ φυλάξαι ὑμᾶς ἀπταίστους. Apparently a reminis-

κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους[1] ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει, 25. μόνῳ[2]

[1] **αμωμους**] **αμεμπτους** A. [2] **μονῳ**] add. **σοφῳ** KLP +.

cence * of Rom. xvi. 25 f., **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι . . . μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.** Similarly the noble doxology in Eph. iii. 20, commences **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ.** The reading **ὑμᾶς** is confirmed by the evidence of ℵ and B, which was unknown to Alford when he endeavoured to defend the reading **αὐτούς**, found In KP and some inferior MSS.

ἀπταίστους. Occurs in 3 Macc. vi. 39, **μεγαλοδόξως ἐπιφάνας τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ὁ τῶν ὅλων δυνάστης ἀπταίστους αὐτοὺς ἐρρύσατο**: used here only in the N.T. The verb **πταίω** has the same figurative sense in James ii. 10, iii. 2, **εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνήρ**, 2 Pet. i. 10, **ταῦτα ποιοῦντες οὐ μὴ πταίσητέ ποτε.**

στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. *Cf.* Matt. xxv. 31-33, **ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ . . . στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ**, Acts vi. 6, **οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων**, Col. i. 22, **παραστῆσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ** (which Lightfoot refers to present approbation rather than to the future judgment of God, comparing Rom. xiv. 22, 1 Cor. i. 29, 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2, vii. 12, xii. 19). In the present passage the addition of the words **τῆς δόξης** shows that the final judgment, the goal of **φυλάξαι**, is spoken of. Hort, in his interesting note on 1 Pet. i. 19, **τιμίῳ αἵματι ὡς ἀμνοῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ**, traces the way in which the words **μῶμος** "blame," and **ἄμωμος** "blameless," come to be used (in "the Apocrypha, the N.T., and other books which presuppose the LXX") in the entirely unclassical sense of "blemish" and "unblemished" *cf.* Eph. i. 4, v. 27, Heb. ix. 14. In 2 Pet. iii. 14, **ἀμώμητος** seems to be used in the same sense. The word **κατενώπιον** is apparently confined to the Bible, where it occurs in Josh. i. 5, xxi. 42, Lev. iv. 17, Eph. i. 4, **ἀμώμητος κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. κατένωπα** is found in Hom. *Il.* xv. 320. For **ἀγαλλίασις** see Hort's note on 1 Pet. i. 6, **ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε**, "in whom ye exult". The verb with its cognate substantives "is unknown except in the LXX and the N.T. and the literature derived from them, and in the N.T. it is confined to books much influenced by O.T. diction (Matt., Luke, Acts, 1 Pet., Jude, John, including Apoc.), being absent from the more Greek writers, St. Paul, and (except in quot.) Heb. . . . It apparently denotes a proud exulting joy, being probably connected closely with **ἀγάλλομαι**, properly 'to be proud of,' but often combined with **ἥδομαι** and such words."

Ver. 25. **μόνῳ Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν.** See above on ver. 4, **τὸν μόνον δεσπότην.** God is called **σωτήρ** in Isa. xlv 15, **σὺ γὰρ εἶ Θεὸς . . . ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρ**, *ib.* ver. 21, Sir. li. 1, **αἰνέσω σε Θεὸν τὸν σωτῆρά μου**, Philo, *Confus. Ling.* § 20, i. p. 418 *fin.*, **τίς δ' οὐκ ἂν . . . πρὸς τὸν μόνον σωτῆρα Θεὸν ἐκβοήσῃ** (? -σαι); *cf.* Luke i. 47, **ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου**, elsewhere in N.T. only in Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4, **ὅτε ἡ χρηστότης . . . ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ . . . κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ . . . πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν**, 1 Tim. i. 1, **Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Ἰ. Χ. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χ. Ἰ.** *ib.* ii. 3, iv. 10. The later writers of the N.T. seem to have felt it needful to insist upon the unity of God, and the saving will of the Father, in opposition to antinomian attacks on the Law.

διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. It seems best to take **διά** with **δόξα** and the following words. The glory of God is manifested through the Word, *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 11, **ἵνα ἐν πᾶσιν δοξάζηται ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἰ. Χ. ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.**

δόξα. The verb is often omitted in these ascriptions, *cf.* 2 Pet. **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα**, Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27, Gal. i. 5, Luke ii. 16, **δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ.** In 1 Peter iv. 11 it is inserted, **ᾧ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος**, and, as we find no case in which **ἔστω** is inserted, and the indicative is more subject to ellipse than the imperative, it might seem that we should supply "is" here; but the R. V. gives "be," and there are similar phrases expressive of a wish or prayer, as the very common **χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρός**, where we must supply **ἔστω** or **γένοιτο.**

* For the position and genuineness of this doxology see the Introduction and notes in Sanday and Headlam's commentary, and the dissertations by Lightfoot and Hort in the former's *Biblical Essays*, pp. 287-374.

Θεῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν διὰ[1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα μεγαλωσύνη κράτος καὶ ἐξουσία πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας[2] τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν.

[1] δια Ι. Χ. του κυριου ημων] om. KP. [2] εις παντας] εις ℵ.

De Wette maintained that the following words **πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος**, referring to already existing fact, were incompatible with a prayer; but it is sufficient that the prayer has regard mainly to the present and future; the past only comes in to give it a fuller, more joyful tone, reminding us of the eternity of God, as in the psalmist's words, "I said it is my own infirmity, but I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High," and the close of our own doxology "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be". I do not see, however, that we need exclude either interpretation. The writer may exult in that which he believes to be already fact in the eternal world, and yet pray for its more perfect realisation in time, as in the Lord's Prayer, **γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς**. The omission of the verb allows of either or both views in varying proportion. **δόξα** by itself is the commonest of all ascriptions. It is joined with **τιμή** in 1 Tim. i. 17 and elsewhere, as here with **μεγαλωσύνη**. It is joined with **κράτος** in 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11, Apoc. i. 6. Fuller ascriptions are found in Apoc. iv. 11, **ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ κύριος . . . λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν**, v. 13, **τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ . . . ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων**, vii. 12, **ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν**. Just before (ver. 10) we have the remarkable ascription **ἡ σωτηρία τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν**. Compare with this the ascription of David (1 Chron. xxix. 11), **σοὶ Κύριε ἡ μεγαλωσύνη καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ τὸ καύχημα καὶ ἡ νίκη καὶ ἡ ἰσχύς, ὅτι σὺ πάντων τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς δεσπόζεις**. For a similar expression in regard to the future blessedness of man, see Rom. ii. 10, **δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν**.* An unusual form of ascription occurs in Clem. Rom. 59. 2, **ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῇ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπό τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ· δι' οὗ αὐτῷ δόξα, τιμή, κράτος καὶ μεγαλωσύνη, θρόνος αἰώνιος ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων**.

μεγαλωσύνη. Only found elsewhere in N.T. in Heb. i. 3, **ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς**, repeated in viii. 1. Dr. Chase notes that it occurs in Enoch v. 4, **κατελαλήσατε μεγάλους καὶ σκληροὺς λόγους ἐν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν κατὰ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης αὐτοῦ**, xii. 3, **τῷ κυρίῳ τῆς μεγαλοσύνης**, xiv. 16 (a house excelling) **ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλοσύνῃ**. It is coupled with **δόξα**, of which it may be regarded as an extension, in the doxology used by Clem. Rom. 20, 61. I am not aware of any other example of **ἐξουσία** in a doxology: compare, however, Matt. xxviii. 18, **ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς**.

πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 7 (**τὴν σοφίαν**) **ἣν προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν**, Prov. viii. 23, **πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με** (*i.e.* **σοφίαν**), **ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι**. An equivalent expression is **πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου** found in John xvii. 24, **ἠγάπησάς με π. κ. κ.** also Eph. i. 4, **ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ π. κ. κ.** and 1 Pet. i. 20 (**Χριστοῦ**) **προεγνωσμένου μὲν π. κ.κ., φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων**. St. Jude speaks of one past age and of several ages to come. On the other hand St. Paul speaks of many ages in the past (1 Cor. ii. 7), and St. John of only one age in the future.

εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας. This precise phrase is unique in the Bible, but **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας** is common enough, as in Luke i. 33, Rom. i. 25, v. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27, 2 Cor. xi. 31, etc., so in LXX, Dan. ii. 4, 44, vi. 6, 26. The stronger phrase **εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων** occurs in Gal. i. 5, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11, Apoc. i. 6, etc. John uses only **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** apparently with the same meaning. Other variations are found in Eph. iii. 21, **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χ. Ἰ. εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων**, 2 Pet. iii. 18, **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος**.

* For a full account of the early doxologies, see Chase on the Lord's Prayer (*Texts and Studies*, i. 3, p. 68 foll.). He states that the common doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer (**σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας**) "appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms," and "was added to the Prayer in the 'Syrian' text of St. Matthew's Gospel".

THE REVELATION

OF

ST. JOHN THE DIVINE,

James Moffatt, D.D.

Longsuffering toward us here is the Most High:
He hath shown us that which is to be,
And hath not hidden from us what befalleth at the end.
For the youth of the world is over,
Long since hath the strength of creation failed,
And the advent of the times is at hand.
The pitcher is nigh to the cistern,
The ship to the haven,
The caravan to the city,
And life to its consummation.
—*The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (lxxxv. 8, 10), A.D. 70-100.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. *The Text.*—The exceptionally corrupt state of the Textus Receptus in the Apocalypse is due to the fact that for this book Erasmus (to whose text it goes back) had access to only a single cursive[1] (numbered 1) of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Even that was inferior and incomplete. The MSS. which have become available since his day are neither ample nor faultless. Throughout the five uncials (two of which, *i.e.*, C and P, are defective palimpsests), over 1600 variants have been counted—excluding merely orthographical differences—in the 400 verses of the book; this proportion is considerably higher than in the Catholic epistles, for example, where 432 verses only yield about 1100 variants. The earliest uncial goes back to the fourth century (ℵ); A and C, the most weighty, to the fifth; Q[2] to the eighth; and P to the ninth. Of these, ℵAQ are complete, while the Apocalypse in Q is bound up with the writings of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa—"one of many instances in which the Apocalypse was bound up with ordinary theological treatises instead of with the other N.T. writings" (Gregory i. 121). C lacks i. 1, iii. 19-v. 14, vii. 14-17, viii. 5-ix. 16, x. 10-xi. 3, xiv. 13-xviii. 2, xix. 5-end. P is defective in xvi. 12-xvii. 1, xix. 21-xx. 9, xxii. 6-end.

ℵAC reflect a fairly uniform text, which seems to have been influenced by an older uncorrected text allied to that underlying the vulgate. Hence, as ℵ in the Apocalypse, owing to its eccentric element, is not of exceptional value by itself (though supported by the cursives 95 and 36), AC vg. form an important group of witnesses, to which the minuscule 95 (like 68 and 38) and Syr. seem allied. The relation of P and Q is less obvious. Their differences (they agree

[1] Relatively high among the secondary documents, but woefully inferior to the uncials. On the performance of Erasmus, see Delitzsch's *Handschrifte Funde*, i. (1861), pp. 17 f., with A. Bludau's essay on the Erasmus editions of the N.T. in Bardenhewer's *Biblische Studien*, vii. 5.

[2] To avoid confusion with the B of Codex Vaticanus, it is better to cite this codex Vaticanus as Q (so, after Tregelles, Weiss, Haussleiter, Bousset, Swete) than as B (Tisch.) or B[2] (WH, Simcox).

only in about fifty cases against ℵAC) point either to two recensions of some older original (Bousset) or to a text based again upon some older revised text (Weiss). Q approximates rather to the cursives in text. But its archetype usually tallies with ℵAC, and is allied somehow to the text behind the so-called "Coptic"[1] version (*cf.* Goussen's "Theolog. Studia, fasciculus I.": *Apoc. S. Johannis apostoli versio sahidica*, 1895, pp. iv.-vii.), like a small group of cursives (Bousset's Q rel.). In no one MS. or group of MSS. is a neutral or fairly accurate text preserved. This is mainly due to the interval which elapsed before the Apocalypse became generally canonical, particularly in the East; its text was less carefully guarded during this period than any other portion of the N.T., and even by the time that the ℵAC text (or texts) came into being, the book had not secured its canonisation throughout the Eastern churches. In addition to this, the grammatical irregularities and anomalies[2] which studded its pages tempted many a scribe to correct and to conform the text. Systematic emendation of this kind must have begun very early (Weiss, pp. 144 f.).

This paucity and conflict of uncial evidence lends additional weight to the versions and patristic citations, especially as they reflect a text or texts which cannot be taken to be identical with, and yet must be older than, those underlying the MSS. Often, indeed, the versions themselves reproduce some of the most patent errors in the MSS., while the patristic texts are sometimes too

[1] In the textual notes = Sah. (*i.e.*, Sahidic): a further fragment is edited by J. Clédat in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* (1899), pp. 263-279. Gregory (pp. 546-547) throws both this and the later Bohairic or Memphitic version (= me.) back into the second century, but this is probably too early a date. All the extant fragments of the former are printed in Delaporte's *Fragments Sahidiques du N.T.* (Paris, 1906). For the latter, *cf.* Leipoldt in *Church Quart. Rev.*, 1906, pp. 292 f.

[2] These are not invariably Hebraisms, as Viteau and the older grammarians argue, but it is almost uncritical at the opposite extreme to rule out Hebraisms entirely. The Apocalypse is so saturated with the original text and the Greek version of the O.T., that there is more likelihood here than elsewhere in the N.T. of a grammatical solecism being due, directly or indirectly, to the influence of Semitic idiom. Even though a parallel instance can be adduced in some cases from the papyri or the κοινή elsewhere (*cf.* Helbing, p. iv.), this merely suggests a possible origin for the phrase in question. Besides, the Apocalypse is a piece of literary art. Where its eccentricities are not due to ignorance of Greek or to reminiscences of Hebrew idiom, they are deliberate violations of grammar and syntax in the interests of rhetoric or faith. That Greek was spoken in these Asiatic townships, although native dialects lingered in the country, is shown by L. Mitteis in his *Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen d. röm. Kaiserreiches* (1891), pp. 23 f.

insecure to admit of reliable inferences being drawn from their contents (*cf.* Bebb in *Studia Biblica*, ii. 195-240). Yet, even with these drawbacks, one need not despair of utilising either. Thus the Latin versions[1] and patristic citations—which are of special moment, since the Apocalypse was never absent from the Latin N.T., and since the fourth century version did not affect it seriously—reveal a fairly distinctive Greek text behind the type of African text preserved by Cyprian (third century, citations in his *Testimonia*), Primasius, the sixth century African commentator, and the fragmentary Fleury palimpsest (sixth or seventh century).[2] Critical opinion is still unsettled upon the precise connexion of this text with the uncials, or even with the citations of Latin fathers like Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine, to say nothing of Ticonius, Beatus (eighth century), Haymo (ninth century) and Cassiodorus (sixth century). Thus it is quite uncertain whether the idiosyncrasies of Tertullian's quotations reflect a private recension (so Haussleiter) or some ecclesiastical version, if they are not made directly from the Greek (*cf.* Nestle's *Einführung*, 94, 227 f., E. Tr. 119-20). Nevertheless, it is in this direction that the most promising outlook of textual criticism upon the Apocalypse lies. It has unique aid in the Latin versions. The greater respect shown by the ecclesiastical West to the Apocalypse must have conspired upon the whole to give its text a better chance of preservation than in the East. Certainly, the fragments of the so-called African text carry us back to a Greek text of the Apocalypse which was current in the middle of the third century, prior to the origin of any extant uncial, while the evidence of Dr. Gwynn's Syriac text comes only second in importance. The Greek citations of Clem. Alex. and Origen also echo a text which hardly corresponds to that of any of the uncials; but, where the latter writer agrees with ℵ, some early Alexandrian text may probably be discerned, which might be termed Western. His citations have also affinities with the text of S (*cf.* Gwynn, pp. lv. f.). As for the more important of the cursives, so far as they have been collated (*cf.* Gregory, i. 316-326, Scrivener's *Introd.*, 1894, i. 321-326), they seem mainly to corroborate other lines

[1] Dr. Armitage Robinson (*Cambridge Texts and Studies*, i. 2, pp. 73, 97 f.), followed by Dr. Salmon (*Introd. to N.T.*, pp. 567 f.), even argues from the Ep. Lugd., (Eus., *H. E.*, v. 1) that the Gallican churches must have had a Latin version of the N.T. (including the Apocalypse) by the middle of the second century, akin to the African old Latin.

[2] *Cf.* Gregory, 609, and Mr. E. S. Buchanan's collation in *Journ. Theol. Studies* viii., pp. 96 f.

of evidence. In the dearth of better witnesses, their place is occasionally more serious than some editors would allow; but no attempt at grouping them can be pronounced successful (about sixty contain the commentary of Andreas), and it is merely in the wake of earlier and heavier authorities that most of the minuscules can, as a rule, be employed with any safety.

In the main, however, there is a fair consensus of editors (*cf.* W.H ., ii., 260 f.) for the bulk of the text as printed in the following pages. Exigencies of space have obliged the present editor to omit nearly all the textual material which he had amassed, and the only variants noted, as a rule, are those of direct significance for the expositor. Once or twice a variant has some intrinsic interest of a special kind, or the reading has had to be justified, but the textual notes do not profess to provide anything like a complete textual conspectus. Thus there is no discussion upon the gloss of S on ἀνὰ in iv. 8, upon the curious Syriac rendering of viii. 13 (as if μεσ. = μέσος οὐρὰ αἷμα), or upon the interpolation at xi. 1. All that one has been able to do is to furnish the reader with as accurate a text as possible for that elucidation of the religious ideas of the book which it is the primary object of the Expositor's Greek Testament to facilitate.

Special Abbreviations (*cf.* others in vol. ii. 754-756, iii. 33-36, 413).

And. = comm.[1] of Andreas, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (fifth or sixth century), author of first Greek edit. (ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν). *Cf.* von Soden's *die Schriften des N.T.*, i. 1, 472-475, 702 f., and Delitzsch's *Hands. Funde*, ii. (1862), pp. 29 f.

Areth. = comm. of Arethas, his successor (in 10th cent.?), allied to Q (Delitzsch) as And. to A upon the whole.

Arm. = Armenian version. *Cf.* Conybeare's *Armenian Version of Rev.* (London, 1907), from codex 4 (12th cent.).

Bs. = Bousset's "Textkritische Studien zum N.T." (*Texte u. Untersuchungen*, xi. 4, 1-44), 1894.

edd. = consensus or large majority of editors: so min. (minuscules), MSS. (manuscripts), and vss. (versions).

[1] Extant in these forms: And^a = codex August., 12th cent. (14th, Gregory), And^c = codex Coisl. (10th cent.), And^{bav} = codex Bavaricus (16th cent.), And^{pal} = codex Palatinus (15th cent.). The newly discovered commentary of Oecumenius (6th cent., *cf.* Diekamp in *Sitzungsberichte der königl. preuss. Akad.*, 1907, 1046 f.), as yet unedited, may take the primacy from Andreas.

gig. = codex gigas Holmiensis (13th cent.), witness either to old Latin text or to "late European" type (Hort).

Pr. = Primasius, ed. Haussleiter in Zahn's *Forschungen zur Gesch. des NTlichen Kanons*, iv., pp. 1-224 (1891), a very important study. *Cf.* the same critic's essay on Vict., Tic., and Jerome in *Zeits. für Kirchl. Wiss. u. Leben* (1886), 237-257.

S. = Syriac Philoxenian recension (6th cent.), ed. Gwynn (1897); reflects a Greek text, which is mixed, but is in the main (lxi. f.) allied to the normal uncial text, and is especially close to C and Origen (lv. f.). *Cf.* Gregory, ii. 507, 509.

Spec. = pseudo-August. *Speculum* (8th or 9th cent.).

Syr. = Harkleian recension (represented by about eight considerable MSS.): posterior and inferior to S.

Tic. = "comm. in Apoc. homiliis octodecim comprehensus" of Tyconius the Donatist (end of 4th cent.).

vg. = vulgate (Jerome's version, 4th cent.), best preserved in codices Am. (= Amiatinus, 8th cent.), and Fuld. (= Fuldensis, 6th cent.), Harl. (= Harleianus, 9th cent.), and Tol. (= Toletanus, 8th cent.).

Vict. = comm. of Victorinus, bishop of Pettau in Pannonia (end of 3rd cent.).

Ws. = B. Weiss: "die Joh. Apk., textkritische Unters. u. Textherstellung" (*Texte u. Unters.* vii. 1), 1891.

§ 2. *Analysis*.—The Apocalypse of John, which is thrown into epistolary form, is a slender book with a large design. After the title (i. 1-3) and prologue (i. 4-8) in which the prophet puts himself into relation with seven churches of Western Asia Minor, he proceeds to describe the vision of Jesus Christ (i. 9 f.) which furnished him with his commission to write.[1] The immediate outcome of the vision is a series of charges addressed to these churches (ii.-iii.).[2] Like the

[1] The phrase ἐν κυριακῇ (=imperial, *cf.* Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten*, 258 f.) ἡμέρᾳ (i. 10) denotes the Christian Sunday, not the day of judgment to which he was transported (so Wetstein, Weyland, Selwyn, Hort, Russell's *Parousia*, 371, 372, and Deissmann in *E. Bi.*, 2815). *The day of the Lord* is only twice used in the Apoc. (vi. 14, xvi. 14), and there in a special eschatological connexion and in its normal grammatical form. In the Apocalypse it means the day of judgment, whereas in i. 10 the words imply revelation, and the Apocalypse is not a mere revelation of the judgment-day. Besides, ἐν πν. must go here with ἐγεν. as in iv. 2, otherwise it would have a verb of transport (so xvii. 3, xxi. 10).

[2] These are addressed to tiny communities in the cities, not to the churches as being in any sense the cities. The character and history of the Christian community are by no means to be identified with those of the city; we have no reason to assume that the local Christians, who were ardently awaiting a citizenship from heaven,

author of the 50th Psalm, he tries to rouse God's people to the seriousness of their own position, before he enters into any predictions regarding the course of the outside world. The scene then changes to the celestial court (iv.-v.), where God appears enthroned in his presence-chamber over the universe, with Jesus installed as the divine revealer of providence in the immediate future. The description of the heavenly *penetralia* forms a series of weird Oriental arabesques, but the nucleus is drawn from the tradition of the later post-exilic prophets (especially Ezekiel). According to one phase of this tradition, the climax of things was to be heralded by physical and political disturbances; a regular crescendo of disasters was imminent on the edge and eve of the world's annihilation. Hence the next series of visions is full of material and military troubles, delineated partly in supernatural colours which are borrowed from the fanciful astro-theology of eschatological tradition. From this point onwards the sword of the Lord is either an inch or two out of its scabbard, or showering blows upon his adversaries. In the prophet's own metaphor, before the contents of the Book of Doom (in the hands of Jesus Christ) can be read, its seven seals must be broken, and at the opening of each (vi.-vii.) some fresh woe is chronicled.[1] The woe heralded by the seventh seal drifts over, however, into another series of fearful catastrophes which are introduced by seven trumpet blasts (viii.-ix.), and it is only on their completion that the way is now clear for the introduction of the protagonists in the last conflict upon earth. These protagonists are the messiah of God, *i.e.*, Jesus

had any vivid civic consciousness, or were keenly sensitive to the historical and geographical features of their cities. The analogies sometimes drawn from the latter are interesting but for the most part specious and irrelevant coincidences. It is modern fancy which discovers in such directions any vital elements present to the mind of the prophet or his readers. Why these particular churches were selected, remains a mystery. The cities in question were not all conspicuous for a special enforcement of the imperial cultus, and the churches themselves can hardly be supposed to be in every case representative or particularly important. Even the plausible theory that they were the most convenient centres for district-groups of churches (Ramsay, *Seven Letters*, pp. 180 f.) does not work out well in detail.

[1] The longing of the martyred souls in vi. 9-11 ("lignes toutes divines, qui suffront éternellement à la consolation de l'âme qui souffre pour sa foi ou sa vertu," Renan, 463), recalls the function of the Erinnys in Greek religion, the Erinnys being primarily "the outraged soul of the dead man crying for vengeance" (*cf.* J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to Study of Greek Religion*, p. 214). Only, the souls in the Apocalypse are passive; they do not actively pursue their revenge upon the living. The point of the vision is in part to reiterate the deterministic conviction that God has his own way and time; he is neither to be hurried by the importunity of his own people nor thwarted by the apparent triumph of his enemies.

Christ, and the messiah of Satan, *i.e.*, the Roman empire in the person of its emperor with his blasphemous claim to divine honours upon earth. The series of tableaux which depict their entrance on the scene indicates that the prophet has now reached the heart and centre of his subject. But at this point his method alters, and the thread of purpose is less patent. Hitherto the Book of Doom, with its seven seals, has sufficed for the artistic and rather artificial presentation of his oracles. Now that the seventh seal is broken, the Book, *ex hypothesi*, is opened; we expect the secrets of divine judgment to be unbared. Instead of describing what follows as the contents of this book, however, the prophet relates how he absorbed another and a smaller volume (x.), containing the sum and substance of the final oracles which bear on the world's fate.[1] He then proceeds, in terms of current and consecrated mythological traditions, to portray the two witnesses (xi.) who herald the advent of the divine messiah (xii.) himself, in the latter days. Messiah's rival, the dragon or Satan, is next introduced, together with the dragon's commission of the Roman empire and emperor (xiii.) as the supreme foe of God's people. Here is the crisis of the world! And surely it is a *nodus dignus vindice;* God must shortly and sternly interfere. The imperial power, with its demand for worship, is confronted by a sturdy nucleus of Christians who will neither palter nor falter in their refusal to give divine honours to the emperor. Characteristically, the prophet breaks off to paint, in proleptic and realistic fashion, the final bliss of these loyal saints (xiv.), and the corresponding tortures reserved by God for the enemy and his deluded adherents. But at this point, just as the closing doom might be expected to crash down upon the world, the kaleidoscope of the visions again alters rather abruptly. The element of fantasy

[1] The distinctive and Jewish characteristics of the following oracles (xi.-xiv., xvii. f.) suggest, as Sabatier was almost the first to see, that the contents of this βιβλαρίδιον are to be found here; so Weyland (a Jewish Neronic source in x.-xi. 13, xii.-xiii., xiv. 6-11, xv. 2-4, xvi. 13, 14, 16, xix. 11-21, xx.-xxi. 8), Spitta (a Jewish source, *c.* 63 B.C., in most of x.-xi., xiv. 14 f., xv. 1-8, xvi. 1-12, 17, 21, xvii. 1-6, xviii., xix. 1-8, xxi. 9-27, xxii. 1-3, 15), Pfleiderer (Jewish source, Neronic and Vespasianic, in most of xi.-xiv., xvii.-xix.), and J. Weiss (Jewish source, Neronic, in xi. 1-13, xii. 1-6, 14-17, xiii. 1-7, xv.-xix., xxi. 4-27). But the first editor has worked over the contents of the βιβλαρίδιον so thoroughly that it is impossible to be sure that it ever was a literary unity. The probability is that xi.-xiii. at least reproduce fragments from it; the evidence hardly warrants us in postulating the incorporation of any coherent source. After chap. x. the symmetry of the Apocalypse is impaired by rapid and bewildering alterations of standpoint to which no satisfactory clue can be found.

becomes still more lurid and ornate. The world of men and nature is drenched by a fresh series of chastisements (xv.-xvi.), which prove unavailing; no repentance follows (xvi. 11, 21), and the climax of history is eventually reached through a succession of mortal penalties inflicted upon the city and empire of Rome (the vices of the empire being ascribed to the city, on the O.T. view which identified capital and kingdom, *cf.* Nah. iii. 1 f.), the votaries of the imperial cultus, and the devil himself (xvii.-xx). To the mind of an early Christian (*cf.* Tert., *Scap.*, 2)[1] it was inconceivable that the world could long survive the downfall of the Roman empire. "And when Rome falls, the world." All that the prophet sees beyond that ruin is the destruction of the rebels employed by God to crush the capital; then—thanks to the survival of an O.T. idea, quickened by later tradition—a desperate recrudescence (xx. 7 f.) of the devil. His defeat ushers in the general resurrection and the judgment. *Earth and sky flee from the face of God*, but men cannot fly. They must stand their trial. Then follows the advent of a new heaven and earth (xxi.-xxii.) for the acquitted and innocent, with the descent of the new Jerusalem and the final bliss of God and of his loyal people.

The cycles of seven (ii.-iii., vi. f., viii. f., xv.-xvi.) apparently formed the nucleus of the book, as the author conceived it, the seals representing the certainty, the trumpets the promulgation, and the bowls the actual execution of the doom. They may have been composed at different times and re-arranged in their present order, like the books of the *Aeneid*, but, as they stand, they are closely welded together. The introductory Christophany leads up to ii.-iii., while these chapters again anticipate the visions of iv.-v., which are independently linked to i. (*cf.* i. 4 = iv. 5, v. 6; i. 5, 6 = v. 9). Chapters vi.-ix. are interwoven, and, although the last cycle of seven (xv.-xvi.) seems abruptly introduced, it is really prepared for by x. (see notes). Like the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse has been edited, possibly after the author's death, by the local Johannine circle in Asia Minor (*e.g.*, i. 1-3, xxii. 18 f.); one or two cases of transposition by copyists also occur (*cf.* notes on xvi. 15, xviii. 14, xix. 9, xx. 14-xxii. 6 f.), and glosses may be suspected occasionally (*e.g.*, i. 18, iii. 8, ix. 9, xvii. 5; see § 8). But substantially it bears the marks of composition by a single pen; the blend of original writing and editorial re-setting does not impair the impression of a literary unity. This may be seen from the following analysis or outline:—

[1] The author of the Daniel-Apocalypse similarly believed that the resurrection of loyal Jews would follow the downfall of Antiochus Epiphanes (xii. 2, 13).

i. 1-8.	Prologue.	
i. 9-20.	A vision of Jesus the messiah, introducing	
ii.-iii.	Seven letters to Asiatic churches:— (1 Ephesus. (2) Smyrna. (3) Pergamos. (4) Thyatira. (5) Sardis. (6) Philadelphia. (7) Laodicea.	
iv.-v.	A vision of heaven: the throne of God, the Lamb, the book of Doom or Destiny, introducing the plagues of the	
vi.	Seven seals:— (1) The white horse. (2) ,, red ,, (3) ,, black ,, (4) ,, pale ,, (5) ,, souls of the slain. (6) ,, earthquake and eclipse, etc.	
		Intermezzo:—
vii 1-8.		the sealing of the redeemed on earth.
vii. 9-17.		the bliss of the redeemed in heaven.
viii. 1.	(7) ,, silence or pause.	
viii. 2-5.	A vision of heaven: an episode of angels, introducing	
viii. 6-ix. 21.	Seven trumpet blasts for (1) earth. (2) sea. (3) streams: the star Wormwood. (4) an eclipse. (5) a woe of locusts. (6) a woe of Parthian cavalry.	
		Intermezzo:—
x.		episode of angels and a booklet.
xi. 1-13.		the apocalypse of the two witnesses.
xi. 14-19.	(7) voices and visions in heaven, introducing	
xii.	A vision of (*a*) the dragon or Satan as the anti-Christ; a war in heaven.	
xiii. 1-10.	(*b*) the Beast or Imperial power } A war on earth.	
xiii. 11-18.	(*c*) the false prophet or Imperial priesthood. }	
		Intermezzo:—
xiv. 1-5.		the bliss of the redeemed in heaven.
xiv. 6-20.		episode of angels and doom on earth.
xv.	A vision of heaven: the triumph of the redeemed, introducing	
xvi.	Seven bowls with plagues for (1) earth. (2) sea. (3) waters. (4) the sun.	

(5) the realm of the Beast.
(6) the Euphrates: an Eastern invasion.
(7) the air: a storm, introducing
A vision of Doom upon

xvii. (a) The realm of the Beast, or Rome, at the hands of the Beast and his allies.
xviii. a song of doom on earth:
xix. 1-10. „ „ triumph in heaven.
xix. 11-21. (b) The Beast and his allies, and the false prophet.
xx. 1-10. (c) The Dragon or Satan himself, with his adherents.
A vision of the new heaven and earth: including
xx. 11-xxi. 8. The judgment of the dead.
xxi. 9-xxii. 5. The descent of the new Jerusalem.
xxii. 6-21. Epilogue.

§ 3. *Literary Structure.*—This general unity of conception as well as of style is a unity of purpose, however, rather than of design.[1] Once we descend into details another series of features emerges into view. Even upon the hypothesis that it was written by one author, it cannot have been the product of a single vision, much less composed or dictated under one impulse. Furthermore, inconsequence of a certain kind is one of the psychological phenomena of visions; a change comes over the spirit even of religious dreams, as they drift through the mind of the seer. But more than this is required to account for incongruities and differences of climate, as *e.g.*, in xi. 1, 2, 19 and xxi. 22, xi. 8 and xviii. 24, the various descriptions of the second advent (i. 7, xiv. 14 f., xix. 11 f.), of the judgment (xx. 11 f., xxii. 12), or of heaven (vii. 11 f., xv. 2, xix. 7 f., xxi. 1 f., xxii. 1-5, etc.), the isolated allusions to Michael, Gog and Magog, the four angels of vii. 1-4, the carnage of xiv. 20, etc., the unrelated predictions which are left side by side, the amount of repetition, the episodical and conflicting passages of vii. 1-8, 9-17, x., xi. 1-13, xiv. 1-5, 6-13, 14-20, xix. 11 f., etc. Such phenomena are too vital and numerous to be explained upon the same principle as the contradictions and discrepancies which are to be found in many great works of ancient

[1] "It is of the nature of an epic poem describing what a Christian Homer might describe as 'the good news of the accomplishment of the righteousness and wrath of God'" (Abbott, p. 75). *Cf.* Rom. i. 16-18, Apoc. vi. 17, x. 7, xi. 17, 18. The dramatic hypothesis, favoured by a series of students from Milton to Archbishop Benson, is worked out elaborately by Palmer and Eichhorn. The latter, after the prelude (iv. 1.-viii. 5), finds the first act in viii. 6-xii. 17 (overthrow of Jerusalem in three scenes), the second in xii. 18-xx. 10 (downfall of paganism), and the third in xx. 11-xxii. 5 (the new Jerusalem). But all such schemes are artificial.

literature, or even as the free play of a poetic mind; they denote in several cases planes of religious feeling and atmospheres of historical outlook which differ not simply from their context but from one another. This feature of the book's structure, together with the absence or comparative absence of distinctively Christian traits from certain sections, the iteration of ideas, the differences of Christological climate, the repetitions and interruptions, and the awkward transitions at one point after another, has given rise to the whole analytic movement of literary criticism upon the Apocalypse. The earlier phases are surveyed by A. Hirscht (*Die Apocalypse u. ihre neueste Kritik*, 1895), Dr. Barton (*Amer. Journ. Theol.*, 1898, 776-801), and the present writer (*Hist. New Testament*, 1901, 677-689); for the later literature, see Dr. A. Meyer's articles in the *Theologische Rundschau* (1907, 126 f., 182 f.), and an article by the present writer in the *Expositor* for March, 1909. The legitimacy of this method is denied by Dr. William Milligan (*Discussions on the Apocalypse*, 1893, pp. 27-74), Zahn in his *Einleitung in das N.T.* (§§ 72-75), and Dr. M. Kohlhofer (*Die Einheit der Apocalypse*, 1902), amongst others, but, although both attack and defence have too often proceeded upon the false assumption that the Apocalypse contains a balanced series of historical and theological propositions, or that it can be treated with the ingenuity of a Dante critic, the storm of hypotheses has at least succeeded in laying bare certain strata in the book, as well as a teleological arrangement of them in their present position. The Apocalypse is neither a literary conglomerate nor a mechanical compilation of earlier shreds and patches. There is sufficient evidence of homogeneity in style and uniformity in treatment to indicate that one mind has been at the shaping of its oracles in their extant guise (*cf.* G. H. Gilbert in *Biblical World*, 1895, 29-35, 114-123, and Gallois in *Revue Biblique*, 1894, 357-374). But the prophet has worked occasionally as an editor of earlier sources or traditions, as well as an original composer. These leaflets or traditions are stones quarried from foreign soils; it is no longer possible[1] to ascertain with any great certainty when or how or even why they were gathered. The main point is to determine approximately the object of the watch-tower which the apocalyptist built by means of them, and the direction of his outlook. In some cases it is probable that, alike as a poet and a practical religious seer, he was indifferent to

[1] The state of the extant literature leaves our knowledge of early eschatological tradition full of gaps. It is less exhilarating but more critical to mark the extent of the gaps than to attempt to fill them up or to bridge them with more or less airy guesswork.

their origin, and in every case the important thing is to learn not the original date or shape of a source, or the particular mythological matrix of a tradition, but the new sense attached to it by the prophet himself and the precise object to which he adapted it. This consciousness of a purpose is the least obscure and the most Christian feature of the Apocalypse. Strictly speaking, it is an apocalypse not of John but of Jesus as the Christ[1] (i. 1), and it is the triumphant adoration of Christ which gives an inner clue to the choice and treatment of the various messianic categories. Where the problems of structure arise, and where source-criticism of some kind[2] is necessary, in order to account satisfactorily for the literary and psychological data—is in the juxtaposition of disparate materials (*cf.* notes on vii., x., xi., xii., xiii., xiv., xvii., xviii.).

The results reached in the following commentary outline a theory of the Apocalypse, in its literary aspect, which falls under (*a*) the incorporation hypothesis. According to this view, the Apocalypse is substantially a unity, due to one hand, but incorporating several older fragments of Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin. So Weizsäcker (ii. 173 f.), Sabatier (*Les origines littéraires et la composition de l'Apocalypse*, 1888: Jewish fragments in xi. 1-13, xii., xiii., xiv. 6-20, xvi. 13-14, 16, xvii. 1-xix. 2, xix. 11-xx. 10, xxi. 9-xxii. 5), Schön (*L'origine de l'Apocalypse*, 1887: Jewish fragments in xi. 1-13, xii. 1-9, 13-17, xviii. [except ver. 20]), Bousset, Jülicher (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, § 22), C. A. Scott, F. C. Porter, A. C. M'Giffert (*History of*

[1] The anti-Jewish note of the Apocalypse is as distinct as, though less loud than, the anti-Roman. *Cf.* notes, *e.g.*, on i. 6, 19 f., ii. 9, iii. 7-10, v. 9, 10, x. 7, xi. 19, xxi. 22, xxii. 18. The Christian church was the new and true Israel, and thus served herself heir to great traditions and to high destinies which were only inferior to her own in that they formed a lower slope on the same hill. One of the minor effects (which differentiates the Apocalypse from the Fourth Gospel) of this conception is that Christians are not invited by John to love God or Christ; the temper of their vocation is defined in Jewish terms as a reverent fear of God (*cf.* xi. 18, xiv. 7, xv. 4, xix. 5). Another is the avoidance of ἐκκλησία as a collective term for the church and the ignoring of ἐπίσκοποι, διάκονοι, πρεσβύτεροι, etc.—for the twenty-four celestial πρεσβύτεροι, of course, have nothing whatever to do with the officials of the same name.

[2] English criticisms of Völter's first essays by Warfield (*Presbyterian Review*. 1884, 228-265), and A. Robertson (*Critical Review*, Jan., 1895), of Vischer and Sabatier by Salmon (*Introd. N.T.*, pp. 232 f.), of Vischer and of Völter's earlier theory by Simcox (pp. 215 f.), and of Vischer by Thomson (*Books which influenced Our Lord*, pp. 461 f.). Northcote once told Hazlitt that he believed the Waverley novels were written by several hands, on account of their inequalities. "Some parts are careless, others straggling; it is only when there is an opening for effect that the master-hand comes in." There are several criticisms of the Apocalypse which, with their quasi-reasons, recall this perverse and hapless verdict of a clever man.

Apostolic Age, pp. 633 f.), A. Meyer (*Theol. Rundschau*, 1907, pp. 132 f.), Abbott, Baljon, Wrede (*Entstehung der Schriften des N. T.*, 103, 104), Schmiedel and Calmes. Pfleiderer's two Jewish fragments lie in xi.-xiv., xvii.-xviii., and in xxi. 10-xxii. 5. Those who are unwilling to admit the use of any Jewish sources fall back, as a rule, upon (*b*) the revision hypothesis of an Apocalypse which has been re-edited and brought up to date. This is represented best by Erbes (*Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1891), who regards the original work as Johannine (before A.D. 70, incorporating one fragment of a Caligula apocalypse = xii.-xiii.), with editorial additions (Domitianic) in i. 1-3, 20, vii. 4-8, 13-17, ix. 12, xi. 14, xiii. 12, 14, xiv. 4, 8-9*a*, xv. 1, 5-xix. 4, xix. 9*b*-xx. 10, xxi. 5-xxii. 2 (18-19 ?). Similarly, but very elaborately, Briggs (*Messiah of Apostles*, pp. 285 f.) discovers a fourfold process of editing, or rather of materials successively gathering round an original nucleus, while Dr. Barth, in his recent *Einleitung in d. N. T.* (1908, pp. 250-276) goes to the opposite extreme of simplicity by conjecturing (partly along the lines followed by Grotius) that John simply revised, under Domitian, an earlier apocalypse of his own (written under Nero). Either (*a*) or (*b*) is preferable to the over-precision and disintegration of (*c*), the compilation hypothesis, according to which two or more large sources, fairly complete in themselves, have been pieced together by a redactor or redactors. So Weyland (*Omwerkings-en compilatie-hypothesen*, etc., 1888: two Jewish sources, with Christian editorial additions (*c.* A.D. 100) in i. 1-9, 11, 18, 20, ii.-iii., v. 6-14 (vi. 1, 16), ix. 18, x. 7, xi. 8*b*, 19, xii. 11, 17*c*, xiv. 1-5, xv. 1, 6-8, xvi. 1-12, 15, 17*a*, 21, xvii. 14, xix. 7-10, 13*b*, xxii. 7*a*, 12, 13, 16-21), K. Kohler (*E. J.*, x. 390-396: two Jewish sources, one from seventh decade, the other slightly later = x. 2-xi. 13, xii. 1-xiii. 10, xiv. 6 f.), Ménégoz (*Annales de bibliog. Théol.*, 1888, 41-45; two Jewish sources), Bruston (*Études sur Daniel et l'Apocalypse*, 1908, summarising his earlier studies: two Hebrew apocalypses, one Neronic = x. 1, 2, 8-11, xi. 1-13, 19*a*, xii.-xiv. 1, xiv. 4-end, xv. 2-4, xvi. 13-16, 19*b*, xvii.-xix. 3, xix. 11-xx.; the other *c.* A.D. 100 = i. 4 f., ii-iii., iv.-ix., x. 1, 2*b*-7, xi. 14-19, xiv. 2-3, 12, 13, xix. 4-10, xxi. 1-8, xxii. 6-13, 16, 17, 20, 21), Spitta (*Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1898: two Jewish sources, one B.C. 63 and one *c.* A.D. 40, with a Christian apocalypse by John Mark *c.* A.D. 60), Schmidt (*Anmerkungen*, etc., 1891: three Jewish sources, iv. 1-vii. 8, viii. 2-xi. 15 [except x. 1-xi. 13], xii. 1-xxii. 5), Eugène de Faye (*Les Apocalypses Juives*, 1892, pp. 171 f.: two Jewish apocalypses, one from Caligula's reign in vii. 1-8, viii. 2-ix. 21, x. 1*a*, 2*b*-7, xi. 14-15*a*, 19, xii.-xiv. 11, etc.; another = A.D. 69-70),

J. Weiss (*die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1904: two sources, one Christian [A.D. 65-70] = i. 4-6, 9-19, ii.-iii., iv.-vi., vii., ix., xii. 7-12, xiii. 11-18, xiv. 1-5, 14-20, xx. 1-15, xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-5; one Jewish, *c.* A.D. 70), etc. Upon similar lines O. Holtzmann (in Stade's *Gesch. Israel*, ii. 658 f.) detected two Jewish sources, one imbedded in the other, the earlier from Caligula's period (xiii., xiv. 6 f.), the later from Nero's. The coast of reality almost disappears from view in Völter's latest theory (*die Offenbarung Johannis, neu untersucht u. erklärt*, 1904), which is a combination of (*b*) and (*c*); it postulates an apocalypse of John Mark (*c.* A.D. 65) and an apocalypse of Cerinthus (*c.* A.D. 70 = x. 1-11, xvii. 1-18, xi. 1-13, xii. 1-16, xv. 5, 6, 8, xvi. 1-21, xix. 11–xxii. 6), both edited under Trajan and under Hadrian. Least successful of all, perhaps, in dealing with the complex literary and traditional data, is (*d*) the Jewish and Christian hypothesis, which is really a simplified variant of (*b*); *e.g.*, Vischer (*Texte u. Untersuchungen*, ii. 3, 1886, 2nd ed. 1895) finds the groundwork of the apocalypse to be an Aramaic Jewish writing (mainly) from A.D. 65-70, which was translated, re-set, and edited by a Christian (in the "Lamb"-passages, with i.-iii., v. 9-14, vii. 9-17, xii. 11, xiii. 9-10, xiv. 1-5, 12, 13, xvi. 15, xvii. 14, xix. 9, 10, 11, 13, xx. 4-6, xxi. 5*b*-8, xxii. 6-21, etc.). Similarly Harnack (*ibid.*), Martineau (*Seat of Authority*, 217-227), and independently, an anonymous writer in the *Zeitschrift für alt. Wiss.* 1887, 167-171, as well as Dr. S. Davidson (*Introd. to N. T.*, ii., pp. 126-233: the Apocalypse an Aramaic Jewish work translated, with additions and interpolations). Von Soden's theory (*Early Christian Literature*, pp. 338 f.), which finds in viii. 1-xxii. 5 of the Johannine Apocalypse under Domitian, a Jewish apocalypse written between May and August of A.D. 70, lies, like C. Rauch's (*Offenbarung des Johannes*, 1894: Jewish composite nucleus, worked up by Christian editor) between (*d*) and (*b*).

The unsatisfactory result of many of these hypotheses is due to the use of inadequate criteria or to the inadequate use of right criteria. The distinction of Jewish and Christian elements is particularly hazardous in a book which deals with eschatology, where no Christian could work without drawing upon Jewish traditions. And these were neither stereotyped nor homogeneous. A given passage in the Apocalypse may not be couched in Christian language, but this does not necessarily prove that it was not written by a Christian; we know far too little about Jewish Christianity in the first century to be sure, apart from certain fundamental beliefs about Jesus, how far it diverged from cognate Jewish conceptions. A failure to appreciate either the poetic freedom of the Apocalyptist or the

characteristic phenomena of apocalyptic writing in general has also turned some literary analysts into theorists of the narrowest *parti pris*. But such extravagances do not invalidate the legitimacy of the method in question; without some application of it, the phenomena of the book present a hopeless literary and psychological enigma, and it may fairly be concluded as well as argued that this apocalypse, like most others of its class, is composite to some degree.

§ 4. *Characteristic Features.*—In spirit as well as in form the Apocalypse of John has affinities to the apocalyptic literature of the later Judaism.[1] An apocalypse was the word for a crisis, and for a crisis which bordered on the end. Whenever such epochs of dire emergency recurred, the faith of Israel rose in poignant hope that by breasting this wave of suffering they would soon be past the worst, and lie safe out of the swing of the sea. Since the exile, Israel's foe had been some foreign power, whose policy threatened the religious conscience and whose annihilation was eagerly awaited by the faithful. Apocalypses frankly doomed the State and the world alike; they maintained an irreconcilable and pessimistic attitude towards both. Hence their speculation upon empires and emperors. Hence their constant appeal for courage, based on a conviction that God would intervene ere long in the political sphere to inaugurate a reign of the saints on earth. For the apocalypse was a programme of the immediate future on earth, or of a new earth, as well as a brilliant panorama of celestial mysteries vouchsafed to men in dreams or visions. Its subject was invariably ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει. Apocalyptic always spread its gorgeous pinions in the dusk of the national fortunes, but it strained to the near dawn of relief.

Our concern, however, is with the genius rather than with the genus of John's Apocalypse. It rises above its class *quantum lenta solent inter uiburna cupressi*. The *uiburna* are not to be ignored, indeed. Their order is the general order of the Apocalypse, and when the latter is approached from the side of the early Christian literature, it seems often to include material of little or no specific Christian value. There is a certain foreign air and shape about its foliage. But when it is approached through the tangled underwoods of apocalyptic writings in general, with their frigid speculations upon cosmic details, their

[1] For the characteristics of apocalyptic literature, and for the relation of apocalypse to prophecy, *cf.* §§ 6-19 of Lücke's epoch-making *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Joh. und in die gesammte apok. Literatur* (sec. ed. 1822); English summaries and surveys by Dr. Torrey (*E. J.* i. 669-675); L. Hassé in *Inaugural Lectures* (Manchester, 1905, 126-159); Dr. Driver ("Daniel," 1900, pp. lxxxvi. f.); Dr. A. C. Zenos in *Dict. of Christ and Gospels*, i. 79-94; and Dr. R. H. Charles (*E. Bi.* 213-250, also 1338-1392 on Eschatology).

wearisome and fantastic calculations, their tasteless and repulsive elements, and the turgid rhetoric which frequently submerges their really fine conceptions, the Apocalypse of John reveals itself as a superior plant. Its very omissions are significant. There is no allusion, *e.g.*, to the prevalent category of the *two æons*, or to the return of the ten tribes, or to the contemporary Jewish wail over the cessation of sacrifice after A.D. 70 (*e.g.* in *Apoc. Bar.* x. 10), or to the martyrs' death as expiatory (*cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 37 f., 4 Macc. vi. 29, xvii. 21, etc.), or to any intercession of the prophet on behalf of the church (*cf.* 4 Esdras viii.). There is no cosmogony, no self-satisfied comparison of God's people with pagans, no reference to the law[1] (in contrast to the contemporary glorification, *e.g.*, in 4 Esdras iii.-ix., *Apoc. Bar.* xv.-lxix. [*cf.* Charles' note on xv. 5], where it rivals even the messiah as a medium of fellowship and a nucleus of future bliss). There are no parables (as in 4th Esdras) or allegories; above all, there are no querulous complaints from the living. Carlyle describes the Girondist pamphlets as far too full of long-drawn out ejaculations, "Woe is me, and cursed be ye!" Even 4 Esdras, for all its noble pathos, partakes of this self-pity and fury; it is half-anger and half-agony. But the Apocalypse of John usually breathes another air, mitigating upon the whole the brusque temper of its class. Though the oppression which makes a wise man mad may also make a good man sad, for all the feelings of exasperation and indignation stirred by the empire, the prophet John has not yielded to any pessimism about the cause of God. He never attempts to justify the ways of God, like his Jewish contemporaries, or to explain how *the devil gave his power to the beast.* His faith in Jesus as the messiah inspires a simple hope which enables him to remain unintimidated by the last threats and terrors of a foe whose end is near. The quarrel with Rome, *e.g.*, is God's affair. His people have merely to stand still and witness their enemy's rout.

It is this faith, this Christian consciousness, with its moral steadiness, which differentiates John's Apocalypse from the other members of its class. To write an apocalypse meant, like the composition of a drama or a sonnet, conformity to certain literary rules or standards as well as approximation to a certain spirit and temper. It justified, if it did not necessitate, the use of earlier fragments, which were only partially intelligible, since the agony of their hour had long passed by. Apocalyptic modified and adapted such sources to the needs of a later generation. There was a sequacity about apocalyptic

[1] This is all the more remarkable as contemporary Christians were being led, for ethical reasons, to view their religion more and more from a nomistic standpoint.

literature.[1] An author in this province could not start *de novo ;* not merely had conventional designs or traditions to be followed, but earlier products were commonly treasured and reset. John followed this method, but his regulative principle was unique, and one fascination of his Apocalypse lies in the fact that we have here a Christian prophet half-mastering and half-mastered by the literary exigencies[2] of apocalyptic, uttering his convictions in strange and hardly relevant terms which had hitherto been appropriated to alien ends. His vision of Jesus came to him through an atmosphere of truculent and fantastic messianism, which was scarcely lucid at all points and which tended to refract if not to blur the newer light; yet the Christian messianic belief generally managed to overpower the inadequate, archaic, and incongruous categories of tradition, through which it had often to pass. It is this juxtaposition which helps to explain the occasional awkwardness and artificiality in the symbolism of the Apocalypse. No doubt the author himself, whether as editor or composer, is partly responsible for this. A certain stiffness of structure pervades the book. There is a lack of sustained interest, and at several points the dove-tailing is defective, while, by a favourite Semitic device, repetition (*cf.* Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, xx. 17) is made to serve the purpose of emphasis. But such inconsistencies and inequalities are mainly due to the fact that the writer's Christian consciousness repeatedly tends to break through forms too narrow for its fulness. Probably the materials at the author's disposal would have been better arranged, had this been anything less than the presentation of a living Redeemer in heaven as the messiah of God's people upon earth. The mere fact that the messiah had lived, involved a readjustment of messianic categories; the further fact that he had suffered and risen meant that many had to be reshaped, There are things in the Apocalypse which show a careful study of earlier prophetic scriptures and rabbinic traditions; but there are

[1] This applies to traditions (*S. C.* 252 f.) as well as to literature (Selwyn, 59 f.). A political and religious crisis promoted the resetting of older eschatological traditions and the resumption of such elements from the common fund or circle of apocalyptic teaching as had acquired special impressiveness (*S. C.* 221 f.). The different interpretations of Jeremiah's prediction about the 70 years by the authors of Daniel and En. lxxxix. 59 f., are a case in point.

[2] One of the clearest instances of this may be found in the *angelus interpres* (*cf.* note on i. 1), which also illustrates, by the way, the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. The Fourth Gospel scrupulously avoids connecting angels with Jesus. The only allusion to them, during his life-time, is the popular mistake (xii. 29 f.) which misinterpreted God's voice to him as if it had been an angel's voice. The Apocalypse, on the other hand, swarms with angels.

other things which could only have been taught and learned within the school of Jesus Christ, and these are really the telling sentences throughout the book.

At the same time it must be remembered that some of the very features which have lost much if not all of their significance for later ages, ornate and cryptic expressions, allusions to coeval hopes and superstitions, grotesque fantasies and glowing creations of an oriental imagination, the employment of current ideas about antichrist, calculations of the immediate future, and the use of a religious or semi-mythical terminology which was evidently familiar to some Asiatic Christians in the first century—these more or less ephemeral elements combined to drive home the message of the book. They signify to us the toll which had to be paid to contemporary exigencies; without them the book could not have made its way at all into the conscience and imagination of its audience. The momentum of its message lay, however, in the deep sincerity and lofty outlook of the prophet himself, and this broke out occasionally in passages of unexampled splendour and dignity. Sublimity, as a contemporary critic of literary style observed (Pseudo-Longinus, περὶ ὕψους), has always a moral basis; it is, he declared, the echo of a great soul (μεγαλοφροσύνης ἀπήχημα)—or, we might add, of a great soul exercised upon a great issue. The same critic makes another remark, which is apposite to a passage like ch. xviii. of the Apocalypse. One avenue to sublimity, he notes, lies through imitation of and devotion to great writers of an earlier age: Ἔστι δὲ οὐ κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν εἰδῶν ἢ πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. This canon throws a ray of light upon the special psychological problem of the Apocalypse's relation to its O.T. and extra-canonical models. Some great writers in every period of literature are only to be understood in the light of a long series of predecessors, and the prophet John is one of these. His apocalypse in one aspect is the final and brilliant flash of the red light which had gleamed from Amos down to the Maccabees. His affinities in point of form, treatment, and general aim are with the line of literary prophets who, from Ezekiel to the authors of Daniel, 4th Esdras, and Baruch, applied themselves to the statement and restatement of apocalyptic eschatology. John's Apocalypse is flecked with allusions to Ezekiel, Zechariah,[1] and above all Daniel.

[1] In two aspects John resembles his prototype Zechariah: (*a*) in the employment of an intricate symbolism, which makes it difficult to be sure where intuition ends and literary decoration begins, (*b*) in the use of schematism to explain providence. For the latter, *cf.* Giesebrecht's *Die Berufsgabung der alttest. Propheten*

But his use of Daniel especially is more than that of a *littérateur* reproducing impressive and poetic conceptions from the study of a classic. For all the artistic and even artificial literary shape of the book, we should weigh it in the wrong scales were we to estimate it as the work of an author who simply drew upon such earlier models for his own later purposes. As contemporary rabbis not only pondered over passages like the Egyptian plagues, the prophecy of Gog and Magog, and the opening vision of Ezekiel, but even had ecstatic visions of heaven granted them (*cf. R. J.*, 350, 379), so the prophet John was not a mere literary artist or a student of prophecy or an editor of earlier fragments. He was that, but he was more. Two features of his book differentiate him from such a class of writers; (*a*) he was a prophet in his own way, and (*b*) his consciousness had been so powerfully affected by the post-exilic Judaism, as well as by contemporary beliefs, that it is not possible to derive his conceptions exclusively from those of the canonical Old Testament.[1] These two features partially coalesce. As a prophet, no less than as a student of the prophetic and apocryphal scriptures, John believed that the predictions of Daniel were at last on the point of being fulfilled. This was the assurance which dominated his whole treatment of the O.T. in general. It explains how he appropriated and applied time-honoured messianic predictions which he considered relevant to Jesus the true messiah, and it also serves to account psychologically for the form of several visions (*e.g.*, that of ch. i.), which imply a mind already brooding over some of these passages. A well-known instance of this suggestion of visions occurs in Tertullian's *De anima*, ix.: "Est hodie soror apud nos reuelationum charismata sortita, quas in ecclesia inter dominica sollemnia per

(1897), pp. 60 f. (p. 68: bei Amos drängt ein Lebendiges zum Lichte, bei Sacharja herrscht das Programm). On Ezekiel as a prophet who foretold the coming of Christ, *cf.* Clem. Rom., xvii. 1. The typical and eschatological significance of the Egyptian plagues especially seems, from Irenæus (iv. 27, 28), to have impressed the Asiatic πρεσβύτεροι.

[1] The author knows the Hebrew original as well as the LXX (or, at any rate, some of his sources do), but the LXX quotations, or rather references (Swete, pp. cxxxv.-cxlviii.) and reminiscences—for no formula of citation occurs—occasionally (*cf.* i. 7, ix. 20, x. 6, xii. 7, xiii. 7, xix. 6, xx. 4, 11) mark a deliberate divergence, not unexampled in the N.T., towards what was apparently a pre-Christian Greek version of the Hebrew, approximating to the version of Theodotion (particularly in Daniel). They thus anticipate the later preference of writers like Origen for the Theodotionic Daniel (*cf.* Salmon's *Introd. to N.T.*, pp. 547 f., and Swete's *Introd. to the O.T. in Greek*, pp. 46 f.), or else they prove that he was translating directly from the Hebrew text (so *e.g.* in i. 6, xi. 4 ?, xiv. 8, 18). For instances of composite O.T. reminiscences *cf.* Selwyn, pp. 62-64.

ecstasin in spiritu patitur; conuersatur cum angelis, aliquando etiam cum Domino, et uidet et audit sacramenta, et quorundam corda dinoscit, et medicinas desiderantibus submittit. Iam uero prout scripturae leguntur aut psalmi canuntur aut allocutiones proferuntur aut petitiones delegantur, ita inde materiae uisionibus subministrantur". When John's soul is stirred to creative vision or prediction, it is usually something he has heard or read in Daniel or Ezekiel which is moving on the face of the waters. But the form taken by some of the oracles cannot be explained simply from the sacred scriptures, and it is therefore necessary to define separately and more precisely each of the features which have been just mentioned, even though the former necessarily involves the latter.

(*a*) The mind of a prophet like John is, in Wordsworth's phrase, "a feeling intellect," which instinctively embodies ideas in symbols. Thought rises before it in pictorial shape. Symbols are idea and picture at once; they embody beliefs and are also realities of a kind. Conceptions clothe themselves in vivid representations which are effective either on account of their traditional associations or from the aptness of their contemporary allusions, though it is often difficult for a modern reader to fathom their origin in the writer's mind or to estimate the precise relation between the figurative element and the definite idea which that element is intended to enshrine.[1] The difficulty is doubled when, as in the present case, we have occasionally to deal with an ecstatic experience. The material to be interpreted includes the reflective working of the prophet's mind upon a previous mental condition, the literary presentment (with some expansions, rearrangement and embellishment) of what he remembers to have seen in the exalted moments of rapture, together with the impressions produced by these upon his later consciousness. The Apocalypse is not a continuous vision. In parts, it is not a vision at all. There are rhapsodies in it, but it is not a rhapsody. Occasionally the prophet speaks as a counsellor, or writes as an editor of earlier fragments, or calculates the future in terms of traditional eschatology. The very elaboration with which the details and design of the book are worked out precludes any idea of it as a mere transcript of visions written when the seer's memory was fresh, even though some phrases were set down as reflective or editorial glosses. At the same time, the nucleus and the origin of the book are inexplicable apart from the presupposition of

[1] On this power of the poetic Eastern imagination, at certain stages of culture, to fill sensuous forms with a higher content, see some admirable remarks in Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, i. 287 ff.

a definite religious experience which assumed in part the form of a trance or rapture. Vision here, as elsewhere, in apocalyptic literature is occasionally the literary form of allegory and tradition; but not always. The psychological problem is to explain the relation between this inner consciousness of inspiration and the curious imaginative forms in which the prophet seemed to think it needful to embody his Christian conceptions. He employs a large number of suggestive figures and metaphors, drawn from the Old Testament and elsewhere, in spite of their literal inadequacy; these phantasmagoria it is impossible to regard as mere symbols, but on the other hand they are hardly to be taken literally in the case of John any more than that of the later prophets of Judaism (*cf.* Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 228 f.) from whom he borrowed many of them. Often the best way to explain them is to let them appeal to the religious imagination, since it is in this way that they are likely to disclose any permanent truth of which they may be at once the vesture and the vehicle. But whatever they are, they are suggestive, not dogmatic; they are poetic coefficients rather than logical definitions of the author's faith.

The comparative independence with which, like the psalmists (*cf.* Cheyne's *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 285, 286), he occasionally employs "anthropomorphic, or, let us say at once, mythic expressions, is a consequence of the sense of religious security which animates" him. These expressions helped out his Christian consciousness by their vivid realism and their time-honoured associations in the circles for which he wrote. He could embody in them some deeper truths of his own faith. In this weird world of fantasy, peopled by a rich Oriental imagination with spectral shapes and uncouth figures,[1] where angels flit, eagles and altars speak, and monsters rise from sea and land—in a world of this kind many Asiatic Christians of that age evidently were at home, and there the prophet's message had to find them. Often the point of an allusion lies in some half-forgotten contemporary belief; the terms of it may be superstitious enough, but the aim is predominantly spiritual. An apt illustration of this procedure in the sphere of popular religion is afforded by Luther's well-known use of the superstition about the wood of the cross. "The cross of Christ," he writes in one of his letters, "is parted throughout all the world, and every one meets with his portion. Do not you therefore reject it, but rather accept it as the

[1] Even grotesque symbols of an Oriental cast would appeal to Hellenic readers who were familiar, *e.g.*, with the Ἄρτεμις πολύμαστος of Ephesus, on whose statue winged bulls and rams appear (*cf.* Apoc. iv. 5 f.).

most holy relic, to be kept, not in a gold or silver chest, but in a golden heart, that is, a heart imbued with gentle charity." Here we have a Christian message couched poetically and effectively in terms of a familiar superstition which neither Luther nor his readers any longer shared. A similar explanation may fairly be applied now and then to John's poetic use of the superstitions about amulets, talismans, secret names,[1] and the like, although it is often a fair question how far his language is faded metaphor, and whether he did not sincerely attach himself to some of the current beliefs which underprop his imagery. Otherwise we must allow that details are often used for their poetical impressiveness, which depends on the power of starting old associations and of suggesting dim, mysterious beliefs.

His relation to history is equally free. Nothing could well be more jejune than to suppose that he is covertly conveying political information to his readers, or laboriously spelling out the course of providence from the politics, warfare, and meteorology of his age. History does not move in neat systems of seven, and even apocalyptic prophecy—for all its artificial dogmas and tendency to produce an impression by means of prediction—forms no calendar of exact events to come, much less any chronicle of recent happenings. It is the dogmatic programme which is uppermost in apocalyptic. The seer, by virtue of his inherited ideas, knew how external events must move; his schematism was more to him than anything else, and this accounts for the large haggadic element in such writings (*cf.* Baldensperger, 100, 117 f.). But John's prophetic impulse in the revelation of Jesus to his spirit overbore the tendency to rest the weight of his message on exact disclosures of the future. "For the mass of his audience," George Eliot says of Savonarola (*Romola*, ch. xxv.), "all the pregnancy of his preaching lay in his strong assertion of supernatural claims, in his denunciatory visions, in the false certitude which gave his sermons the interest of a political bulletin." John's forecasts, such as they were, did not aim, at any rate, at the gratification of curiosity, and even his dogmatic programme was little more than a traditional form of expressing his absolute certainty that the God of Jesus Christ would conquer evil.

(*b*) As a product of Asiatic Christianity towards the close of the first century, no less than as a member of a literary class which was usually heterogeneous in eschatology, the Apocalypse further reflects the religious syncretism which prevailed especially in Phrygia and

[1] Thus in ii.-iii., especially, Christians are promised a real initiation into the privileges of the Divine cult after death, instead of the pagan cults which they abjure.

the surrounding districts. The visions of the book are frequently put in terms of local and contemporary religion. Even the contour of what are apparently Old Testament reminiscences is occasionally modified by the collateral foreign tendencies which permeated post-exilic Judaism, especially along apocalyptic lines (*cf.* Cheyne's *Bible Problems*, 70 f.). Thus (*a*) the Babylonian background of several conceptions[1] is now recognised on all hands (see notes on i. 4, 20, iv. 7, 8, v. 6, vi. 1 f., xiii. 11, xiv. 6, xix. 7, 16, xxi. 1-2, 18, xxii. 1, 16). The gnosticism of Asia Minor during the second century reveals the survival and adaptation of more than one feature which was ultimately due to Babylonian mythology or astro-theology, and the previous developments of Judaism had already assimilated ideas from the older speculations of the Babylonians. (*b*) Along with this, traits corresponding to analogous conceptions in Egyptian religion are fairly common (see notes on i. 8, ii. 7, 11, 17, 26 f., iv. 3, 9, v. 13, vii. 16, xii., xiv. 5, xv. 6, xxii. 4, 16). This is hardly surprising, as Egyptian prophecy probably affected Hebrew prophecy (*cf.* Wilcken in *Hermes*, 1905, 544 f.), as the relations between Asia Minor and Egypt were close, and as the latter country was the natural home of eschatology.[2] (*c*) The Hellenic traits, though fewer and fainter, are not inconspicuous (*cf.* notes on ii. 17, iv. 11, vii. 9, 16, viii. 5, ix. 11, xii., xv. 6, xx. 8 f.), but specifically Orphic features (*cf.* Maas, *Orpheus*, 1895, pp. 250-261) are scarcely recognisable. (*d*) The Zoroastrian[3]

[1] Especially behind xii. (*cf.* Calmes, *Rev. Biblique*, 1903, 52-68, and Jeremias, pp. 34 f.). But cosmological traits or traditions from Babylonia will not explain the entire form of this oracle (*cf.* Cheyne's *Bible Problems*, 195-207, and Kohlhofer, pp. 72 f.), and even elsewhere they break down. Thus it is extremely questionable if the Babylonians had any conception of the millennium or of the resurrection of the dead; the accusing function of the devil is absent from Babylonian theology, as are the features of xiii. 11-17; and the Babylonian origin of the heavenly temple seems to be highly doubtful (*cf.* Prof. G. B. Gray in *Expos.*, 1908, May-June).

[2] Hermas, the next apocalypse of the early church, is tinged at one point by this influence (*cf.* Reitzenstein's *Poimandres*, 12 f.). The occupation of the Cyclades led to the introduction of many Egyptian deities into the local cultus between 308 and 146 B.C. (*cf.* F. Hiller von Gaertringen's *Beiträge zur alten Gesch.*, i., 1902, pp. 218 f.), including not only Isis but that worship of the Ptolemies which, *e.g.* in Thera (*cf.* the same writer's *Thera*, i., pp. 237 f.) fostered the later Imperial cultus of Rome. Some further Egyptian parallels are collected by Miss A. Grenfell in *The Monist* (1906), 179-200.

[3] The English reader may consult Prof. Moulton's article on "Zoroastrianism" in Hastings' *Dict. B.*, vol. iv., *E. Bi.* iv. 5428-5442, Lightfoot's *Colossians*, pp. 385 f.), and Renan (pp. 470 f.). I have stated and discussed the general evidence in *H. J.*, 1903-1904. The best investigations are in the *Jahr. für protest. Theologie*, by Hübschmann (1879, pp. 203-245) and Brandt (1892, pp. 405 f., 575 f.) respectively. *Cf.* also Böklen and Stave (§ 10).

influence is strongly marked, though not so strongly as Völter, in his latest volume (pp. 29 f., 63 f., 86 f., 116 f.), would make out. This, like that of Babylonia, reaches back not simply to the indirect channel of the post-exilic Judaism, but apparently to an almost direct relationship. In Zoroastrian angelology and eschatology alone, for example, does anything adequate correspond to the sort of conceptions which in their present shape are peculiar, or almost peculiar, to the Apocalypse: *viz.* (i.) the binding or noosing of the fiend (xx. 1 f., *cf. S. B. E.*, v. 19), (ii.) the blasting of the third part of the earth (viii. 7 f., *cf. S. B. E.*, v. 164, where the climax of the evil spirit's work is that "he took as much as one-third of the base of the sky in a downward direction, into a confined and captive state"), (iii.) the seven spirits of God (i. 4, *cf. Encycl. Religion and Ethics*, i. 384-385, and *S. B. E.*, iv. pp. lxxi. f.), (iv.) the guardian *fravashis* of the churches (see note on i. 20—quite an Avestan touch), (v.) the recrudescence of evil genii before the consummation (xx. 7 f., *cf.* Stave, pp. 227 f.), (vi.) the emphasis on the millennium-period,[1] and (vii.) the renewal of the universe. See, further, notes on i. 13, ii. 5, iv. 3, vii. 17, xi. 5 f., xiv. 17 f., xvi. 13, 20. Upon the other hand, no distinct references to Mithraism (as, *e.g.*, against Barns in *Expos.*, iii. 220 f.: Titan, the number of the Beast = Mithra as sun-god) can be detected, while the Buddhistic or Indian parallels are scanty and as a rule remote.

Nothing is more deceptive than such coincidences between primitive religions. *Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem.* They may simply be due in certain cases to analogous but independent movements of the religious feeling in different quarters. Here as elsewhere inferences have to be drawn with extreme caution, yet there is good reason to believe that a number of the special traditions and paraphernalia used in the Apocalypse owed part of their form, if not of their content, to ideas which were current in Jewish and pagan circles during the first century in Asia Minor. The coincidences with Oriental religious conceptions (*cf.*, *e.g.*, J. Brandis in *Hermes*, 1867, pp. 259-284) are too numerous and too striking to be dismissed in every case as accidental. Even when the cord is Christian, it may be spun out of several variegated threads, though it is often diffi-

[1] Plutarch (*De Iside*, 46 f.), in describing the Zoroastrian doctrines of the Magi as these were known to Romans and Greeks of the first century A.D., closes by sketching the final doom of Ahriman, when the earth lies smooth under a single ruler and a single language, and "at the end Hades shall fail and men be happy" (Apoc. xx. 6-14). Similarly, the fierce doom of Apoc. xix. 17-18, where birds are summoned to eat the flesh of messiah's victims, is probably a reflex of the supreme penalty inflicted on the carcases of those who resist Mazdeism, *viz.*, that they be devoured by birds of prey (*S. B. E.*, iv. 27, 131).

cult and sometimes impossible to determine where the threads were drawn from. Clemen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments* (1909) is a convenient handbook to the whole subject of these highways and byways of the apocalyptic fairy-land.

§ 5. *The Nero-redivivus Myth.*—The most central of these co-efficients, drawn from a mixture of supernatural and political legends, is the belief in the return of a Nero-antichrist from the underworld.

The massacre of A.D. 64 had invested Nero with such peculiar infamy for the early Christians, that it is not surprising to find Satan's chief agent in the final attack upon God's kingdom depicted by the prophet John as an infernal Nero, issuing from the underworld to head a coalition of the East against Rome and then against the Christ. Both the Jewish and the Christian literature of this period show traces of the successive phases of the Nero-redivivus anticipation (Suet. *Nero*, 47).[1] The legend sprang up on Roman soil. People could hardly credit the tyrant's death, so sudden and secret had been its circumstances. A curious mixture of relief and regret prevailed after the removal of the last member of the Julian dynasty at the age of thirty-two. For some time, indeed, a more or less sincere belief (Tacit., *Hist.* ii. 8, 9) prevailed, that he could not have died, but must be lying hidden somewhere in the East. This idea was suggested by his friendly relations with Parthia, and perhaps corroborated by the wide-spread notion, which he had encouraged in his own life-time, that he would reign over the East from Jerusalem, or that Rome was to be supplanted by an Eastern empire (Suet. *Nero*, 40, *Vesp.* 4, Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 36, *Hist.* v. 13, 3: pluribus persuasio inerat antiquis sacerdotum litteris contineri eo ipso tempore fore ut ualesceret Oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur; *cf.* Joseph. *Bell.* vi. 5, 4). On the strength of this superstition, edicts were actually issued in Nero's name, 'quasi uiuentis et breui magno inimicorum malo reuersuri' (Suet. *Nero*, 57). The East was disturbed by pretenders, who exploited this superstition. One

[1] In *Sib.* iv. 119 f. the great king (*i.e.*, Nero) flies away wounded across the Euphrates into Parthian territory, while in *Sib.* iv. 137-139 (after 80 A.D.) the eruption of Vesuvius is taken as a portent of Nero's immediate return from the East with a huge retinue to wreak vengeance on Rome. In another of these Asiatic oracles (v. 143-147, dating 71-74 A.D.) the flight of the detested and unpopular Nero from Babylon (*i.e.*, Rome) to the Parthians is described. He reaches the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, to return in the last days (361 f.) for a bloody conquest of the earth (κοσμομανὴς πόλεμος). *Cf.* Geffcken's studies "Zur älteren Nero-sage" in *Nachrichten d. Götting. Gesellschaft d. Wissensch.* (1899), pp. 443 f. The presence of the Nero-myth in the Apocalypse seems to have been first re-discovered by a Spanish Jesuit, Juan Mariana, who commented on the book in 1619.

appeared shortly (Tac. *Hist.* ii., 8-9) after Nero's death; another (Terentius Maximus) came forward in 80 A.D., who bore a physical resemblance to the emperor, and was only surrendered by the Parthians to Domitian after some years of power; a third emerged in 88 A.D. (Suet. *Nero*, 57). This created disaffection, especially in the Eastern provinces (Tacit. *Hist.* i. 2: "mota prope etiam Parthorium arma falsi Neronis ludibrio"), where revolutionary hopes and dislike of the existing *régime* were only too easily excited. Even under Trajan, Nero was believed by some to be still alive somewhere (Dio Chrysost. *Orat.*, xxi.), but by that time the illusion had been broken for most people, or rather it had been transmuted into the shuddering belief that Nero would return from the under-world. The political expectation thus became semi-supernatural or transcendental.[1] In certain Jewish and early Christian circles towards the close of the first century, particularly throughout Asia Minor, Nero-redivivus became fused with the other weird figures of Beliar and the antichrist. To some of the Romans Domitian was another Nero. To the Christians who shared John's view, Nero was to come again in another form. The Apocalypse passes over the Beliar-myth of a Satanic accuser who thwarts and seduces God's people (*cf.* Introd. to 2 Thessalonians); incidentally, it assigns this function to the dragon, Satan (xii. 10). But it follows one cycle of Jewish tradition in associating antichrist with some political or foreign persecuting power (Antiochus Epiphanes, *Daniel;* Pompey = dragon, *Ps. Sol.* ii. 29; head of Roman Empire, *Apoc. Bar.*, xxxix.-xl.). The dragon Satan delegates his authority on earth to the Roman empire and emperor. The supreme enemy on earth, however, is the weird, spectral figure of this *revenant* Nero, who reappears in history (*A. C.* pp. 184 f.; *cf.* for contemporary Jewish evidence, Dr. L. Ginzberg in *E. J.*, i. 625-627 on Nero as the devil-antichrist). Thus it is that the saga is doubled, not in xiii. 1-10, 11-18, so much as in xvii., and this doubling seems to be anticipated even in xi. 7 (compare xiii. 1 f.). The seduction of the Jews by antichrist proper (xi. 7 f.) is subordinated by the prophet John to the seduction of the pagan nations (xiii.-xiv., xvi.-xviii.), the latter being regarded as a far more ominous sign of the end. On the other hand, Nero-redivivus is employed, quite in Old Testament fashion, as the unconscious instrument of the divine vengeance upon Rome-Babylon; then he falls as a just victim to God's wrath.

[1] On the apocalypse as a means of transition from political to transcendental messianism, see Dr. Shailer Mathews' scholarly pages (pp. 25 f.) in his *Messianic Hope in the New Testament* (1906).

The eschatological portent of Nero-redivivus, however, was bound up with the pressing claim of the Roman emperors to be worshipped as divine, and it was the latter peril which formed at once the occasion and the theme of John's Apocalypse.

§ 6. *The Imperial Cultus.*—Over two centuries earlier the great exemplar of apocalyptic literature had been issued in order to nerve the faithful who were persecuted for refusing to admit the presumptuous divine claims of Antiochus Epiphanes. The Apocalypse of John is a latter-day pamphlet thrown up by a similar crisis. The prophet believed that the old conflict had now revived in its final form; Daniel's predictions were on the way to be fulfilled at last in an age when the Roman emperor insisted upon being worshipped as the august lord and god of men!

Since the days of Augustus, the emperor had been viewed as the guardian and *genius* of the empire, responsible for its welfare and consequently worthy of its veneration. It was a convenient method of concentrating and expressing loyalty, to acknowledge him as entitled to the prestige of a certain sanctity, even during his lifetime. There were no monarchical traditions available to strengthen the sense of imperial patriotism, and it was a politic step of the emperor to permit a certain adoration to gather round his official figure, an adoration which was generally the outcome of gratitude to the dead and deference to the living ruler for his εὐεργεσίαι (*cf.* Rushforth's *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, pp. 46 f., and A. J. H. Greenidge's *Roman Public Life*, pp. 440, 444, with Gwatkin's article in Hasting's *D.B.*, iv., pp. 293-295). The imperial cultus in this aspect was instinctive rather than deliberate, developing out of certain germs within the ancient mind, such as the blend of religion and patriotism among the Persians, the custom of hero-worship[1] (ἀφηρωίξαι, especially prevalent in the Ionian islands, *e.g.*, at Thera, *cf. CIG*, 2467—2473, Usener's *Götternamen*, 1896, pp. 249-250), and the worship of the Ptolemies which shocked the pious Plutarch. Its primary aim was to foster patriotism by presenting a symbol of

[1] For the Latin germs of Caesar-worship, prior to Augustus, see Mr. E. Fiddes in *Historical Essays* (Manchester), 1902, pp. 1-16. Many heroes were πάρεδροι θεοί, associated with specific gods in a cult as σύνναοι or σύνθρονοι of the gods (*cf.* E. Kornemann's essay "Zur Gesch. der antiken Herrscherkulte" in *Beiträge zur alten Gesch.*, i. 51 f.); *e.g.*, the later Attalidae at Pergamum had statues in the temple dedicated to them as divine (pp. 85 f.). The shrinking of the Christian conscience from this deification or apotheosis reveals the significance of the divine honours paid to Jesus in the Apocalypse. The position assigned him by Christian faith was no result of apotheosis.

the solidarity and unity of the empire. Its political convenience, however, lent it increasing momentum. Gradually, on the worship of the *Lares Augusti* in Italy and the capital (Rushforth, pp. 59 f.) and on the association of the imperial cultus with that of *dea Roma* (to whom a temple had been erected at Smyrna as far back as 195 B.C.), the new canonisation rose to its height, never jealous of local cults, but thriving by means of its adaptability to the religious syncretism of the age. It was the religious sanction of the new imperialism.[1] It had temples, sacrifices, choirs (as at Smyrna), and even a priesthood (the *sodales Augustales*) of its own.

For obvious reasons the cult flourished luxuriantly in the provinces, particularly in Asia Minor,[2] where the emperor was often regarded as an incarnation of the local god or named before him. Distance lent enchantment to the provincial view of the emperor. Any sordid traits or idiosyncrasies retired into the background before the adoration felt for the divinity which hedged this unseen, powerful figure, who was hailed with a mixture of servility and real gratitude as "the Saviour," "the Peace," "the αὐτοκράτωρ" of the world, or as the lord of men (κύριος, dominus; *cf.* Kattenbusch, ii. pp. 612 f.). Asia Minor became a hotbed of the cultus. The mere recognition of an abstract empire with its authority providentially vested in the emperor passed often into a religious adulation of the latter, as θεός (*cf.* Thieme's *Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander u. das N.T.*, pp. 28 f.). The annual festival or diet of the nine Asiatic townships, which served as an organ of government throughout the province, readily coalesced with an annual festival in honour of the reigning

[1] Full investigations by Boissier (*La Religion Romaine*, i. 184 f.), Friedländer (iii. 455 f.), and Mr. B. W. Henderson (*Nero*, pp. 347 f., 434 f.), to be supplemented by Otto Hirschfeld's essay in *Sitzungsberichte d. Akademie d. Wissensch. zu Berlin* (1888), 833 f, the articles in Roscher's *Griech. u. Röm. Mythologie* (ii. pp. 902-919) and in *Prot. Real-Encykl.* (1901), x. 539 f., Wendland's *Hellen.-Römische Kultur in ihren Bezieh. zu Jud. u. Christ.* (1907), §§ 5 and 7, and especially by J. Toutain's pages on the cult of *Roma* (37 f.) and the spread of the imperial cultus generally (pp. 43 f.) in his notable work on *Les cultes païens dans l'Empire Romain* (première partie, tome i. Paris, 1907). Popular sketches in English in L. Dyer's *Studies of the Gods in Greece* (1891, pp. 37, 45); Lecky's *History of European Morals* (i. 257 f.), Westcott's *Epistles of St. John* (235-269), Iverach *H.J.* (1906, 262 f.), Workman's *Persecution in the Early Church* (1906, pp. 94 f.), and Harnack's *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (1908), i. book ii. chap. ix.

[2] With the title of Jesus (ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ), in Apoc. iii. 14, contrast the servile language of the decree issued (*c.* 9 B.C.) by the Asiatic κοινόν, fixing New Year's Day as the emperor's birthday: ἣν τῇ τῶν πάντων ἀρχῇ ἴσην δικαίως ἂν εἶναι ὑπολάβοιμεν (τοῦτο αὐτῷ ἀρχὴν τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ζωῆς γενονέναι). *Cf.* Dittenberger's *Orientis Graeci Inscript. Selectae*, 458.

emperor (Mommsen, *Provinces*, i., 344 f.). The Asiarchs probably organised and pushed the new religion, even more than the local magistrates (*cf.* xiii. 11 f.). At any rate the cultus, attaching itself like mistletoe to institutions and local rites alike, shot up profusely; polytheism found little trouble in admitting the emperor to a place beside the gods, and occasionally, as in the case of Augustus and Apollo, or of Domitian and Zeus, "the emperor was represented as the deity incarnate in human form" (*C. B. P.* i. 53 f.). The islands also shared in this cult, as they had previously shared in the worship of the Ptolemies. At Thera, for example, a pagan altar has been found which was dedicated "to the almighty Caesar, the son of God" (contrast Apoc., ii. 18). This *divi filius* title was one of the most common and least conventional of what John called βλασφημίας ὀνόματα.

The inevitable clash between this cult and the sensitive monotheism of Judaism was struck during the latter years of the insane madcap, Caligula (39-41 A.D.). His pretensions to divinity would have been ridiculous, if they had not been dangerous. But he deified himself in literal earnest by means of incense, gestures, and clothing (*cf.* Joseph. *Antiq.* xviii. 7-8, xix. 1-2; Suet. *Calig.* 22); and the climax of his insults to Judaism—the proposed erection of his statue in the temple at Jerusalem—was only averted by the prudent temporising of Petronius and the murder of the emperor himself. Under Claudius matters righted themselves. Still, the shock of the crisis (*cf.* Eus. *H. E.* ii. 5-6) left a deep impression on the conscience of the Jews. It revived the worst memories of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the dread remained, as Tacitus allows, that some other emperor might attempt what Caligula had failed in (*cf.* Spitta 490 f.). Echoes of this are to be heard possibly in 2 Thess. and the synoptic apocalypse as well in Apoc. xiii., which (according to many critics)[1] is based upon a source either Christian (Erbes 19 f., Bruston, Briggs) or Jewish (Spitta, Pfleiderer, de Faye, O. Holtzmann, Rauch adding xvi. 13-14, 16), dating from this period. On this view, the general tenor

[1] Otherwise, xii. 18 - xiii. 7 is held to contain a Jewish fragment (Kohler, J. Weiss), concluded in xix. 11-21, which dates from 70 A.D. Similarly Schmidt, Weyland, Wellhausen, and others (Neronic). "Caligula", in Hebrew (Gaskulgas = קסר גסקלגס) as in Greek (ΓΑΙΟΣ ΚΑΙϹΑΡ) is equivalent by gematria to 616, the variant to which Irenæus objected (*cf.* on xiii. 18); but so is ΚΑΙϹΑΡ ΘΕΟϹ (Deissmann: *Licht vom Osten*, 199 f.) as well as the shortened form of "Nero Caesar". For a discussion of the Beast's number, see the recent symposium by Clemen, Corssen, Bruston, and Vischer in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutest. Wiss.* 1901-1904.

of the oracle required only a few alterations to render it applicable to the later situation, when Nero and Domitian had become for Christians what Caligula had been for the Jews half a century earlier. The arguments for this literary hypothesis, however, are not oxen strong enough to pull the plough (*cf.* notes on xiii.).

Hitherto Christians had been out of the fray. Even Nero's massacre of them was a freak of personal violence, justified by their reputation for hostility to the State, and apparently prompted by Jewish malevolence. It had nothing whatever to do with the imperial cultus. The latter was not seriously enforced until the second part of Domitian's reign. Like Caligula [1] formerly and Diocletian afterwards, this emperor (*cf.* Schoener, in *Acta Semin. Philologici Erlang.* 1881, pp. 476 f.) laid claim to the title of *dominus et deus*, and though his claim was not official, it was none the less serious. Hence, while he proved a "second Nero" to the Christians no less than to his own restive subjects, the former had special reasons for remembering the reign of terror,

> "When Vespasian's brutal son
> Cleared Rome of what most shamed him."

The strict and harsh enforcement of the poll-tax (Suet. *Domit.* 12) pressed heavily upon the Jews, indeed, but otherwise they were generally undisturbed, since normally, under the semi-tolerant policy of the empire, they were not obliged to erect or worship statues of the emperor (Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 6). They sacrificed for him, not to him. As a national religion, Judaism had its own rights like the rest.[2] But Christianity was not a *religio licita*, and the Nazarene faith, by the sheer force of its principles and the success of its contemporary propaganda, had soon to face the exercise of the law against illicit cults (especially when these refused the test of swearing by the emperor's genius). The very differentiation of Christianity from Judaism, which had become increasingly plain ever since Nero's outburst,[3] deprived the

[1] The bisellium, a splendid double throne, was assigned as a divine honour to Caligula alone after Caesar. Contrast Apoc. xxii. 1.

[2] They suffered under Domitian not for their personal faith but for the success of their propaganda in making proselytes; *cf.* S. Gsell's *Essai sur le Règne de l'Empereur Domitien*, pp. 313 f.

[3] The most recent discussion is by Klette in *Die Christen-Katastrophe unter Nero* (1907; *cf.* the present writer's review in *H. J.*, 1908, 704-707). Renan's coloured pages (pp. 124 f.) and Hausrath's graphic outline (*Hist. of N.T. Times. The Apostles* iv. 168 f.) must be checked by the statements of Ramsay (*Church in Roman Empire* ch. xi.) and of Mr. B. W. Henderson in his *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero* (1903).

former of its right to the shelter of the imperial aegis and rendered it liable to the religious and patriotic tax of the Caesar-worship which Domitian's claim now emphasised. The growth of the new faith and the deepening need of the imperial cultus as a national bond of loyalty made a collision between the church and the State inevitable; and, although no literary record exists of the opening movement in the campaign, the correspondence of Trajan and Pliny is now recognised pretty generally to presuppose an earlier stage in the policy of the empire towards Christianity—a stage most probably associated with the later years of Domitian (*cf.* Neumann's *der Röm. Staat u. die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diocletian*, 1890, i. pp. 7 f. 11-15).[1] Then the conflict became more than sporadic (οἱ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ Δομετιανοῦ διωγμοί, *Mart. Ign.* 1). Domitian not only permitted but encouraged and enforced the payment of divine honours to himself; compliance with the rites of the Caesar cultus was made the convenient test of loyalty for Christians who had hitherto been arraigned for the most part upon criminal charges (*flagitia cohaerentia nomini*) such as anarchy; confession of the Name of Christ now involved a refusal to give the emperor the name of *deus* or *divus*, and, as John put it, all who refused to *worship the image of the beast* or to be *marked by his name* were liable to death. The religious recusant was naturally suspected of *lèse majesté*. When his religious susceptibilities were outraged by the quasi-deification of the emperor, his protest was viewed as a veiled pretext for rebellion, as well as an assertion of ἀθεότης or sacrilege (*cf.* for Domitian's reign, Lightfoot's *Clem. Rom.* i. pp. 104-115). But whether *obstinatio* or ἀθεότης or *maiestas*, the crime was visited with the same penalties.

This conflict of loyalties is the business of the Apocalypse. At

[1] The connexion of the Apocalypse with this Domitianic phase is also worked out by A. Matthaei (*Preussische Jahrb.* 1905, 402-479) from the Roman standpoint. He argues (477 f.) that the first θηρίον of ch. xiii. is the imperial cultus itself, while the second symbolises the provincial authorities especially in Asia Minor. Ramsay (*Seven Letters*, p. 97) partly agrees with the latter identification, taking the θηρίον of xiii. 11 f. to mean "the Province of Asia in its double aspect of civil and religious administration," but the probability (see notes) is that the writer is thinking of the Asiatic priests of the imperial cultus, who may have played a part like that of the Buddhist and Taoist priests during the Boxer rising in China, or like that of the officials of the Russian Church in the recent campaign against the Milkist sectaries. It is noticeable that there is no Christian antithesis, in the way of priesthood, to Satan's embodiment in the priesthood of the imperial cultus (xiii. 11 f.), whereas the latter in the sense of *false prophet* is implicitly contrasted with the true prophetic order of Christianity, as are the official ὑμνῳδοί of the cultus at Pergamos and elsewhere with the singers of hymns to God and Jesus in the Apocalypse.

the first shock of persecution in Asia Minor over the principle of the imperial cultus, John grasped with moral power the truth that this was not a local skirmish but a matter of life or death to the church. The issue between ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗCΟΥΣ and ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΚΑΙCΑΡ was to be neither compromised nor confused; the worship of the emperor, even as a form of patriotism, and the adoration of Jesus as the Christ of God were incompatible. The State did not realise this until afterwards, when the dimensions and irrepressible vigour of the Christian movement revealed it as a menace to the older civilisation of the empire. As yet the Nazarene faith was little more than one of the numerous Oriental weeds which had to be rooted out as immoral, anti-social, and unpatriotic; it was mainly notable for its tenacity of life. The State did not dream as yet of regarding these atheists and anarchists as a rival power. It was contemptuous rather than distrustful of the new faith. That this sect within a sect, or rather this struggling offshoot of the Jewish superstition, would outlive the empire which treated it as the legions treated the daisies on their line of march, must have seemed then the infatuation of a narrow-minded fanatic. History, by justifying this expectation, has proved that it was more than a magnificent reach of the religious instinct, that it was in fact what men have agreed to label rather than define as "inspired". It is true that the messianic and apocalyptic traditions, with which the prophet worked, tended to foreshorten his view of the campaign. The host of martyrs were not crowded into a brief interval, and the triumph of the church over the empire came in a very different way from what the prophet or any of his contemporaries imagined. But the Apocalypse penetrated to the heart of the issue. The resolve which it knit and the hope which it kindled were substantially the faith which nerved the later church, from Ignatius and Polycarp onwards. What "faithfulness to death" (*cf.* ii. 10) involved may be illustrated from the normal procedure of the pro-consul in Bithynia, where Pliny, as he tells us, had people brought before him who were accused, sometimes anonymously and sometimes erroneously, of being Christians. They included persons of both sexes, all ages, and varying health. After being thrice warned, those who still adhered to their confession of faith were, in consequence of the *cognitio* or preliminary investigation, either imprisoned and killed (if provincials, *cf.* Apoc. ii. 13) or deported to Rome (if Roman citizens, *cf.* Apoc. xvii. 6, Ignatius, etc.). Others, however, were not so loyal to their Lord.[1] When an

[1] There were the δειλοὶ and ἄπιστοι, *e.g.*, of Apoc. xxi. 8. Cowardice was particularly dangerous on account of its infectious nature. For the bad example of the

opportunity of recantation was offered, some denied any recent connexion with Christianity, telling the proconsul that they had been (some twenty years ago, *i.e.*, *c.* 93 A.D., the period of the Apocalypse), but no longer were, Christians. Some also had no objection to offer incense before the image of the emperor or to curse publicly the name of Christ. This was the criterion applied to the suspect,[1] and it was largely due to the propagation of such resolute ideas as are expounded in the Apocalypse that Christians were kept loyal to their faith, and that, without a tear in their eye or a sword in their hand, they were able eventually to change the face of the world by enforcing the recognition of their claims at the hands of the empire. Like the conventicles of the Scottish Covenanters, the primitive Christian churches were accused of immorality and sedition, but, unlike them, they succeeded by passive resistance pure and simple. The Apocalypse is a call to arms, but the arms are only patience and loyalty to conviction.[2]

It is unnecessary to assume that any widespread persecution under Domitian, or indeed any "persecution" in the later and technical sense of the term, was before the prophet's mind, in order to account for the language and spirit of the Apocalypse. John himself had only been banished or imprisoned, like some of his friends (ii. 10, *Clem. Rom.* ix. and *cf.* on i. 9). But from the position of matters he already argued the worst. The few cases of repressive interference and of martyrdom in Asia Minor (and elsewhere)

δειλοὶ spies, *cf.* Joseph. *Antiq.*, iii. 15, 1. Ep. Lugd. describes ten renegades "who occasioned us much grief and immeasurable sorrow and impaired the ready zeal of those who had not yet been arrested". "Some remained **ἔξω** (*cf.* Apoc. xxi. 8, xxii. 15), **οἱ μηδὲ ἴχνος πώποτε πίστεως, μηδὲ αἴσθησιν ἐνδύματος νυμφικοῦ, μηδὲ ἔννοιαν φόβου θεοῦ σχόντες**" (*cf.* Apoc. xi. 18).

[1] Pliny's idea of repentance was that Christians should give up their faith. He thought that a number would be willing to recant if they got the opportunity, and Trajan confirmed his suggestion by ordering that *whoever denies himself to be a Christian and makes that plain by his actions, i.e., by worshipping our gods, shall gain forgiveness.* Contrast Apoc. ix. 20, xvi. 9 f. At Vienne and Lyons the Roman citizens in the church were beheaded (*cf.* Apoc. xx. 4, and the cases of John the Baptist and James, Ac. xii. 1). The rest were thrown to the wild beasts or tortured to death in other ways. It must always be remembered that **μάρτυς**, in its sombre sense, did not necessarily imply that a Christian had suffered the death-penalty (*cf.* Tert. *de Fuga* 12, Eus. *H. E.* v. 18, etc.).

[2] *Cf.* xiii. 10, xiv. 12. In spite of the Cameronian touch of xiii. 17, this is the normal temper of the book; it is a Christian expression of the passivity shown already by the Quietists in Judaism, but the controlling motive is the spirit of Jesus as recorded in his own saying (Matt. xxii. 21) and in the reply of his relatives to Domitian (Eus. *H. E.*, ii. 32): "His kingdom is not of this world or of this earth, but heavenly and angelic, to arrive at the consummation of this age".

were enough to warn him of the storm rolling up the sky, though as yet only one or two drops had actually fallen. Eusebius probably exaggerates when he speaks of "many others" along with Clemens and Domitilla (iii. 18), and the period of terror was admittedly short (H. E., xx. 9-11, *cf.* Tert. *Apol.* 5), but the crisis was sufficiently acute to open John's mind to the issues at stake. It is this sense of the irreconcilable antagonism between the imperial cultus and Christianity, not any specific number of martyrdoms, which accounts for the origin of the Apocalypse during the latter years of Domitian. A cursory glance will show that its language presupposes a situation more definite and serious than any covered by earlier references to persecution for *The Name* or *My Name*, which in all likelihood, as 1 Peter indicates, obtained more or less generally after the crisis of 64 A.D. in Rome. John sees another name set up against the name of Christ, and he stamps it as the essence of blasphemy to recognise any such title. What Christians were summoned by him to do was to say "No". Their positive confession of the Christian name resolved itself practically into a refusal to admit the legitimacy of the emperor's divine names.

This power of penetrating to the eternal issues underneath the conflict of the day is one note of the true prophet, and in touching the Apocalypse we touch the living soul of Asiatic Christendom. The book comes forward as a work of prophecy (*cf.* notes on i. 1, 3; xi. 18; xviii. 20, 24; xxii. 6-7, etc.). As such it is designed for the instruction and encouragement of the Christian society (1 Cor. xiv. 3 f.). It fulfils this design by means of visions depicting (*a*) the approach and certainty of the Christ's return, (*b*) the warnings and comfort of God for the churches during the interval, and (*c*) the bliss and terror of the world to come. Ordinarily the revelation takes the form of rapture or vision. This, again, may pass into an address in which the prophet leaves the *rôle* of seer for that of spiritual adviser. Or, rhapsody may become a song (ψαλμός), reflecting the antiphonal outbursts of melody (*E. Bi.* 2138-2140, 3242) in the congregation (*cf.* the responsive *Amen* in v. 14, vii. 12, the Trisagion in iv. 8, and the Hallelujah in xix. 1 f.) which were based in part upon earlier Jewish psalms of the synagogue (as Pliny found in Bithynia: "carmen Christo quasi deo dicere secum inuicem"). Finally, the prophet may work along the lines of traditional apocalyptic oracles which were more or less familiar to his hearers, just as the author of Daniel took Jeremiah's seventy weeks as one of his texts. All these varieties are represented in the Apocalypse of John. But, whatever *rôle* he assumes, the seer or speaker is pre-eminently a

prophet, and the Christian prophet is ranked beside Moses and the angels as the *servant of God* κατ' ἐξοχήν. The order of prophets is second only to the apostles.

If it is the vocation of the prophet to reveal and emphasise the faith, it is the corresponding duty of the martyr to be loyal at all costs to that faith in the killing times. Hence the martyr or confessor is, next to the prophet, the most prominent figure in the landscape of the Apocalypse. One of the tests proposed (most unfairly) by an anti-Montanist in the second century as a criterion of Montanist prophecy was its capacity for producing martyrs. Did it inspire a faith equal to the stress of persecution? Was the religion it fostered strenuous enough to provoke persecution? The crisis of the imperial cultus under Domitian seemed to John at any rate to demand an attitude of passive resistance[1] on the part of Christians which involved the risk of death. Neither rebellion nor suicide was to be contemplated as a means of escape, and flight was out of the question. Whither could one flee from the Caesar? The Christian must be prepared to be *faithful unto death*, and if there is any distinction among Christians drawn by the prophet's mind it lies not between Jewish and Gentile Christians, but between the martyrs on the one hand and the rank and file of the church upon the other. The martyr is *primus inter pares;* an exceptional place and space is assigned him for his persistent fidelity. At the same time the extravagant prerogatives of the martyrs and the confessors in later Christian belief lie outside the purview of the Apocalypse. The prophet's homage to them is partly due to the exceptional circumcumstances of the "killing" time, and the permanent element underlying it is the truth (witnessed by Zoroastrianism in its own way, *cf. Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, i. 210) that history is neither caprice nor blind fate, but a moral order in which sacrifice for the sake of Christ and loyalty to God are not water spilt upon the ground—a moral order, too, whose end is bound up with the person of Jesus Christ as Lord and Redeemer. It was perhaps inevitable that the expression of this great religious conception should, by its very emphasis, lead to some exaggeration. The flood-tide which submerges some truths isolates others in a position of abnormal prominence. Thus the Apocalypse, which is a tract for the bad times of persecution, views the philosophy of history as catastrophe rather

[1] With xiii. 9-10 compare the Jewish high-priest's prayer on the day of atonement (Jer. Jom. v. 42 c.), that "neither this day nor through this year may any captivity come upon us. . . . And as for Thy people Israel, let no enemy exalt himself against them."

than as growth; the virtues of asceticism and even celibacy (*cf.* on xiv. 4) acquire unwonted prominence; sensuous aspects of the messianic reign tend to predominate; the impulse of propaganda is checked by the sombre and fore-shortened view of the world which the presentiment of approaching judgment fostered; religion tends to be bound up with a hatred and fear of the civil power;[1] and God is a dazzling, silent, enthroned figure of majesty, who has men warned and wounded, not (as in the fourth gospel) a Father who is in direct touch with his children upon earth. The passion for moral retribution regards material and political convulsions more and more as the proper dynamic of providence. To John's eyes, the cause of affairs in the empire of his day was running straight to the edge of a precipice. He saw in history not any τύχη or εἱμαρμένη but the justice and irony of providence abroad, and his puritanic temper expressed itself in a mixture of spiritual resignation with an imperious and vindictive expectation:—

> Rome shall perish! write that word
> In the blood that she has spilt.

This expectation is only a heightened form of the traditional belief (*cf.* 4th Esd. xii. 11 f., Apoc. Bar. iv. 4-5) that the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision was the Roman empire, which was to be overthrown at the advent of messiah's reign. Josephus prudently evades this interpretation, though he is well aware of it. His business, he protests, is not to explain the future (*Antiq.* x. 10. 4). But the interpretation was widespread in apocalyptic circles, and a Christian had special reasons for sharing it. John expresses it with characteristic vigour. He will encourage no fifth-monarchy tendencies among Christians in Asia Minor, but he has no word of showing loyalty to the empire as distinguished from worshipping the emperor. He makes no attempt, such as Agrippa made before Caligula (*Leg. ad Gaium*, 36), to disprove the charge of treason, and no considerations of patriotism qualify his threats of doom against the Roman empire.[2]

[1] It cannot be too strongly insisted that the tone of the Apocalypse here was neither normal nor final. Indeed the subsequent history of the church bears out this verdict. The Asiatic idiosyncrasies of its eschatology, and above all of its relation to the State are thrown into relief against the "loyalist" tone of a contemporary Roman writing like that of *Clemens Romanus*. The moderation of this fine epistle is attributed by Lightfoot (*Clem. Rom.*, i. pp. 27 f. 60 f. 382 f.) to the fact that its author and bearers were connected with the imperial household.

[2] Dr. Selwyn actually conjectures (pp. 124 f.) that the prophet was banished for having written the seditious oracles of iv.-xxii., and that when he re-edited the work (adding i.-iii.) during Galba's reign it was only the strong anti-Neronic feeling at Ephesus which saved him from capital punishment as a traitor (pp. 214 f.).

§ 7. *The Date.*—When the motive of the Apocalypse is thus found in the pressure upon the Christian conscience exerted by Domitian's emphasis of the imperial cultus, especially as that was felt in Asia Minor, any earlier date for the book becomes almost impossible (*cf.* Mommsen's *Provinces of Rom. Empire*, ii. 175 f.). The traditional alternative, *i.e.*, the reign of Claudius, is absurd. The Neronic date (*i.e.*, soon after Nero's death) exerts most of its fascination on those who cling to too rigid a view of the book's unity, which prevents them from looking past passages like xi. 1 f. and xvii. 9 f. But (*a*) the phase of the Nero-redivivus myth which is represented in the Apocalypse cannot be earlier than at least the latter part of Vespasian's reign; (*b*) the church of Smyrna, as we know from Polycarp (ad Phil. xi.) was not founded by 64 A.D., and it is impossible to crush the development implied in ii. 8-11 into a few years; (*c*) the conception of the new Jerusalem implies a post-70 date (*cf.* notes on xxi.-xxii.); (*d*) no worship of the emperor, adequate to explain the data of the Apocalypse, was enforced under Nero; and (*e*) the allusions to the martyrs (ii. 13, and especially vi. 10-11—the *How long?* of the Neronic victims, and their subsequent comrades in martyrdom) surely presuppose a much longer period than three or four years. For recent English statements of the Neronic date, see Selwyn (pp. 215 f.) and Mr. B. W. Henderson (*op. cit.* pp. 439 f.). The Vespasianic date (*cf.* V. Bartlet, *Apostolic Age*, 388-408; Scott, 48-56), which has rather a better case in the internal evidence of the book, is ruled out of court by (*d*). The lack of any traditional reference to persecution under this emperor would not indeed be a decisive argument by itself; it is only by the letters of Pliny that we happen to know anything of the troubles experienced by Asiatic Christians under Trajan, and a similar outburst under Vespasian might have passed unnoticed by Christian or pagan writers. But this is unlikely.[1] In any case, Vespasian did not take his inherited and official divinity seriously. Christians had a temporary and comparative immunity under him, and "so rapidly did their influence grow that they even made converts in the imperial family itself" (*cf.* Lightfoot, *Clem. Rom.* ii. 507). Parts of the Apocalypse, taken singly (*e.g.*, in xiii.), might be referred to Vespasian's reign, but, unlike Domitian, he does not seem to have interfered with Oriental

[1] An even stronger term might be used, in view of the researches by critics like Matthaei, Gsell, Neumann and Ramsay. The extreme unlikelihood of the Apocalypse being elicited by anything during the reigns of Titus or Vespasian is also recognised by Linsenmayer in his *Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat* (1905), pp. 66 f.

cults. Thus, since the general intensity of John's language about martyrdom cannot be explained altogether as either a reminiscence of the Neronic outburst or as a prophetic anticipation of what was to be expected at the hands of the world-power during the latter days—for some concrete occasion is necessary to account for the prophet's standpoint—the most probable solution is that Christians were being persecuted here and there in Asia Minor for what Domitian (as Neumann and others rightly point out) regarded as a cardinal offence, *viz.*, the refusal to acknowledge him as the divine head of the empire. The religious development of the churches is often held to presuppose a considerable length of time, but this argument must be used with caution. Worldliness and error and uncharitable feelings did not require decades to spring up in the primitive churches of Asia Minor and elsewhere. No great stress can be laid on this feature. Still, the character of the heresies described in ii.-iii. certainly presupposes an acquaintance with incipient gnosticism which requires a later period than 70 A.D. for its development.

The one passage (apart from vi. 6, where see note) which appears to be a water-mark of the date is unfortunately ambiguous (see notes on xvii.), as it contains an earlier Vespasianic source. But in xvii. 10-11 so much at least seems clear. The numbers are literal, not symbolical. The reckoning probably begins with Augustus as the first emperor; the three usurpers (Galba, Otho and Vitellius) are passed over (*cf.* Suet. *Vesp.* 1: rebellione trium principum et caede incertum diu et quasi uagum imperium suscepit firmauitque tandem gens Flavia), as was only natural to a provincial, who would be specially apt to regard their struggle as a brief nightmare. The sixth and reigning emperor (ὁ εἷς ἔστιν) is Vespasian (69-79 A.D.), with whom the Flavian dynasty took up the imperial succession, after Nero's death, which ended the Julian dynasty, had well-nigh broken up the empire (*cf.* xiii. 3 f.). Vespasian's successor (Titus, 79-81 A.D.) is to have a very brief reign.[1] As a matter of fact it only lasted for a couple of years. After him, the deluge! Nero-redivivus (τὸ θηρίον), incorporating the full Satanic power of the empire, who had already reigned on earth (ὃ ἦν) but who meanwhile was

[1] This might be (*a*) a *uaticinium ex euentu*, or (*b*) an eschatological inference(a writer, composing under the sixth emperor of a series which was only to number seven, would naturally argue that, as the end was near, the seventh emperor could not have long to reign), or (*c*) a reflection of the widespread feeling (*cf.* Schiller's *Gesch. d. Röm. Kaiserzeit*, i. 520) that the poor health of Titus would not permit him to reign for very long.

invisible (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν) was to reappear from the abyss, only to be crushed finally (καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει). In its present form the oracle announces that the downfall of the empire is to be heralded by the reappearance after Titus of one belonging to the seven emperors (ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν) who, on the traditional scheme of the *heads*, were to see the rise and ruin of the State. Here a literary problem of some nicety emerges, for, while ver. 10 implies the reign of Vespasian, ver. 11 points to an eighth emperor (evidently Domitian). The solution is either that the writer of both throws himself back in thought into Vespasian's age, representing history under the form of apocalyptic prophecy, or that ver. 11 (Domitian recalling and playing the part of Nero) represents a later addition,[1] inserted in order to bring the source up to date. In either case the final standpoint is Domitianic, however, and this tallies with the general evidence of the rest of the book.[2]

It also tallies with second-century tradition. In describing the persecution of Christians by Domitian, that worthy successor of Nero, Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 18) quotes the following words from Irenaeus on the name of Antichrist: εἰ δὲ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ, δι' ἐκείνου ἂν ἐρρέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑορακότος. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς. The attempts to turn the force of this passage by supposing that Irenaeus confounded Domitian's actual reign with his temporary regency in 70 A.D., or by referring ἑωράθη to the seer instead of to the vision, are ingenious but quite unconvincing. The tradition must be taken as it stands. Originally, as πρὸς τῷ τέλει

[1] "To me it seems that there are two distinct notes of time in the passage, and that we are almost compelled to suppose that what was written at one date has been adapted to another" (Dr. Sanday in *Journ. Theol. Studies*, viii. 492).

[2] This kind of elusive, enigmatic reckoning is illustrated by the Jewish Domitianic apocalypse in 4 Esd. iii-.xiv. and by Barn. iv. In the former, the Roman empire is an eagle with three heads (*i.e.* the Flavian dynasty: Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian), the first of which rules the earth oppressively, the second of which is devoured by the third (alluding to the belief that Domitian had made away with his brother), while the third is to be challenged and vanquished by messiah (a parallel to John's prediction). The Christian writing, in order to prove the nearness of the end, quotes Dan. vii. 7-8 and 24 for the purpose of showing that *from the beast* (*i.e.* the Roman empire) *ten horns* were to spring (*i.e.* the Caesars from Julius to Vespasian or Domitian) and *from them a little horn by way of excrescence* (παραφυάδιον, *i.e.* Nero antichrist) which will abase *three of the great horns* (*i.e.* the Flavian dynasty) Similarly Daniel's addition of the 11th horn to the traditional 10 illustrates John's apocalyptic revisal of the 7 heads. The only σοφία of the Apocalypse is the knack of solving puzzles in this province of religious arithmetic (xiii. 18, xvii. 9).

suggests, it was more precise and extended. It was held by Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, and Victorinus, possibly even by Hegesippus at an earlier date, if Dr. Lawlor is correct in his argument (*Journ. Theol. Studies,* viii. 436 f.) that the statements of Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 11-20) were borrowed from that writer's *Hypomnemata;* indeed, no other early tradition has anything like the same support or plausibility. Irenaeus, of course, is no great authority by himself on matters chronological, but he is reporting here what there was no obvious motive for inventing. The internal and the external evidence thus converge upon the latter part of the reign of Domitian as the period of the book's composition or publication. Little more than half a century later, one of its first commentators, bishop Melito of Sardis, protested to Marcus Aurelius that "of all the emperors it was Nero and Domitian alone who, at the instigation of certain slanderous persons," assailed the Christian church (so Lact. *De Morte Persec.* 3). Whether Melito knew this independently of the Apocalypse or not, we need have very little hesitation (*cf.* Stephan Gsell's *Essai sur le règne de l'Empereur Domitien,* 1894, pp. 307 f.) in collating this persecution with the book in question.

§ 8. *The Author.*—The settlement of the date clears up the problem of the authorship to this extent, that it confirms the disjunctive canon of Dionysius (*cf.* Lücke, §§ 39-42; Simcox xxiii. f. xxxiii. f.), Origen's thoughtful pupil, who saw, upon grounds of internal evidence, that it was impossible for the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to have come from the same pen. Were the Apocalypse dated earlier, it could be supposed that John had matured during the interval, since twenty or twenty-five years' residence in a Greek city might be conjectured to have improved his style and widened his outlook. But when the Apocalypse has to be dated in the same decade as the Fourth Gospel, the hypothesis of a single author collapses. While the data of vocabulary, style, and thought suggest that both writings originated in a school or circle of Asiatic Christians, they differentiate the one book from the other unambiguously.[1]

Hardly any writing in the New Testament loses so little, or gains so much, by translation as the Apocalypse, for almost any version

[1] Recent, though rather extreme, statements are to be found in J. Réville's *Le Quatr. Évangile* (1901), pp. 26-47, 333 f. in Selwyn (pp. 81 f. 114 f., 222 f., 258 f., the Fourth Gospel = a correction not only of the synoptists but of the Apocalypse), and in Schmiedel's article (*E.B.* ii. ii. 2515-2518). As Alford admits, "the Greek of the Gospel and Epistle is not that of the Apocalypse in a maturer state".

serves to obliterate most of the exceptionally numerous and glaring irregularities of its syntax. But one drawback of this advantage is that the distinctive characteristics of the book are less vividly felt; the further one goes from the original, the less visible are those idiosyncrasies of conception, style, and construction which mark off the Apocalypse from the rest of the early Christian literature and notably from the Fourth Gospel. The psychological difference by itself should not be pressed too far. One has only to recollect men like Samuel Rutherford and Keble, to understand how vindictiveness to religious opponents is compatible with a sweet and even devout spiritual tone in certain natures. But the disjunctive canon in the present case proceeds from a wider induction. Thus *e.g.* the well-known resemblances of the Lamb and the Logos are both specious and secondary. The former (τὸ ἀρνίον Apoc.; ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, Gospel, ἀρνίον being reserved for Christians) does not exist in the original, nor is it peculiar to the Johannine literature. The latter again (ὁ λόγος τ. θεοῦ, Apoc.; ὁ λόγος, Gospel) is verbal (*cf.* note on xix. 13); the two ideas are adapted from totally different soils in pre-Christian Judaism and for alien ends. Some closer analogies, such as (*a*) the relation of God, Christ, and the believer (*cf.* on ii. 27, iii. 19 f.), (*b*) the use of the partitive ἐκ, ἵνα, δείκνυμι (of revelation), etc., (*c*) the explanation of Hebrew terms, (*d*) formulas like μετὰ ταῦτα, and (*e*) phrases about witnessing or keeping God's word (commandments), do not necessarily imply more than a common *milieu* of thought and expression such as contemporary writers belonging to the same school might naturally employ. A common religious dialect often produces similar instances of corresponding or coincident expression in different authors of the same period. On the other hand, the Apocalypse has a vocabulary of its own, whose peculiarities are not to be explained simply from the subject matter; *e.g.* δοῦλοι θεοῦ (in explicit contrast to Joh. xv. 15), λατρεύειν, οἰκουμένη, παντοκράτωρ, πίστις, ὑπομονή, etc. besides cases of the multiplied genitive (xiv. 8, etc.). It ignores many favourite and even characteristic terms of the Fourth evangelist, *e.g.* ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής, ἀληθῶς, ἀπεκρίθη κ. εἶπεν, ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, θεᾶσθαι, ἴδε, ἴδιος, καθὼς, μετὰ τοῦτο, πάντοτε, παρρησία, πώποτε, ὑψοῦσθαι, χάρα, sonship (*cf.* on xxi. 7) asking (ἐρωτάω) God, *darkness*, μὲν . . . δέ, μένειν (except in xvii. 10, historically), πονηρός or ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου (of the devil), to be of God or to be born of God, love to God or Christ, ὑπέρ with genitive, ἀντί, ὑπό (accus.), μέντοι, etc., etc. Even where the Apocalypse uses certain terms or ideas of the Fourth Gospel, it is in a different sense; *e.g.* αἰώνιος (only in xiv. 6, never with ζωή), *light* and *the world* (physically not spiritually), ἐκεῖνος (never substantival),

ἐμός (only once), οὖν of logical appeal[1] (not of historical transition), Ἰερουσαλήμ not Ἱεροσόλυμα, νικᾶν (never transitive, and in special sense *cf.* on ii. 7), judgment (outward and dramatic, not inward), *the Spirit* (wholly prophetic, in contrast to the inward Comforter of the Gospel), σημαίνειν, ὑπάγειν, etc. Furthermore, the Fourth Gospel ignores, often deliberately, a large number of words or phrases used not only by the Apocalypse (once at least) but by the earlier synoptic Gospels; *e.g.* ἀναγινώσκω (of Scriptures), ἀποδίδωμι, ἀπόστολοι, ἄρσην, ἀφαιρέω, βασανίζειν, βδέλυγμα, βίβλος, γαστήρ, γρηγορεῖν, γυνή (wife), δαιμόνια, δένδρον, διαθήκη, δίκαιος (of men), δῶρον, ἔθνη (=Gentiles), εἰκών, ἔλαιον, ἐνδύειν, ἑπτά, ἐσθίω, ἔσχατος, ἔσωθεν (ἔξωθεν), εὐαγγέλιον (*cf.* on xiv. 6), ἑξήκοντα, ἐχθρός, ἥλιος, θρόνος, ἰσχύς, ἰσχυρός, κληρονομεῖν, κλίνη, κηρύσσειν, κόπτω, λιμός, λοιπός, λυχνία, μακρόθεν, μαρτύριον, μάρτυς, μηδείς, μετρέω, μικροί, μυστήριον, νεφέλη, ὀλίγος, ὀμνύειν, ὀδούς, οὐαί, οὖς (contrast John xviii. 10, 26), πάσχω, πατάσσειν, περί (accus.), πέτρα, πίστις, πλοῦτος (-σιος), ποτίζειν, πόλεμος, πρεσβύτεροι, προσευχή, πρόσωπον, ῥάβδος, ῥίζα, σεισμός, σελήνη, σκηνή, σοφία, σταυρόω, σφόδρα, ὑψηλός, φυλακή, ψευδοπροφήτης, and χήρα. The Apocalypse also substitutes ἔρχου for ἐλθέ, and uses phrases like ἄξιος with infin. for ἄξιος with ἵνα. The eschatological differences of conception, which are too patent to require comment or to admit of harmonising, corroborate the impression made by this argument from words. Such features, linguistic and mental (*cf. e.g.* on i. 4, ii. 7, iii. 21, vii. 15), are not due to literary versatility, nor to an imaginary growth in the same writer's vocabulary and soul, nor even to a common editorial revision. The argument from solecisms (*cf.* § 1) and regular irregularities of style, from the special vocabulary, and above all from the realistic type of religious feeling, may be cumulative, but it is none the less able to support the contention that whilst the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse must have sprung from the same circle of Asiatic Christianity, they could not have been written by the same person within a few years of each other; the divergences of eschatology, angelology, and Christology—which represent the crucial points of comparison between the two books—are almost as clearly cut in Apoc. i.-iii., where the Apocalypse is least apocalyptic, as in the later oracles. In general, it would not be irrelevant to apply to the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse the terms used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to characterise the works of Herodotus and Thucydides respectively; the one is radiant (ἱλαρόν), the other is awe-inspiring (φοβερόν).

[1] This is particularly significant, since, as the Apocalypse "is largely made up of narrative, we might have expected narrative οὖν in abundance if it had been written by the hand that wrote the Fourth Gospel" (Abbott, *Joh. Grammar*, p. 479).

While the author of the Apocalypse cannot have been the author of the Fourth Gospel, his personality is partially disclosed by the internal evidence of the book, which shows that it was the work of a Jewish Christian prophet called John (i. 1, 9, etc.) who was in close touch with the Asiatic churches. It is a προφητεία, and as such it is ranked by the first Christian writer of the second century who definitely mentions it (*cf.* Justin's *Dial.*, 81, 82). It was intended to be read aloud in the worship[1] of those Christian congregations, primarily but not exclusively, to which its opening messages were addressed. In reality it is a sort of catholic epistle as it stands (*cf.* ii. 7, etc., xxii. 16, 21), an open letter or manifesto to the churches. The authority claimed by John is that of a prophet, not of an apostle. The seven Asiatic communities may have lain within his circuit or diocese, but the data of Apoc. ii.-iii. do not suggest any specifically concrete relations between the prophet and the churches. He does not seem to have founded any of them, nor does he promise to re-visit them. Upon the other hand, John claims no special relation to Jesus Christ, and there is no distinct evidence that he had been an eye-witness of Jesus the messiah upon earth. None of the visions implies any such personal intimacy; indeed that of i. 9 f. tells against it, for the apocalyptic categories which dominate the opening vision are not such as might be expected from one who had been among the Galilean disciples.[2] It may be replied that an apocalypse is not a gospel, and that in an apocalypse it was the qualities of a προφήτης which would naturally be prominent. But this only raises the further psychological problem: how should a primitive disciple adopt such categories? The reference in xviii. 20 does not absolutely exclude the possibility of John having been an apostle, for ἀπόστολος is here employed in its wider sense, and in any case the addition of προφῆται shows that this προφήτης might have equally well referred objectively to the class or order to which he

[1] Passages like i. 3, ii. 7, etc., xiii. 9, 18, xxii. 7, reflect this ecclesiastical use, while the explanatory comments in iv. 5 (ἅ εἰσιν . . . θεοῦ), v. 6 (οἵ εἰσιν . . . γῆν), v. 8 (ἅ εἰσιν . . . ἁγίων), xviii. 24, xix. 8 (τὸ γὰρ . . . ἐστίν), xix. 10 (ἡ γὰρ . . . προφητείας), xix. 13 (καὶ κέκληται . . . θεοῦ), xx. 14 (οὗτος . . . πυρός), sound often like prose glosses which in some cases may have been inserted by the author himself or a general editor, but in others were probably due to the interpretative reading in the churches. A partial analogy is furnished by the influence of the players on the text of Shakespeare's plays.

[2] The seer never says, *I saw the Lord Jesus*, or, *Behold, the Lord Jesus.* Contrast Acts vii. 55, 56, etc. "Jesus speaks through His Spirit under various forms or without any form, and is never beheld in the form He wore in Galilee" (Abbott, p. 214). *Cf.* Prof. A. S. Peake, in Mansfield College Essays (1909), pp. 89-106.

belonged. The unique allusion in xxi. 14 to *the twelve apostles of the Lamb*, however, has an objective and retrospective tinge, which, though it does not absolutely rule out apostolic authorship, points in that direction. It is not a subtle anti-Pauline touch, for even Paul did not number himself among the twelve (1 Cor. xv. 5), but when it is collated with such discrepancies as that between xi. 1-2 and Mk. xiii. 2 (*cf.* also iii. 21 with Mk. x. 37-40) or that between Ac. i. 6-8 and the apocalyptic calculations of the end (see further, on iii. 21, vii. 1-3, 14, ix. 15) the result is a cumulative argument in favour of some primitive Christian who sat looser to the synoptic tradition than a disciple such as the son of Zebedee would have done. During last century the apostolic authorship of the book, in conjunction with the Neronic date, was urged by Baur (*cf. Church Hist. of First Three Centuries*, i. 84 f., 153 f.) and his school, on the double ground that it represented a type of narrow Jewish Christianity in the apostolic church, and that it contained an overt polemic against the apostle Paul. Neither of these arguments is seaworthy at the present day, although the anti-Pauline reference becomes a much more serious question, when the Nero or Galba date is chosen, than some recent defenders of the latter hypothesis appear to realise. The Apocalypse has the Pauline teaching behind it (*cf.* iii. 14, xxii. 17), but it neither reproduces any of the Pauline idiosyncrasies nor opposes Paul personally. It goes back to the popular Jewish Christianity of the primitive churches, whose "theology" consisted primarily in a belief that Jesus, the true messiah, had secured the forgiveness of sins for his people and would return presently to establish the divine βασιλεία. The writer ignores any problem of the law or of the resurrection of the body. Echoes of the synoptic tradition are audible enough, particularly of its Lucan form, and one feature of the teaching of Jesus is preserved carefully, *viz.*, the belief in the catastrophic advent of the βασιλεία; but no evidence is available to prove a literary filiation between it and any of the synoptic gospels.[1]

[1] So far as the local colour is not derived from O.T. traditions, it may be ascribed, as, *e.g.*, by Mr. Theodore Bent (*Nineteenth Century*, 1888, 813-881, *cf.* also *Historical New Testament*, p. 688) to a personal acquaintance with Palestine and Asia Minor (see on iv. 2, vi. 12 f., viii. 8 f., ix. 16, 18, xxii. 2). Thus, *e.g.*, the references to the appearance or the disappearance (*cf.* the case of Chrysê near Lemnos, told by Pausanias, viii. 33-4) of islands reflect the insular situation of Patmos, from which several of the Ægean islands were at least visible (Tozer: *Islands of the Aegean*, pp. 178-95), as well as the volcano of Santorin. The crater of some Mediterranean volcano may have lent special point to *the lake of fire and brimstone*. But John's imagination is stronger than his susceptibility to his environment, though

Who was this John? Was he some otherwise unknown figure (ἄλλον τινα τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων, Dionysius) in the primitive church of Asia Minor (so *e.g.*, J. Reville, F. C. Porter, Jülicher)? This is possible, for the name was common enough. But, if it is felt that the work must be connected with a more authoritative personality, tradition offers us the choice of three figures. (*a*) That of John Mark (so *e.g.*, Hitzig, Weisse, and Hausrath), whom Dionysius of Alexandria mentions in this connection but only to set aside on the score of his un-Asiatic career, need not be seriously discussed, though Beza favoured his claims ("quod si liceret ex stylo conjecturam facere, nemini certe potius quam Marco tribuerim qui et ipse Johannes dictus est"). The real alternative lies between (*b*) John the son of Zebedee, and (*c*) John the presbyter, both of whom have strong traditional claims. The latter is not to be emended out of existence by any manipulation of the text of Papias, and we have no reason to regard the one as the *doppelgänger* of the other. Whether Eusebius was right in arguing from that text or from other evidence that Papias was one of his hearers, John ὁ πρεσβύτερος was an important Christian disciple; his authority was so great that he could be called ὁ πρεσβύτερος without any further designation. There is strong and early support for (*b*) in tradition, but the internal evidence, as we have seen, is at best neutral and in certain lights unfavourable. It is impossible here to analyse that tradition in its bearings upon the Apocalypse, but it may be said that there were special reasons which contributed to its popularity (*cf.* § 9). Internal evidence weighed less with the early church than other considerations. The wavering position of the Apocalypse required nothing short of apostolic sanction to keep it within the canon, and indeed apostolic authorship came more and more to be tantamount to inspiration. Under these circumstances it was not easy for any theory or tradition of unapostolic authorship to keep its footing. Mr. Conybeare puts this succinctly (*The Armenian Text of Revelation*, pp. 161 f.): "Between 350 and 450 Greek texts of Revelation were rare in the Eastern half of the empire. The best minds of the Greek Church, men such as Eusebius Pamphili and Dionysius of Alexandria, denied its Johannine authorship. Living in an age when

sometimes it is not fanciful to trace a special significance in some conventional phrase, *e.g.*, the boom of the Mediterranean in i. 15, or in vi. 15-16—an allusion to the Sipylus range, north of the Gulf of Smyrna, where cisterns and holes cut in the rocks afforded temporary shelter to the population during the frequent panics caused by earthquakes on the coast (*cf.* Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phrygia*, Eng. tr., 1892, pp. 61-62).

old Greek was still the language of every-day life, they were too conscious of the contrasts of style which separate it from the Fourth gospel to accept the view that a single author wrote both. Having to accept John the apostle as author of one or the other, they decided in favour of the gospel. In the West, on the other hand, where both documents circulated only in a Latin dress, men were unconscious of these contrasts of style, and so found no difficulty in accepting both as writings of the apostle John." Hence, taking the Apocalypse by itself on the one hand and the tradition of John the presbyter on the other, we find both converging on the conclusion that, even if John the apostle did survive till the end of the first century in Asia Minor, it was not he but his namesake who wrote the Johannine Apocalypse. καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται (Acts ii. 17), under the influence of the prophetic spirit. In this case, the term πρεσβύτερος (as in 2 John ver. 3, and 3 John ver. 1) is the Christian term of honour and authority (*cf.* Deissmann, 154 f., 233 f.), not the Jewish term[1] for a member of the Sanhedrin (πρεσβύτης). Occasionally, as in the case of John, the presbyter must have had prophetic gifts; the fragments preserved by Irenæus from the tradition of the Asiatic presbyters point unmistakably to prophetic and even chiliastic tendencies, though they are more sensuous than in the corresponding features in the Apocalypse. John was also a μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου in the wider sense of the term. He was one of the most important authorities who were in touch with apostolic tradition, and it is easier to credit him with the rabbinic erudition and apocalyptic lore of the Apocalypse than one who was ἀγράμματος καὶ ἰδιώτης (Acts iv. 13).

A further possibility (recognised by Erasmus) lies in the direction of pseudonymity. Apocalypses were almost invariably pseudonymous, and it is held by some (*e.g.*, S. Davidson, Weizsäcker, Wernle, Forbes, and Bacon in *Expositor*, 1907, 233 f.), that the presumption is in favour of John's Apocalypse also belonging to the pseudepigrapha. This would be rendered more probable, were it taken to include fragments or traditions which were really due to John Mark (Spitta, Völter), John the son of Zebedee (Erbes, Bruston), or John the presbyter (J. Weiss, so differently Bousset and Schmiedel). But it does not follow that an early Christian apocalypse must necessarily be pseudonymous. Hermas is not. Besides, one *raison d'être* for pseudonymity is absent, *viz.*, the consciousness that the prophetic

[1] So Selwyn (127 f.), holding that the author of the Apocalypse retained his earlier Jewish title. But it is prosaic to see that semi-circular court reflected in iv. 2 f., or to find evidence of special legal knowledge in v. 1 and xii. 10.

spirit was no longer present in the church. The amount of antedated prediction in the Apocalypse (*i.e.*, in xiii. xvii.), too, is barely adequate, of itself, to support this theory. And it may be argued that a pseudonymous writer would probably have been more explicit upon the apostolic authority of John, *i.e.*, if John the apostle was the John under whose name he issued the Apocalypse. The case for the latter form of the hypothesis would be strengthened, of course, if it could be shown, as many critics have recently attempted to prove, that the tradition of John's early martyrdom is reliable. In any case the ardent and even vindictive spirit of the Apocalypse is not to be connected necessarily with Luke ix. 55. Such a passionate, unpatriotic temper would be as much due to the apocalyptic traditions and to the local exigencies of the period as to any personal idiosyncracy, and if John retained this feeling till the end of the century, or even till the seventh or eighth decade, he must have profited very little by the lesson which Jesus had read him long ago. When he is connected with the tradition or authorship of the Fourth gospel, the supposition that he was responsible for the attitude of the Apocalypse becomes doubly, trebly difficult.

To sum up. The Apocalypse was a product of the "Johannine" school or circle in Asia Minor, towards the close of the first century. Beyond the disjunctive canon that it was not composed by the author of the Fourth Gospel, but that it may have been written by the presbyter whose name appears in the address of 2 and 3 John, we can hardly go, in our comparison of the Johannine writings. The data of tradition are unfortunately ambiguous and contradictory, but, whether or not the son of Zebedee resided in Asia Minor, the presbyter John seems on the whole to suit the requirements of the Apocalypse better than any other contemporary figure, and, unless we are content with Castellio and others to share the pious reticence of Dionysius (ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἰωάννης ἐστὶν ὁ ταῦτα γράφων, αὐτῷ λέγοντι πιστευτέον· ποῖος δὲ οὗτος, ἄδηλον), the balance of probability is in favour either of pseudonymity or of the hypothesis that the prophet John who composed the Apocalypse was the presbyter John of early Christian tradition (so after Dionysius, from various standpoints,[1] Eichhorn, Wittichen, De Wette, Mangold, Credner, Bleek, Ewald, Keim, Havet, Düsterdieck, Selwyn, Erbes, O. Holtzmann, Harnack, Kohler, Von Soden, Heinrici (*Das Urchristenthum*, 1902, 126 f.), and Von Dobschütz (*Probleme d. apost. Zeitalters*, 1904, 91 f.).

[1] Grotius: "Credo autem presbytero, apostoli discipulo, custoditum hunc librum; inde factum, ut eius esse opus a quibusdam per errorem crederetur". Loisy (*Le*

§ 9. *The Reception of the Apocalypse.*—No immediate traces of the Apocalypse (*cf.* Zahn's *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, i., pp. 201 f., and Leipoldt's *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons*, i., pp. 32 f., 58 f., etc.), are to be found in early Christian literature; the two or three apparent allusions in Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, and Hermas, imply nothing but common oral tradition or the independent use of the O.T., if not of apocryphal sources. Ignatius, however, seems to have known it (see on iii. 12, xxi. 3); certainly Papias and Justin did. Melito of Sardis (*c.* 170 A.D.) wrote a commentary upon it, while Apollonius and Theophilus of Antioch were acquainted with it; so were the Valentinians, and of course the chiliasts. Irenæus and the *Ep. Lugd.* attest its circulation in southern Gaul (*c.* 177 A.D.). Clement also read it in Alexandria as a sacred scripture. The evidence of the martyrdoms and of Tertullian proves that in Africa, as well as in southern Gaul and Egypt, it was widely circulated before the close of the second century, and the Muratorian canon witnesses to its authority in Rome. But it did not escape sharp criticism (τί με ὠφελεῖ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, λέγουσά μοι περὶ ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἑπτὰ σαλπίγγων;) and even repudiation not only from Marcion, with his antipathy to the O.T., but from the anti-Montanists, alike in Asia Minor and in Rome,[1] who disliked the sensuous elements in its prophecies and repudiated ecstasy as a form of true prophecy. The predilection for Hellenistic eschatology also helped to throw it into disfavour, as compared with, *e.g.*, *The Apocalypse of Peter*, which even the Muratorian canon ranks alongside of it. Another feature which probably told against its popularity was its unpatriotic attitude to the empire. When prayers were offered in the churches for the emperor, and when the empire had come to be viewed, as Paul had taught, in the

Quatr. Evangile, p. 134), Swete, M'Giffert, Peake (*Introd. N.T.*, 1909, 152 f.), and some others incline to this hypothesis with hesitation, as does Jacoby (*Neutestam. Ethik*, 1899, 444-455). It was admitted by Vogel (*Commentationes*, etc., 1811-1816), who was almost the first to suggest the composite origin of the Apocalypse.

[1] The controversy between Hippolytus and Gaius the Roman presbyter, in the beginning of the third century, shows that the latter, like the Alogi, possibly ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus (*cf.* Schwartz's essay, *Ueber den Tod d. Söhne Zebedaei*, 1904, pp. 33-45). Hippolytus feels that Caius has gone too far in his wholesale repudiation of the Apocalypse along with its Montanist exploiters. One of the objections urged by the Alogi was that there was no church at Thyatira, and consequently that John was no true prophet, which probably means that the local church had become Montanist (*cf.* Corssen in *Texte u. Unters.*, xv. 1, 52-56), and therefore had ceased to exist as a church, from the standpoint of catholic Christianity. For the most part, as Dionysius says, they went through every chapter of the book, with a keen scent for its Oriental phantasy (ἄγνωστόν τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστον ἀποφαίνοντες).

light of a providential bulwark, it is not surprising that John's Apocalypse had a hard struggle to retain its place in the canon, and that except in times of sore persecution it did not appeal to the majority of Christians. The result was that before very long the only means of preserving it for ecclesiastical edification was to allegorise it freely. This naturally threw the interpretation of the book quite out of focus, so that the fortunes of the Apocalypse really form a chapter in the history of the canon or of the church (*cf.* Lücke, §§ 30-36, 50-59). But even prior to, or independent of, the allegorical interpretation, the book had vitality. It is paradoxical to claim that the apocalypses of the early church, including that of John, were the first Christian scriptures to be canonised, owing to their prophetic origin, which ranked them with the O.T. Their place in the series of prophetic writings is obvious, but the treatise *de aleatoribus*, from which the main evidence for this theory is drawn, is of too uncertain a date to be used safely in this connexion. Still, the Apocalypse did retain its vogue in many circles of the early church, especially throughout the west. Often this was due to a vague and correct instinct for John's great religious message in spite of its archaic paraphernalia and its fantastic elements (*cf.* Renan, 479, 480). Yet even its literal prophecies still maintained an appeal of their own. It was the chiliasm of the book, not its unfulfilled predictions, which proved a difficulty. The prediction which went soonest out of date (*i.e.*, xvii. 8-11) seems to have occasioned as little trouble to the church as the Sibylline oracles or the similar passages of the O.T. prophets. The Apocalypse evidently was not final any more than normal.[1] Besides, against the failure of its historical programme to correspond with the subsequent trend of history, must be set the fact that the number of the Beast could be interpreted as Trajan, Hadrian, or Marcus Aurelius, that the expectation[2] of a Nero-antichrist lingered down to the fifth century in certain corners of the popular religious mind, that Gog and Magog were repeatedly expected in the form of savage hordes (Huns, Goths, etc.), and that the dread (*cf.* Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i., 644 f.) of a Parthian invasion did not become obsolete till the third century. In several respects the book could still be taken reasonably as a prediction of near events. Thus, by the time that Constantine's policy had antiquated the Apocalypse's view of

[1] *Cf.* A. B. Davidson on this point in Hastings, *D.B.*, i. 736, 737, iv. 126.

[2] Though "it was during the continuance of the Flavian dynasty that the expectation was at white heat," yet it "lingered on for many centuries" (Lightfoot, *Clem. Rom.*, ii., pp. 511, 512).

the Roman State, the position of the book was fairly secure. New systems of interpretation, allegorical (*e.g.*, that of Tyconius) and semi-historical, were devised to vindicate its rights as a scripture of the church, and these were the more cordially welcomed, as the book itself was enigmatic and in parts ambiguous. All sense of its original object had faded from the uncritical mind of the church. Dogmatic prepossessions underlay its rejection as well as its reception; it was exposed to extravagant censure and extravagant praise, but the growing belief in its apostolic origin helped to save it, like Hebrews, from ultimate exclusion or depreciation. In the case of the one book as of the other, the instinct which determined the judgment of the councils and the churches was sounder than the political reasons which they adduced. *Nostra res agitur*, they felt. The authentic note of loyalty to Jesus Christ at all costs was audible enough to prevail with them over their antipathy to the crashing discords of Christian apocalyptic.[1]

§ 10. *Literature, etc.*—In addition to abbreviations which are already noted (page 284), or which are obvious enough, the following may be mentioned:—

Abbott = E. A. Abbott's *Notes on N. T. Criticism* (1907), pp. 75 f., 175 f.

AC = Bousset's *der Antichrist* (Eng. Tr. by Keane, 1896).

Baldensperger = sec. ed. (1892) of Baldensperger's *das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu.*

Blass = *Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch* (2nd ed. 1902; Eng. Tr. 1905).

Böklen = B.'s *die Verwandtschaft d. jüdisch-christlichen mit der Parsischen Eschatologie* (1902).

Burton = E. de W. Burton's *New Testament Moods and Tenses* (2nd ed. 1894).

C.B.P. = W. M. Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, vol. i. part i. (1895), part ii. (1897).

Dalman = Dalman's *Worte Jesu* (Eng. Tr. *The Words of Jesus*).

Dieterich = A. Dieterich's *Nekyia* (1893).

[1] "If a great man interprets a national crisis so as to bring home to the nation its true ideals and destination, he remains a true prophet even if his forecast was mistaken. Without the critical situation it is probable that the great man could never have brought so much truth to such powerful expression. So an eschatology is not to be judged by a simple rule of agreement with facts, but rather by its fitness under the circumstances to quicken faith in God, to stir the conscience and put men's wills under the domination of ideal motives, to give a living sense of God and eternity" (F. C. Porter, *Messages of the Apoc. Writers*, p. 73).

Dobschütz = Von Dobschütz's *die urchristlichen Gemeinden* (1902; Eng. Tr., "Christian Life in the Primitive Church," 1904).

E.B.D.—"The Egyptian Book of the Dead" (ed. E. Wallis Budge; the translation, 1898).

E.Bi. = *The Encyclopædia Biblica.*

E.J. = *The Jewish Encyclopædia* (1901 ff.).

Ep. Lugd. = "The epistle of the churches at Vienne and Lyons," 177 A.D. (Eus. *H.E.* v. 1).

Friedländer = *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms* (1888, 6th ed.), by L. Friedländer.

Gfrörer = Gfrörer's *das Jahrhundert des Heils* (1838).

Grill = J. Grill's *Untersuch. über die Entstehung d. vierten Evglms* (1902).

Grotius = Grotius's *Annotationes*, viii. 234 f. (1839 ed.).

Helbing = R. Helbing's *Grammatik der Septuaginta* (1907).

Gregory = C. R. Gregory's *Textkritik des N.T.* (1900-1909).

Jastrow = Prof. Morris Jastrow's *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).

Jeremias = A. Jeremias' *Babylonisches im N. T.* (1905).

Kattenbusch = K., *das apostolische Symbol*, vol. ii. (1900).

Lueken = Lueken's *Michael* (1898).

Moulton = J. H. Moulton's *Gramm. N. T. Greek*, vol. i. (sec. ed., 1906).

Pausanias = Pausanias' "Description of Greece" (ed. J. G. Frazer, 1898).

Pfleiderer = *das Urchristentum* (1902), vol. ii., pp. 281 f.

P.W. = Pauly's *Real-Encycl. der class. Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. Wissowa, 1894 f.).

Renan = Renan's *L'antéchrist* (1871).

R.J. = Bousset's *die Religion des Judentums im neutest. Zeitalter* (1903; the references are to the first edition).

R.S. = W. Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites.*

S.B.E. = "The Sacred Books of the East" (Oxford).

S.C. = Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895): with his essay (1903) *Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N. T.* (*cf. The Monist*, 1903, 398-455).

Selwyn = E. C. Selwyn: "The Christian Prophets and the Prophetic Apocalypse" (1901).

Stave = *Ueber d. Einfluss d. Parsismus auf d. Judentum* (1898).

Thumb = *Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter d. Hellenismus* (1901).

Titius = Dr. A. Titius: *die vulgäre Anschauung von d. Seligkeit im Urchristentum* (1900).

Viteau = Viteau's *Étude sur le grecque du nouveau Testament*, vol. i. (1893), vol. ii. (1896).

Volz = P. Volz: *Jüdische Eschatologie* (1903).

Weinel = Weinel's *die Wirkungen des Geistes u. der Geister im nachap. Zeitalter* (1899).

Weizsäcker = *The Apostolic Age* (Eng. Tr., 1894-1895).

Win. = Winer's *Grammatik* (8th ed., by P. W. Schmiedel).

In order to save space, most of the citations from the O.T. and the N.T. have been relegated to the margin; often the substance of a note has been crushed into a handful of such references. It has been impossible to give any register of opinion or history of interpretation, and I have abstained from furnishing such grammatical, philological, or geographical information as may be found in any concordance, grammar, or dictionary of the Bible. For fuller details on questions of introduction I must refer the reader to the relevant sections in my forthcoming *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.*

The English student is now excellently served by the articles of Bousset (*E.Bi.* i. 194-212, summarising the results of his *editio princeps* in Meyer [1896, 1906]) and Dr. F. C. Porter (Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, iv. pp. 239-266, an invaluable introduction), and by Dr. Swete's full edition of the Greek text (3rd. ed. 1909). Manual editions by W. H. Simcox (Cambridge Greek Testament, 1893), C. A. Scott (Century Bible, 1902), and H. P. Forbes (*Intern. Handbks to N. T.*, iv., 1907, pp. 86-149). The main English contributions, since Alford, are those of Farrar (*Early Days of Christianity*, 1882, ch. xxviii.), Lee (*Speaker's Comm.* 1881), Wordsworth (1875), Randall (*Pulpit Comm.*, 1890), Milligan (*Discussions on the Apocalypse*, 1893; also his edition in the fourth vol. of Schaff's Commentary), E. W. Benson (*The Apoc.*, 1900), Selwyn, and Briggs (*Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 285-461); *cf.* further G. H. Gilbert (*The First Interpreters of Jesus*, 1901, pp. 332-397), F. Palmer's *The Drama of the Apocalypse* (1903), H. Berg's *The Drama of the Apocalypse* (1894), Dr. F. C. Porter's *Messages of the Apoc. Writers* (1905, pp. 169-296), the English translations of Beyschlag's *Neutest. Theol.* (vol. ii., 247-361) and Wernle's *Die Anfänge*, pp. 256-274 ("The Beginnings of Christianity," 1901, vol. i., pp. 360 f.), Sir W. M. Ramsay's *Letters to the Seven Churches* (1904), Hort's posthumous fragment (*Apoc.* i.-iii., 1908), and Canon J. J. Scott's *The Apocalypse* (1909).

German edd.—De Wette (1848), Bleek (Eng. tr. 1875), Düster-

dieck (1887), B. Weiss (2nd ed. 1902), J. Weiss (*die Schriften des N. T.*, 1907), Bousset, and H. J. Holtzmann (*Hand-Commentar*, 3rd. ed., 1908). Schmiedel's *Volksbuch* (1906) is included in the English edition of his *Johannine Writings* (1908). There is a competent Dutch commentary by J. M. S. Baljon (Utrecht, 1908); besides French works by Havet (*Le Christ. et ses origines*, iv. 314-344), Reuss (Paris, 1878), A. Crampon (Tournai, 1904), and Th. Calmes (Paris, 1905), with the last-named scholar's pamphlet, *L'Apoc. devant la tradition et devant la critique*[3] (1907). Baljon's critical introduction is given in his *Geschiedenis van de Boeken des nieuwen Verbonds* (1901), 241-265.

Of the commentaries which preceded Alford, almost the only English works which retain any critical value are those of Moses Stuart (Andover, 1845: on the lines of Lücke) and Trench (*Commentary on the Epp. to the Seven Churches*, 1861, sixth edition, 1897).

Since the present commentary was drafted, six years ago, a number of monographs, including some of those just mentioned, have been issued. I have occasionally inserted references to them in the text, for the sake of convenience and completeness, but, for the sake of independence, the notes have otherwise been left untouched.

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.[1]

I. 1. [a] ᾿ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἣν [b] ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς [c] δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ,[2] ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει, καὶ ἐσήμανεν

a Sc. ἥδε ἐστιν (article absent as from Matt. i. 1, *cf.* Win. § 19, 10). For eschat. connotation, *cf.* Rom. ii. 5, viii. 19. b John xii. 49, xiv. 10: constr. John vi. 52. c John v. 20, x. 32.

[1] Om. with ℵC, etc. (edd.), from the title the **του θεολογου** of Q and (with expansions) many cursives, which was a description of the apostle John in the fourth century as the author of the fourth gospel, and applied to him here as the exponent of divine oracles (**θεολογος = προφητης,** Philo, de Vit. Mos., ii. 11; Luc., *Alex.*, 19, 22) or as the herald of God (*cf.* Chrys., *Orat.*, 36). Inscriptions show that **θεολογοι** were sacred officials in Pergamum, Ephesus, Smyrna, etc. (Deissm., 231-232, *Licht vom Osten*, 252 f.), who were frequently **υμνωδοι** as well.

[2] Punctuate **Θεος δειξαι τ. δ. αυτου,** with WH, Ws., Bs., Hort. On the alternative form **Ιωανει** (ℵ*), *cf.* Win. § 5, 26c, Schmiedel (*E. Bi.*, 2504-2505), Thumb 20 f., Helbing 29-30.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-3. The superscription. **᾿Απ. ᾿Ιωάννου** is the ecclesiastical title (distinguishing it from the apocalypse of Peter, or of Paul, etc.) of what professes in reality to be an **ἀπ. ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (subjective genitive), *i.e.*, a disclosure of the divine **μυστήρια** (Dan. ii. 19, 22, 28, Theod.) in the immediate future (**ἃ δεῖ γ. ἐν τάχει**) which has been communicated (**ἔδωκεν,** *cf.* on iii. 9) by God to Jesus (*cf.* v. 7) and which in turn is transmitted by Jesus (Gal. i. 12) to John as a member of the prophetic order.

Ver. 1. **δούλοις,** in specific sense of x. 7, xi. 18, after Dan. ix. 6, 10; Zech. i. 6, and Amos iii. 7 (**ἀποκαλύψῃ παιδείαν πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ τοὺς προφήτας**). *Jesus Christ* is used only in i. 1-5 (xxii. 21 ?), *Lord Jesus* only in xxii. 20, *Lord* (*i.e.*, Jesus) only in xi. 8 and xiv. 13; elsewhere either **ὁ Χριστός** (xx. 4, 6) **αὐτοῦ** (xi. 15, xii. 10) or (as in Hebrews) the simple *Jesus*. **ἃ δεῖ κ.τ.λ.** (from Dan. ii. 28-29), either object of **δεῖξαι** (Vit. ii. 229) or more probably in opposition to **ἥν**. **ἐν τάχει** = "soon" (as in Clem. Rom. xxiii. 5 and the instructive logion of Luke xviii. 8). This is the hinge and staple of the book. When the advent of Jesus is hailed as a relief, it is no consolation to say that the relief will come suddenly; sudden or not, it must come soon (x. 7), if it is to be of any service. The keynote of the Apocalypse is the cheering assurance that upon God's part there is no reluctance or delay; His people have not long to wait now. **καὶ ἐσήμανεν** (so of what is future and momentous, Ezek. xxxiii. 3, Acts xi. 26, etc.: Heracleitus on the Delphic oracle, **οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει**) **ἀποστείλας** (from seventh heaven, in Asc. Isa. vi. 13), a loose Heb. idiom for "he (*i.e.*, Jesus here and in xxii. 16, God in xxii. 6) sent and signified it". **διὰ** (as in Asc. Isa. xi. 30, etc.) **τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ** (*cf.* Test. Jos. vi. 6). Jesus is the medium of all revelation, but **ἀποκάλυψις** is further conceived of as transmitted through the *angelus interpres*, a familiar and important figure in rabbinic (*cf. E. J.* i. 592, 593) and apocalyptic tradition (see reff. and on Acts vii. 30), who stands here between Jesus and the prophet as a sort of *double* of the former. Like Hermas (*Mand.* xi. 9), the post-exilic tradition required the executive function of this angel, in order to (*a*) satisfy the yearning for some means of divine communication, and (*b*) at the same time to maintain reverence for the divine glory (Baldensperger, 48 f.). But John's Christian consciousness here and elsewhere is

ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ [d] ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, 2. ὃς ἐμαρτύρησεν τὸν [e] λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅσα [f] εἶδεν. 3. μακάριος ὁ [g] ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς

d Zech. i. 9, 13, ii. 3, Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21 f., Ap. Bar. lv. 3 (Ramiel), etc.: Dieterich's *Mithras Liturgie*, 47 f. e Ver. 9. f *i.e.*, in present apocalypse. g 2 Cor. iii. 15, Acts xv. 21, Matt. xxiv. 15, 1 Tim. iv. 13, Clem. Hom. xix.

too large for the traditional and artificial forms of its expression. Unless this angel is identified with that of x. 1 f., he plays only a scanty and tardy rôle (xvii. 1 f., xxi. 5 f.) in the series of visions; the prophet's sense of direct experience (*e.g.*, in i. 9 f.) bursts through the cumbrous category of an intermediate agent between himself and Christ. It is by a conventional form of religious symbolism prevalent in this *genre* of literature, that Jesus, like Yahweh in Ezekiel (*cf.* x. 1, 3, xliv. 2), is represented both as addressing the prophet directly and as instructing him indirectly. The latter mode of expression (*cf.* Milton's *Uriel* and 4 Esd. iv. 1) was due to a hypostatising tendency which was not confined to Judaism. As Plutarch points out (*cf.* below on viii. 5 and xv. 8), the daemons in Hellenic religion are a middle term between the divine and the human; they prevent the former from being disturbed or contaminated by direct intercourse with men, and they also act as interpreters who communicate the divine will to men (*cf. De Iside* 25; Oakesmith's *Religion of Plutarch*, pp. 121 f., 163 f.). Wherever the reaction against materialism prevailed, especially in the popular religion of the empire, the belief in daemons or spirits as intermediate agents gave expression to the conviction that human weakness could not come into direct touch with the divine glory (*cf.* Friedländer, iii. 430 f.; Hatch's *Hibbert Lectures*, 245 f.).

Ver. 2. **ἐμαρτ.** (epistol. aor., *cf.* Phlm. 19, *cf.* further Thuc. i. 1 **ξυνέγραψε**). **λόγ. τ. θ.**, like דבר יהוה (LXX **λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ**, *e.g.*, Jer. i. 2), a collective term for God's disclosures to men (**τοὺς λόγους**, 3), or as here for some specific revelation more exactly defined in **ὅσα εἶδεν**, all that was seen or even heard (Amos i. 1) in visions being described by this generic term. The double expression *the word of God and the testimony borne by Jesus Christ* (xxii. 16, 20; *cf.* xix. 10) is an amplified phrase for the gospel. The subject upon which Jesus assures men of truth is the revelation of God's mind and heart, and the gospel is that utterance of God—that expression of His purpose—which Jesus unfolds and attests. The book itself is the record of John's evidence; he testifies to Christ, and Christ testifies of the future as a divine plan. For the revelation of God, in the specific form of prophecy, requires a further medium between Jesus and the ordinary Christian; hence the rôle of the prophets. On the prophetic commission to write, *cf.* Asc. Isa. i. 4-5 and i. 2, **παρέδωκεν αὐτῷ τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας οὓς αὐτὸς εἶδεν, κ.τ.λ.** The primitive sense of **μαρτ.** (= oral confession and proclamation of Jesus by his adherents) thus expands into a literary sense (as here) and into the more sombre meaning of martyrdom (ii. 13, John xviii. 37-39, xix. 19; *cf.* Lightfoot on Clem. Rom. v.). It is significant that the **λόγος τ. θ.** of Judaism was not adequate to the Christian consciousness without the **μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ.**

Ver. 3. The first of the seven beatitudes in the Apocalypse (xiv. 13, xvi. 15, xix. 9, xx. 6, xxii. 7, 14), endorsing the book as a whole. In the worship of the Christian communities one member read aloud, originally from the O.T. as in the synagogues, and afterwards from Christian literature as well (apostolic epistles, Col. iv. 16, and sub-apostolic epistles), while the rest of the audience listened (Eus. *H. E.* iv. 23). In its present form the Apocalypse was composed with this object in view. *Cf.* Justin's description of the Christian assemblies on Sunday, when, as the first business, **τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται** (Apol. i. 67). The art of reading was not a general accomplishment in the circles from which the Christian societies were for the most part recruited, and this office of reader (**ἀναγνώστης**), as distinct from that of the president, soon became one of the regular minor positions in the worship of the church. Here the reader's function resembles that of Baruch (*cf.* Jer. xxii. 5, 6). **τηροῦντες τὰ, κ.τ.λ.**, carefully heeding the warnings of the book, observing its injunctions, and expecting the fulfilment

λόγους [h] τῆς προφητείας καὶ [i] τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα· [k] ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς.

4. Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· [l] χάρις ὑμῖν

h *Cf.* xxii. 10. i Lk. xi. 28, John xiii. 17; contrast below, xxii. 18-19. k After Dan. vii. 22 (Lk. xxi. 8-9), *cf.* Ap. Bar. xxiii. 7. l Sc. εἴη (primit. Christ. salutation).

of its predictions, instead of losing heart and faith (Luke xviii. 8). *Cf.* Hipp. *De Antich.* 2 and En. civ. 12, "books will be given to the righteous and the wise to become a cause of joy and uprightness and much wisdom". The content of the Apocalypse is not merely prediction; moral counsel and religious instruction are the primary burden of its pages. The bliss of the obedient and attentive, however, is bound up with the certainty that the crisis at which the predictions of the book are to be realised is imminent; they have not to wait long for the fulfilment of their hopes. This, with the assurance of God's interest and intervention, represented the ethical content of early Christian prediction, which would have been otherwise a mere satisfaction of curiosity; see on ver. 19.

[*Note on* i. 1-3. If this inscription (absent from no MS.) is due to the author, it must have been added (so Bruston, Jülicher, Hirscht, Holtzm., Bs.), like the **προοίμιον** of Thucydides, after he had finished the book as a whole. But possibly it was inserted by the later hand of an editor or redactor (Völter, Erbes, Briggs, Hilg., Forbes, Wellhausen, J. Weiss, Simcox = elders of Ephesus, John xxi. 24) rather than of a copyist (Spitta, Sabatier, Schön), who reproduced the Johannine style of the Apocalypse proper. At the same time, the change from the third to the first person (ver. 9) is not unexampled (*cf.* Jer. i. 1-3, 4 f.; Ezek. i. 1-4; Enoch repeatedly), and forms no sure proof of an original text overlaid with editorial touches; nor is a certain sententious objectivity (*cf.* Herod. i. 1, ii. 23, etc.) unnatural at the commencement of a book, when the writer has occasion to introduce himself. The real introduction begins at ver. 4 (*cf.* xxii. 21).]

Vv. 4-8. The prologue.

Ver. 4. **ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλ.**, seven being the sacred and complete number in apocalyptic symbolism (*E. Bi.* 3436). The **ταῖς** must refer proleptically to to ver. 11; for other churches existed and flourished in proconsular Asia at this time, *e.g.*, at Troas, Magnesia, Hierapolis and Colossae, with which the prophet must have been familiar. These seven are selected by him for some special reason which it is no longer possible to disinter (see above, Introd., § 2). **ἀπὸ ὁ ὤν, κ.τ.λ.**, a quaint and deliberate violation of grammar (Win. § 10, 1c.; Moult. i. 9) in order to preserve the immutability and absoluteness of the divine name from declension, though it falls under the rule that in N.T. and LXX parenthetic and accessory clauses tend to assume an independent construction. The divine title is a paraphrase probably suggested by rabbinic language (*e.g.*, Targum Jonath. apud Deut. xxxii. 39, ego ille, qui est et qui fuit et qui erit); the idea would be quite familiar to Hellenic readers from similar expressions, *e.g.*, in the song of doves at Dodona (**Ζεὺς ἦν, Ζεὺς ἔστιν, Ζεὺς ἔσσεται**) or in the titles of Asclepius and Athene. Simon Magus is said to have designated himself also as **ὁ ἑστὼς, ὁ στὰς, ὁ στησόμενος**, and the shrine of Minerva (= Isis) at Sais bore the inscription, *I am all that hath been and is and shall be: my veil no mortal yet hath raised* (Plut. *de Iside*, 9), the latter part eclipsed by the comforting Christian assurance here. **ἦν**, another deliberate anomaly (finite verb for participle) due to dogmatic reasons; no past participle of **εἰμί** existed, and **γενόμενος** was obviously misleading. **ὁ ἐρχ.**, instead of **ὁ ἐσόμενος**, to correspond with the keynote of the book, struck loudly in ver. 7. In and with his messiah, Jesus, God himself comes; **ἐρχ.** (the present) acquires, partly through the meaning of the verb, a future significance. For the emphasis and priority of **ὢν** in this description of God, see the famous passage in Aug. *Confess.* ix. 10. **τ. ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων**: a puzzling conception whose roots have been traced in various directions to (*a*) an erroneous but not unnatural interpretation of Isa. xi. 2-3, found in the Targ. Jonath. (as in En. lxi. 11, sevenfold spirit of virtues) and shared by Justin (*Dial.* 87, *cf.* *Cohort. ad Graec.*, c. 32, **ὥσπερ οἱ ἱεροὶ προφῆται τὸ ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα εἰς ἑπτὰ πνεύματα μερίζεσθαί φασιν**), or—more probably—to the later Jewish

καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ [m] ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ [n] ἐρχόμενος· καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων ἃ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ· 5. καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, [o] ὁ μάρτυς ὁ [p] πιστός, ὁ [q] πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ὁ [r] ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς· τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι [1] ἡμᾶς

m i. 8, iv. 8, Ex. iii. 14 f.
n From Hab. ii. 3, Zech. ii. 14, etc.
o 1 Tim. vi. 13, Heb. xii. 1-2, John xviii. 37.
p ii. 10, 13, *cf.* Ps. lxxxviii. 38 (LXX).
q 1 Cor. xv. 20, Col. i. 18, Clem. Rom. xxiv.
r Isa. lv. 4 (LXX), only here in Apoc.

[1] The **λουσαντι . . . απο** of PQ, min., vg., Me., Aeth., Areth. (so Bg., Trench, Bw., de W., Balj., Sp., Bs., Burgon: *Corruption in Trad. Text*, 59-60; for constr. *cf.* Deissm., 227) is a corruption of **λυσαντι εκ** (ℵAC, 1, etc., Syr., Arm., And[a], Pr., edd., *cf.* xx. 7), probably due to misconception of Heb. use of **εν** (WH), and to the association of the two ideas (*cf.* Iren. iv. 27, 1: qui abluit et emundat eum hominem qui peccato fuerat obstrictus, and Plato's *Cratylus*, 405 B **ὁ ἀπολούων τε καὶ ἀπολύων τῶν κακῶν**).

notion (*b*) of the seven holy angels (Tobit xii. 15; *cf.* Gfrörer, i. 360 f.) which reappears in early Christianity (*cf.* Clem. Al. *Strom.* vi. 685, **ἑπτὰ μέν εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ μεγίστου δύναμιν ἔχοντες πρωτόγονοι ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες**), modified from (*c*) a still earlier Babylonian conception, behind (*b*), of the seven spirits of the sky—the sun, the moon, and the five planets. The latter is not unknown to Jewish literature before 100 A.D. (*cf.* Jub. ii. 2 f.; Berachoth, 32, *b*), corresponding to the Persian Amshaspands (Yasht, xix. 19, 20, *S. B. E.* xxxi. 145) and reflected in "the seven first white ones" or angelic retinue of the Lord in Enoch xc. 21 f. (Cheyne, *Orig. Ps.* 281-2, 327 f., 334 f.; Stave, 216 f.; Lüken, 32 f.; *R. J.* 319). Whether the prophet and his readers were conscious of this derivation or not, the conception is stereotyped and designed to express in archaic terms the supreme majesty of God before whose throne (*i.e.*, obedient and ready for any commission, *cf.* v. 6) these mighty beings live. They are not named or divided in the Apocalypse, but the objection to taking the expression in the sense of (*a*) denoting, as in Philo (where, *e.g.*, **ὁ κατὰ ἑβδομάδα ἅγιος** or **κινούμενος** is a characteristic symbol of the divine Logos), the sevenfold and complete energy of the Spirit in semi-poetic fashion, is the obvious fact that this is out of line with the trinity of the apocalypse, which is allied to that of Luke ix. 26; 1 Tim. v. 21; Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 6. The Spirit in the Apocalypse, as in Jude, 2 Peter and the pastoral epistles, is wholly prophetic. It has not the content of the Spirit in Paul or in the Fourth Gospel. Since the writer intends to enlarge upon the person of Jesus, or because the seven spirits stood next to the deity in the traditional *mise-en-scène*, he makes them precede Christ in order.

Ver. 5. **ἀπὸ, κ.τ.λ.**, another grammatical anomaly; as usual the writer puts the second of two nouns in apposition, in the nominative.—**ὁ μ. ὁ π.** Jesus not merely the reliable witness to God but the loyal martyr: an aspect of his career which naturally came to the front in "the killing times". **ὁ πρωτότοκος** (a Jewish messianic title by itself, Baldensperger, 88) **τ. ν.**, his resurrection is the pledge that death cannot separate the faithful from his company. The thought of this and of the following trait (*cf.* Matt. iv. 8 f.) is taken from Ps. lxxxviii. 28, **κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θήσομαι αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς.** On the two allied functions of ruling and witnessing (Isa. lv. 4) *cf.* the different view of John xviii. 37. At the inspiring thought of Christ's lordship the prophet breaks into adoration—**ἀγαπῶντι κ.τ.λ.** The eternal love (*cf.* iii. 19) which Christ bears to his people is proved by his death, as a revelation of (*a*) what he has done for them by his sacrifice, and (*b*) what he has made of them (so Eph. v. 25-26 = Apoc. xix. 7, 8). The negative deliverance from sins (*cf.* Ps. cxxix. 8) at the cost of his own life (**ἐν** instrumental) is a religious emancipation which issues in (*b*) a positive relationship of glorious religious privilege.—**βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς**, a literal (*cf.* Charles on Jub. xvi. 18) and inaccurate rendering of ממלכת כהנים (Exod. xix. 6) to emphasise the royal standing of the Christian community in connexion with their Christ as **ἄρχων, κ.τ.λ.**, and also (Tit. ii. 3) their individual privilege of intimate access to God as the result of Christ's sacrificial death.

ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν [s] ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ· 6. καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς [t] βασιλείαν [1] ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ [u] πατρὶ αὐτοῦ· [v] αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.

7. [w] Ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται [x] μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν [y] πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς, καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν· καὶ [z] κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. [a] ναί· ἀμήν.

s v. 9, 1 Pet. i. 18-19.
t v. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 9; *cf.* 2 Macc. ii. 17, Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9, Jub. xvi. 13.
u *Cf.* on xxi. 7 (Ps. lxxxviii. 27) (LXX).
v Resuming τῷ ἀγ. Same doxology as in 1 Pet. iv. 11; see also Mk. xiii. 26, 2 Thess. i. 9, and Chase in *Camb. Texts and Stud.* i. (1891) 168 f.
w xvi. 15.
x Mk. xiii. 26, xiv. 62, 4 Esd. xiii. 3; *cf.* on Apoc. xiv. 14.
y "The world," Did. xvi.; *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 64.
z xviii. 9; from Hab. iii. 10, LXX.
a John xi. 27

[1] **βασιλεις και** (P, 1, 28, 36, etc., And.) is one of several glosses introduced (like **ιεραν** or **ιερατικην** of Syr., S. for **ιερεις**, or **ημων** of C, Lat. for **ημας**) to ease the difficulty of the original **βασιλειαν** (א*AC, etc., vg., Syr., Areth., edd.) [like **ιερατευμα** 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9].

καὶ ἐποίησεν, the harsh anacolouthon breaks up the participial construction. **ἡμᾶς**, emphatic. "We Christians are now the chosen people. In us the Danielic prophecy of a reign of the saints is fulfilled and is to be fulfilled." This is a characteristically anti-Jewish note. Persecution (*cf.* 1 Peter ii. 5) deepened the sense of continuity in the early Christians, who felt driven back on the truth of election and divine protection; they were the true successors of all noble sufferers in Israel who had gone before (*cf.* the argument of Heb. xi. 32—xii. 2). In the Apocalypse the Christian church is invariably the true Israel, including all who believe in Christ, irrespective of birth and nationality. God reigns over them, and they reign, or will reign, over the world. In fact, Christians now and here are what Israel hoped to become, *viz.*, priest-princes of God, and this position has been won for them by a messiah whom the Jews had rejected, and whom all non-Christians will have to acknowledge as sovereign. According to rabbinic tradition, the messianic age would restore to Israel the priestly standing which it had lost by its worship of the golden calf; and by the first commandment (Mechilta on Exod. xx. 2), "slaves became kings". There may also be an implicit anti-Roman allusion. We Christians, harried and despised, are a community with a great history and a greater hope. Our connection with Christ makes us truly imperial. The adoration of Christ, which vibrates in this doxology (*cf. Expos.*[6] v. 302-307), is one of the most impressive features of the book. The prophet feels that the one hope for the loyalists of God in this period of trial is to be conscious that they owe everything to the redeeming love of Jesus. Faithfulness depends on faith, and faith is rallied by the grasp not of itself but of its object. Mysterious explanations of history follow, but it is passionate devotion to Jesus, and not any skill in exploring prophecy, which proves the source of moral heroism in the churches. Jesus sacrificed himself for us; **αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα.** From this inward trust and wonder, which leap up at the sight of Jesus and his grace, the loyalty of Christians flows.

This enthusiasm for Jesus naturally carries the prophet's mind forward (7, 8) to the time when the Lord's majesty will flash out on mankind. He resumes the line of thought interrupted by the doxology of 5*b*-6.

Ver. 7. A reminiscence and adaptation of Dan. vii. 13 (Theod.) and Zech. xii. 10-14. The substitution of **ἐξεκέντησαν** (so John xix. 37, Justin's *Apol.* i. 52, *Dial.* xxxii., *cf.* lxi., cxviii., adding **εἰς**) for **κατωρχήσαντο** (LXX mistranslation in this passage, though not elsewhere, of דקרו)—shows that the original text was used (though Lücke and Ewald hold that **ἐξ.** was the LXX reading till Origen), and that it was interpreted in some (Johannine? Abbott, *Diatessarica*, 1259-1262, 2317) circles as a prophecy of the crucifixion. Only, the reference is no longer to repentance (Zech.), but, by a turn of characteristic severity, to remorse and judgment. There is a remarkable parallel in Matt. xxiv. 30,' where patristic tradition (*cf.* *A. C.* 233-36) early recognised in **τὸ σημεῖον τ. ὑ. ἀ.** the cross itself, made visible on the day of judgment. The first of the three signs preceding Christ's advent in the clouds, acc. to Did. xvi. 6 (*cf.* Zech. ii. 13 LXX), is **σημεῖον ἐκπετά-**

8. "Ἐγώ εἰμι [b] τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ," λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, [c] ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ [d] παντοκράτωρ.

9. Ἐγὼ [e] Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει

b Cf. Riedel (S. K. 1901, 295 f.). The patristic reference of this verse to Jesus is defended by Abbott, 182 f., cf. Isa. xli. 4, xliii. 10, etc. c Ver. 4.
d Isa. xliv. 6, Amos iv. 13; except (Cit.) 2 Cor. vi. 18, only in Apoc. (?) in N.T. Here, as 3 Macc. vi. 17 f., in connection with retribution; cf. R. J. 305, and Kattenbusch (ii. 533 f.). e xxii. 8. Dan. vii. 2, Ex. xii. 3, 4 Esd. ii. 42, etc.

σεως ἐν οὐρανῷ (Christ with outstretched arms, as crucified?); and, acc. to Barn. vii. 9, "they shall see him on that day wearing about his flesh **τὸν ποδήρη κόκκινον**". Note (*a*) that the agreement with John xix. 37 is mainly verbal; the latter alludes to the crucifixion, this passage to an eschatological crisis. (*b*) No such visible or victorious return of Christ is fulfilled in the Apocalypse, for visions like xiv. 14 f., xix. 12 f., do not adequately correspond to i. 7, xxii. 12, etc. (*c*) No punishment of the Jews occurs at Christ's return, for the vengeance of xix. 13 f. falls on pagans, while xi. 13 lies on another plane. **καί, κ.τ.λ.**: the monotonous collocation of clauses (Vit. i. 9-16) throughout the Apocalypse with **καί**, is not necessarily a Hebraism; the syntax of Aristotle (*e.g.*, *cf.* Thumb, 129), betrays a similar usage. **καὶ οἵτ. κ.τ.λ.**, selected as a special class (**καὶ τότε μετανοήσουσιν, ὅτε οὐδὲν ὠφελήσουσι**, Justin). The responsibility of the Jews, as opposed to the Romans, for the judicial murder of Jesus is prominent in the Christian literature of the period (Luke-Acts, *cf.* von Dobschütz in *Texte u. Unters.* xi. 1, pp. 61, 62), though the Apoc. is superior to passages like 2 Clem. xvii. **πᾶσαι κ.τ.λ.** = the unbelieving pagans, who are still impenitent when surprised by the Lord's descent (**ἐπί** = "because of," *cf.* xviii. 9 in diff. sense); a realistic statement of what is spiritually put in John xvi. 8, 9.—This forms an original element in the early Christian apologetic. To the Jewish taunt, "Jesus is not messiah but a false claimant: he died," the reply was, "He will return in visible messianic authority" (Mark xiv. 62 = Matt. xxvi. 64, significant change in Luke xxii. 69). In several circles this future was conceived not as a return of Jesus, nor in connexion with his historical appearance, but as the first real manifestation of the true messianic character which he had gained at the resurrection (*cf.* Titius, 31, 32). See on xii. 4 f. **ναί, ἀμήν**: a double (Gk. Heb.) ratification of the previous oracle.

Ver. 8. Only here and in xxi. 5 f. is God introduced as the speaker, in the Apocalypse. The advent of the Christ, which marks the end of the age, is brought about by God, who overrules (**παντοκράτωρ** always of God in Apocalypse, otherwise the first part of the title might have suggested Christ) even the anomalies and contradictions of history for this providential climax. By the opening of the second century **πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ** had become the first title of God in the Roman creed; the Apocalypse, indifferent to the former epithet, reproduces the latter owing to its Hebraic sympathies. **ἐγώ εἰμι**: Coleridge used to declare that one chief defect in Spinoza was that the Jewish philosopher started with *It is* instead of with *I am*. **τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ**: not the finality (Oesterley, *Encycl. Relig. and Ethics*, i. 1, 2), but the all-inclusive power of God, which comes fully into play in the new order of things inaugurated by the second advent. The symbolism which is here put in a Greek form had been developed in rabbinic speculation upon אמת. With this and the following passage, *cf.* the papyrus of Ani (*E. B. D.* 12): "He leadeth in his train that which is and that which is not yet. . . . Homage to thee, King of kings, and Lord of lords, who from the womb of Nut hast ruled the world and Akert [the Egyptian Hades]. Thy body is of bright and shining metal, thy head is of azure blue, and the brilliance of the turquoise encircleth thee." For the connexion of a presentiment of the end (7, 8) with an impulse to warn contemporaries (9 f.) see 4 Esd. xiv. 10 f., where the warning of the world's near close is followed by an injunction to the prophet to "set thine house in order, reprove thy people, console the humble among them"; whereupon the commission to write under inspiration is given.

i. 9-iii. 22, an address to Asiatic Christendom (as represented by seven churches) which in high prophetic and oracular style rallies Christians to their genuine oracle of revelation in Jesus and his prophetic spirit. At a time when local oracles (for the famous one of Apollo near Miletus, see Friedländer, iii.

καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ [f] ὑπομονῇ ἐν Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ [g] διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν

f Keynote of age, Heb. vi. 12, x. 36, Lk. xxi. 19, Clem. Rom. xxxv., etc.

g In sense of vi. 9, xx. 4, *cf.* Epict. *Diss.* iii. 24, 113. διὰ = ἕνεκεν practically (*cf.* Eus., *H. E.*, iii 18, 1-3).

561 f.), besides those in Greece and Syria and Egypt, were eagerly frequented, it was of moment to lay stress on what had superseded all such media for the faithful. *Cf.* Minuc. Felix, *Oct.* 7, "pleni et mixti deo uates futura praecerpunt, dant cautelam periculis, morbis medelam, spem afflictis, operam miseris, solacium calamitatibus, laboribus leuamentum".

i. 9-20, introductory vision.

Ver. 9. The personality of the seer is made prominent in apocalyptic literature, to locate or guarantee any visions which are to follow. Here the authority with which this prophet is to speak is conditioned by his kinship of Christian experience with the churches and his special revelation from God. **ἀδελφός** (*cf.* vi. 11, xii. 10): for its pagan use as=fellow-member of the same (religious) society, *cf.* *C. B. P.* i. 96 f., and Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscr. Graec.* 474, 10 (**ἀδελφοὶ οἷς κοινὰ τὰ πατρῷα**). **θλίψει**, put first as the absorbing fact of their experience, and as a link of sympathy between writer and readers; **καὶ βασιλείᾳ**, the outcome of **θλίψις** in the messianic order: distress no end in itself; **καὶ ὑπομονῇ**, patient endurance the moral condition of participation in **ἡ θλίψις** and **ἡ βασιλεία**, by which one is nerved to endure the presence of the former without breaking down, and to bear the temporary delay of the latter without impatience. While **μακροθυμία** is the absence of resentment at wrong, **ὑπομονή**=not giving way under trials. See Barn. ii., "the aids of our faith are fear and patience, long-suffering and self-control are our allies"; also Tertullian's famous aphorism, "ubi Deus, ibi et alumna eius, patientia scilicet". —**ἐν Ἰησοῦ** (a Pauline conception, only repeated in Apocalypse at xiv. 13), either with all three substantives or merely (*cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 5) with **ὑπομονῇ**. In any case **ὑπ.** is closely linked to **ἐν Ἰ.**; such patience, as exemplified in Jesus, and inspired by him, was the cardinal virtue of the Apocalypse and its age. In the early Christian literature of this period "we cannot name anything upon which blessedness is so frequently made to rest, as upon the exercise of patient endurance" (Titius, 142). **ἐγενόμην ἐν** ("I found myself in": implying that when he wrote he was no longer there), not by flowing waters (as frequently, *e.g.*, En. xiii. 7), but in the small, treeless, scantily populated island of Patmos, one of the Sporades, whither criminals were banished sometimes by the Roman authorities (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* iv. 12, 23). *Relegatio* to an island was not an infrequent form of punishment for better-class offenders or suspects under the black *régime* of Domitian, as under Diocletian for Christians (*cf.* Introd. § 6). No details are given, but probably it meant hard labour in the quarries, and was inflicted by the pro-consul of Asia Minor. Why John was only banished, we do not know. As "the word of God and the witness of Jesus" are not qualified by any phrase such as **ὅσα εἶδεν** (ver. 2, and thereby identified with the present Apocalypse), the words indicate as elsewhere (*cf.* **διὰ, κ.τ.λ.**, reff.) the occasion of his presence in Patmos, *i.e.*, his loyalty to the gospel (*cf.* **θλίψις**), rather than the object of his visit. The latter could hardly be evangelising (Spitta), for Patmos was insignificant and desolate, nor, in face of the use of **διὰ**, can the phrase mean "for the purpose of receiving this revelation" (Bleek, Lücke, Düsterdieck, Hausrath, B. Weiss, Baljon, etc.). Either he had voluntarily withdrawn from the mainland to escape the stress of persecution (which scarcely harmonises with the context or the general temper of the book) or for solitary communion (*cf.* Ezek. i. 1-3), or, as is more likely, his removal was a punishment (*cf.* Abbott, 114-16). The latter view is corroborated by tradition (*cf.* Zahn, § 64, note 7), which, although later and neither uniform nor wholly credible, is strong enough to be taken as independent evidence. It can hardly be explained away as a mere elaboration of the present passage (so, *e.g.*, Reuss, Bleek, Bousset); the allusion to **μαρτύριον** is too slight to have been suggested by the darker sense of martyrdom, and it is far-fetched to argue that the tradition was due to a desire to glorify John with a martyrdom. Unless, therefore, the reference is a piece of literary fiction (in which case it would probably have been

Ἰησοῦ. 10. ἐγενόμην [h] ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ

h (From Zech. i. 6, vii. 12, etc. LXX), *cf.* iv. 2, xxi. 10; condition of vision, Acts vii. 55; = ἐν ἐκστάσει (Acts xi. 5, xxii. 17), contrast γεν. ἐν ἑαυτῷ Acts xii. 11.

elaborated) it must be supposed to be vague simply because the matter was perfectly familiar to the circle for whom the book was written. It is to those exercised in prudence, temperance, and virtue that (according to Philo, *de incorrupt. mundi*, § 1, *cf.* Plutarch's discussion in *defect. orac.* 38 f.) God vouchsafes visions, but John introduces his personal experience in order to establish relations between himself and his readers rather than to indicate the conditions of his theophany.

Ver. 10. Ecstasy or spiritual rapture, the supreme characteristic of prophets in Did. xi. 7 (where the unpardonable sin is to criticise a prophet **λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι**), was not an uncommon experience in early Christianity, which was profoundly conscious of living in the long-looked for messianic age (Acts ii. 17 f., *cf.* Eph. iii. 5), when such phenomena were to be a matter of course. Throughout the Apocalypse (xxi. 5, etc.) John first sees, then writes; the two are not simultaneous. While the Apocalypse is thus the record of a vision (**ὅρασις**, ix. 17), the usual accompaniments of a vision—*i.e.*, prayer and fasting—are significantly absent from the description of this inaugural scene, which is reticent and simple as compared, *e.g.*, with a passage like *Asc. Isa.* iv. 10-16. It is possible, however, that the prophet was engaged in prayer when the trance or vision overtook him (like Peter, Acts x. 9-11, *cf.* Ign. *ad Polyc.* ii. 2, **τὰ δὲ ἀόρατα αἴτει, ἵνα σοι φανερωθῇ**), since the day of weekly Christian worship is specially mentioned on which, though separated from the churches (was there one at Patmos?), he probably was wrapt in meditations (on the resurrection of Christ) appropriate to the hour. The *Imperial* or Lord's day, first mentioned here in early Christian literature (so Did. xiv., Gosp. Peter 11, etc.) contains an implicit allusion to the ethnic custom, prevalent in Asia Minor, of designating the first day of the month (or week?) as **Σεβαστή** in honour of the emperor's birthday (see Thieme's *Inschr. Maeander*, 1906, 15, and Deissmann in *E.Bi.* 2813 f.). Christians, too, have their imperial day (*cf.* Introd. § 2), to celebrate the birthday of their heavenly king. With his mind absorbed in the thought of the exalted Jesus and stored with O.T. messianic conceptions from Daniel and Ezekiel, the prophet had the following ecstasy in which the thoughts of Jesus and of the church already present to his mind are fused into one vision. He recalls in spirit the usual church-service with its praises, prayers, sudden voices, and silences. (Compare Ign. *Magn.* ix. **εἰ οὖν οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον, μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπομένομεν.**) John's service of God (ver. 2) involved suffering, instead of exempting him from the trials of ordinary Christians; the subsequent visions and utterances prove not merely that in his exile he had fallen back upon the O.T. prophets for consolation but that (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 28, 29) he was anxiously brooding over the condition of his churches on the mainland. *Cf.* Dio Chrys. *Orat.* xiii. 422, where the philosopher dates the consciousness of his vocation from the period of his exile. Upon the other hand, the main criterion of a false prophet (Eus. *H. E.* v. 17, 2), apart from covetousness, was speech **ἐν παρεκστάσει**, *i.e.*, the arrogant, ignorant, frenzied rapture affected by pagan Cagliostros, who were destitute of any unselfish religious concern for other people. **ὀπίσω μου**, the regular method of spiritualistic voices and appearances: **σάλπιγγος**, loud and clear, not an unusual expression for voices heard in a trance (*cf. Martyr. Polyc.* xxii. 2, Moscow MS.). The following Christophany falls into rhythmical expression. As a revelation of the Lord (ver. 1, *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 1), with which we may contrast Emerson's saying ("I conceive a man as always spoken to from behind and unable to turn his head and see the speaker"), it exhibits several of the leading functions discharged by Jesus in the Apocalypse, where he appears as (*a*) the revealer of secrets (i. 1 f., v. 5), (*b*) the guardian and champion of the saints (ii., iii., etc.), (*c*) the medium, through sacrifice, of their relationship to God, (*d*) associated with God in rewarding them, and (*e*) in the preliminary overthrow of evil which accompanies the triumph of righteousness. Compare the main elements of the divine

ἤκουσα [i] ὀπίσω μου φωνὴν μεγάλην [k] ὡς σάλπιγγος 11. [l] λεγούσης, "Ὃ βλέπεις γράψον εἰς βιβλίον καὶ πέμψον [m] ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις, εἰς Ἔφεσον καὶ εἰς Σμύρναν [1] καὶ εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ εἰς Θυάτειρα καὶ εἰς Σάρδεις καὶ εἰς Φιλαδελφίαν καὶ εἰς Λαοδικίαν".

12. Καὶ ἐπέστρεψα [n] βλέπειν τὴν φωνὴν ἥτις ἐλάλει μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ·
καὶ ἐπιστρέψας εἶδον ἑπτὰ [o] λυχνίας χρυσᾶς,

13. καὶ ἐν μέσῳ [2] τῶν λυχνιῶν ὅμοιον [p] υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου

i *Cf.* Ezek. iii. 12.
k Sc. φωνήν; *cf.* Exod. xix. 6 and Apoc. iv. 1, where voice recurs, also Soph. *Ajax*, 17.
l = λεγοῦσαν, false attract. to σ. instead of φ.
m ii. 8, etc., xxii. 16. For ἐκκλ. *cf.* on 1 Thess. i. 2.
n *Cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, ix. 4, 5.
o Exod. xxxvii. 23 (*cf.* Abbott, 194 f.).
p *Cf.* xiv. 14, Ez. i. 26, from Dan. vii. 13 (*cf.* Abbott, 175).

[1] For the orthography of **Σμυρναν** (**ζμυρναν** ℵ, vg.) see on ii. 8.

[2] Almost invariably AC, like A (LXX), write **εμμεσω** for **εν μεσω** (*cf.* Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. att. Inschr.*, 110 f.): the original **υιον** (of ℵQ, 1, etc., Andc, so Ti., WH, Simcox, Bj., Swete, Bousset) has been corrected, as at xiv. 14, into **υιω** by ACP, etc., Cyp., Ar. (so Al., Ws., WH marg.): the **μαστοις** (**απ. λεγ.** in this sense) of CPQ, min., Ar. (edd.) has also been corrected into **μασθοις** (ℵ, min., Ti.) or even **μαζοις** (A, min., so Lach., Ws.); **μαζους** uirorum **μαστους** (Luke, xxiii. 29) mulierum: **χρυσαν**, an irregular contraction, is smoothed out in ℵcPQ into **χρυσην** (for the papyri-usage, *cf. Class. Rev.*, 1901, 35).

nature as conceived by the popular religion of contemporary Phrygia, *viz.*, (*a*) prophetic power, (*b*) healing and purifying power, and (*c*) divine authority (symbolised by the axe): *C. B. P.*, ii. 357.

Ver. 11, **γράψον** (*cf.* Herm. *Vis.* II. iv. 3); this emphasis put upon the commission to compose and circulate what he sees in the vision, is due to the author's claim of canonical authority and reflects a time when a literary work of this nature still required some guarantee, although at an earlier date smaller oracles had been written and accepted (*e.g.*, that which determined the flight of the early Christians to Pella, Eus. *H. E.*, iii. 5, 3). John's rôle, however, is passive in two senses of the term. He seldom acts or journeys in his vision, whereas Jewish apocalypses are full of the movements of their seers; nor does his vision lead to any practical course of action, for—unlike most of the O.T. prophets—he is not conscious of any commission to preach or to reform the world. The prophet is an author. His experience is to be no luxury but a diffused benefit; and as in Tob. xii. 20 ("and now . . . write in a book all that has taken place") and 4 Esd. xii. 37 ("therefore write in a book all thou hast seen, and thou shalt teach," etc.), the prophet is careful to explain that composition is no mere literary enterprise but due to a divine behest. The cities are enumerated from Ephesus northwards to Smyrna (forty miles) and Pergamos (fifty miles north of Smyrna), then across for forty miles S.E. to Thyatira, down to Sardis, Philadelphia (thirty miles S.E. of Sardis), and Laodicea (forty miles S.E. of Philadelphia). *Cf.* on ver. 4 and Introd. § 2. Except Pergamos and Laodicea, the churches lay within Lydia (though the writer employs the imperial term for the larger province) which was at that period a by-word for voluptuous civilisation.

Ver. 12. The seven golden lamp-stands are cressets representing the seven churches (20), the sevenfold lamp-stand of the Jewish temple (*cf. S. C.* 295-99) having been for long used as a symbol (Zech. iv. 2, 10). The function of the churches is to embody and express the light of the divine presence upon earth, so high is the prophet's conception of the communities (*cf.* on ii. 4, 5); their duty is to keep the light burning and bright, otherwise the reason for their existence disappears (ii. 5). Consequently the primary activity of Jesus in providence and revelation bears upon the purity of those societies through which his influence is to reach mankind, just as his connexion with them on the other hand assures them of One in heaven to whom out of difficulties here they can appeal with confidence.

Ver. 13. The churches are inseparable from their head and centre Jesus, who moves among the cressets of his temple with the dignity and authority of a high priest. The anarthrous **υ. α.** is the human appearance of the celestial mes-

ἐνδεδυμένον [q] ποδήρη καὶ [r] περιεζωσμένον πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην χρυσᾶν.

14. ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τρίχες λευκαὶ ὡς ἔριον λευκόν, [t] ὡς χιών·[1]

καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς [u] φλὸξ πυρός·

q Only here in N.T.: Sir. xxvii. 8.
r Like angels in xv. 6.
s From Dan. vii. 9, En. xlvi. 1.
t From En. xiv. 20 (cvi. 2, 10), *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 3, Slav. En. i. 5, xxxvii. 1.
u ii. 18, xix. 12, Sir. xxiii. 19-20, Hom. *Iliad*, xiii. 474.

[1] For a late variant (αι τρ. λ. ωσει ερ. και το ενδ. αυτου λ. ως χιων), conforming the words to Daniel, *cf.* Simcox in *Expos.*[3] iv. 316-318.

siah, as in En. xlvi. 1-6 (where the Son of man accompanies God, who, as the Head of Days, had a head "white as wool") and *Asc. Isa.* xi. 1. The difficult ὅμοιον is to be explained (with Vit. ii. 127, 223, 227) as = ὡς (ii. 18, vi. 14, ix. 7, 8, xxi. 11) or οἷον, "something like," a loose reproduction of the Heb. ("un être semblable à nous, un homme"). The whole passage illustrates the writer's habit of describing an object or person by heaping up qualities without strict regard to natural or grammatical collocation. ποδήρης (sc. χιτὼν or ἐσθής), a long robe reaching to the feet, was an oriental mark of dignity (*cf.* on i. 7, and Ezek. ix. 2, 11, LXX), denoting high rank or office such as that of Parthian kings or of the Jewish high priest who wore a purple one. High girding (with a belt?) was another mark of lofty position, usually reserved for Jewish priests, though the Iranians frequently appealed to their deities as "high-girt" (*i.e.*, ready for action = *cf.* Yasht xv. 54, 57, "Vaya of the golden girdle, high-up girded, swift moving, as powerful in sovereignty as any absolute sovereign in the world"). The golden buckle or πόρπη was part of the insignia of royalty and its φίλοι (1 Macc. x. 8, 9, xi. 58). The author thus mixes royal and sacerdotal colours on his palette to heighten the majesty of Christ's appearance. *New*, *golden* (as in Iranian eschatology), *shining*, *white*—are the usual adjectives which he employs throughout the book for the transcendent bliss of the life beyond and its heavenly tenants; "golden" had been used already in Greek as a synonym for precious, excellent, divine.

Ver. 14. ὡς χ.; another conventional simile for celestial beings. ἡ κ. κ. αἱ τ., a pleonastic expression; either = "his head, *i.e.* his hair," or "his forehead and his hair"; scarcely a hendiadys for "the hair of the head" (Bengel). Jewish tradition rationalised the white hairs into a proof of God's activity as a wise old teacher (Chag. 14, *cf.* Prov. xx. 27 f.), and the Daniel-vision might suggest the fine paradox between the divine energy and this apparent sign of weakness. But such traits are probably poetical, not allegorical, in John's vision; they body forth his conception of Jesus as divine. In Egyptian theology a similar trait belongs to Ani after beatification. The whole conception of the messiah in the Apocalypse resembles that outlined in Enoch (Similitudes, xxxvii.-lxxi.), where he also possesses pre-existence as Son of man (xlviii.) sits on his throne of glory (xlvii. 3) for judgment, rules all men (lxii. 6), and slays the wicked with the word of his mouth (lxii. 2); but this particular transference to the messiah (i. 14, 17, 18, ii. 8, xxii. 12, 13), of what is in Daniel predicated of God as the world-judge, seems to form a specifically N.T. idea, unmediated even in Enoch (xlvi. 1), although the association of priestly and judicial attributes with those of royalty was easy for an Oriental (it is predicated of the messiah by Jonathan ben Usiel on Zech. iv. 12, 13). ὡς φλὸξ πυρός, like Slav. En. i. 5, from Dan. x. 6; *cf.* Suet. *August.* 79, "oculos habuit claros et nitidos, quibus etiam existimari uoluit inesse quiddam diuini uigoris; gaudebatque si quis sibi acrius contuenti quasi ad fulgorem solis uultum submitteret". Divine beauty was generally manifested (Verg. *Aen.* v. 647 f.) in glowing eyes (insight and indignation), the countenance and the voice; here also (ver. 15) in feet to crush all opposition. The messiah is not crowned, however (*cf.* later, xix. 12). χ. = some hard (as yet unidentified) metal which gleamed after smelting. The most probable meaning of this obscure hybrid term is that suggested by Suidas: χαλκολίβανον· εἶδος ἠλέκτρου τιμιώτερον χρυσοῦ, ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἤλεκτρον ἀλλότυπον χρυσίον μεμιγμένον ὑέλῳ καὶ λιθείᾳ (ἤλ. actually occurring in LXX, Ezek. i. 27).

15. καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι [v] χαλκολιβάνῳ, ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένης·,[1]
καὶ [w] ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς φωνὴ ὑδάτων πολλῶν·
16. καὶ [x] ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἀστέρας ἑπτά·
καὶ [y] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ῥομφαία δίστομος ὀξεῖα ἐκπορευομένη·
καὶ [z] ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος φαίνει ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ.
17. Καὶ ὅτε εἶδον αὐτόν, [a] ἔπεσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός· καὶ [b] ἔθηκεν τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἐμὲ λέγων, "Μὴ φοβοῦ·

v ii. 18, *cf.* Ezek. i. 7 (LXX).
w Ezek. i. 24, xliii. 2 (Heb.), 4 Esd. vi. 17.
x Pres. ptc. = pres. indic. (Heb. idiom?) as often.
y 2 Thess. ii. 8, *cf.* 4 Esd. xiii. 4, 10, and Isa. xlix. 2.
z Judg. v. 31, Slav. En. i. 5, xix. 1.
a Isa. vi. 5, Dan. viii. 17-18, x. 17-19, En. xiv. 13-14, 19, 24-25, Slav. En. i. 7-8, Tob xii. 16, Add. Esth. xv. 15, Matt. xxviii. 4.
b Dan. x. 10, 12.

[1] **πεπυρωμενοι** (PQ, etc., And., Ar., so Al., WH marg.) and **πεπυρωμενω** (ℵ, min., vg., Sah., Syr., S., Aeth., Vict., so Ti , Bj., Bs., Holtzm.) seem variant corrections of the original genitive **πεπυρωμενης** (AC, so Lach., Tr., WH, Ws., Sw.)—Pr. = sicut de fornace ignea.

The reference then is to amber or to some composition like brass or (copper) bronze; only, it contains gold (*cf.* vulg. = aurichalcum, a valuable and gleaming metal). Abbott (201) sees a corruption of some phrase like **χαλκὸν ἐν κλιβάνῳ**, while others suggest **χαλκός** and לבן (*i.e.*, glowing white brass). Haussleiter would upon inadequate grounds omit **ὡς ἐκ. κ. πεπ.** (219-24).

Ver. 16. The care and control exercised by Christ over the churches only come forward after the suggestions of majesty and authority (13-15) which followed the initial idea of Christ's central position (**ἐν μέσῳ**) among the churches. *Cf.* v. 6 (**ἐν μέσῳ**) for another reference to Christ's central authority—**ἔχων, κ.τ.λ.** For the astrological background of this figure, *cf.* Jeremias 24 f. The traditional symbol, of which an interpretation is given later (ver. 20), probably referred to the seven planets rather than to the Pleiades or any other constellation. If the description is to be visualised, the seven stars may be pictured as lying on Christ's palm in the form of the stars in the constellation of Ursa Major—**ῥομφαία, κ.τ.λ.** By a vivid objectifying of the divine word (corresponding to that, *e.g.*, in Isa. ix. 8 f., ix. 4, and suggested by the tongue-shaped appearance of the short Roman sword or dagger), the figure of the sharp sword issuing from the mouth is applied (in Ps. Sol. xvii. 27, 39, as here) to the messiah, as in Jewish literature to God (Ps. cxlix. 6, etc.) and to wisdom (Sap. xviii. 15), elsewhere to the **λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ** (Heb. iv. 12, *cf.* Apoc. xix. 13-15): Christ's power of reproof and punishment is to be directed against the church (ii. 12 f.) as well as against the world of heathen opposition (xix. 21, where the trait is artistically more appropriate). As a nimbus or *coronata radiata* sometimes crowned the emperor ("image des rayons lumineux qu'il lance sur le monde," Beurlier), so the face of Christ (**ὄψις** as in John xi. 44, *cf.* below, x. 1) is aptly termed, as in the usual description of angelic visitants (reff.), bright as sunshine unintercepted by mist or clouds. This is the climax of the delineation.

Ver. 17. **ἔπεσα κ.τ.λ.**, the stereotyped behaviour (*cf.* Num. xxiv. 4) in such apocalyptic trances (Weinel, 129, 182, *R. J.* 375 f.; for the terror of spiritual experience *cf.* Schiller's lines: "Schrecklich ist es Deiner Wahrheit | Sterbliches Gefäss zu seyn"); Jesus, however, does here what Michael (En. lxxi. 3) or some other friendly angel does in most Jewish apocalypses. There is no dialogue between the prophet and Christ, as there is afterwards between him and the celestial beings—**μὴ φ.** The triple reassurance is (1) that the mysterious, overwhelming Figure reveals his character, experience and authority, instead of proving an alien unearthly visitant; (2) the vision has a practical object ("write," 19) bearing upon human life, and (3) consequently the mysteries are not left as baffling enigmas. All the early Christian revelations which are self-contained, presuppose the risen Christ as their source; the Apocalypse of Peter, being fragmentary, is hardly

c Isa. xliv. 6, xlviii. 12, *cf.* below on iii. 14. ἐγώ εἰμι ᶜ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ᵈ ἔσχατος, 18. καὶ [1] ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ᵉ καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς ᶠ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου. 19. Γράψον οὖν ἃ εἶδες, καὶ ἅ εἰσὶ καὶ ἃ

d *Cf.* xxii. 3, 16 f.
e Job xxxviii. 17, Sap. xvi. 13. f = κλεῖδας (Helbing 40). g Gen. obj. For Hades = θαν. or the grave, see Rohde's *Psyche* (1894), 491 f., 673 f.

[1] Om και ο ζων, after εσχατος, with primitive Latin text (Pr., Tic., Beatus, etc.), Haussl. 218-220, Wellh. The words (a marginal gloss., from και ι. ζ. ε.?) are more likely to have been added (and retained for their bearing on Christ's pre-existence) than omitted; they add nothing to the sense or continuity of the passage. The expression is used of God in iv. 9 10, as of Yahveh in O.T. ℵ om. και ("If ο ζων was a marginal note, it would enter the text at first without και," Simcox).

an exception to the rule. The present vision presents him as superhuman, messianic, militant and divine. But the writer is characteristically indifferent to the artistic error of making Christ's right hand at once hold seven stars and be laid on the seer (16, 17). *Cf.* the fine application of the following passage by Milton in his "Remonstrant's Defence". The whole description answers to what is termed, in modern psychology, a "photism".

Ver. 18. Not "it is I, the first and the last" (which would require ἐγώ εἰμι before μὴ φοβοῦ), but "I am, etc." The eternal life of the exalted Christ is a comfort both in method and result; ἐγενόμην νεκρός (not ὡς; really dead), his experience assuring men of sympathy and understanding; καὶ ἰδού, κ.τ.λ., his victory and authority over death = an assurance of his power to rescue his own people from the grim prison of the underworld (Hades, *cf.* 3 Macc. v. 50, the intermediate abode of the dead, being as usual personified in connexion with death). A background for this conception lies in the primitive idea of Janus, originally an Italian sun-god, as the key-holder (*cf.* Ovid's *Fasti*, i. 129, 130, Hor. *Carm. Sec.* 9, 10) who opens and closes the day (sun = deus clauiger), rather than in Mithraism which only knew keys of heaven, or in Mandæan religion (Cheyne's *Bible Problems*, 102-106). The key was a natural Oriental symbol for authority and power (*cf.* in this book, iii. 7, ix. 1, xx. 1). Jewish belief (see Gfrörer, i. 377-378) assigned three keys or four exclusively to God ("quos neque angelo neque seraphino committit"); these included, according to different views, "clauis sepulchorum," "clavis uitae," "clauis resurrectionis mortuorum". To ascribe this divine prerogative to Jesus as the divine Hero who had mastered death is, therefore, another notable feature in the high Christology of this book. For the whole conception see *E. B. D.* ch. lxiv. (fifth century B.C.?): "I am Yesterday and To-day and To-morrow . . . I am the Lord of the men who are raised again; the Lord who cometh forth from out of the darkness." It is based on the theophany of the Ancient of Days in Dan. vii. 9 f. (yet *cf.* x. 5, 6), who bestows on the ideal Israel (ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθ.) dominion. John changes this into a Christophany, like the later Jewish tradition which saw in υἱὸς ἀ. a personal, divine messiah. When one remembers the actual position of affairs, the confident faith of such passages is seen to have been little short of magnificent. To this Christian prophet, spokesman of a mere ripple upon a single wave of dissent in the broad ocean of paganism, history and experience find unity and meaning nowhere but in the person of a blameless Galilean peasant who had perished as a criminal in Jerusalem. So would such early Christian expectations appear to an outsider. He would be staggered by the extraordinary claims advanced on behalf of its God by this diminutive sect, perhaps more than staggered by the prophecy that imperial authority over the visible and invisible worlds lay ultimately in the hands of this deity, whose power was not limited to his own adherents.—Christophanies were commissions either to practical service (Acts x. 19, etc.), or, as here, so composition.

Ver. 19. οὖν, at the command of him who has authority over the other world and the future (resuming ver. 11. now that the paralysing fear of ver. 17 has been removed). Like the author of 4th Esdras, this prophet is far more interested in history than in the chronological speculations which engrossed many of the older apocalyptists. The sense of γράψον

μέλλει γενέσθαι[1] μετὰ ταῦτα. 20. [h] τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀστέρων οὓς εἶδες ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς—

h Anacolouthon, μ = nom. pendens, λ. irreg. attracted into case of οὕς after εἶδες.

[1] For γινεσθαι [Luke xxi. 36] (ℵcA, 1, 38, etc., Andc, Areth., WH, Bs., Bj., Sw., Lach.) read γενεσθαι (ℵ*CQP, etc., Andpal, Al. Ti., Ws.).

κ.τ.λ. is not, write the vision already seen (ἃ εἶδες, i. 10-18), the present (ἃ εἰσὶν, i. 20-iii. 20, the state of the churches, mainly conceived as it exists now and here), and the future (ἃ μέλλει γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα, *i.e.*, iv. 1 f.), as though the words were a rough programme of the whole book; nor, as other editors (*e.g.*, Spitta) unconvincingly suggest, is ἃ εἰσὶν = "what they mean," epexegetic of ἃ εἶδες, or εἶδες (*cf.* x. 7, xv. 1) in a future perfect sense (Selwyn). The following chapters cannot be regarded merely as interpretations of i. 10-18, and the juxtaposition of μέλλει γεν. (from LXX of Isa. xlviii. 6) fixes the temporal meaning of εἰσίν here, even although the other meaning occurs in a different context in ver. 20. Besides, i. 10-18 is out of all proportion to the other two divisions, to which indeed it forms a brief prelude. The real sense is that the contents of the vision (εἶδες, like βλέπεις in ver. 11, being proleptic) consist of what is and what is to be, these divisions of present and future underlying the whole subsequent Apocalypse. The neut. plur. with a plural verb and a singular in the same sentence, indicates forcibly the indifference of the author to the niceties of Hellenistic grammar. For the whole see Dan. ii. 29, 30, also Barn. i.: "The Lord (δεσπότης) hath disclosed to us by the prophets things past and present, giving us also a taste of the firstfruits of the future"; v.: "We ought, therefore, to be exceedingly thankful to the Lord for disclosing the past to us and making us wise in the present; yea as regards the future even we are not void of understanding". Moral stimulus and discipline were the object of such visions: as Tertullian declares of the Mortanist seers: "uidunt uisiones et ponentes faciem deorsum etiam uoces audiunt manifestas tam salutares quam occultas" (*de exhort. cast.* 10).

Ver. 20. μυστ. (as in Dan. ii. 27, LXX; see below on x. 7) = "the secret symbol". These two symbols, drawn from the lore of contemporary apocalyptic, are chosen for explanation, partly as an obscure and important element in the foregoing vision which had to be set in a new light, partly because they afford a clue to all that follows (especially the opening section, ii. 1, 5). The seven-branched lamp-stand was a familiar symbol, frequently carved on the lintel of a synagogue. Along with the silver trumpets and other spoils of the temple it now lay in the temple of Peace at Rome. The fanciful symbolism, by which the cressets shining on earth are represented — in another aspect — as heavenly bodies, corresponds to Paul's fine paradox about the Christian life of the saints lying hidden with Christ in God; even unsatisfactory churches, like those at Sardis and Laodicea, are not yet cast away. Note also that the light and presence of God now shine in the Christian churches, while the ancestral Jewish light is extinguished (4 Esd. x. 22): "The light of our lamp-stand is put out"). It is curious that in Assyrian representations the candelabrum is frequently indistinguishable from the sacred seven-branched tree crowned with a star (*R. S.* 488); Josephus expressly declares (*Ant.* iii. 6. 7, 7. 7) that the seven lamps on the stand signified the seven planets, and that the twelve loaves on the shew-bread table signified the signs of the zodiac (*Bell.* v. 5, 5), while Philo had already allegorised the lamp-stand (=seven planets) in *quis haeres*, § xlv. This current association of the λύχνοι with the planets is bound up with the astral conception of the angels of the churches (ἀγγ. = "angels" as elsewhere in Apocalypse), who are the heavenly representatives and counterparts or patron angels of the churches, each of the latter, like the elements (*e.g.*, water xvi. 5, fire xiv. 18; see further in Baldensperger, 106, and Gfrörer, i. 368 f.), the wind (vii. 1), and the nether abyss (ix. 11), having its presiding heavenly spirit. The conception (*E. J.* i. 593, 594) reaches back to post-exilic speculation, in which Greece, Persia and Judæa had each an influential and responsible angelic prince (Dan. x. 13, 20-21, xii. 1), and especially to the Iranian notion of *fravashis* or semi-ideal prototypes of an earthly personality

i Similar explanations, xiii. 18, xvii. 7, 9, Mk. xiii. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 51, Rom. xi. 25 (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 1 f.).

[1] οἱ ἑπτὰ ἀστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσί· καὶ αἱ λυχνίαι αἱ ἑπτὰ, ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσί.

II. 1. "ΤΩι ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ[1] ἐκκλησίας γράψον, Τάδε λέγει

[1] The variant τω (AC, Pr., τω της 36, *cf.* Ws., 64-65) for the της (τω εν εκκλησια Εφεσου = S) of ℵQP, Arm., And., Areth. is preferred by Lach., Tr., Naber, WH (136-137), Sx., Sw., and Hort (38-40): for χρυσων (ℵQP, etc., Ti., WH, Bj., Bs.) Lach., Tr., Ws., Sw. (after AC) substitute χρυσεων (*cf.* Helbing, 84 f).

(here, a community), associated with reminiscences of the Babylonian idea that certain stars were assigned to certain lands, whose folk and fortunes were bound up with their heavenly representatives (*cf.* Rawlinson's *Cuneif. Inscript. West. Asia Minor*, ii. 49, iii. 54, 59, etc.). Afterwards (*cf.* Tobit) individuals were assigned a guardian spirit. This belief (Gfrörer, i. 374 f.) passed into early Christianity (Matt. xviii. 10, Acts xii. 15, where see note), but naturally it never flourished, owing to Christ's direct and spiritual revelation of God's fatherly providence. The association of stars and angels is one of the earliest developments in Semitic folklore, and its poetic possibilities lent themselves effectively as here to further religious applications; *e.g.*, Enoch (i. 18) had long ago represented seven stars, "like spirits," in the place of fiery punishment for disobedience to God's commands. As Dr. Kohler points out (*E. J.* i. 582-97), the determining factors of Jewish angelology were the ideas of "the celestial throne with its ministering angels, and the cosmos with its evil forces to be subdued by superior angelic forces," which corresponds to the punitive and protective rôles of angels in the Johannine Apocalypse. But in the latter they are neither described at length nor exalted. They are simply commissioned by God to execute his orders or instruct the seer. The supreme concern of God is with the earth and man; angels are but the middle term of this relationship, at most the fellow-servants of the saints whose interests they promote (see below on xix. 9, 10, xxii. 8, 9). Christians, unlike the Iranians (*e.g. Bund.* xxx. 23, etc.), offer no praises to them; they reserve their adoration for God and Christ. However graphic and weird, the delineation of demons and angels in this book is not grotesque and crude in the sense that most early Jewish and Christian descriptions may be said to deserve these epithets. Here the guardian spirit who is responsible for a church's welfare, would, roughly speaking, be identified with itself; his oversight and its existence being correlative terms. Hence there is a sense in which the allied conception of ἀγγ. is true, namely, that the ἀγγ. is the personified spirit or genius or heavenly counterpart of the church, the church being regarded as an ideal individual (so Andr., Areth., Wetst., Bleek, Lücke, Erbes, Beyschlag, Swete, etc.) who possesses a sort of Egyptian *Ka* or double. By itself, however, this view lies open to the objection that it explains one symbol by another and hardly does justice to the naïve poetry of the conception. The notion of guardian angels was widespread in the early church (Hermas, Justin, Clem. Alex., Origen, etc.), independently of this passage. Statius (*Silv.* i. 241) says that Domitian "posuit sua sidera" (*i.e.*, of his family) in the heaven, when he raised a temple to the Flavians—a contemporary parallel upon a lower level of feeling, but indicating a similar view of the heavenly counterpart (*cf.* Ramsay, *Seven Letters*, 68 f.) The Apocalypse, though presupposing the exercise of discipline and the practice of reading, prayer, and praise within the Christian communities, entirely ignores officials of any kind; and the following homilies are directly concerned with the churches (ii. 7, ἐκκλησίαις, not the angels), their different members (*cf.* ii. 24) and their respective situations. Hence the poetic idealism of the ἄγγελοι soon fades, when the writer's practical sense is brought to bear. As the scene of revelation is ἐν πνεύματι and its author the heavenly Christ, the writer is instructed to address not τοῖς ἁγίοις (*e.g.*, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ), but their patron spirit or guardian angel. The point of the address is that the revelation of Jesus is directly conveyed through the spoken and written words of the prophets, as the latter are controlled by his Spirit.

CHAPTER II. 1-CHAPTER III. 20. The

ὁ κρατῶν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, ὁ [a] περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἑπτὰ λυχνιῶν τῶν χρυσῶν· 2. Οἶδα τὰ [b] ἔργα σου, καὶ τὸν κόπον καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν σου, καὶ ὅτι οὐ δύνῃ [c] βαστάσαι κακούς, καὶ [d] ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι ἀποστόλους [e] καὶ οὐκ

a Lev. xxiv. 4, xxvi. 12 (LXX).
b Not in ii. 9, 13.
c (*Cf.* Epict. Diss. i. 3, 2 οὐδεὶς σου τ. ὀφρὺν βαστάσει), "Thou canst not so much as tolerate".
d 1 John iv. 1, *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 5: "tested, put to the proof".
e *Cf.* on i. 6.

seven open letters or pastorals (in the modern and ecclesiastical sense of the term) are appeals for vigour and vigilance which reflect a mind in which imaginative, even mystic fervour was accompanied by shrewd penetration into the existing state of morals and religion in the Asiatic communities. Their disorders and difficulties do not escape the notice of the prophet. He will neither spare nor despair of the churches. He speaks in the name of a Lord who knows not only who are his, but what they are, One who is keenly alive to their plight and struggles (οἶδα, ii. 1, etc.) alike against inward corruption and the external pressure of the Empire, one to whom their obscure provincial conflict is a matter of infinite moment.

ii. 1-7, to Ephesus.

Ver. 1. The political and commercial primacy of Ephesus, conjoined with its prestige as a centre for the Imperial cultus which flourished beside the local cult of Diana, lent it œcumenical importance in the Eastern Empire. Christianity had for about half a century already made it a sphere and centre, and its position was enormously enhanced after the crisis of 70 A.D. in Palestine, when Asia Minor became one of the *foci* of the new faith (*cf.* von Dobschütz, pp. 100 f.). The description of the speaker is carried on from i. 12, 16, 20, with κρατῶν for ἔχων (the church is neither to be plucked nor to be dropped from his hand) and the addition of περιπατῶν to ἐν μέσῳ (activity and universal watchfulness, *cf.* Abbott, pp. 196 f.), touches which make the sketch more definite, but which are too slight to be pressed into any significance, unless one supposes a subtle general contrast between the ideal of the churches—"a star shining by its own inherent light"—and their actual condition upon earth which, like the lamp, requires constant replenishing and care, if its light is not to flicker or fade.

Ver. 2. οἶδα: nothing escapes his notice, neither the good (2-3, 6) nor the bad (4, 5) qualities. ἔργα = the general course and moral conduct of life, exemplified more especially in its active and passive sides, as exertion and endurance, by κόπος and ὑπομονή, which are knit together by the final σου as epexegetic of ἔργα. The κόπος, or hard work, is further specified in the text of ver. 2 (the church's vigorous dealing with impostors), while the ὑπομονή is developed in ver. 3. For a parallel, verbal rather than real, see 1 Thess. i. 3. Here duty follows privilege (ver. 1), and communion with Christ involves practical energy and enterprise on earth. The remarkable prominence of ἔργα in this book corresponds to its O.T. conception of the *fear of God* which, as a religious principle, manifests itself effectively in *works*. The phrase has nothing to do with the special sense in which Paul had employed it during a bygone controversy. *Works* here are the result of an inner relation to God (xii. 11).—Patient endurance (2, 3, 7) wins everything and triumphs over opposition, as in the case of the Maccabean martyrs (4 Macc. i. 11) who are lauded for their courage, καὶ τῇ ὑπομονῇ . . . νικήσαντες τὸν τύραννον τῇ ὑπομονῇ.—βαστάσαι, the weak are a burden to be borne (Gal. vi. 2): the false, an encumbrance to be thrown off. Patience towards the former is a note of strength: towards the latter, it is a sign of weakness. The prophet is thoroughly in sympathy (*cf.* 2 John 10, 11) with the sharp scrutiny exercised at Ephesus over *soi-disant* missioners; he gladly recognises the moral vigour and shrewdness which made the local church impatient of itinerant evangelists whose character and methods would not stand scrutiny. Pretensions, greed and indolence were the chief sins of this class, but the prophet does not enter into details. He is content to welcome the fact that uncomplaining endurance of wrong and hardship has not evaporated the power of detecting impostors and of evincing moral antipathy to them, upon the principle that ὑπομονή, as Clem. Alex. finely explained (*Strom.* ii. 18), is the knowledge of what is to be endured and of what is not. The literature of this

εἰσί, καὶ [f] εὗρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς, 3. καὶ ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις, καὶ ἐβάστασας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, καὶ οὐ [f] κεκοπίακες. 4. Ἀλλ' ἔχω [g] κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι τὴν [h] ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκας.[1] 5. [i] μνημόνευε οὖν πόθεν πέπτωκες,[2] καὶ μετανόησον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα

f For these uneducated forms in -ες, *cf.* Moulton, i. 52.
g For phrase, *cf.* Matt. v. 23.
h 1 Thess. iii. 12, iv. 9, 2 Thess. i. 3; Clem. Rom. xxxiii. 1, xlix. 7. *Cf.* Eph. iii. 17, v. 2, 1 Tim. i. 5.
i See Acts xxvi. 20.

[1] For the perfective flexion (Helbing, 103-104) αφηκας (ℵccAPQ, etc., Al. Lachm., Bs., Ws.) [Matt. xxiii. 23] some (Ti., Tr., WH, Bj., Sw.) substitute αφηκες (ℵ*C).

[2] For the εκπεπτωκας of P, 1, etc., S., Andpal, vg., Vict., read either πεπτωκες (ℵ, Ti., WH, Bj , Sw.) or -ας (ACQ, etc., Andc, Areth., Cyp., Pr., Al. Lachm., Tr., Ws.).

period (1 John, Didachê, etc.) is full of directions upon the moral and religious tests which a community should apply to these itinerant evangelists and teachers called "apostles". The popularity and spread of Christianity rendered precautions necessary on the part of the faithful against unscrupulous members of this order, which had already attracted men of quite inferior character as well as of heretical beliefs. The *evil men* here includes these pseudo-apostles as well as the Nikolaitan libertines of ver. 6 (*cf.* 15) with whom perhaps the "apostles" were in sympathy; ἐπείρ. and εὗρ. denote some definite and recent crisis, while μισ. reflects the permanent obstacles of the local situation. This temper of the church is warmly commended by Ign. (*ad Eph.* ix.) at a later period; "I have learned that certain folk passed through you with wicked doctrine (κακὴν διδαχήν), but you would not allow them to sow seed in you". With equal loftiness and severity of tone, John like Ignatius might have added: τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, ὄντα ἄπιστα, οὐκ ἔδοξέν μοι ἐγγράψαι (*Smyrn.* v.).

Ver. 3. The tenses as in ver. 2 denote a general attitude still existing, the outcome of some special stage of persecution for the sake of the Christian name. κεκοπίακες, *cf.* κόπον (ver. 2), a slight play on words; "noui laborem tuum, nec tamen laboras, *i.e.*, labore non frangeris" (Bengel). Tired in loyalty, not of it. The Ephesian church can bear anything except the presence of impostors in her membership.

Ver. 4. Brotherly love, an early and authentic proof of the faith; as in ver. 19, 2 John 5-6, 3 John 6, and the striking parallel of Matt. xxiv. 12 (see 10) where, as at Corinth (see also Did. xvi. 3) party-spirit and immorality threatened its existence. Jealous regard for moral or doctrinal purity, and unwavering loyalty in trial, so far from necessarily sustaining the spirit of charity, may exist side by side, as here, with censoriousness, suspicion, and quarrelling. Hence the neglect of brotherly love, which formed a cardinal fault in contemporary gnosticism (*i.e.*, 1 John ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 5 f.), may penetrate the very opposition to such error. During any prolonged strain put upon human nature, especially in a small society driven jealously to maintain its purity, temper is prone to make inroads on affection and forbearance; it was inevitable also that opportunities for this should be given in early Christianity, where party-leaders tended to exaggerate either the liberal or the puritan element in the gospel. When Apollonius of Tyana visited Ephesus, one of the first topics he raised was the duty of unselfish charity (*Vit. Apoll.* iv. 3). The historical reference here is probably to the temporary decline of the Ephesian church after Paul's departure (see Acts xx. 29 f., etc.) Its revival took place under the ministry of the Johannine circle, who—carrying on the spirit of Paulinism with independent vigour—made it the most prominent centre of Christianity in the East. With vv. 2-4, compare Pliny, *H. N.* ii. 18: "deus est mortali iuuare mortalem, et haec ad aeternam gloriam uia"; also Pirke Aboth, ii. 15, where R. Jehoshua, a contemporary Jewish sage, says: "an evil eye [*i.e.*, envy, niggardliness], and the evil nature, and hatred of mankind put a man out of the world" (*cf.* 1 John iii. 15). This emphasis upon brotherly love as the dominant characteristic of the church and the supreme test of genuine faith, is early Christian, however, rather than specifically Johannine (see the account of the young aristocratic martyr Vettius Epagathus, *Ep. Lugd.*). The purity which is not peaceable cannot be adequate to the demands of Jesus, and nowhere did this need reinforcement more than in the townships of Asia Minor, where factiousness and division constantly spoiled their guilds and mutual relations.

Ver. 5. πόθεν, from what a height. Contrast Cic. *ad Attic.* iv. 17: "non

ἔργα [l] ποίησον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρχομαί [k] σοι καὶ [l] κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ [l] τόπου αὐτῆς, ἐαν μὴ μετανοήσῃς. 6. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο

k ii. 16, iii. 3.
l For phrase see vi. 14.

recordor unde ceciderim, sed unde resurrexerim". To realise that a decline has taken place, or to admit a lapse, is the first step and stimulus to amendment (see the fine passage in Bunyan's preface to *Grace Abounding*, and the "Hymn of the Soul," 44, 45, in *Acts of Thomas*). Once this is brought home to the mind (**μνημόνευε**, a prolonged effort), repentance quick and sharp (**μετανόησον**, aor.) will follow, issuing in a return to the first level of excellence (**καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποίησον**), *i.e.*, to the initial charity (2 John 6, 8; love shown in deeds). The way to regain this warmth of affection is neither by working up spasmodic emotion nor by theorising about it (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* ii. 4), but by doing its duties. ("The two paracletes of man are repentance and good works," Sanhed. 32). It is taken for granted that man possesses the power of turning and returning; the relation of Christ's redeeming death to the forgiveness of sins throughout the Christian life, although implied, is never explicitly argued (as in Hebrews) by this writer. The present (**ἔρχ.**) emphasises the nearness of the approach, while the future (**κιν.**) denotes a result to follow from it. **σοι** either a dat. incommodi or (more probably) a local dat. (rare in classical literature, *cf.* Aesch. *Pr. V.* 360) with "the sense of motion to a place" (Simcox, *Lang. N. T.* 81), if not an incorrect reproduction of Heb. לָךְ (as Matt. xxi. 5, Blass). *Cf. Journ. Theol. St.* iii. 516. **κινήσω κ.τ.λ.**, ("efficiam ut ecclesia esse desinas," Areth.); not degradation but destruction is the threat, brotherly love being the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*. So, in a remarkable parallel from Paul (Phil. ii. 14-16), quarrelsomeness forfeits the privileges of Christ's care and service, since the function of being **φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες** depends upon concord and charity in the church (**πάντα ποιεῖτε χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν**). A slackened sense of the obligation to mutual love formed the cardinal sin at Ephesus; to repent of this was the condition of continued existence as a church; utility or extinction is the alternative held out to her. The nature of the visitation is left unexplained; the threat is vague, but probably eschatological. The Apocalypse, however, knows nothing of the Jewish idea that Israel's repentance would bring the advent of messiah (*cf.* Schürer's *Hist.* II. ii. 163, 164), as though the transgressions of the people hindered his appearance.

Ver. 6. The message ends with a tardy echo of 2 *b*. The prophet admits that one redeeming feature in the church is the detestation of the N. Not all the spirit of animosity at Ephesus is amiss. When directed, as moral antipathy, against these detestable Nikolaitans (corresponding to the Greek quality of **μισοπονηρία**), it is a healthy feature of their Christian consciousness. The Nikolaitans have been identified by patristic tradition, from Irenæus downwards, with the followers of the proselyte Nikolaos (Acts vi. 5, where see note), who is alleged, especially by Tertullian and Epiphanius, to have lapsed into antinomian license, as the result of an overstrained asceticism, and to have given his name to a sect which practised religious sensuality in the days before Cerinthus. The tenets of the latter are in fact declared by Irenæus to have been anticipated by the Nicolaitans, who represented the spirit of libertinism which, like the opposite extreme of legalism at an earlier period, threatened the church's moral health. But if the comment of Vict. were reliable, that the N. principle was merely *ut delibatum exorcizaretur et manducari posset et ut quicumque fornicatus esset octauo die pacem acciperet*, the representation of John would become vigorously polemical rather than historically accurate. The tradition of the N.'s origin may of course be simply due to the play of later imagination upon the present narrative taken with the isolated reference to Nikolaos in Acts vi. 6. On the other hand it was not in the interest of later tradition to propagate ideas derogatory to the character of an apostolic Christian; indeed, as early as Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* ii. 20, iii. 4; *cf. Constit. Ap.* vi. 8), a disposition (shared by Vict.) to clear his character is evident. Whatever was the precise relation of the sect to Nikolaos, whether some tenet of his was exploited immorally or whether he was himself a dangerously lax teacher, there is no reason to doubt the original connexion of the party with him. Its accommodating principles are luminously indicated by the comment of Hippolytus

ἔχεις, ὅτι [m] μισεῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, [n] ἃ κἀγὼ μισῶ. 7. [o] Ὁ ἔχων οὗς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· Τῷ

m Ps. cxxxix. 21, *cf.* on Rom. xii. 9.
n *Cf.* Polyk. *Phil.* ii. 2.
o Mk. iv.23, etc., fr. Ezek. iii. 27.

(**ἐδίδασκεν ἀδιαφορίαν βίου**) and the phrase attributed to him by Clem. Alex. (**παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκὶ δεῖ**), a hint which is confirmed, if the Nikolaitans here and in ver. 15 are identified with the Balaamites (**νικο-λαος**, in popular etymology, a rough Greek equivalent for בלע עם, perdidit uel absorpsit populum). This symbolic interpretation has prevailed from the beginning of the eighteenth century (so Ewald, Hengstenberg, Düst., Schürer, Julicher, Bousset). The original party-name was probably interpreted by opponents in this derogatory sense. It was thus turned into a covert censure upon men who were either positively immoral or liberally indifferent to scruples (on food, clubs, marriage, and the like) which this puritan prophet regarded as vital to the preservation of genuine Christianity in a pagan city. A contemporary parallel of moral laxity is quoted by Derenbourg, *Hist. de la Palestine* (1867), p. 363. If Nikolaos was really an ascetic himself, the abuse of his principles is quite intelligible, as well as their popularity with people of inferior character. Pushed to an extreme, asceticism confines ethical perfection to the spirit. As the flesh has no part in the divine life, it may be regarded either as a foe to be constantly thwarted or as something morally indifferent. In the latter case, the practical inference of sensual indulgence is obvious, the argument being that the lofty spirit cannot be soiled by such indulgence any more than the sun is polluted by shining on a dunghill.

Ver. 7. A stringent demand for attention (**πίστις, ὦτα ψυχῆς**: Clem. Alex.) to the utterances of prophets who were inspired by the Spirit (of prophecy, *cf.* on xix. 10). These as usual are ejaculatory, positive and brief—**ἐκκλ.** scattered local communities, and not a Catholic organisation, being the conception of the Apocalypse, it is for use in their public worship that this book is written (i. 3). It is a subordinate and literary question whether the seer means in such phrases as this to designate himself (Weinel, 84 f.) liturgically as the speaker, or whether (as the synoptic parallels suggest) they form an integral part of the whole menage. In any case the prophet represents himself simply as the medium for receiving and recording (*cf.* i. 19) these oracles of the Spirit (*cf.* xiv. 13, xix. 9, xx. 17). Unlike other writers such as Paul and the authors of Hebrew and 1 John, he occupies a passive rôle, throwing his personal rebuke and counsels into the form *Thus saith the Spirit:* but this really denotes the confidence felt by the prophet in his own inspiration and authority. The Spirit here, though less definitely than in Hermas, is identified with Jesus speaking through his prophets: it represents sudden counsels and semi-oracular utterances (*cf.* on i. 10), not a continuous power in the normal moral life of the saints in general. The seven promises denote security of immortal life (positively as here and ver. 28 or negatively as ver. 11), privilege (personal, ver. 17, or official, ver. 27), honour (iii. 5, 21), or increased intimacy (iii. 12). As usual, (*cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 9f.), the higher Christian **γνῶσις** is connected with eschatology.

Observe the singling out for encouragement and praise of each soldier in the host of the royal. The effect resembles that produced by Pericles in his panegyric over the Athenians who had fallen in the Peloponnesian war: "together they gave up their lives, yet individually they won this deathless praise" (Thuc. ii. 43, 2). **νικῶν** (a quasi-perfect), in Herm. *Mand.* xii. 2, 4 f., 5. 2, 4, 6. 2, 4 (over sin and devil), might have its usual Johannine sense, the struggle being obedience in face of the seductions and hardships which beset people aiming to keep the divine commandments (*cf.* on John xvi. 33). For a special application of the term, see xv. 2. But behind the general usage lies the combination of "to be pure or just" and "to conquer or triumph" in the Hebrew *ṣédeḳ* and the Syriac *zedhā*. Furthermore, **νικῶν** throughout is equivalent to the Egyptian eschatological term "victorious," applied to those who passed successfully through life's temptations and the judgment after death. Its generic sense is illustrated by 4 Esd. vii. [128]: "here is the intent of the battle to be fought by man born upon earth: if he be overcome, he shall suffer as thou hast said; but if he conquer, he shall receive the thing of which I speak" (*i.e.*, paradise and its glories). The Essenes,

[p] νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ [r] φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ [s] παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

"8. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς[1] ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίας γράψον· Τάδε

p En. l, 2.
q Redundant, Moult. i. 85, Win. § 22, 5a.

r xxii. 2, 14, 19. s Ezek. xxxi. 8, 2 Cor. xii. 4, Lk. xxiii. 43: Deissm. 148.

[1] For της ℵCPQ (Ti., Al. Ws., Bs., Bj.) Lach., WH, Sw. prefer τω (A, *cf.* ii. 1, 18): Ζμυρνη (ℵ, am., fuld., S., Ti.), an orthography which ceases on coins towards end of Trajan's reign (according to Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques*, i. 158).

according to Josephus (*Ant.* xviii. 1, 5), held the soul was immortal, περιμάχητον ἡγούμενοι τοῦ δικαίου τὴν πρόσοδον—eternal life the reward of an untiring, unsoiled fight against evil. The imagery of the metaphor is drawn from Jewish eschatology which anticipated the reversal of the doom incurred in Eden; *cf. Test. Levi*, 18, καὶ δώσει τοῖς ἁγίοις φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, also En. xxiv. 1-11, xxv., xxxi. 1-3, etc., and (for Egyptian ideas) below on iii. 21. The garden-park of God (π. = a garden with fruit-trees, Wilcken's *Griech. Ostrakd*, i. 157) is one of the intermediate abodes, possibly (as in Slav. En. viii. 1, and Paul) the third heaven where the favoured saints live after death in seclusion and bliss, So Iren. v. 5. 1 (abode of translated) and v. 36, 1-2, where heaven is for the Christians of the hundredfold fruit, paradise for the sixty-fold, and the heavenly city for the thirty-fold (a very ancient Christian tradition). The tree of life blooms in most of the apocalypses (*cf.* on xxii. 2). Philo had already allegorised it into θεοσέβεια ὁ τῆς τελείας ἀρετῆς χαρακτήρ. But the allusion corresponds to the general eschatological principle (borrowed from Babylonia, where cosmological myths passed into eschatological) that the end was to be a transcendently fine renovation of the original state (Barn. vi. 8). μου a deliberate addition to the O.T. phrase; Christ's relation to God guarantees his promise of such a privilege (iii. 12). God's gift (Rom. vi. 23) is Christ's gift. He is no fair promiser like Antigonus II., whom men dubbed Δώσων for his large and unfulfilled undertakings (Plut. *Coriol.* xi.).

Vv. 8-11. The message (shortest of the seven) to the Christians in Smyrna, "one of the first stars in the brilliant belt of the cities of Asia Minor" (Mommsen), a wealthy and privileged seaport, and like Sardis a constant rival of Ephesus for the title of primacy which properly belonged to Pergamos, the real capital of the province. It is probably owing to the petty jealousies of these urban communities that the prophet refrains from speaking of one to the other (as Paul did, with his churches), by way of example.

Ver. 8. The title from i. 17-18, with special reference to ver. 10 and its situation, also to the promise of ver. 11. The Smyrniote Christians, in peril of death, are addressed and encouraged by One who himself has died—and risen to life. He is familiar [ver. 9] with the rough brake and briars through which faith must struggle to win its crown, and this familiarity is as usual put forward as the first element of encouragement. The other notes of help are (i.) the unapproachable wealth of a devoted life, (ii.) the justice of their claim in spite of their opponents' prestige and pretensions, (iii.) the providential limit assigned to their trial, and (iv.) its ample reward, besides the fact that Christ does not conceal from them the worst.—πτωχ. Contrast R. Jochanan's aphorism: "Whosoever fulfils the Torah in poverty will at length fulfil it in wealth; and whosoever neglects the Torah in wealth, will at length neglect it in poverty" (Pirke Aboth, iv. 13). The subsequent allusion to Jews acquires fresh point from a comparison with (Chagigah, 9*b*) another contemporary rabbi's comment on Isa. xlviii. 10: "this means that the Holy One sought for all good qualities to give to Israel, and found only poverty".—Ἰουδ. Does the prophet resent (see on this, von Dobschütz, *Texte u. Unters.* xi. 1. 35 f.) the Jewish claim to the title of God's people, declaring in so many words (as Matt. xxi. 43), that Judaism, so far as it is genuine, is now inside the church, and that the Jewish nation has forfeited its privilege and is now a pseudo-church (Harnack, *H. D.* i. 177-179)? If the passage does not breathe this common antipathy, the calumnies may be supposed to have taken the form of taunts upon the Christian delusion of believing that a Palestinian peasant and criminal was messiah, or of slanders upon Christian morals and mo-

λέγει ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς καὶ [t] ἔζησεν· 9. Οἶδα [u] σου τὴν θλίψιν καὶ τὴν [v] πτωχείαν· ἀλλὰ [w] πλούσιος εἶ· καὶ τὴν [x] βλασφημίαν [y] ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων [z] Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτούς, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ συναγωγὴ [a] τοῦ Σατανᾶ. 10. Μηδὲν[1] φοβοῦ ἃ μέλλεις πάσχειν. ἰδοὺ μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος [b] ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς φυλακὴν

t Cf. xiii. 14.
u Vernacular genitive (as in ii. 19, iii. 1, 8, 15), cf. Abbott, *Diat.* 2781.
v Result of θλῖψις (Heb. x. 33-34)?
w 2 Cor. vi. 10, viii. 9, Jas. ii. 5, cf. Ps. xxxiv. 10-11, and espec. Tobit iv. 21.
x Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 16, iv. 4.
y John iii. 25.
z Constr. iii. 9, Rom. ii. 19, Lk. xx. 20 (Blass, § 72, 2).
a iii. 9, 2 Cor. xi. 14-15.
b 2 John 4, partitive by harsh Hellenistic usage.

[1] For μηδεν (ℵP, etc., vg., Syr., Aeth., And[acbav], Areth., Cypr., Pr., Ti., Sx., Bs.) Lach., Al., Düst., Tr., WH, Ws., Bj., Sw. read the easier and less probable μη (ACQ, 8, 38, 49, Arm, And[pal]).

tives (reff.), or of malicious, anonymous accusations laid before the Roman authorities with reference to revolutionary designs on the part of the churches. "Les Orientaux prennent d'ordinaire la religion comme un prétexte de taquineries" (Renan). Judaism was strong at Smyrna, and its hostility to the Christians (see Otto's notes on Just. *Dial.* xvi. 11, xxxv., etc.) would not be lessened by the accession of converts from the old faith to the new (Ign. *ad Smyrn.* i. 2, describes the saints and faithful folk of Christ εἴτε ἐν Ἰουδαίοις εἴτε ἐν ἔθνεσιν); the reasons for such social animosity and interference are analysed in Jowett's note on 1 Th. iii. 13, in E. G. Hardy's *Christianity and the Roman Government*, pp. 45-53, and in Ramsay's *Seven Letters*, 272 f. At the martyrdom of Polykarp in Smyrna, some years after the Apocalypse was written (as later still at the death of Pionius, 250 A.D.) the Jews made themselves conspicuous by denouncing him with the pagan mob before the Asiarch (ἀκατασχέτῳ θυμῷ καὶ μεγάλῃ φωνῇ), eagerly assisting to heap faggots on his pile (προθύμως, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς), and helping to prevent the Christians from obtaining the martyr's body (ὑποβαλλόντων καὶ ἐνισχυόντων τῶν Ἰουδαίων: Mart. *Polyk.* xii., xvii.). The name of "Jew," ancient and honourable, is claimed (καὶ οὐκ εἰσί) for believers in Jesus the messiah, who constitute the real people of God with a legitimate claim to the privileges and titles of the O.T. community. "Now by our faith we have become more than those who seemed to have God" (2 Clem. ii. 3).—συν. σατ. a bitter retort to the contemporary claims of Judaism with its σ. τοῦ κυρίου (*cf*, Num. xvi. 3, xx. 4, Ps. Sol. xvii. 18, σ. ὁσίων). The allusion here is to Jewish, in ver. 13 (throne of S.) to pagan, and in ver. 24 (depths of S.) to heretical, antagonism.

Ver. 10. μη. φοβοῦ, κ.τ.λ. "Thou orderest us to endure, not to love, trials. A man may love to endure, but he does not love what he endures" (Aug. *Conf.* x. 28). Ill-treatment, as well as misrepresentation, is traced back to a diabolic source, in the common early Christian manner (Weinel, 13 f.). The Imperial authorities (διάβολος as in 1 Peter v. 8), although often instigated by the Jews, had the sole power of inflicting imprisonment, in this case for a refusal to worship the emperor's image; the prophet here predicts an imminent persecution of this kind (compare Acts ix. 16, and above Introd. § 6) lasting for a short and limited time (δέκα ἡμ. see reff., originally due to the rough Semitic division of a month into decades). The local intensity of feeling upon the Imperial cultus may be gathered from the fact that in 23 A.D. Smyrna had secured from Tiberius and the senate, after keen competition, the coveted distinction of possessing the second temple decreed by the province to the Imperial cultus. Hence the struggle anticipated here is desperate (ἄχ. θ.); martyrdom is no remote contingency. Compare Ep. Lugd., where the martyr-crisis is taken as an anticipation of the final persecution (*cf.* Apoc. iii. 10, xiii. 7-15): "with all his might the adversary assailed us, giving us a hint of what his unbridled advent would be like at the end"; the martyrs "endured nobly all the assaults heaped on them by the mob. They were shouted at, struck, haled about, robbed, stoned, imprisoned; in fact they suffered all that an infuriated mob likes to inflict on enemies and opponents."—Then follows a commandment with promise: γίνου (not ἴσθι), "show thyself" throughout all degrees of trial and in any emergency. It is more than doubtful if this is a subtle local allusion to the loyalty and local patriotism upon which Sardis prided her-

ἵνα πειρασθῆτε· καὶ ἕξετε θλίψιν ἡμερῶν [c] δέκα. γίνου πιστὸς [d] ἄχρι θανάτου, καὶ δώσω σοι τὸν [e] στέφανον τῆς [f] ζωῆς. 11. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· Ὁ νικῶν οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ [g] θανάτου τοῦ [g] δευτέρου.

"12. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Περγάμῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον. Τάδε λέγει [h] ὁ ἔχων τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν· 13. Οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς, ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καὶ κρατεῖς [i] τὸ ὄνομά μου,

c Gen. xxiv. 55, Num. xi. 19, Dan. i. 12, 14.
d xii. 11, Acts xxii. 4, Phil. ii. 8, Sib. Or. ii. 47, Ign., *Polyk.* ii. 3.
e 1 Pet. v. 4, 2 Tim. iv. 8, Jas. i. 12.
f Gen. epexeg.
g See on xx. 6, 14.
h xix. 15, Heb. iv. 12, En. lxii. 2; its stroke = Sir. xxi. 3. The spiritual *jus gladii*.
i *Cf.* on ver. 10, and iii. 8.

self and which she had urged as her plea to Tiberius (Tacit. *Ann.* iv. 56). On the honours subsequently paid to martyrs in Smyrna, *cf. Mart. Polyk.* xvii. **τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν, τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ κυρίου ἀγαπῶμεν** (also Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15. 46, 47), with the contemporary cry of 4 Esd. viii. 27: "Look not at the deeds of the impious but at those who have kept Thy covenants amid affliction" (*i.e.*, the martyrs), also the subsequent Christian honour paid by Hermas (*Vis.* iii. 1, 2), who reserves the right hand of God for the martyrs who have "suffered for the sake of the Name," enduring "stripes, imprisonments, great afflictions, crosses, wild beasts". For **καὶ** with fut. after imperative, see Eph. v. 14, James iv. 7.—**στέφ. ζ.** *Life*, the reward assigned in ver. 7 to the triumph of faith is here bestowed upon the loyalty of faith. To hold one's ground is, under certain circumstances, as trying and creditable as it is under others to win positive successes. The metaphor of **στέφ.** with its royal, sacerdotal, and festal (Cant. iii. 11, Isa. xxviii. 1, Herm. *Sim.* viii. 2) associations, would call up civic and athletic honours to the local Christians, the latter owing to the famous games at Smyrna, the former from the fact that **στ.** frequently occurs also in inscriptions as = public honour for distinguished service (paid, *e.g.*, to Demosthenes and Zeno), whilst the yearly appointment of a priest at Eumeneia to the temple of Zeno was termed **παράληψις τοῦ στέφανου** (*C. B. P.* ii. 358). Compare, with the **ἄξιοι** of iii. 4, the sentence in Ep. Lugd. upon the martyrs: **ἐχρῆν γοῦν τοὺς γενναίους ἀθλητάς, ποικίλον ὑπομείναντας ἀγῶνα καὶ μεγάλως νικήσαντας, ἀπολαβεῖν τὸν μέγαν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας στέφανον**, and the Greek phrase for noble deeds, **ἄξια στεφάνων** (Plut. *Pericl.* 28).

Ver. 11. **οὐ μὴ** (emphatic): no true Christian, much less one who dies a martyr's death, need fear anything beyond the pang of the first death. The second death of condemnation in the lake of fire leaves the faithful scatheless, no matter how others may suffer from the terrors (*cf.* on iii. 12) which haunted the ancient outlook (especially the Egyptian) upon the dark interval between death and heaven. *Cf.* the sketch of Ani, seated on his throne and robed in white, holding sceptre and staff, and crying: "I am not held to be a person of no account, and violence shall not be done me. I am thy son, O Great One, and I have seen the hidden things that belong to thee. I am crowned king of the gods, and shall not die a second time in the underworld" (*E. B. D.* 99). If a Christian keep himself loyal till death, the prophet here guarantees that Christ will keep him safe after death. After the promise of ver. 10 however, this sounds like an anticlimax. The general tenor of the message indicates that John was rather more cordial and sympathetic to the Smyrniote church than to the Ephesian.

Vv. 12-17. The message to Pergamos, the Benares or Lourdes of the province.

Ver. 12. The title is apt in view of ver. 16.

Ver. 13. Two features in the local situation menaced Christianity. Pergamos, besides forming a legal centre for the district (ad eam conueniunt Thyatireni aliaeque inhonorae ciuitates, Plin. v. 33), was an old centre of emperor-worship in Asia Minor; in 29 B.C. a temple had been erected to the divine Augustus and the goddess Roma, and a special priesthood had been formed (**ὑμνῳδοὶ θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ καὶ θεᾶς Ῥώμης**). Another feature, shocking to early Christian feeling, was the local cult of Aesculapius (*cf.* Zahn, § 73, note 2), whose favourite symbol (*e.g.*, on coins) was a serpent ("the god of Pergamos, Mart. ix. 17); so Pausan. *Cor.* 27, (iii. 402), **κάθηται δὲ ἐπὶ θρόνου βακτηρίαν κρατῶν, τὴν δὲ ἑτέραν τῶν χειρῶν**

καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσω τὴν [k] πίστιν [l] μου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας [1] ὁ μάρτυς μου, ὁ [m] πιστός μου, ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη παρ' ὑμῖν, ὅπου ὁ σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ. 14. Ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγα. ἔχεις ἐκεῖ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν [n] τῷ Βαλὰκ [o] βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον

k 1 Tim. v. 8.
l xiv. 12: "in me".
m Christ's own title (i. 5, iii. 14).
n Heb. dat. (Job xxi. 22 למד ל); correct constr. in ver. 20.
o Peculiar to Apocalypse; for τίθεναι or ποιεῖν.

[1] As an alternative to taking **Αντιπας** as indeclinable, WH (after Lachm.) suggest the genit. **Αντιπα** (final C taken up from following O); so Nestle, Zahn, Schmiedel, Bj., Sw. With **εν αις** or **αις** (before **Αντιπας**, so Ws., Bs.), supply either *exstitit* (Haym) or *occisus est* (*Quaestt.*, 102, 2950). The **αντειπας** of S. might suggest a significant appellation rather than any personal noun (Gwynn).

ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἔχει τοῦ δράκοντος. In addition to these fashionable cults, a magnificent throne-like altar to Zeus Soter towered on the Acropolis (Paus. ii. 73, 75, iii. 556, 557) commemorating the defeat of the barbarian Gauls by Attalus two centuries earlier, and decorated by a famous frieze of the gods warring against the giants (the latter, a brood of vigorous opponents, having often human bodies and serpentine tails, *cf.* below, ix. 19). No wonder Pergamos was called "a throne of Satan" by early Christians who revolted against the splendid and insidious paganism of a place where politics and religion were firm allies. Least of all at this cathedral centre of the Imperial cultus could dissent be tolerated. The Asiarch, *e.g.*, who condemns Polykarp is the local high priest of the altar, and the animus against Cæsar-adoration which pervades the Apocalypse easily accounts for the last phrase **ὁ θ. τ. σ.**, particularly as the symbol of the serpent in the Aesculapius cult would come vividly home to pious Jewish Christians in the church, as a reminder of Satan (*e.g.*, xii. 9 and *passim*). The priesthood of this cult, "a vast college, believed to be in possession of certain precious medical secrets," came "nearest, perhaps, of all the institutions of the pagan world, to the Christian priesthood," its rites being "administered in a full conviction of the religiousness, the refined and sacred happiness, of a life spent in the relieving of pain" (Pater, *Marius the Epicurean*, i. 30; see Usener's *Götternamen*, 1896, pp. 147 f., 350, and Dill's *Roman Soc. from Nero to M. Aur.* 459 f.). **κρατεῖς, κ.τ.λ.**, "And the magistrate pressed him hard, saying, 'Swear the oath [by the genius of Cæsar] and I will release thee; curse the Christ.' But Polykarp replied, 'For eighty-six years I have served him, and he has never injured me. How then can I blaspheme my King, who has saved me?'" (*Mart. Polyc.* ix., Jewish analogies in 2 Macc. viii. 4, *Ass. Mos.* viii. etc.). Some definite outburst of persecution at Pergamos is in the writer's mind (**ἠρνήσω**). To disown or abjure faith in Jesus, saying **Κύριος Καῖσαρ**, implies here as in the gospels the moral fault of cowardice, elsewhere (*e.g.* 1 John, Jud. 4, 2 Peter ii. 1) erroneous doctrine. The circumstances and surroundings of the local church are taken into account, as usual, in the prophet's estimate; they either claim some allowance to be made, or reflect additional credit and lustre on the particular community. **ὁ μάρτυς, κ.τ.λ.** He is faithful who retains his faith. Antipas (= **Ἀντίπατρος**, Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 1, 3; the name occurs in a third century inscription of Pergamos, Deissm. 187), is mentioned by Tertullian (*adv. Gnost. scorp.* 12); otherwise he is unknown. His Acts appear to have been read by Andreas and Arethas, and, according to Simon Metaphrastes, he was an old, intrepid bishop of Pergamos whose prestige drew upon him the honour of being burned to death in a brazen bull during Domitian's reign. The sober truth is probably that he formed the first prominent victim in the local church, possibly in Asia Minor, to the demands of the Imperial cultus. Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonikê, the other martyrs of Pergamos named by Eusebius (*H. E.*, iv. 15, 48), died at a later period. On the whole verse see Ep. Lugd., "then did the holy martyrs endure indescribable torture, Satan eagerly striving to make them utter **τι τῶν βλασφήμων**". The textual variants arose from a failure to to see that **Ἀντίπας** (or **-α**) was a genitive and that **μάρτυς** was in characteristic irregular apposition to it. The name is neither a personification nor typical.

Ver. 14. **ὀλίγα**, the errorists are a mere minority; they do not represent or

ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, [p] φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα καὶ [q] πορνεῦσαι. 15. οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σὺ κρατοῦντας τὴν διδαχὴν τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν ὁμοίως.[1] 16. Μετανόησον· εἰ δὲ μή, [r] ἔρχομαί σοι ταχὺ καὶ

p 1 Cor. viii. 7-13, x. 20-30. q xiv. 8, xvii. 1-2, 4-5, xviii. 3, 9. r ii. 5, iii. 3.

[1] Al., Düst., Lachm., WH, Sw. (after ACQ, Arm.) om. των before Νικ.

affect the main body of the church, whose fault is not sympathy but indifference. This carelessness arose probably from contempt or fear rather than through ignorance.—ἐκεῖ (in the midst of loyalty and martyrdom). κρατ. (not τὸ ὄνομά μου, but) lax principles worthy of a Balaam, the note of a pupil of Balaam being (according to Pirke Aboth, v. 19), an evil eye, a proud spirit, and a sensual soul. Contemporary opponents of Gnostic tendencies evidently found it an effective weapon to employ O.T. analogies or identifications such as this or the similar ones in 2 Tim. iii. 8, Jud. 11. In the Hexateuch (JE = Num. xxv. 1-5, P = Num. xxv. 6-18, xxxi. 8-16, Josh. xiii. 22) Balaam is represented as a magician who prompts the Moabite women to seduce the Israelites into foreign worship and its attendant sensualism; but in the subsequent Jewish Midrash (followed here) his advice is given to Balak (Joseph. *Ant.* iv. 6, 6; *cf.* iv. 6, 11 for Zimri, and Philo's *Vit. Mos.* i. 48-55), and the sorcerer comes to be regarded as the prototype of all corrupt teachers and magicians (for this sombre reputation, see *E.J.* ii. 467), as of this party at Pergamos who held—to John's indignation—that it was legitimate for a Christian to buy food in the open market, which had already been consecrated to an idol. This problem, which had occurred years before in a sharp form at Corinth, was certain to cause embarrassment and trouble in a city like Pergamos, or indeed in any pagan town, where entertainments had a tendency towards obscenity. It is a curious instance of how at certain periods a scruple may assume the rank of a principle, and of how the ethical inexpediency of some practices lies in their associations rather than in their essential elements. Such questions of religious conscience in the East were frequently connected with food; for the association of the latter with sexual vice, see the notes on Acts xv. 20 (also 1 Cor. x. 4, 8, in its context). The literal sense is preferable, although the usage of the Apocalypse makes the metaphorical sense of πορν. possible, as a general description of pagan religions viewed under the aspect of unfaithfulness to the true God (*cf.* John viii. 41, Philo *de migr. Abr.* § 12). For the connexion between certain forms of popular religion in Phrygia and prostitution, see *C.B.P.*, i. 94 f. Such burning questions arose from the nature of the early Christian society, which never aspired to form a *ghetto*, and consequently, in a pagan township, had to face many nice problems with regard to the prudence and limits of conformity or the need of nonconformity (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 16, 17). In social and trading pursuits the individual Christian met and mingled with fellow-citizens outside his own religious circle, and these relationships started serious points of ethical principle (Dobschütz, 26 f., 188 f.). The line was drawn, but not always at the same place; and naturally laxity lay on the borders of enlightenment.

Ver. 15. οὕτως κ.τ.λ. Are the N. put parallel to, or identified with, the Balaamites? The latter becomes more probable when the symbolical sense of N. and B. (see above, on ver. 6, and Kalisch's *Bible Studies*, i. 23) is adopted. In this event a single class of errorists is in view; they are instigating and seducing the local Christians much as Balaam managed (by means of Balak, in rabbinic tradition, *cf.* the slight play on βαλεῖν) to get the Israelites enticed to ruin (*Sanh.* 105 a). Josephus explains that Balaam showed Balak how to win a victory over the Israelites (νίκην τινὰ . . . κατ' αὐτῶν κερδᾶναι) by enticing them to lust, and such a symbolic allusion is quite in the manner of the Apocalypse. The Nikolaitans, who probably resembled Cerinthus or Carpokrates in their tenets, are no better than a Balaam. And the Jewish dictum was (*Sanh.* 106 b) that whenever one discovered anything bad in Balaam's life, one should preach about it.

Ver. 16. The church as a whole must repent of her too tolerant attitude to these errorists, but the threatened visitation is directed against the errorists themselves in the shape of some physical malady or mortal sickness, according to the current belief in early Christianity

[s] πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ στόματός μου. 17. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· Τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ [t] μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου, καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ ψῆφον

s xii. 7, xiii. 4, xvii. 14 (Hebraism = עם־נלחם); *cf.* Isa. lxiii. 10.   t Sib. vii. 149, John vi. 31-32; partit. gen.

(*cf.* on 1 Cor. v. 4-5, 13, xi. 30, Everling: *die paul. Angelologie*, etc., 20 f.). Grotius refers the threat to the prophetic order ("prophetas suscitabo in ecclesia"). But the ethnic conscience generally regarded pestilence or any physical calamity as a punishment inflicted by the god for some offence against his ritual or some breach of morals. In the Hexateuch, the sword opposes (Num. xxii. 23, 31) and finally slays (xxxi. 8) Balaam. The run of thought in the verse is that if the church does not repent, *i.e.*, if she does not act on her own initiative and expel the wrongdoers (in the hope of them ultimately coming to a better mind, 1 Cor. v. 4, 5), she must submit to having them cut out of her, and thus being irretrievably lost by death. The church is responsible for her erring members, and the exercise of discipline is viewed as a duty to them as well as to herself and God. Weak laxity is false kindness, the prophet implies; it merely exposes offenders to an alternative far more dreadful than discipline itself. The sword, Vict. remarks on i. 16, is used to punish deserters as well as to win victory for the faithful. For instrumental ἐν in the pre-Christian vernacular, see *Tebtunis Papyri* vol. i. (p. 86) ἐν μαχαίρῃ-αις.

Ver. 17. The reward for those who deny themselves pagan pleasures in this world is (as in ver. 26) participation in the privileges (*Pereq Meir* 5), reserved for God's people in the latter days (here = a victor's banquet, Gen. xiv. 18), not as hitherto (7, 11) simply participation in eternal life. The imagery is again rabbinic (2 Macc. ii. 4-6, Apoc. Bar. vi. 7-9). Previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, Isaiah or the prophet Jeremiah was supposed to have hidden the ark of the covenant (*cf.* on xi. 19) with its sacred contents, including the pot of manna. At the appearance of the messiah, this was to be once more disclosed (*cf.* Mechilta on Exod. xvi. 25, etc.). It is significant how the writer as usual claims for his messiah, Jesus, the cherished privileges and rights to which contemporary Judaism clung as its monopoly, and further how he assumes that all the past glories of O.T. religion upon earth—as well as all the coming bliss, which in one sense meant the transcendent restoration of these glories—were secured in heaven for the followers of Jesus alone (vii. 17, xxi. 2, etc.). See Apoc. Bar. xxix. 8, where "the treasury of manna will again descend from on high," at the messianic period, that the saints may eat of it; the Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, follows Philo (*quis rer. div.* 39, *leg. allegor.* iii. 59, 61, etc.) in using manna as a type of the soul's nourishment in the present age. There does not seem to be any allusion to the rabbinical legend underlying Sap. xvi. 20.—The strange association of manna and white stones, though possibly a reminiscence of the rabbinic notion preserved in Joma 8 (cadebant Israelitis una cum manna lapides pretiosi), cannot be explained apart from the popular superstitions regarding amulets which colour the metaphor. White stones represented variously to the ancient mind acquittal, admission to a feast (tessera hospitalis), good fortune, and the like. But the point here is their connexion with the new name. This alludes to the mysterious power attached in the ancient mind to amulets, stones (*cf.* *E.J.* i. 546-550, where vignettes are given; also Dieterich's *Mithras-Liturgie*, 31 f.) marked with secret and divine names (Jeremias, 79-80, Pfleid. *Early Christ. Conc. of Christ*, 112 f.), the possession of which was supposed to enable the bearer to pass closed gates, foil evil spirits, and enter the presence of the deity. If the new name (*cf.* Heitmüller's *Im Namen Jesu*, 128 f.), is thus regarded as that of Jesus—the irresistible, invincible name above every name—the promise then offers safe entrance through all perils into the inner bliss and feast of God; the true Christian has a charmed life. But when the new name is taken to apply to the individual, as seems more likely here, another line of interpretation is required, and the origin of the phrase (though tinged still with this amulet-conception of a stone, the more potent as it was hidden somewhere on the person, *cf.* Prov. xvii. 8, etc.), is best approached from a passage like Epict. i. 19, where the philosopher is trying to dissuade a man from undertaking the duties of priesthood in the Imperial cultus at Nikopolis. What good will it do him

λευκήν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα [u] καινὸν γεγραμμένον, ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων.

"18. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν [v] Θυατείροις[1] ἐκκλησίας γράψον,

u Isa. lxii. 2, lxv. 15.
v Cf. on Acts xvi. 14.

[1] On the variant **τω** (Lach., WH, Sw.) for **της**, *cf.* ii. 1, 8. The singular form, **Θυατειρη** (Q, vg., etc.), is less well supported; similar collocations of singular (i. 11) and plural are not uncommon (*E. Bi.*, 4538*b*, 5064*b*).

after death, to have his name used to mark his year of office in public documents? "My name will remain," replies the man. "Write it on a stone and it will remain," is the retort of Epictetus—plainly a colloquial expression for permanence. This would fit in with the Apocalyptic saying excellently (see Schol. on Pind. *Olymp.* vii. 159). Still more apposite, however, is an ancient ceremony of initiation (as among the aborigines of New South Wales: Trumbull, *Blood-Covenant*, 1887, pp. 335-337), by which each person, on the close of his novitiate, received a new name from the tribe and at the same time a white stone or quartz crystal. The latter was considered to be a divine gift, and was held specially sacred, never to be surrendered or even shown. These boons formed part of the religious covenant which marked the entrance of a man into the closest relation with the deity of his tribe and also into the full enjoyment of manhood's privileges. Hence, if we suppose some such popular rite behind the language here, the idea is apt: the victor's reward is the enjoyment of mature and intimate life with his God (so Victor.). For the symbolism of a name as evidence of personal identity (and inferentially of a new name as proof of a renovated, enduring nature), see *E.B.D.* 75: "May my name be given to me in the Great House, and may I remember my name in the House of Fire. . . . If any god whatsoever should advance to me, let me be able to proclaim his name forthwith" (the latter clause illustrating Apoc. iii. 12). The significance attached by the Egyptian religion especially to the *ren* or name was due to the belief that its loss meant the extinction of a man's existence. The idea in the prophet's mind is little more than that developed, *e.g.*, in Mrs. Browning's sonnet, "Comfort": "Speak low to me, my Saviour, low and sweet, From out the hallelujahs sweet and low, Lest I should fear and fall, and miss Thee," etc. As the succeeding chapters are full of the state and splendour of heaven, with royal majesty predominating, the prophet finds place here for the more intimate and individual aspect of the future life, depicting God in touch with the single soul (*cf.* xiv. 1). In addition to this, he conveys the idea that outside the Christian experience no one can really know what God is or what He gives; the redeemed and victorious alone can understand what it means to belong to God and to be rewarded by him.—Wünsch has recently pointed out (*Excav. in Palestine*, 1898-1900, p. 186) that, as in Egypt the sacred paper (**χάρτης ἱερατικός**) was used for solemn appeals to the gods (*Brit. Mus. Papyri*, xlvi. 308), "in like manner, doubtless, in Palestine, limestone had some superstitious significance, but of what special kind we do not know. Perhaps it is in this connexion that in Apoc. ii. 17 "he that overcometh" is to receive "a white stone" inscribed with a "new" spell, evidently as an "amulet". There may also be a further local allusion to the **ψῆφοι** and names which were supposed to be received by votaries of Asclepius as they lay in a trance or dream (Aristides, i. 352, 520). For the initiation-custom, *cf.* Spence and Gillen's *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, pp. 139-140, where the secret, individual name is described as given only to those who are "capable of self-restraint" and above levity of conduct. Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* i. 23) preserves a Jewish tradition that Moses got three names—Joachim, Moses, and Melchi (*i.e.*, king), the last-mentioned **ἐν οὐρανῷ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, ὡς φασὶν οἱ μύσται.**

Vv. 18-29. The longest message of the seven is to a church in the least important of the cities (judged from the historical standpoint) Thyatira, a township of Northern Lydia, the holy city of Apollo Tyrimnaios, adjacent to the high road between Perg. and Sardis. It soon became a centre of Montanism.

Ver. 18. **χαλκολιβ.** Some local allusion to the bronze-work for which Thyatira was famous. *Son of God* (*cf.* Kattenbusch ii. 563 f.) is practically an equivalent for messiah (Luke iv. 41), or for the superhuman personality of Jesus as divinely commissioned (*cf.* Grill,

Τάδε λέγει [w] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς [x] φλὸξ[1] πυρός, καὶ [y] οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ· 19. Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν [z] ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν διακονίαν καὶ τὴν [a] ὑπομονήν σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου τὰ ἔσχατα [b] πλείονα τῶν πρώτων. 20. Ἀλλ' ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι ἀφεῖς τὴν γυναῖκα[2] [c] Ἰεζάβελ, ἡ λέγουσα [d] ἑαυτὴν προφῆτιν, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς [e] ἐμοὺς

w Like vv. 26-27, from Ps. ii. 7-9; only here in Apoc. In inscript. = *divi filius*, of Augustus (Deissm. 166-167; *Inscript. Maris Ægei*, iii. 174, etc.). x i. 14, *cf.* ἐραυν. ver. 23. y i. 15, *cf.* ὡς . . . συντ. ver. 27. z ii. 4. a ii. 2. b Contrast ii. 4-5, Matt. xii. 45, 2 Pet. ii. 20, *cf.* Ruth iii. 10. c From 2 Kings ix. 22, *cf. Sams. Agon.* 1034-1045. d Constr. i. 5. e Possess. pron. only here in Apoc.

[1] For **φλογα** (ACQP, etc., Lach., Al., WH, Ws., Sw.) read the harder **φλοξ** (א 12, am., fuld., Pr., Ti., Bs., Bj., sc. **εστιν**).

[2] The well-attested **σου** after **γυναικα** (AQ, min., Syr., Areth., Pr., etc., so Grot., Al., Zahn, and J. Weiss) may have arisen from the repeated **σου** previously, or from 1 Kings xix.-xx. But any such allusion to the wife of the local bishop is untenable, and to retain it as = "thy woman" (Ramsay, *Seven Letters*, 341) is harsh in the extreme. It is to be omitted with אCP, min., g., vg., Me., Arm., Aeth., Tert.

pp. 76-77) to carry out God's purpose for his people (*cf.* John x. 36). But the expression has pagan as well as Jewish colouring; and there is undoubtedly an apologetic allusion to the similar terminology of the Imperial cultus (*cf.* Introd. § 6).

Ver. 19. Instead of being retrograde like Ephesus, Thyatira has steadily progressed in *the works* of Christianity. The sole flaw noted (see Ramsay's discussions in *D. B.* iv. 758 f., *Seven Letters*, 338 f.) is an undue laxity shown to certain members (not, as at Pergamos, a mere minority) who, under the sway (*cf.* Zahn, § 73, n. 7) of an influential woman, refused to separate themselves from the (**ἐργασίαι**) local guilds where moral interests, though not ostensibly defied, were often seriously compromised. The prophet takes up a puritan attitude, corroborated by that of the leading church of the district (ii. 6); he demands in the name of Christ that such inconsistent members should withdraw—a severe and costly step to take, amid the social ties and interests of an Asiatic city, where social clubs were a recognised feature of civic life and appealed forcibly to several natural instincts, especially when backed by the approval of an oracular and impressive leader in the local church.

Ver. 20. Women (*cf.* Acts xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 5, and the later Ammia in Philadelphia: Eus. *H. E.* v. 17. 2) occasionally prophesied in the early church, and false prophetesses were as likely to exist as false prophets. This "Jezebel of a woman, alleging herself to be a prophetess," seems to have been some influential female (as the definite imagery of vv. 21-23 indicates); her lax principles or tendencies made for a connexion with foreign and compromising associations which evidently exerted a dangerous charm upon some weaker Christians in the city. The moral issue corresponds to that produced by the Nikolaitan party at Pergamos (**εἰδ. φαγεῖν, πορνεῦσαι**), but the serious nature of the heresy at Thyatira appears from the fact that it was not simply propagated within the church but also notorious (ver. 23) and long-continued (**τέκνα**), thanks to obstinacy among the Ahabs and adherents of this prominent woman (ver. 21). They prided themselves on their enlightened liberalism (ver. 24). The definiteness of her personality, the fact of her situation within a Christian church which had jurisdiction over her, and the association of her practices with those of the Nikolaitans, who were members of the church, render it impossible to identify this libertine influence of J. with a foreign institution such as the famous shrine of the Chaldean Sibyl at Thyatira (Schürer: *Theol. Abhandlungen*, pp. 39 f., a theory suggested by Blakesley, in Smith's *DB*), or with the wife of the local Asiarch (Selwyn, 123). Besides it was not the cults but the trade-guilds that formed the problem at Thyatira. Jastrow points out (p. 267) that for some occult reason female sorcerers were preferred to men among the Babylonians; "the witch appears more frequently than the male sorcerer". Hillel (Pirke Aboth, ii. 8; see Dr. C. Taylor's note) had already de-

[f] δούλους πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθυτα. 21. Καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῇ χρόνον ἵνα μετανοήσῃ, [g] καὶ οὐ θέλει μετανοῆσαι ἐκ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς. 22. ἰδοὺ βάλλω αὐτὴν εἰς [h] κλίνην, καὶ τοὺς [i] μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς θλῖψιν μεγάλην, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσουσιν ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς, 23. καὶ τὰ [k] τέκνα αὐτῆς ἀποκτενῶ ἐν [l] θανάτῳ· καὶ γνώσονται πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι [m] ὁ ἐραυνῶν[1] [n] νεφροὺς

f vii. 3, xix. 2, 5, xxii. 3, 6 = Christians in general.
g ii. 22, ix. 20 f., xvi. 11, *cf.* Sap. xi. 23—xii. 2.
h See Jud. ix. 2-3.
i Mal. iii. 5, *cf.* Isa. lvii. 3.
k 2 Kings x. 7, Sir. xxiii. 24-25, En. x. 9.
l Jer. xiv. 12, xxi. 7, Ezek. xxxiii. 27, Ps. Sol. vii. 4, etc.; LXX (θ. = דבר).
m Clem. Rom. xxi.
n ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.

[1] For ερευνων (אQP, etc., Al. Bs.) read (with AC, etc., edd.) the Egyptian (Thumb, pp. 176-177; Helbing, 7) form εραυνων.

clared, "more women, more witchcraft". For the connexion of women and sorcery *cf.* Blau's *Altjüd. Zauberwesen* 18 f., 23 f. —ἡ λέγουσα κ.τ.λ., an irregular nomin. absolute, characteristic of the writer. This LXX peculiarity of a detached participle thrown into relief, which is not confined to the Apocalypse (*cf.* Phil. iii. 16-19, etc.), renders the participle almost a relative (Vit. I., 202); but indeed any word or group of words, thus singled out as characteristic of some preceding noun, tends to become independent and to take its own construction (II. 8f). See Zeph. i. 12 (LXX).

Ver. 21. The immorality was flagrant; more flagrant still was the obstinate persistence in it, despite admonitions and forbearance (*cf.* Eccles. viii. 11; Bar. Ap. xxi. 20; 2 Peter iii. 9). This allusion to an abuse of God's patience and to a warning given already (hardly in some writing like Jud. 2 Peter, Spitta) is left quite indefinite; it was probably familiar enough to the first readers of the book. Interests and old associations had proved hitherto too strong for this prophetic counsel to be followed. Membership of a trade-guild, although it necessarily involved the recognition of some pagan deity and often led to orgies, "was a most important matter for every tradesman or artisan; it aided his business, and brought, him many advantages socially" (Ramsay).

Ver. 22. κλίνην (bed, not a couch of revelry) aegritudinis non amoris; disease or sickness (*cf.* for the phrase, 1 Macc. i. 5) the punishment of error, especially of error accompanied by licentiousness. The inscriptions from Asia Minor abound with instances of the popular belief that impurity, moral and even physical, was punished by disease or disaster to oneself, one's property, one's children. Sickness might even go the length of death (1 Cor. xi. 29-30). The prophet, however, seems to avoid calling Jesus or God σωτὴρ or σώζων, a term appropriated by the popular religions of Phrygia and lavished on many deities as healers and helpers (*C. B. P.* i. 262 f.). —μοιχ., men and women who imitate her licentiousness. θλ., physical distress, illness.—μετανοήσουσιν, the fut. indic., expresses rather more probability than subj. with ἐὰν μή (*cf.* Blass, § 65, 5). For tense of βάλλω see Zech. viii. 7, LXX, etc.

Ver. 23. τέκνα, literally, perhaps with an indirect allusion to the killing of Ahab's seventy sons. ἀποκτ. θ. (Hebraism), "I will utterly slay"; see on vi. 8. If any particular form of death is meant, it may be pestilence (the inscriptions often mention fever), which represented to an Oriental mind the punishment of God on man's unfaithfulness. The curious difference between the treatment of the μοιχ. and the τέκνα is due to the fact that (*cf.* Dan. vi. 24), a parent's sin was visited upon his family, both in Jewish and in contemporary pagan belief (*cf.* the Phrygian inscription, cited by Mayor on Jas. v. 12, κατηράμενος ἤτω αὐτὸς καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ). Yet even when both classes are allegorised into active coadjutors and deluded victims, the relative punishment looks unequal. John, unlike Ezekiel (xiii. 17-23), holds that the victims of the false prophetess are willing and responsible for their position.—πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλ., the judgment was to be as notorious as evidently the scandal had been. The idea recalls one of Ezekiel's favourite conceptions.—ἐγώ κ.τ.λ. "I know the abysses," and "discerner of hearts and searcher of the reins" were old Egyptian titles for divine beings. This intimate knowledge of man (*cf.* 16 c) pierces below superficial appear-

καὶ [o] καρδίας· καὶ [p] δώσω ὑμῖν ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ὑμῶν. 24. Ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις, ὅσοι οὐκ ἔχουσι τὴν διδαχὴν ταύτην, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ [q] βαθέα τοῦ Σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν, [r] Οὐ βάλλω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἄλλο βάρος· 25. πλὴν ὃ ἔχετε

o Ps. vii. 9, xxvi. 2, etc.
p Ps. lxii. 13, *cf.* Apoc. xx. 12, xxii. 12, 2 Clem. xviii. 4, etc. Fresh clause, indep. of ὅτι, begins here.
q 1 Cor. ii. 10.
r *Cf.* 1 John v. 3.

ances, *e.g.*, connexion with the church, prophetic zeal, and plausible excuses. As in Jer. xvii. 10, xx. 12 (*cf.* Ps. Sol. viii. 8), the divine acquaintance with man's real, secret life forms the basis of unerring and impartial judgment; while, as in Jer. iv. 16, 17 (*cf.* Acts iv. 1 f., 1 Tim. i. 20, 1 Cor. v. 4, etc.) the prophetic denunciation or imprecation has a direct effect upon the person denounced (*cf.* von Dobschütz, 270 f.). The former would be a fairly novel idea to most of those accustomed to the Roman *religio*, which was "one of observance, sacrifice, and outward act, that in no way searched the heart of the worshipper—a system of rules which covered the circumstances of Roman life" (H. O. Taylor, *Ancient Ideals*, i. 417, 418).

Ver. 24. To know "the depths" of the divine being and counsel was a characteristic claim of the Ophites and the later Gnostics; *cf.* Iren. *adv. Haer.* ii. 22, 1 (qui profunda bythi adinuenisse se dicunt; *cf.* 3), and Tertullian's sarcastic description (*adv. Valent.* 1), "Eleusinia Ualentiniana fecerunt lenocinia, sancta silentio magno, sola taciturnitate coelestia. Si bona fide quaeris, concreto uultu, suspenso supercilio *Altum est* aiunt." "The depth of knowledge" was a phrase of Herakleitus, the famous Ephesian philosopher, and in the creed of the Dukhobortsui, a sect in modern Russia, the Holy Spirit is Depth, the Father being Height and the Son Breadth. Since ὡς λέγουσιν refers to the errorists themselves, the quoted phrase about "knowing the depths of Satan" may (i.) contain an indignant and sarcastic retort; "depths of —Satan," not "God," as they boast (τοῦ σ. being substituted for τοῦ θεοῦ); such teaching and principles are simply infernal. Or (ii.) as is more probable the words may voice the actual claim of the errorists, who considered that some accommodation to pagan practices gave them a necessary acquaintance with the meaning of evil (so *e.g.*, Spitta, Pfleiderer, Zahn, Jülicher, Bousset). Their higher standing gave them immunity from any risks. They could fathom securely what the immature orthodox called immorality. Devil-study, or even devil-worship (xiii. 4 is quite different) was not uncommon in some of the Gnostic sects throughout Asia Minor, *e.g.*, the Cainites, the Naassenes, and the Ophites (the earliest Gnostics, φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γινώσκειν, Hipp. *adv. Haer.* v. 6). The idea was that as the principle of evil would ultimately be redeemed, it might be used meantime for the advantage of the initiated. Compare Mansel's *Gnostic Heresies*, pp. 73, 96, 105. In En. lxv. 6 the unrighteous are punished for their acquaintance with "all the secrets of the angels and all the violence of the Satans and all their hidden power and all the power of those that practise sorcery, and the power of witchcraft." The influence of a movement like Gnosticism, whose motto was *eritis sicut deus scientes bonum et malum*, gave wide opportunities to immorality, in its more popular applications. It produced the same sort of union between subtlety and sensualism which can sometimes be traced within Hinduism. In contrast to this unwholesome temper of speculation, the prophet substitutes for speculative flights the obedience of the normal Christian praxis (*cf. Parad. Lost*, viii. 170-197, xii. 561-589), with a plain allusion to the Jerusalem concordat of the early church which is recommended tacitly as a safe, wise rule of conduct. In the case of the βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ, ignorance is bliss. John is totally unsympathetic to the local liberals. He does not combat the theoretical principles at the root of their movement. Like the prophets who wrote Jude and 2 Peter, he attacks instead of arguing, quite content to judge it by its moral fruits of libertinism. He bitterly declares that such occasional results are the deliberate object of the party. The strange collocation of this error with the habit of partaking of sacrificial food is probably due to the prophet's stern conviction that the latter, with its friendly and liberal attitude to pagan customs, fostered the former, in the case of people who took an ultra-spiritual view of Paul's principle of Christian freedom.

κρατήσατε, [s] ἄχρι οὗ ἂν ἥξω. 26. Καὶ ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ [t] τηρῶν ἄχρι τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, δώσω [u] αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν. 27. καὶ ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν [v] ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, ὡς τὰ σκεύη τὰ κεραμικὰ [w] συντρίβεται, [x] ὡς κἀγὼ εἴληφα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου· 28. [y] καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστέρα τὸν πρωϊνόν. 29. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

"III. 1. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐκκλησίας γράψον,

s "Till such time as I come" (eschat., as iii. 11): ἥξω aor. subj. from ἧξα.
t i. 3, suggested by κρατ. 25.
u Resuming nom. absol.
v *Cf.* Mic. v. 5, Isa. x. 24-26.
w xii. 5, xix. 15, *cf.* Bar. iv. 25.
x *Cf.* John xiv. 6 f., etc.
y Double promise here only (exc. iii. 12 ?).

Ver. 26. Triumph here consists in unflagging attention to the duties of a Christian vocation. The ἔργα are (xiv. 12, xix. 8) the normal activities of this calling, viewed as the outcome of a personal relation to Jesus; they are "his," as commanded by him and executed in his strength. The general idea of this and the following verse is that the only irresistible force is the force of a life which is able to resist seduction and compromise, because it holds to faith and purity. The promise of reward, preceding (as in iii. 5, 12, 21) the appeal for attention, is couched in terms of messianic conquest (from Ps. ii. 8, 9). In a more or less figurative form, the rule of the saints, a cherished hope of Jewish eschatology, had its own attraction for some circles of early Christianity (see on v. 10 and 1 Cor. vi. 3; and for ῥάβδῳ, the well-known flail wielded by Horus, the Egyptian god of requital or warfare): evidently it appealed to their eagerness for a righting of present wrongs and a reversal of the immoral sway of captain ill over captive good. The ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν (by which they are not governed but shivered in irreparable ruin; *cf.* Isa. xxx. 14, Jer. xix. 11) is defined with ferocious detail in 27; the whole description is modelled on a traditionally messianic application of (LXX) Ps. ii. 8, 9. For the shepherd's staff as a royal sceptre see *E. Bi.* 4317. ὡς κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ., God, Christ, and the individual Christian as in iii. 21 (John xvii. 16-22). "Illud ὡς aliquam similitudinem, non paritatem significat" (Rosenmüller). John xxi. 15-17 is not "a deliberate correction of this terrible sentence" (Selwyn, 195), but the mature expression of Christian solicitude in a different province, from which messianic incongruities have been wholly purged.

Ver. 28. To "grant the morning-star" (a characteristically loose usage of δίδωμι) means, not to invest him with its glory, nor to give him possession of Christ himself, but (so Bleek, after Victor.) to make the dawn of salvation or of life eternal shine on him after his dark afflictions. The victor shares in the divine life (with its punitive government) and honour above, or rather in the new messianic era of Jesus himself (see note on xxii. 16, where by a further application the metaphor is directly connected with Jesus). Staunch adherence to the truth on the part of leaders and confessors is similarly rewarded in Dan. xii. 3, En. civ. ii. Semitic folklore found some mystic connexion between the countless brilliant stars in heaven and the departed faithful, who became immortal (4 Esd. vii. [97]), and the sense here might be that the loyal Christian was sure of shining like a star in immortality; *cf.* Ign. *ad Rom.* ii. 2, καλὸν τὸ δῦναι ἀπὸ κόσμου πρὸς Θεὸν, ἵνα εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνατείλω (and passage cited on i. 10). But xxii. 16 (*cf.* Job iii. 9) tells against this, as does Ign. *ibid.* vi. 2 (speaking of his martyrdom) ἄφετέ με καθαρὸν φῶς λαβεῖν· ἐκεῖ παραγενόμενος ἄνθρωπος ἔσομαι. The collocation of the morning star and the judicial authority over the nations may have been suggested to the prophet's mind (*cf.* 14, 20) by the prophecy, read in a messianic sense, of Num. xxiv. 17. The sequence and the Christian spirit of the whole promise are certainly improved if we omit 27 *a* with Selwyn (194) and Jacoby (*Neutest. Ethik*, 1899, p. 446) and Wellhausen (with 23-28 *a*), since the doubled promise and the later use of the metaphor do not justify any suspicion of 28 as a gloss (so Könnecke, p. 34). But it is as likely that the author himself (*cf.* xvii. 14) added this co-operation with the vindictive messiah (*cf.* xii. 5, xix. 15), as that an early copyist was responsible for the insertion.

Chapter III.—Vv. 1-6. The message to Sardis. The title of the speaker (drawn from i. 4, 16, 20), as general as

Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀστέρας· Οἶδα σοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι [a] ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῇς, καὶ [b] νεκρὸς εἶ. 2. Γίνου [c] γρηγορῶν, καὶ [d] στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ ἔμελλον ἀποθανεῖν· οὐ γὰρ εὕρηκά σου ἔργα [1] πεπληρωμένα ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ μου. 3. [e] μνημόνευε οὖν πῶς [f] εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας, καὶ τήρει καὶ μετανόησον. ἐὰν οὖν μὴ γρηγορήσῃς, [g] ἥξω ὡς [h] κλέπτης, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῷς [2] [i] ποίαν ὥραν ἥξω ἐπὶ σέ. 4. Ἀλλὰ ἔχεις ὀλίγα

a Herod. vii. 138 οὔνομα εἶχε, ὡς ἐπ' Ἀθήνας ἐλαύνει, Plato *Hipp. Maj.* 281c.
b Jas. ii. 17, 1 Tim. v. 6: Philo, *de profug.* § 10.
c Eph. v. 14.
d Ezek. xxxiv. 4, 16 (Helbing 85).
e See Gal. iii. 2 f., Heb. x. 32 f.
f John iii. 11, 33, xiv. 17, xvii. 8.
g ii. 5, 16.
h Jer. xlix. 9, Matt. xxiv. 43 = Lk. xii. 39, see on 1 Thess. v. 2.
i Temporal acc. as xi. 2, 6, 9, xii. 6.

[1] **τα** bef. **εργα** is om. by Lach., WH, Ws., Sw. (AC, 1 mg.).
[2] For **γνως** (ACP, 1, etc., Areth., Al., Ws., Bs., Sw., Bj.) Lach. Ti. Tr. WH (marg.) read the correct **γνωση** with ℵQ, vg., Aeth., Syr., Andc, Pr.,

in the similar letter to Ephesus, has no special bearing on the subsequent address, unless an antithesis be implied between the plenitude of the divine spirit and the deadness of a church which had the name or credit of being "alive". The sweeping verdict of ver. 1 upon the formalism of the local church—which had lapsed from its pristine vitality, just as the township of S. had by this time declined from its old historical prestige—is modified by the recognition of better elements not yet too far gone in decay to be recovered (2) and of a goodly nucleus of members. The metaphor is paralleled by a Jewish estimate of orthodoxy (Kidd. 71 *b*) which dubbed Mesene as "dead," Media as "ill," Elymais as "in extremis," and the strict inhabitants of the Ghetto between the Tigris and the Euphrates as "healthy".

Ver. 2. **ἔμελλον**, epistol. impf.—**σου ἔργα**, "any works of thine". Judged from the Divine standpoint (**ἐνωπ. θ.**), no matter how satisfactory is the verdict of outsiders upon her or of her own complacency, her condition is decadent.

Ver. 3. Memory again the lever for repentance (as at ii. 5); **εἴληφας** aoristic pf. (*cf.* v. 7, Burton 88) rather than pf. of existing result (Weiss, Bs.); **πῶς** = our colloquial "how" (practically equivalent to "that"). The melancholy feature about contemporary indifference at S. was that it had a fine beginning behind it: yet this very circumstance afforded hopeful ground for an appeal. **καὶ τήρει** (the primitive deposit of the faith) **καὶ** (to secure this steadfast adherence) **μετανόησον** (aor., sharp and decisive act of repentance). As ver. 4 (compared with ver. 2) implies, positive stains were visible in the local church no less than sins of mere omission. Sardis and Laodicea, which apparently were the only members of this group untroubled by outside persecution or inward error, were the least satisfactory of all the seven. **ἐὰν οὖν μὴ γρηγορήσῃς**, although the need is so desperate (*cf.* below on xvi. 15). The sudden and signal visitation of punishment threatened in the following words (for **ὥραν** in acc. *cf.* Moult. i. 63, Abbott's *Diat.* 2013) is left vaguely impressive. It may be that (as in Jude 4, 18, and 2 Peter) local libertinism meant a slackening of belief in the second Advent.

Ver. 4. **ὀλ. ὀν.** "quasi paucos nominatos, *i.e.*, bonos qui nominatione digni sunt" (*cf.* the use of **πρόσωπα** = persons or individuals, in Clem. Rom. and Ignat.). **ἐμόλ.** (*cf. Fragment of Uncanonical Gospel, Oxyrhyn.* 2 cent. A.D., line 16 **μεμολυμμένος ἐπάτησας, κ.τ.λ.**) the sullied garment an emblem of moral stains, including but not identical with that of **πορνεύειν** (xiv. 4, *cf.* Sir. xxii. 1, 2). The language reflects that of the votive inscriptions in Asia Minor, where soiled clothes disqualified the worshipper and dishonoured the god. Moral purity qualifies for spiritual communion (note the dramatic contrast of this **ἄξιοι** [*cf.* on ii. 16] with that of xvi. 6); the apocalyptic beatitude is: blessed are the pure in life, for they shall join God (see on xiv. 14, xix. 8). Note here only in the seven messages an eschatological promise unintroduced by the phrase **ὁ νικῶν**, although ver. 5 really repeats the same idea. **οὕτως** = "as being victor" (*i.e.*, accordingly). The idea of heavenly raiment is distinctively Persian (Brandt, 575, 580; Lüken, 122), but permeates Jewish eschatology from Enoch

[k] ὀνόματα ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἃ οὐκ [l] ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν· καὶ περιπατήσουσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, [m] ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν. 5. Ὁ νικῶν οὕτως περιβαλεῖται ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς· καὶ οὐ μὴ [n] ἐξαλείψω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς [o] βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ [p] ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ [p] ἐνώπιον τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ. 6. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

"7. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Φιλαδελφίᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον,

k xi. 13, see on Acts i. 15, etc., En. lxx. 1.
l Jude 23 (Isa. lxiv. 6).
m *Cf.* Ignat., *Smyrn.* ix. 2; Herm. *Sim.* viii. 2.
n *Cf.* Jos. *Ant.* vi. 6, 1, xvii. 5, 2, etc. See Herm. *Vis.* I. 3, 2, *Sim.* ix. 24, 4, Clem. Rom. xlv. 8, etc.
o v. 1, xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 12, 15, xxi. 27, En. cviii. 2.
p Reminisc. of syn., Matt. xii. 32, Lk. xii. 8.

(lxii. 15, 16, the elect clothed after the resurrection in eternal "garments of glory") down to Slav. En. xxii. 8; 4 Esd. ii. 39, 45 (*cf.* Herm. *Sim.* viii. 2) and *Asc. Isa.* iv. 16 (garments = spiritual bodies in which the saints are vested at the last day, stored up in seventh heaven; *cf.* viii. 26, ix. 24 f., uidi stolas multas et thronos et coronas jacentes). **περιβαλεῖται κ.τ.λ.**, like Joshua (Zech. iii. 3 f.); or (as others suggest) like priests acquitted before the Sanhedrin, who were robed in white. In the Apoc., as in En. lxxxv.-xc., white is the colour of righteousness, associated with innocence (and joy? Eccles. ix. 8), just as black with evil. In Apoc. Pet. 5, the dwellers in Paradise are clothed in **ἔνδυμα ἀγγέλων φωτινῶν**, whilst the angels who (ver. 6) chastise the wicked are robed in black. All such metaphors reflect the primitive notion that clothing somehow could form almost a part of a man's personality, corresponding to his identity and character (*E. Bi.* 1140, 1141), rather than the Roman custom of assuming a white *toga uirilis* to mark entrance upon manhood's privileges ("uitae liberioris iter," Ovid).—**τῆς βίβλου τῆς ζωῆς**, this favourite symbol of the Apocalypse which goes back even to pre-exilic Judaism (Isa. iv. 3, *cf.* Exod. xxxii. 32 f., etc.; for the Babylonian background, *cf.* Jeremias, 69 f.), had through the influence of Dan. (xii. 1) a great vogue in apocalyptic dreams as an apt image no longer of a share in the temporal felicity of God's reign but of personal salvation. For a name to be erased from the book of life (one's deeds not corresponding, upon scrutiny, to one's position; *cf.* xx. 12, Jub. xxxvi. 10) meant condemnation, or exclusion from the heavenly kingdom. To have one's name retained ("and never will I blot out," etc.) on the list of heavenly citizens was by this time a current metaphor for eternal fellowship with God and his people, and (by a natural inference drawn in xiii. 8) for predestination, the belief in which formed then as always a vivid inspiration in distress and conflict. For the erasure of names from the civic register, consequent upon their owner's condemnation, *cf.* Dio Chrys. xxxi. 336 *c*, **ὅταν δημοσίᾳ τινὰ δέῃ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἐπ' ἀδικήματι, πρότερον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐξαλείφεται**; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3, 51, and Arist. *Pac.* 1180. Also Dittenberger's *Sylloge inscript. Graec.*[2] 439[20] (iv. B.C.) **ὃς δ' ἂν δόξηι μὴ ὢν φράτηρ ἐσαχθῆναι, ἐξαλειψάτο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτô ὁ ἱερεύς**, and *Orientis Græci Inscr. Sel.* 218[129] (iii. B.C.) **ἐξαλείψαντας τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐκείνου.** The special comfort of this verse is intelligible when one reads the prayer offered in contemporary Jewish worship (*cf.* Shmone-Esreh xii. Palest. recension): "for apostates let there be no hope, may the kingdom of the haughty quickly collapse in our days, and may the Nazarenes and the Minim suddenly perish, may they be blotted out of the book of Life and not enrolled along with the righteous".

The message to Sardis, the most vehement of the seven, has some interesting resemblances to that addressed to Ephesus; *cf.* ii. 1 = iii. 1, ii. 5 (**μνημ.**) = iii. 3, ii. 5 (visitation) = iii. 5, ii. 6 = iii. 4. The hope described in ver. 5 is burlesqued by Lucian (*Peregr.* xl.) who describes his pseudo-Christian hero as seen after death **περιπατοῦντα ἐν λευκῇ ἐσθῆτι, φαιδρόν, κοτίνῳ τε ἐστεμμένον.** The metaphorical references to raiment gain point in view of the local trade in woollen goods and dyed stuffs.

Vv. 7-13. The message to Philadelphia.

Ver. 7. **ἐν Φ.** Less than twenty years later an equally favourable account of the local church was given by Ignatius (*ad Phil.* 3, 5, 10). **ἅγιος κ.τ.λ.**, Jesus is a messiah indeed, one deserving that honoured name and realising its meaning. The favourite Johannine term **ἀληθινός** (= "true," in the wider sense

Τάδε λέγει ὁ [q] ἅγιος ὁ ἀληθινός, ὁ ἔχων τὴν [r] κλεῖν τοῦ [s] Δαυείδ, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει καὶ κλείων καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀνοίγει· 8. [Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα·][1] ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ἐνώπιόν σου [t] θύραν [t] ἠνεῳγμένην, ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι [u] αὐτήν· ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, καὶ

q Only here = Christ (*cf.* Acts iii. 14, iv. 27, 30, John vi. 69, etc.), in Apoc. Hendiadys = ὁ ἀληθῶς ἅγιος (Grot.)? "Holy and true," of God vi. 10, *cf.* iv. 8. r i. 18. s On such orthographical forms in ει or ι, see Win. § 5, 13, 32, generally (§ 9, 7). t 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3. u Constr. vii. 2, 9, xiii. 8, 12, xx. 8, *cf.* xii. 6, 14, xvii. 9; redundant Heb. use, Win. § 22, 7.

[1] Pr. om. **οιδα σου τα εργα** (so Hauss. i. 211-212, breaking connection and harmonistic).

of "genuine," opposed to unreal rather than to untruthful, *cf.* Justin's *Dial.* cxvi., Athen. vi. 253 c: no pseudo-messiah, as local Jews asserted, *cf.* 8 *c* and 9) is here grouped with **ἅγιος** (*i.e.*, not merely = legitimately messianic as in John x. 36, Clem. Rom. xxiii. 5, but freed from creaturely weakness and imperfection, his nature in intimate touch with the divine fulness, Issel: *der Begriff der Heiligkeit im N.T.*, 1887, pp. 70, 110, *R.J.* 305), as in iii. 14, xix. 11, xxi. 5, xxii. 6 with **πιστός**, and in xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2 with **δίκαιος**. Slightly otherwise, Apoc. Bar. lxvii. 7: "He is true, so that he shall do you good and not evil," and below at xvi. 7 (though this sense might suit here also, as an amplification of **ἅγιος**). **κλεῖν κ.τ.λ.** (based on Isa. xxii. 22) the messiah, as Davidic scion, possesses the absolute power of admission to and exclusion from the divine realm. This part of the title (*cf.* Job xii. 14, **ἐὰν κλείσῃ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων τίς ἀνοίξει;**) alludes to what immediately follows as well as to the arrogant claim mentioned in ver. 9. Christ alone, the heavenly **κλειδοῦχος**, has the right to excommunicate. Compare Savonarola's brave reply to the bishop of Vasona who had pronounced his sentence of degradation (*separo te ab ecclesia militante atque triumphante*):—*Militante, non triumphante: hoc enim tuum non est.*

Ver. 8. **οἶδά . . . ἔργα**, as in the case of Smyrna implying unqualified approval. The reward of this steadfastness (8 *c*, 10) is threefold: (*a*) security in their relation to God (8 *b*), through the love of Christ for them (9); (*b*) ultimate triumph over their foes (9), and (*c*) deliverance in the final crisis (10). The open door, here as in Paul (for the ethnic use of the term on sepulchres *cf.* *C. B. P.*, ii. 395) is usually taken to denote facilities for preaching and advancing the faith among outsiders, in which case the sense would be that the extension of the gospel depends upon, as it forms a high reward of, open confession and a decided stand for Christ. But in view of a passage written by Ignatius to this very church (*ad Philad.* 3, where Christ himself is termed **θύρα τοῦ πατρὸς, δι' ἧς εἰσέρχονται** the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, **καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία**) and of Clem. Rom. xlviii. (where the gate of righteousness is described as open in Christ), the phrase is better connected with Christ himself, not with any good opening for Christian activity. He makes access to God through himself sure; despite trials and temptations (vv. 8, 9, 10) his church's standing is guaranteed by his authority (as in John x. 7, 9, Christ **ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων**). **θύρα** here is the open heart of God for man; in ver. 20, man's open heart for God. Jesus, then, equipped with the O.T. attributes of divine authority, assures the church how futile are such excommunications as the Jews were levelling against them. The latter have nothing to do with the conditions of the kingdom. Faith in Jesus constitutes a relation to God which cannot either be impaired or rivalled. Only, the perseverance of the saints is needed; an assured position with God depends not merely on Christ's will and power but on Christian loyalty as the coefficient of grace. The church at P. is not blamed for the slenderness of her equipment, which evidently is due to causes outside her control. She is praised for having made good use of the slight resources she possessed (*cf.* Mark xiv. 8). Otherwise, though less well, a full stop might be placed after **αὐτήν**, and **ὅτι . . . τὸ ὄνομά μου** taken as the reason for the promise **ἰδοὺ . . . σε**, just as in ver. 10 **ὅτι . . . μου** is followed by **κἀγὼ . . . γῆς.**—**αὐτήν**, pleonastic use of pron. after relative, a Semitic idiom with Greek affinities (Vit. ii. 138, Thumb 128, Blass § 50, 4) confined to Apoc. (exc. cit. fr. LXX,

ἐτήρησάς μου τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου. 9. ἰδοὺ [v] διδῶ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τοῦ [w] Σατανᾶ, τῶν λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται· ἰδοὺ [x] ποιήσω αὐτοὺς [x] ἵνα ἥξουσι καὶ [y] προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, καὶ γνῶσιν[1] ὅτι ἐγὼ [z] ἠγάπησά σε. 10. Ὅτι ἐτήρησας τὸν [a] λόγον

v Irreg. form, WH 174, Deissm. 192.
w ii. 9, = "hypocrites," Did. viii. 1.
x Constr. John iv. 35, v. 42, etc., ἵνα = infin. of conseq. as ix. 20, xiii. 13.
y Isa. xlix. 23, xlv. 14, lx. 14.
z John xi. 36, *cf.* Ps. lxii. 8, Zech. viii. 20 f., John xvii. 23. See on xxi. 9.
a i. 9, *cf.* Sir. ii. 14, Dan. xii. 3.

[1] For γνωσιν ACPQ, etc., Syr., Arm., Aeth., Andr., Areth. (edd.), the variant γνωση (ℵ, 14, Sah., Pr.) is preferred by Wellh. (*cf.* ii. 23 and Isa. xlix. 23).

Acts xv. 17) in N.T. In Enoch (xxxviii. 2, and *passim*) to deny the Lord of Spirits is the capital crime,',as opposed to "believing in his name .

Ver. 9. διδῶ ἐκ (partit. gen., the construction being dropped and resumed in a rather harsh anacolouthon, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.). The absence of ἐκ before λεγ. does not prevent it from being interpreted as in apposition to συναγωγῆς rather than as directly dependent on διδῶ. On the forms of δίδωμι in Apocalypse see Jannaris' *Hist. Gk. Gramm.* 996, 51; the wide usage of the verb is carried on through the LXX from the equally extended employment of the Hebrew equivalent in the later stages of O.T. literature. The Jewish synagogue is denounced as Satanic, owing to its persecuting habits (Satan being regarded as the final source of persecution as of error, *cf.* above ver. 8 and on ii. 9). Ignatius corroborates the malign activity of Jews at Philadelphia, who were in the habit of molesting the church (*ad Philad.* 6); he also refers them to the malicious cunning of Satan. Apparently Judaizing tendencies were rife among Christians of Gentile birth at Philadelphia. As in writing to Smyrna, the prophet therefore claimed the ancestral title "Jew" for the Christian church. Faith in Christ, not mere nationality, constituted true Judaism; the succession had passed to Christianity. The prominence assigned to this phase of polemic is characteristic of the period, though already presaged by Paul (in Rom. ix. 6-7, ii. 28, 29). The supercilious contempt of these churchmen for all Christian dissenters from Judaism was to be changed one day into humble respect. The former would find out their grievous mistake when it was too late. καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν, κ.τ.λ., in the spirit and realistic language of post-exilic Judaism (see reff.), denoting abject submission and homage before the glory of the church in the future messianic reign (slightly otherwise in 1 Cor. xiv. 25). What they fondly expected from the Gentiles, they were themselves to render to Christians—such would be the grim irony of providence. Compare with what follows, the earlier expectation of Jub. i. 25: "and they shall all be called children of the living God, and every angel and spirit will know, yea they will know that these are my children, and that I love them". καὶ γνῶσιν, κ.τ.λ., still Isaianic in colouring (from xliii. 4, xlix. 23). Christ's love to his church (ἠγ. = "I have loved") will be proved by her triumphant survival of perils. Her final position, when the conditions of earth are reversed, will throw light upon the divine affection which underlay her previous perseverance, and which meantime is a secret save to those who experience it. The promise of dominion over the Jews here corresponds to that of authority over the Gentiles in ii. 26, 27, except that the latter is definitely eschatological. The Jews tardily awaken to the privileges of the church as to the claims of Jesus (see on i. 7). Probably they scoffed at the claim of the Philadelphian Christians to be objects of the true God's love. The answer is that faith in Jesus means a revelation of Divine love (*the* revelation of it), apart from which no Christian life can be accounted for.

Ver. 10. The position of μου shows that it belongs not to τὸν λόγον τῆς ὑπομονῆς as a whole, but to ὑπομονῆς (2 Thess. iii. 5). The precise sense therefore is not "my word about patience" (*i.e.*, my counsel of patience as the supreme virtue of these latter days, so Weiss, Bousset, etc.), but "the word, or the preaching, of that patience which refers to me" (*i.e.*, the patient endurance with which, amid present trials, Christ is to be served; so Alford, Spitta, Holtzm.).

τῆς ὑπομονῆς μου, κἀγώ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ [b] πειρασμοῦ τῆς [b] μελλούσης ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης, πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 11. [c] ἔρχομαι ταχύ· [d] κράτει ὃ ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεὶς λάβῃ τὸν στέφανόν σου. 12. [e] Ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτὸν [f] στύλον ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ μου, [g] καὶ ἔξω οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ἔτι, καὶ

b Matt. xxiv. 21 f. *cf.* Apoc. vii. 3, ix. 4, Jer. xxx. 7 f.
c A comfort (xxii. 7, 20) not a threat (ii. 16), *cf.* xxii. 12.
d ii. 25, *cf.* 4 Macc. vi. 18-21, Heb. x. 36.
e Nom. pendens, as ii. 7. For constr., Win. § 22, 5*a*, Abbott, *Diat.* 1920.
f Gal. ii. 9 (see Lgft.'s note), Isa. xxii. 23, Jer. i. 18.
g Emphatic, as opposed to Isa. xxii. 25.

See Ps. xxxviii. (xxxix.), 8: **καὶ νῦν τίς ἡ ὑπομονή μου; οὐχὶ ὁ κύριος;** The second reason for praising the Philadelphian Christians is their loyal patience under persecution, as well as the loyal confession of Christ (ver. 8) which had possibly brought on that persecution. **κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ.** ("I in turn"; *cf.* similar connection in John xvii. 6-8), a reproduction of the saying preserved in Luke xxi. 36. The imminent period **τοῦ πειρασμοῦ** refers to the broken days which, in eschatological schemes, were to herald messiah's return. Later on, this period is specifically defined as a time of seduction to imperial worship (*cf.* xiii. 14-17, vii. 2, with Dan. xii. 1, LXX). The Philadelphian Christians will not only triumph over the contempt and intrigues of their Jewish foes but also over the wider pagan trial (which is also a temptation), inasmuch as their devotion, already manifested in face of Jewish malice, will serve to carry them through the storm of Roman persecution. The reward of loyalty is in fact fresh power to be loyal on a higher level: "the wages of going on, and ever to be". This seems better than to take the world-wide trial as the final attempt (viii. 13, xi. 10, etc.) to induce repentance in men or to punish them, from which the P. Christians (*cf.* vii. 1-8, and Ps. Sol. xiii. 4-10, xv. 6, 7) would be exempt; but it is impossible from the grammar and difficult from the sense, to decide whether **τηρεῖν ἐκ** means successful endurance (pregnant sense as in John xvii. 15) or absolute immunity (*cf.* 2 Peter ii. 9), safe emergence from the trial or escape from it entirely (thanks to the timely advent of Christ, ver. 11). Note the fine double sense of **τηρεῖν**: unsparing devotion is spared at least some forms of distress and disturbance. It is like Luther's paradox that when a man learns to say with Christ, "The cross, the cross," there is no cross. Rabbinic piety (*Sanh.* 98 *b*) expected exemption from the tribulation of the latter days only for those who were absorbed in good works and in sacred studies.

Ver. 11. "You have not long to wait and suffer now"; a fresh motive for tenacity of purpose. Compare with what follows the tradition of R. Simon (in Tract. Shabb. bab. 88 *a*) that on the occasion of Exod. xxiv. 7, the Israelites were each crowned with two crowns by 600,000 angels—one when they said *we will do*, the other when they said *we will be obedient*; but on the occasion of Exod. xxxiii. 6 these crowns were snatched off by 1,200,000 devils. In the last day, at the messianic age, God restores these crowns (according to Isa. xxxv. 10). The sense is not altered if **ἵνα . . . σου** (like Luke xii. 20) is taken as a vivid form of the passive "lest thou be deprived of thy crown" (*cf.* Col. ii. 18 with 2 Tim. iv. 8), forfeiting it through misconduct.

Ver. 12. The reward of steadfastness here is a stable relation to God and absolute (trebly verified) assurance of eternal life, permanence **ἐν τῷ ναῷ** (verbally inconsistent with xxi. 22) **τοῦ θεοῦ μου** (four times in this verse). From Strabo (xii. 868 B, **ἥ τε Φιλαδελφία . . . οὐδὲ τοὺς τοίχους ἔχει πιστούς, ἀλλὰ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν τρόπον τινὰ σαλεύονται καὶ διίστανται**: xiii. 936 B, **πόλις Φιλ. σεισμῶν πλήρης· οὐ γὰρ διαλείπουσιν οἱ τοῖχοι διϊστάμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοτ᾽ ἄλλο μέρος τῆς πόλεως κακοπαθῶν, κ.τ.λ.**) we learn that the city was liable to frequent and severe earthquakes, one of which had produced such ruin a while ago (Tac. *Ann.* ii. 47) that the citizens had to be exempted from Imperial taxation and assisted to repair their buildings. These local circumstances (*cf.* Juv. vi. 411; Dio Cass. lxviii. 25; Renan, 335) lend colour to this promise, which would also appeal to citizens of a city whose numerous festivals and temples are said to have won for it the sobriquet of "a miniature Athens" (*E. Bi.* 3692). The promise is alluded to in Ep. Lugd., where God's grace is said to have "delivered the weak and set them up as **στύλους ἑδραίους**

γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως [h] τοῦ θεοῦ μου, [h] τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ [i] καταβαίνουσα [1] ἐκ τοῦ

h Gal. iv. 26, Heb. xi. 10, xii. 22, xiii. 14.
i See on xxi. 2, 10; false apposition.

[1] The ungrammatical η καταβαινουσα (ℵ*AC) has been corrected into η καταβαινει (Q, Andr., Ar.) and της καταβαινουσης (ℵ[ca]).

able by means of their patience to stand all angry onsets of the evil one," and Attalus of Pergamos is termed a στύλον καὶ ἑδραίωμα of the local Christians. Permanent communion with God is further expressed in terms of the widespread ethnic belief that to be ignorant of a god's name meant inability to worship him, whereas to know that name implied the power of entering into fellowship with him. "Just as writing a name on temple-walls puts the owner of the name in continual union with the deity of the temple, so for early man the knowledge, invocation and vain repetition of the deity's name constitutes in itself an actual, if mystic, union with the deity named" (Jevons' *Introd. Hist. Religion*, 1896, p. 245; *cf.* Jastrow, p. 173). καὶ γράψω, κ.τ.λ., inscriptions upon pillars being a common feature of Oriental architecture, *cf.* Cooke's *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 266, names on pillars; also Reitzenstein's *Poimandres*, 20. The provincial priest of the Imperial cultus erected his statue in the temple at the close of his year's official reign, inscribing on it his own name and his father's, his place of birth and year of office. Hence some of the mysterious imagery of this verse, applied to Christians as priests of God in the next world. This is more probable than to suspect an allusion to what was written on the high priest's forehead (Exod. xxviii. 36, *cf.* Apoc. vii. 3, xiv. 1, xvii. 5, xxii. 4). Pillars were also, of course, sculptured now and then in human shape. For the first (*a*) of the three names, *cf. Baba Bathra*, 75, 2: R. Samuel ait R. Jochanan dixisse tres appellari nomine Dei, justos (Isa. xliii. 7), Messiam (Jer. xxiii. 6), Hierosolyma (Ezek. xlviii. 35); also Targ. Jerus. on Exod. xxviii. 30, quisquis memorat illud nomen sanctum [*i.e.*, τετραγράμματον] in hora necessitatis, eripitur, et occulta reteguntur. Where a name was equivalent in one sense to personality and character, to have a divine name conferred on one or revealed to one was equivalent to being endowed with divine power. The divine "hidden name" (*Asc. Isa.* i. 7 Jewish: "as the Lord liveth whose name has not been sent into this world," *cf.* viii. 7) was (according to En. lxix. 14 f.) known to Michael, and had talismanic power over dæmons. Perhaps an allusion to this also underlies the apocalyptic promise, the talismanic metaphor implying that God grants to the victorious Christian inviolable safety against evil spirits (*cf.* Rom. viii. 38, 39). The second (*b*) name denotes (*cf.* Isa. lvi. 5, Ezek. xlviii. 35) that the bearer belongs not merely to God but to the heavenly city and society of God. Since rabbinic speculation was sure that Abraham had the privilege of knowing the mysterious new name for Jerusalem in the next world, John claims this for the average and honest Christian. On the connexion between the divine name and the temple, see 3 Macc. ii. 9, 14, Judith ix. 8, etc. The third (*c*) "my own new name" (xix. 12) is reflected in *Asc. Isa.* ix. 5 (the Son of God, *et nomen eius non potes audire donec de carne exibis*); it denotes some esoteric, incommunicable, pre-existent (LXX of Ps. lxxi. 17, En. lxix. 26, *cf. R. J.* 249, 344) title, the knowledge of which meant power to invoke and obtain help from its bearer. The whole imagery (as in ii. 17, xix. 12) is drawn from the primitive superstition that God's name, like a man's name, must be kept secret, lest if known it might be used to the disadvantage of the bearer (Frazer's *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. i. 443 f.). The close tie between the name and the personality in ancient life lent the former a secret virtue. Especially in Egyptian and in Roman belief, to learn a god's name meant to share his power, and often "the art of the magician consisted in obtaining from the gods a revelation of their sacred names". The point made by the prophet here is that the Christian God bestows freely upon his people the privilege of invoking his aid successfully, and of entering into his secret nature; also, perhaps, of security in the mysterious future across death. See the famous ch. cxxv. of *E. B. D.* where the successive doors will not allow Nu to pass till he tells them their names (*cf.* chapters cxli. f.). Ignatius tells the Philadelphians (obviously referring to this passage, *ad Phil.* 6) that people unsound upon the truth of

οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ [k] ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν. 13. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

"14. Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον, Τάδε λέγει ὁ [l] Ἀμήν, ὁ [m] μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ [n] ἀληθινός, ἡ [o] ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ· 15. Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι οὔτε ψυχρὸς εἶ οὔτε

k Cf. Isa. xliii. 7, lxii. 2.
l Isa. lxv. 16 (LXX ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἀληθινός).
m Cf. on i. 5, Ps. lxxxix. 37.
n = Genuine, Did., xiii. 1-2.
o See on Col. i. 15 f., also Just. *Apol.* ii. 6, Diognet. vii.

Jesus Christ are to him στῆλαι καὶ τάφοι νεκρῶν, ἐφ' οἷς γέγραπται μόνον ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων. The μόνον is emphatic. In the survival of P. during the later conquests which left the other six towns of the Apocalypse more or less ruined, Gibbon (ch. lxiv.) irrelevantly finds "a pleasing example that the paths of honour and safety may sometimes be the same".

Vv. 14-22. The message for Laodicea, where a church existed by 60 A.D. (Col. iv. 16).

Ver. 14. Jesus is *the Amen* because he guarantees the truth of any statement, and the execution of any promise, made by himself. He is consequently *the faithful and true witness*, whose counsel and rebuke (18, 19) however surprising and unwelcome, are therefore to be laid to heart as authoritative. A faithful witness is one who can be trusted never to misrepresent his message, by exaggeration or suppression, (ἀληθινός practically = ἀληθής as often, since a real witness is naturally a truthful and competent one) his veracity extending not only to his character but to the contents of his message. In point of sincerity and unerring insight (as opposed to "false" in both senses of the term), Jesus is the supreme moral critic; the church is the supreme object of his criticism. He is also absolutely trustworthy, and therefore his promises are to be believed (vv. 20, 21), or rather God's promises are assured and realised to men through him (*cf.* π. καὶ ἀ. in 2 Macc. ii. 11). Compare the fine Assyrian hymn of Ishtar (Jastrow, p. 343): "Fear not! the mind which speaks to thee comes with speech from me, withholding nothing. . . . Is there any utterance of mine that I addressed to thee, upon which thou couldst not rely?" (also, Eurip. *Ion* 1537). The resemblance of ἡ ἀρχή κ.τ.λ., to a passage in Colossians is noteworthy as occurring in an open letter to the neighbouring church of Laodicea (Philonic passages in Grill, pp. 106-110). Here the phrase denotes "the active source or principle of God's universe or creation" (ἀρχή, as in Greek philosophy and Jewish wisdom-literature, = αἰτία or origin), which is practically Paul's idea and that of John i. 3 ("the Logos idea without the name Logos," Beyschlag). This title of "incipient cause" implies a position of priority to everything created; he is *the first* in the sense that he is neither creator (a prerogative of God in the Apocalypse), nor created, but creative. It forms the most explicit allusion to the pre-existence of Jesus in the Apocalypse, where he is usually regarded as a divine being whose heavenly power and position are the outcome of his earthly suffering and resurrection: John ascribes to him here (not at xii. 5, as Baldensperger, 85, thinks) that pre-existence which, in more or less vital forms, had been predicated of the messiah in Jewish apocalyptic (*cf.* En. xlviii.). This pre-existence of messiah is an extension of the principle of determinism; God foreordained the salvation itself as well as its historical hour. See the Egyptian hymn: "He is the primeval one, and existed when as yet nothing existed; whatever is, He made it after He was. He is the father of beginnings. . . . God is the truth, He lives by Truth, He lives upon Truth, He is the king of Truth." The evidence for the pre-existence of messiah in Jewish Christian literature is examined by Dr. G. A. Barton, *Journ. Bibl. Lit.* 1902, pp. 78-91. *Cf.* Introd. § 6.

Ver. 15. The moral nausea roused by tepid religion. It is best to be warm, and energetic; but even a frank repudiation of religion is at least more promising from an ethical standpoint (Arist. *Nik. Eth.* vii. 2-10) than a half-and-half attachment, complacently oblivious of any shortcoming. The outsider may be convinced and won over; there is hope of him, for he is under no illusion as to his real relation to the faith. But what can be done with people who are nominal Christians, unable to recognise that they need repentance and that Jesus is really outside their lives (ver. 20)? *Cf.* Dante's *Inferno*, iii. 30 f. For such homely metaphors and their effectiveness, compare the criticism of Longinus in περὶ ὕψους

[p] ζεστός · [q] ὄφελον ψυχρὸς ἦς ἢ ζεστός · 16. οὕτως ὅτι [r] χλιαρὸς εἶ, καὶ οὔτε ζεστὸς οὔτε ψυχρός, μέλλω σε [r] ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου. 17. ὅτι λέγεις, [s] ὅτι [t] πλούσιός εἰμι καὶ [u] πεπλούτηκα καὶ οὐδὲν [1] χρείαν ἔχω, καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ [v] ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ ἐλεεινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμνός · 18. συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι

p ἅπ. λεγ. N.T., cf. Rom. xii. 11. q Cf. Moult. i. 200, Helbing, 73-74, Win. § 12, 5. For idea, Matt. xii. 33? Epict. iii. 15, 13. r ἅπ. λεγ. N.T. s John i. 32, cf. Plato's *Symp.*, 204A. t 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. viii. 9. u Hos. xii. 8 (9), Zech. xi. 5. v Art. as in Lk. xviii. 13.

[1] **ουδενος** (אPQ, 1, Areth, etc.) is a correction of the difficult and original **ουδεν** ("like *nil opus est*," Simcox: *cf.* Epict. iii. 7) AC, 12, And[bav], edd.

(xxxi.): "Sometimes a plain expression like this tells more forcibly than elegant language; being drawn from common life, it is at once recognised, whilst its very familiarity renders it all the more convincing". The spirit of the verse resembles that which pervaded Christ's denunciation of the religious authorities in his day for their **ὑπόκρισις**, and his more hopeful expectations with regard to the harlots and taxgatherers (*Ecce Homo*, ch. xiii.); the former condition of religious life was to Jesus a sickening feature in the situation. Just as spiritual death, in the case of the Sardis Christians, meant a lost vitality, so in the case of Laodicea lukewarmness implies that a condition of religious warmth once existed. "He who was never fervent can never be lukewarm." In his analysis of this state (*Growth in Holiness*, ch. xxv.), Faber points out not only that its correlative is a serene unconsciousness and unconcern (*cf.* ver. 17 *b*), but that one symptom is a complacent attention to what has been achieved (*cf.* 17 *a*) rather than sensitiveness to what is left undone, with "a quiet intentional appreciation of other things over God" (*cf.* ver. 20), which is all the more mischievous that it is not open wickedness.

Ver. 16. The divine disgust at lukewarm religion. Christ, says the prophet, is sick of the lukewarm: as the purpose (**μέλλω**) of rejection does not exclude the possibility of a change upon the part of the church which shall render the execution of the purpose needless, advice to repent immediately follows upon the threat. The latter is unconditional only in form. Exclusion from God's life forms one side of the penalty, humiliating exposure before men the other (18).

Ver. 17. Priding herself not merely on the fact but (as is implied) on the means by which it had been secured (*viz.*, personal skill, merit) and finally on the independent self-reliant position thus attained: a profuse certificate of merit, self-assigned. To conceit and self-deception the prophet wrathfully ascribes the religious indifference at Laodicea. "No one," says Philo (*Fragm.* p. 649, Mang.), "is enriched by secular things, even though he possessed all the mines in the world; the witless are all paupers." The reference is to spiritual possessions and advantages. It is irrelevant to connect the saying with the material wealth and resources of Laodicea, as exemplified in the fact that it was rebuilt by its citizens after the earthquake in 60-61 A.D. without help from the imperial authorities (Tacit. *Ann.* xiv. 27). For one thing, the incident is too far back; for another, the Apocalypse is concerned not with the cities but with the Christian churches. Such an allusion may have been in the writer's mind, especially if the church included in its membership prosperous and influential citizens, since complacency and self-satisfaction are fostered by material comfort. "If wealthily then happily," in Laodicea as in Padua. Still, these weeds spring from other soils as well. An inefficient ministry (*cf.* Col. iv. 17) and absence of persecution or of special difficulties at Laodicea probably helped to account for the church's languid state. As John suggests, the church which is truly rich in spiritual and moral qualities does not plume itself upon them (ii. 9). **οὐκ οἶδας**, *cf.* the echo of this in *Oxyrhynchite Logia*, i. 3: **τυφλοί εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ βλέπ[ουσιν, πτωχοὶ καὶ οὐκ οἴδασιν τ]ὴν πτωχιαν** (?), where blindness and poverty and unconsciousness of both occur. **σύ**, emphatic; **ἐλεεινός**, "needing pity" rather than (as Dan. ix. 23, x. 11, LXX) "finding pity"; **ταλ.** (*cf.* with ver. 19, Sap. iii. 11: **σοφίαν γὰρ καὶ παιδείαν ὁ ἐξουθενῶν ταλαίπωρος**), only here and Rom. vii. 24 in N. T., two passages representing the extremes of misery—unconscious and conscious. **ὁ κ.τ.λ.** = "the embodiment of".

Ver. 18. The counsel is conveyed in the

[w] παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ χρυσίον [w] πεπυρωμένον [x] ἐκ [x] πυρὸς ἵνα πλουτήσῃς, καὶ [y] ἱμάτια [y] λευκὰ ἵνα περιβάλῃ καὶ μὴ φανερωθῇ ἡ [z] αἰσχύνη τῆς γυμνότητός σου· καὶ [r] κολλούριον [a] ἐγχρῖσαι [1] τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου ἵνα βλέπῃς. 19. ἐγὼ [b] ὅσους ἐὰν φιλῶ [c] ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω·

w A forgotten lesson, *cf.* Col. ii. 3, iv. 16. x Zech. xiii. 9. For constr. ii. 11, viii. 11 = dative. y iii. 4, vii. 9, 14, xix. 14. z See on xvi. 15. a 1 John ii. 20, 27. b Prov. iii. 11-12 = Heb. xii. 5-6, Ps. Sol. x. 2, 1 Cor. xi. 32. c John iii. 20, xvi. 8 (*R.J.* 365), Sir. xviii. 13.

[1] For **εγχρισον** (P, 1, 92 marg., 96, etc.) read **εγχρισαι** (infin. not imper; the technical term; **ἅπ. λεγ.** in N.T.) with ℵAC, etc., vg., Pr., And[a], edd.

dialect of the local situation. **ἀγοράσαι** in the poor man's market (Isa. lv. 1, *cf.* Matt. vi. 19, 20), significant words as addressed to the financial centre of the district. "From me," is emphatic; the real life is due to man's relation with Christ, not to independent efforts upon his own part. Local Christians needed to be made sensitive to their need of Christ; in Laodicea evidently, as in Bunyan's Mansoul, Mr. Desires-awake dwelt in a very mean cottage. "Refined" = genuine and fresh, as opposed to counterfeit and traditional (*cf.* Plato, *Rep.* iii. 413 *e*, 416 *e*). For **παιδεία** wrought upon the people of God by a divine Davidic king whose words are **πεπυρωμένα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον τίμιον**, see Ps. Sol. xvii. 47, 48.—**ἱμάτια.** Laodicea was a famous manufacturing centre, whose trade largely consisted of tunics and cloth for garments. The allusion is (*cf.* below, on ver. 20 and xvi. 15) to careless Christians caught off their guard by the suddenness of the second advent. **κολλούριον** or **κολλύριον** (*cf.* the account of a blind soldier's cure by a god [Aesculapius ?] who bade him **κολλύριον συντρῖψαι**, Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscript. Graec.* 807, 15 f.), an eye-salve for tender eyes: an allusion to the "Phrygian powder" used by oculists of the famous medical school at Laodicea (*C. B. P.* i. 52). To the Christian Jesus supplies that enlightenment which the Jews found in the law (Ps. xix. 8); "uerba legis corona sunt capitis, collyrium oculis" (*Tract. Siphra* fol. 143, 2); "uerba legis corona sunt capitis, torques collo, collyrium oculis" (Vajikra R., fol. 156, 1). True self-knowledge can be gained only by the help of Christ, *i.e.*, in the present case mediated by Christian prophecy. Like Victor., Lightfoot (*Colossians*, p. 44) interprets this allusion by the light of Eph. i. 8, Col. i. 27, as a rebuke to the vaunted intellectual resources of the Church; but there is no need thus to narrow the reference. It is to be observed that John does not threaten Laodicea with the loss of material wealth (*cf. Pirke Aboth*, cited above on ii. 9) in order to have her spiritual life revived.

Ver. 19. The prophet now relents a little; the church has still a chance of righting herself. Such a reproof as he has given in Christ's name, and the discipline it involves (**παιδεύω**, wider than **ἐλ.**) are really evidence of affection, not of antipathy or rejection. This is the method of God at least (**ἐγώ**, emphatic; "whatever others do"), with whom censure does not mean hostility. **φιλῶ**, the substitution of this synonym (contrast Heb. xii. 6) for the LXX **ἀγαπᾷ** is remarkable in view of the latter term's usage in the Apocalypse; the other variation **ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω** (**ἐλ.** B, **παιδ.** ℵA, LXX) is probably ornate rather than a duplicate. The love of Christ for his people is mentioned in the Apocalypse only here (with a reminiscence if not a quotation of O.T.), in i. 5, and in iii. 9 (incidentally). In the latter passage, the divine love sustains and safeguards those who are loyal; here it inflicts painful wounds upon the unworthy, to regain their loyalty. **ζήλευε** (pres.) = a habit, **μετανόησον** (aor.) = a definite change once for all. The connexion (**οὖν**) seems to be: let the foregoing rebuke open your eyes at once to the need of repentance, and also to the fact that it is really love on my part which prompts me thus to expose and to chastise you; such a sense of my loving concern, as well as of your own plight, should kindle an eager heat of indignation (2 Cor. viii. 11, **ἀλλα ζῆλον**) gathering into a flame of repentance that will burn up indifference and inconsistency (*cf.* Weinel, 188 f.). The urgent need of immediate repentance rests not only on the special character of the temptation to which the local Christians were succumbing ("It is a great grace to find out that we are lukewarm, but we are lost if we do not act with vigour. It is like going to sleep in the snow, almost a pleasant, tingling feeling at the first, and then—lost for

ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. 20. Ἰδοὺ ἕστηκα ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ κρούω· [d] ἐάν τις [e] ἀκούσῃ τῆς [e] φωνῆς μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, καὶ εἰσελεύσομαι [1] πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ [f] δειπνήσω μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ. 21. Ὁ [g] νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ [h] καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ

d And if not?—then fate of Matt. xxvi. 64.
e Constr. xiv. 13, xvi. 1, xxi. 3; crying "open" (*aperi*), *cf.* John x. 3.
f Gen. xxvi. 29-31, En. lxii. 14-15.
g Ver. 12, Suspended nom. (Abbott, *Diat.* 2421).
h 1 Macc. x. 63, *cf.* Lk. xxii. 30, a reminiscence of Col. iii. 1, Eph. ii. 6?

[1] Before εισελευσομαι add (Hebraistic, introd. apodosis, x. 7, xiv. 10) και ℵQ, etc., And[c], Pr. (Ti., WH marg., Bj., Bs.): the apparent absence of ακουσῃ της φωνης μου και from the text used by Orig., Hil., Epiph. might suggest that the words were a natural though (as their excellent textual attestation shows) an early gloss upon ανοιξῃ. S. reads και ανοιξει (thus beginning the apodosis).

ever," Faber), but on the fact that this warning was their last chance.

Ver. 20. The language recalls Cant. v. 2 (φωνὴ ἀδελφιδοῦ μου κρούει ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν· ἄνοιξόν μοι, for contemporary evidence of the allegorical use of Canticles see Gunkel's note on 4 Esdras. v. 20 f. and Bacher's *Agada d. Tannaiten*, i. 109, 285 f. 425, etc.) interpreted in the eschatological sense (γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις Mark xiii. 29 = Matt. xxiv. 33) of the logion in Luke xii. 35-38 upon the servants watching for their Lord, ἵνα ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος εὐθέως ἀνοίξωσιν αὐτῷ (whereupon, as here, he grants them intimate fellowship with himself and takes the lead in the matter). To eat with a person meant, for an Oriental, close confidence and affection. Hence future bliss (*cf.* En. lxii. 14) was regularly conceived to be a feast (*cf.* Dalman i. § 1, C. 4 *a* and Volz 331), or, as in Luke xxii. 29, 30 and here (*cf.* ver. 21), feasting and authority. This tells against the otherwise attractive hypothesis that the words merely refer to a present repentance on the part of the church or of some individuals in it (so *e.g.* de Wette, Alf., Weiss, Simcox, Scott), as if Christ sought to be no longer an outsider but a welcome inmate of the heart (*cf.* Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies*, § 95). The context (*cf.* 18 and 21), a comparison of xvi. 15 (which may even have originally lain close to iii. 20), and the words of Jas. v. 9 (ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἕστηκεν) corroborate the eschatological interpretation (so *e.g.* Düsterdieck, Pfleid., Bousset, Forbes, Baljon, Swete, Holtzmann), which makes this the last call of Christ to the church when he arrives on the last day, though here Christ stands at the door not as a judge but as a friend. Hence no reference is made to the fate of those who will not attend to him. In ii. 5 and 16, ἔρχομαί σοι need not perhaps be eschatological, since the coming is conditional and special, but ἔρχομαι by itself (iii. 11) and ἥξω (ii. 25) must be, while iii. 3 probably is also, in view of the context and the thief-simile. The imminent threat of iii. 16 is thus balanced by the urgency of iii. 20. For the eschatological ἰδού *cf.* i. 7, xvi. 15, xxi. 3, xxii. 7, 12. φωνῆς, implying that the voice is well-known. To pay attention to it, in spite of self-engrossment and distraction, is one proof of the moral alertness (ζήλευε) which means repentance. For the metaphorical contrast (reflecting the eternal paradox of grace) between the enthroned Christ of 21 and the appealing Christ of 20, *cf.* the remarkable passage in Sap. ix. 4, 6 f., 10 f., where wisdom shares God's throne and descends to toil among men; also Seneca's *Epp.* xli. (quemadmodum radii solis contingunt quidem terram, sed ibi sunt unde mittuntur; sic animus magnus et sacer conuersatur quidem nobiscum, sed haeret origini suae [Apoc. v. 6]: illinc pendet, illuc spectat ac nititur, nostris tanquam melior interest). By self-restraint, moderation, and patience, with regard to possessions, a man will be some day a worthy partner of the divine feast, says Epictetus (*Enchir.* xv.): "but if you touch none of the dishes set before you and actually scorn them, τότε οὐ μόνον ἔσει συμπότης θεῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ συνάρχων.

Ver. 21. δώσω κ.τ.λ., To share Christ's royal power and judicial dignity is a reward proffered in the gospels, but Jesus there (*cf.* Mark x. 40) disclaimed this prerogative. God's throne is Christ's, as in xxii. 1. νικῶν = the moral purity and sensitiveness (*cf.* 18 and on ii. 7) which succeeds in responding to the divine appeal. The schema of God, Christ, and the individual Christian (*cf.* on ii. 27) is characteristically Johannine (*cf.* John xv. 9 f., xvii. 19 f., xx. 21), though here as in ver. 20 (contrast John xiv. 23) the eschatological emphasis makes the parallel one of diction rather than of thought.

The scope and warmth of the promises

[h]θρόνῳ μου, ὡς κἀγὼ ἐνίκησα καὶ ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. 22. Ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ Πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις."

to Laodicea seem rather out of place in view of the church's poor religion, but here as elsewhere the prophet is writing as much for the churches in general as for the particular community. He speaks ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. This consideration, together with the close sequence of thought in 19-21 forbids any attempt to delete 20, 21 as a later editorial addition (Wellhausen) or to regard 20 (21) as an epilogue to the seven letters (Vitringa, Alford, Ramsay) rather than as an integral part of the Laodicean epistle. Such a detachment would be a gratuitous breach of symmetry. But, while these closing sentences are not a sort of climax which gathers up the menaces of ii.-iii., ver. 21 (with its throne-reference) anticipates the following visions (iv.-v.). To the prophet the real value and significance of Christ's life were focussed in his sacrificial death and in the rights and privileges which he secured thereby for those on whose behalf he had suffered and triumphed. This idea, already suggested in i. 5, 6, 17, 18, forms the central theme of the next oracle.

The ἐκκλησίαι now pass out of sight till the visions are over. During the latter it is the ἅγιοι who are usually in evidence, until the collective term πόλις is employed in the final vision (*cf.* iii. 12). John knows nothing of any catholic ἐκκλησία. To him the ἐκκλησίαι are so many local communities who share a common faith and expect a common destiny; they are, as Kattenbusch observes, colonies of heaven, and heaven is their mother-country. Partly owing to O.T. associations, partly perhaps on account of the feeling that an ἐκκλησία (in the popular Greek sense of the term) implied a city, John eschews this term. He also ignores the authority of any officials; the religious situation depends upon the prophets, who are in direct touch with God and through whom the Spirit of God controls and guides the saints. Their words are God's words; they can speak and write with an authority which enables them to say, *Thus saith the Spirit*. Only, while in the contemporary literature of Christianity the prophetic outlook embraces either the need of organisation in order to meet the case of churches which are scattered over a wide area and exposed to the vagaries of unauthorised leaders (Pastoral Epistles and Ignatius), or contention among the office-bearers themselves (a sure sign of the end, *Asc. Isa.* iii. 20 f.), John's apocalypse stands severely apart from either interest.

NOTE on i. 9-iii. 22. We have no data to show whether the seven letters or addresses ever existed in separate form, or whether they were written before or after the rest of the visions. All evidence for such hypotheses consists of quasi-reasons or precarious hypotheses based on some *a priori* theory of the book's composition. The great probability is that they never had any rôle of their own apart from this book, but were written for their present position. As the Roman emperors addressed letters to the Asiatic cities or corporations (the inscriptions mention at least six to Ephesus, seven to Pergamos, three to Smyrna, etc.), so Jesus, the true Lord of the Asiatic churches, is represented as sending communications to them (*cf.* Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 274 f.). The *dicit* or λέγει with which the Imperial messages open corresponds to the more biblical τάδε λέγει of ii. 1, etc. Each of the apocalyptic communications follows a fairly general scheme, although in the latter four the appeal for attention follows (instead of preceding) the mystic promise, while the imperative *repent* occurs only in the first, third, fifth, and seventh, the other churches receiving praise rather than censure. This artificial or symmetrical arrangement, which may be traced in or read into other details, is as characteristic of the whole apocalypse as is the style which—when the difference of topic is taken into account—cannot be said to exhibit peculiarities of diction, syntax, or vocabulary sufficient to justify the relegation of the seven letters to a separate source. Even if written by another hand or originally composed as a separate piece, they must have been worked over so thoroughly by the final editor and fitted so aptly into the general scheme of the whole Apocalypse (*cf. e.g.* ii. 7 = xxii. 2, 14, 19; ii. 11 = xx. 16; ii. 17 = xix. 12; ii. 26 = xx. 4; ii. 28 = xxii. 16; iii. 5 = vii. 9, 13; iii. 5 = xiii. 8, xx. 15; iii. 12 = xxi. 10, xxii. 14; iii. 21 = iv. 4; iii. 20 = xix. 9; etc.), that it is no longer possible to dis-

IV. 1. [a] ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα [a] εἶδον, [b] καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ [c] πρώτη ἣν ἤκουσα ὡς σάλπιγγος [d] λαλούσης

a vii. 1, 9, xv. 5, xviii. 1, xix. 1, *cf.* i. 12.

b xiv. 14, xix. 11, *Zech.* v. 9. c i. 10. d Loose appos. to σ. instead of φωνή, *cf.* ix. 13, etc.

entangle them (or their nucleus). The special traits in the conception of Christ are mainly due to the fact that the writer is dealing here almost exclusively with the inner relation of Jesus to the churches. They are seldom, if ever, more realistic or closer to the messianic categories of the age than is elsewhere the case throughout the apocalypse; and if the marjoram of Judaism or (as we might more correctly say) of human nature is not wholly transmuted into the honey of Christian charity—which is scarcely surprising under the circumstances—yet the moral and mental stature of the writer appears when he is set beside so powerful a counsellor in some respects as the later Ignatius. Here John is at his full height. He combines moral discipline and moral enthusiasm in his injunctions. He sees the central things and urges them upon the churches, with a singular power of tenderness and sarcasm, insight and foresight, vehemence and reproach, undaunted faithfulness in rebuke and a generous readiness to mark what he thinks are the merits as well as the failings and perils of the communities. The needs of the latter appear to have been twofold. One, of which they were fully conscious, was outward. The other, to which they were not entirely alive, was inward. The former is met by an assurance that the stress of persecution in the present and in the immediate future was under God's control, unavoidable and yet endurable. The latter is met by the answer of discipline and careful correction; the demand for purity and loyalty in view of secret errors and vices is reiterated with a keen sagacity. In every case, the motives of fear, shame, *noblesse oblige*, and the like, are crowned by an appeal to spiritual ambition and longing, the closing note of each epistle thus striking the keynote of what follows throughout the whole Apocalypse. In form, as well as in content, the seven letters are the most definitely Christian part of the book.

The scene now changes. Christ in authority over his churches, and the churches with their angels, pass away; a fresh and ampler tableau of the vision opens (*cf.* on i. 19), ushering in the future (vi.-xxii. 5), which—as disclosed by God through Christ (i. 1)—is prefaced by a solemn exhibition of God's supremacy and Christ's indispensable position in revelation. In Apoc. Bar. xxiv. 2 the seer is told that on the day of judgment he and his companions are to see "the long-suffering of the Most High which has been throughout all generations, who has been long-suffering towards all those born that sin and are righteous." He then seeks an answer to the question, "But what will happen to our enemies I know not, and when Thou wilt visit Thy works (*i.e.*, for judgment)"? This is precisely the course of thought (first inner mercies and then outward judgments) in Apoc. ii.-iii. and iv. f.; although in the former John sees in this life already God's great patience towards his people. The prophet is now admitted to the heavenly conclave where (by an adaptation of the rabbinic notion) God reveals, or at least prepares, his purposes before executing them. Chapter iv. and chapter v. are counterparts; in the former God the Creator, with his praise from heavenly beings, is the central figure: in the latter the interest is focussed upon Christ the redeemer, with his praise from the human and natural creation as well. Chapter v. further leads over into the first series of events (the seven seals, vi.-viii.) which herald the *dénouement*. Henceforth Jesus is represented as *the Lamb*, acting but never speaking, until in the epilogue (xxii. 6-21) the author reverts to the Christological standpoint of i.-iii. Neither this nor any other feature, however, is sufficient to prove that iv.-v. represent a Jewish source edited by a Christian; the whole piece is Christian and homogeneous (Sabatier, Schön, Bousset, Pfleiderer, Wellhausen). Chapter iv. is a preliminary description of the heavenly court: God's ruddy throne with a green nimbus being surrounded by a senate of πρεσβύτεροι and mysterious ζῷα. Seven torches burn before the throne, beside a crystal ocean, while from it issue flashes and peals accompanied by a ceaseless liturgy of adoration from the πρεσβύτεροι and the ζῷα, who worship with a rhythmic emotion of awe.

CHAPTER IV.—Ver. 1. μετὰ . . . ἰδού introducing as usual in an independent clause (instead of a simple accus., Vit. ii.

μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, λέγων,[1] "Ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ δείξω σοι ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα". 2. εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι·
καὶ ἰδοὺ [e] θρόνος [f] ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,
καὶ [g] ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον [g] καθήμενος·

e Cf. 1 Kings xxii. 19.
f (Of local position = "stood") Jer. xxiv. 1, Jo. xix. 29, etc.
g Used in Apoc. with gen., dat., and acc. indifferently.

[1] The λεγουσα of א^cP, 1, 92 marg., Areth., etc. is a correction of orig. λεγων א*AQ, etc., And^c, edd. [an awkward *constr. ad sensum* = לאמר; *cf.* Vit. i. 204 f].

8 f., 31, 173, 174, to which he reverts in ver. 4) some fresh and weighty revelation; lesser phases are heralded by the simpler καὶ εἶδον. The phrase indicates a pause, which of course may have covered days as well as hours in the original experience of the seer, if we assume that his visions came in the order in which they are recorded. He is no longer in the island but up at the gates of heaven. In his trance, a heavenly voice comes after he has seen—not heaven opened (the usual apocalyptic and ecstatic symbol, *e.g.* Acts x. 11 = a vision, xi. 5, Ezek. i. 1, Matt. iii. 16, Ap. Bar. xxii. 1) but—a door set open (ready, opened) in the vault of the mysterious upper world which formed God's house. Then follows the rapture (which in i. 9 precedes the voice). The whole vision is composed by a man familiar with O.T. prophecy, in Semitic style: short clauses linked by the monotonous καί, with little or no attempt made at elaboration of any kind. Traits from the theophany of God as a monarch, surrounded by a triple circle (*cf.* the triple circle surrounding Ahuramazda), are blended with traits drawn from the theophany in nature. The ordinary Jewish conception (Gfrörer, i. 365 f.) tended to regard God as the royal priest, to whom angels rendered ceaseless levitical praise and service (*cf.* Apoc. iv.-v.), or as a glorified rabbi whose angels act as interpreters of the heavenly mysteries for man (*cf.* Apoc. x. and apocalyptic literature in general with its angelic cicerones). In the seven heavens of Chagiga, 12*b*, the third is the place where "the millstones grind manna for the righteous" (Ps. lxxviii. 23, 24, *cf.* Apoc. ii. 17), whilst in the fourth are the heavenly Jerusalem (*cf.* Apoc. xxi. 10) and the temple (Apoc. xv. 5 f.) and the altar (Apoc. viii. 3 f.) where the great prince Michael offers an offering, but in the fifth the ministering angels, who sing God's praise by night, are silent by day to let Israel's adoration rise to the Most High (see on ver. 8). ἀνάβα ὧδε (*cf.* the common phrase, ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, of penetration into heavenly mysteries), from Exod. xix. 16, 24, φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα . . . εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Κύριος . . . ἀνάβηθι. As in the O.T. the revelation is vouchsafed spontaneously, whereas in Iranian theology (*e.g.*, in the Vendîdâd) "it is the wish of man, not the will of God, that is the first cause of the revelation" (Darmesteter, *S. B. E.* iv. p. lxxxv.). The seer does not enter the door till he is called; to know the divine will is the outcome of revelation, not of inquiry or speculative curiosity (similar idea in 1 Cor. ii. 9 f.). Enoch (xiv. 9 f.) also does not enter the palace of God with its fire-encircled walls, but sees through the open portals "a high throne, καὶ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ κρυστάλλινον . . . καὶ ὄρος χερουβίν . . . and from underneath the great throne came streams of flaming fire so that I could not look thereon. And the great Glory sat thereon and his raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than any snow." He is finally called by God to approach but not to enter. *Cf.* Ap. Bar. li. 11, *Test. Levi.* v, "and the angel opened unto me the gates of heaven, and I saw the holy One, the Most High, seated on the throne".

Ver. 2. A fresh wave of ecstasy catches up the seer. εὐθέως . . πνεύματι, repeating i. 10, not because the author had forgotten his previous statement, and still less because a new source begins here (Vischer), but simply because every successive phase of this Spirit-consciousness, every new access of ecstasy, was considered to be the result of a fresh inspiration; so the O.T. prophets (*e.g.*, Ezek. xi. 1 καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ., followed by ver. 5 καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ πνεῦμα, ii. 2 and iii. 24; *cf.* Enoch xiv. 9 καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐν τῇ ὁράσει μου . . . εἰσήνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν followed by ver. 14 ἐθεώρουν ἐν τ. ὁ. μ. καὶ ἰδοὺ κ.τ.λ., lxxi. 1 and 5, etc.). The primitive

3. καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ὅμοιος [h] ὁράσει λίθῳ [i] ἰάσπιδι καὶ [k] σαρδίῳ· καὶ [l] ἶρις [l] κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου [m] ὅμοιος ὁράσει σμαραγδίνῳ.

h "In appearance."
i Cf. on xxi. 11.
k xxi. 20, Exod. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13, Ezek. xxviii. 20.
l Ezek. i. 28, ἅπ. λεγ. N.T., cf. x. 1, where also it is substituted for τόξον of LXX.
m Cf. Win. § 11, 1.

Christian conception of the Spirit was that of a sudden and repeated transport rather than a continuous experience (Acts iv. 8, 31, etc.), particularly in the region of ecstasy. The royal presence is depicted in this theophany by means of similes and metaphors (partly rabbinic) which originally were suggested in part by the marvellous atmospheric colouring of an Eastern sky during storm or sunset; several had been for long traditional and fanciful modes of expressing the divine transcendence (*e.g.*, En. xiv. 18 f. the divine glory like crystal, etc.) which dominates the Apocalypse. God is a silent, enthroned (*cf.* 1 Kings xxii. 19 etc.), eternal Figure, hidden by the very excess of light, keeping ward and watch over his people, but never directly interfering in their affairs till the judgment, when mankind appears before his throne for doom and recompense. This reluctance to name or describe God, so characteristic of the later Judaism, was allied to the feeling which mediated his action upon the world through angels or through his Christ (see on i. 1 and xv. 8). For the tendency to describe God and heaven in priestly terms, *cf.* Gfrörer, i. 276 f. The whole of the present passage is illustrated by *Pirke Elieser*, iv.: "majestas sancti benedicti est in medio quattuor classium angelicarum. Ipse insidet throno excelso eleuatus, atque solium eius sublime suspensum est sursum in aere, figura autem gloriae eius est sicut color Chasonal, juxta uerba prophetiae (Ezek. i. 27) . . . atque oculi per totum orbem discurrunt. Sagittae eius sunt ignis et grando; a dextra eius uita est, a sinistra mors, sceptrum ignitum in manu eius. Expansum est ante eum uelum, et septem angeli qui prius creati sunt, famulantur ei ante uelum . . . infra thronum gloriae eius est sicuti lapis sapphiri."

Ver. 3. The sources of the general conception lie far back in passages like Isa. vi. 1 f., Ezek. i. 26 f., Dan. vii. 9 f., Enoch xxxix., xl., xlvi., mediated by rabbinical interpretations. But it should be noted that in the palace-temple of Hatra, the Parthian capital, one well-known frieze contained a row of figures including the griffin, the eagle, the human face, the head of an ox, and an emblem on the cornice apparently representing the sun. With a sublime restraint, the author leaves the royal presence undefined, though he is more definite and explicit on the whole than (say) Ezekiel. The latter's advance in this respect upon his predecessors was explained by the rabbis (*cf.* Streane's *Chagiga*, p. 73) as a needful counteractive to the Jewish belief that visions were impossible outside Canaan, and as a help to men of the captivity who needed "special details to support them in their trials" (*cf.* above, i. 9 f.). The **σάρδιον**, a flesh-coloured, semi-transparent, often golden or ruddy gem, answers to our red jasper or cornelian, so-called perhaps from Sardis, whence the stone was originally exported. **ὅμοιος**, adj. only here with two terminations. "The striking simile **ὅμ. ὁρ. λ. ἰ. κ. σ.** recalls the portrait statues of Roman emperors and others, in which the raiment is worked out in hard-coloured stones—a fashion introduced in the last years of the republic from Ptolemaic Egypt" (Myres, *E. Bi.*, 4812).—**ἶρις.** The nimbus or halo round the throne is green, **σμ.** (*cf.* Deissm. 267) being malachite or more probably an emerald (xxi. 19), to which the ancients attributed a talismanic power of warding off evil spirits. "Thou hast made heaven and earth bright with thy rays of pure emerald light" (hymn to Ra, *E. B. D.* 8). The rabbis (*Chagiga*, 16 *a*) discouraged any study of the rainbow, as it symbolised the glory of God. As the symbol of God's covenant, it may be here a foil to the forbidding awe of ver. 5 *a* (which develops 3 *a*, as 5 *b* develops 3 *b*-4); "Deus in judiciis semper meminit foederis sui" (Grotius.) But, like the parabolic details of Jesus, these traits are mainly descriptive. The association of jasper, sardius, and emerald is a genuinely Hellenic touch: *cf. Phaedo*, 110, where Plato describes the real earth under the heavens of paradise as a place where in perfection lie such things as exist here but in fragmentary beauty—for example, the pebbles esteemed here, **σάρδιά τε καὶ ἰάσπιδας καὶ σμαράγδους.** Flinders Petrie, taking **σμ.** as rock-crystal, argues that the rainbow here is of the prismatic colour which a hexagonal prism of that colourless stone would throw (Hastings, *D. B.* iv. 620).

n Sc. εἶδον from ἰδού.
o On the forms τεσσερ. τεσσαρ. throughout, *cf.* Win. § 5, 20c.
p Sap. v. 15-16, 2 Macc. xiv. 4, *cf.* Jos. *Ant.*, iii. 7, 7.

4. Καὶ κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου[1] [n] θρόνους εἴκοσι [o] τέσσαρας·
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους εἴκοσι τέσσαρας πρεσβυτέρους καθημένους,
περιβεβλημένους ἐν ἱματίοις λευκοῖς·
καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν [p] στεφάνους χρυσοῦς.

[1] **θρονοι** (PQ, etc., Areth., Bg., Al. Bs.) after **θρονου** seems a correction of (anacoluthon) **θρονους** ℵA, 34, 35, And[c], etc. (Lach., Ti., WH marg., Bj., Sw., Ws.).

Ver. 4. This verse breaks the continuous description of 3 and 5; it is evidently an original touch of the writer introduced into the more or less traditional scenery of the eternal court where "all the sanctities of heaven stood thick as stars" (*cf.* v. 11). The conception of twenty-four **πρεσβύτεροι** royally (i. 6) enthroned as divine assessors, with all the insignia of state, reaches back in part to a post-exilic apocalypse (Isa. xxiv. 23, **βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐν Σιὼν καὶ εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται**), in part to the historic gerousia. But their attire (golden crowns, white robes) and functions are royal rather than judicial or sacerdotal. They are heavenly beings, angelic figures corresponding to the **θρόνοι** of Col. i. 16 (*cf.* Isa. lxiii. 9 **οὐ πρεσβὺς οὐδὲ ἄγγελος**). The significance of the doubled 12 has been found in the twelve patriarchs or tribes + the twelve apostles (Andr., Areth., Vict., Alford, Weiss, etc.), in Jewish and Gentile Christianity (Bleek, de Wette, Weizsäcker, Swete), or in the twenty-four classes of the post-exilic priests with their "elders" (Schürer, *H. J. P.* i. 216 f., so from Vitringa to Ewald, Hilg., Renan, Spitta, Wellh., Erbes, Briggs). But the notion of the church as a fusion or combination of the old and the new covenants is alien to primitive Christianity, and the "elders" are not the ideal or celestial representatives of the church at all. They pertain to the heavenly court, as in the traditional *mise-en-scène* of the later Judaism, which had appropriated this and other imaginative suggestions of the heavenly court (Schrader,[3] pp. 454 f.), or judicial council from the Babylonian astro-theology, where **μετὰ τὸν ζῳδιακὸν κύκλον** were ranged four-and-twenty stars, half to the north, and half to the south, of which the visible are reckoned as belonging to the living, the invisible to the dead, **οὓς δικαστὰς τῶν ὅλων προσαγορεύουσιν** (Diod. Sic. ii. 31, quoted by Gunkel in *S. C.* 302-308, who rightly finds in the same soil roots of other symbols in this passage, such as the four **ζῷα** and the seven **λαμπάδες**). In Slav. En. iv. 1, immediately after "the very great sea" in the first heaven is mentioned (*cf.* Apoc. iv. 6), Enoch is shown "the elders and the rulers of the orders of the stars;" so in *Judicium Petri*, **εἴκοσι γὰρ καὶ τέσσαρές εἰσι πρεσβύτεροι**, twelve on the right hand of God and twelve on the left, as in *Acta Perpet.* The twenty-four star-deities of the Babylonian heaven had thus become adoring and subordinate angelic beings (*cf.* **ἡμῶν**, ver. 11) in the apocalyptic world of the later Judaism, and our author retains this Oriental trait, together with the seven torches, the halo, etc., in order to body forth poetically his conception of the divine majesty (so, after Gunkel, Jeremias, and Bousset, Bruston, J. Weiss, Scott, Forbes, Porter). A partial anticipation of this feature, as well as of some others, in the Apocalypse occurs not only in the "sacred council" of Doushara, the Nabatean deity (*cf.* Cook's *North Semit. Inscr.*, pp. 221 f., 443 f.), but in Egyptian mythology, as, *e.g.*, in the following inscription from the tomb of Unas (5th dynasty, 3500 B.C.) "His place is at the side of God, in the most holy place; he himself becomes divine (*neter*), and an angel of God; he himself is triumphant. He sits on the great throne by the side of God [Apoc. iii. 21]. He is clothed with the finest raiment of those who sit on the throne of living right and truth. He hungers not, nor thirsts, nor is sad, for he eats daily the bread of Ra, and drinks what He drinks daily, and his bread also is that which is spoken of by Seb, and that which comes forth from the mouth of the gods [Apoc. vii. 16, 17, xxi. 4]. Not only does he eat and drink of their food, but he wears the apparel they wear—the white linen and sandals, and he is clothed in white . . . and these great and never-failing

5. Καὶ [q]ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ [q]βρονταί·
καὶ [r]ἑπτὰ [r]λαμπάδες πυρὸς καιόμεναι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου [ἅ εἰσιν[1] τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ].
6. καὶ[2] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ὡς [s]θάλασσα [t]ὑαλίνη, ὁμοία κρυστάλλῳ.
Καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσερα ζῷα

q Ps. xvii. 14, xxix., Jub. ii. 1.
r i. 4, 12, 16, iii. 1, v. 6, cf. Ap. Bar. xlviii. 8, and Slav. En. xix. 6.
s xv. 2.
t Exod. xxiv. 10 f., Ezek. i. 22 f., ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.

[1] Either α εισιν (אcP, 1, 36, 94, Syr., Ti., WH, Sw., Bj.) or α εστιν (A, Lach., Ws., Bs.) is to be read for αι εισιν (Q, etc., S., Areth.).

[2] Könnecke (*Emendationen zu Stellen N.T.*, 34) and Bs. (?) om. και κυκλω του θρονου as a gloss (so min., Me., Harl., Arm., Tic.), while Bruston takes και εν μεσω του θρονου as the mistranslation of ובתוך הכסא (= and the throne was in the midst of it, *i.e.*, of the glassy sea). For τεσσαρα here and in ver. 8 read τεσσερα (A, edd.), as generally throughout Apoc. (a κοινή-form, possibly Ionian: Helbing, 5-6, Thumb, 72), though "the papyri would seem to supply decisive evidence for τεσσαρα as the first century form" (*Class. Review*, 1901, p. 33, *cf.* 1904, p. 107).

gods give unto him of the Tree of Life [Apoc. ii. 7] of which they themselves do eat, that he likewise may live."

Ver. 5. The impression of awe is heightened by traits from the primitive Semitic theophany which, especially in judgment, was commonly associated with a thunderstorm (φωναί = the shrieks and roaring blasts of the storm). Thunder in the Apocalypse is either a sort of chorus in praise of God (as here) or punitive (*e.g.*, xvi. 18); in Enoch lix. 1 the seer beholds the secrets of the thunder, "how it ministers unto well-being and blessing, or serves for a curse before the Lord of Spirits". For the "torches of fire" (seven being a sacred number = collective and manifold power, Jastrow 265, Trench 62-70) *cf.* Ezek. i. 13 ὡς ὄψις λαμπάδων συστρεφομένων ἀναμέσον τῶν ζῴων καὶ φέγγος τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐξεπορεύετο ἀστραπή, and Apoc. Bar. xxi. 6, where "holy living creatures, without number, of flame and fire" surround the throne. Fulness, intensity, energy, are implied in the figure, which reflects the traditional association (in the primitive mind) of fire and flame with the divinity, and especially with the divine purity or holiness of which they were regarded as an outward expression. There may be an allusion to the *ignes aeterni* or *sempiterni* of Roman mythology, an equivalent for the heavenly bodies; but Jewish eschatology had for over two centuries been familiar with the seven watchers of the heavenly court and their counterparts in Persian and Babylonian mythology. The combination of fire and crystal (ver. 6, see also xv. 2) goes back originally to Exod. xxiv. 9, 10, 17, and Ezek. i. 22, 27, mediated by passages like En. xiv. 9, 17 f., 21-23; while the groundwork of the symbol answers to the seven Persian councillors (Ezra vii. 14, Esth. i. 14) who formed the immediate circle of the monarch, a counterpart of the divine Amshaspands, as well as to the sacred fire of Ormuzd, which (on Zoroastrian principles) was to be kept constantly burning. Seven burning altars, evidently representing a planetary symbolism, also occur in the cult of Mithra, while in the imageless temple of Melcarth at Gades fires always burned upon the altar, tended by white-robed priests.—5 *c* reads like an editorial comment or a liturgical gloss; the πρεσβύτεροι, *e.g.*, are undefined.

Ver. 6. For a sea in heaven, *cf.* above (on ver. 4). In *Test. Patr. Levi.* 2 the sea lies within the second (first) heaven ὕδωρ κρεμάμενον ἀνάμεσον τούτου κἀκείνου, and in the Egyptian paradise the triumphant soul goes to "the great lake in the Fields of Peace," where the gods dwell. The description, "a sea of glass, like crystal" (*i.e.*, transparent, ancient glass being coarse and often semi-opaque, and ὕαλος being primarily = transparent, not vitreous) borrowed partly from archaic tradition (coloured by Egyptian and Assyrian ideas), is intended to portray the ether, clear and calm, shimmering and motionless. Rabbinic fancy compared the shining floor of the temple to crystal,

[u] From Ezek. i. 10, x. 12.
[v] Num. xxiii. 22, xxiv. 8.
[w] "apiece" (distribut. as John ii. 6, etc.)
[x] Isa. vi. 3, *cf.* Slav. En. xi. 2, xxi. 1.
[y] Not in Isa. vi. 3 (LXX), *cf.* on i. 8.

[u] γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν. 7. καὶ τὸ ζῷον τὸ πρῶτον ὅμοιον λέοντι, καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ζῷον ὅμοιον [v] μόσχῳ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῷον ἔχων τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ζῷον ὅμοιον ἀετῷ πετομένῳ. 8. καὶ τὰ τέσσερα ζῷα, ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν ἔχων [w] ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ, κυκλόθεν[1] καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ [x] ἀνάπαυσιν [x] οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες,

"[x] Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ [y] παντοκράτωρ,
ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος."

[1] It is arbitrary to omit (Wellh.) **κυκλοθεν . . . οφθαλμων**, and the variant addition (**και εξωθεν**, Q, Pr., etc.) after **κυκλοθεν** is an attempt to smooth out the phrase.

and the hot eastern sky is likened (in Job xxxvii. 18) to a molten mirror, dry and burnished. Heaven is a sort of glorified temple (1 Kings vii. 23, the sea in the Solomonic temple being copied from the oblong or round tank which represented the ocean at every Babylonian temple, while the earth was symbolised by the adjoining zikkurat), and the crystal firmament is a sort of sea. In Slav. En. iii. 1-3 the seer observes, in the first heaven, the ether, and then "a very great sea, greater than the earthly sea". **καὶ ἐν μέσῳ, κ.τ.λ.**: "and in the middle (of each side) of the throne and (consequently) round about the throne," the four חַיּוֹת of Ezek. i. 5, 18 (*cf.* Apoc. Bar. li. 11). **γέμοντα κ.τ.λ.**, a bizarre but archaic symbol for completeness of life and intelligence rather than for Argus-like vigilance. The four angels of the presence in En. xl. 2 move out, like Milton's seven (*Par. Lost*, iii. 647 f.), on various errands (lxxi. 9, *cf.* lxxxviii. 2, 3). The **ζῷα** of John are stationary, except in xv. 7, where the context (*cf.* vi. 6) might suggest that the seer took them to represent creation or the forces of the natural world (*cf.* the rabbinic dictum: quattuor sunt qui principatum in hoc mundo tenent, inter creaturas homo, inter aues aquilo, inter pecora bos, inter bestias leo). Note also that when they worship (9), the **πρεσβύτεροι** acknowledge God's creative glory (11), and that the O.T. cherubim are associated with the phenomena of the storm-cloud. The seer does not define them, however, and they may be, like the **πρεσβύτεροι**, a traditional and poetical trait of the heavenly court.—**τέσσερα**, *cf.* Slav. En. xxx. 13,14. The posture of the **ζῷα** may be visualised from a comparison of the Alhambra Court of the Lions.

Ver. 7. **μόσχῳ**, "an ox or steer" (as LXX). The four animals are freely compounded out of the classical figures of Ezekiel's cherubim and the seraphim in Isa. vi.; the latter supply the six wings apiece. This function of ceaseless praise (8-9) is taken from Enoch lxi. 10 f., where the cherubim and seraphim are also associated but not identified with the angelic host (though in xl. the cherubim are equivalent to the four archangels); for a possible Babylonian astral background, *cf.* Zimmern in Schrader,[3] 626-632, and Clemen's *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. T.* (1909), pp, 74 f. Behind them lie the signs of the zodiac (the bull, the archer, the lion and the eagle, as a constellation of the North; so, *e.g.*, Gunkel, Bruston, etc.). The analogous figures of the four funerary genii before the Egyptian throne represent the four points of the compass.

Ver. 8. A description of the sounds and songs of heaven follows the picture of its sights.—**γέμουσιν**, either with **τὰ τ.ζ.** (**ἔχων** for once a real participle) or an asyndeton (if **ἔχων** here, as elsewhere in the Apocalypse, must be supplied with a copula). **κυκλ. κ. ἔ.** = "round their bodies and on the inside" (*i.e.*, underneath their wings). For the ceaseless praise, which resembles that of Nin-ib, the Assyrian deity, *cf.* on ver. 7 and ver, 11, also Enoch xxxix. 12 (the trisagion sung by the sleepless ones, *i.e.*, angels), Slav, En. xvii., and *Test. Levi* 3 (where endless praise is the function of denizens in the fourth heaven). The first line of the hymn is Isaianic, the second (**ὁ ἦν κ.τ.λ.**) is characteristic of the Apocalypse. In En. xli. 7 the sun and moon in their orbits "give thanks and praise and rest not; for to them their thanksgiving is rest". In the Apocalypse, however, the phenomena of nature are generally the objects or the scourges of the divine

9. καὶ ὅταν [z] δώσουσι [1] τὰ ζῷα δόξαν καὶ [a] τιμὴν καὶ [b] εὐχαριστίαν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, τῷ [c] ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, 10. [d] πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες [d] πρεσβύτεροι ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ [e] βαλοῦσιν τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, λέγοντες,

11. "[f] Ἄξιος εἶ, ὁ [f] Κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, [g] λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν
καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν·

z *Cf.* Moult. i. 168.
a Ps. xxviii. (xxix.) 1, 1 Tim. i. 17, Apoc. v. 13, vii. 12, *cf.* *Par. Lost*, iv. 677 f., vii. 600 f.
b vii. 12.
c Deut. xxxii. 40 ζῶ ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
d v. 14, *cf.* 2 Chron. vii. 3.
e Verg. *Georg.* iv. 212, Mart. x. 72, Tiridates in Tac. *Ann.* xv. 29, Tigranes in Dio Cass. xxxvi., Cicero's *pro Sextio*, 27.
f Nom. practically = vocative (contrast xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7), Abbott, *Diat.* 2681, Helbing, 34.
g v. 12, *cf.* 1 Chron. xxix. 11.

[1] For **δωσουσι** AP, min., And[a] (edd.), **δωσωσι** (ℵQ, min., Bs.) [*cf.* WH, app. 172] and **δωσι** (min., S., And[c], Areth.) are variants (Pr. *cum dederant*, vg. *cum darent*); *cf.* Win. § 14, 9; § 13, 7—the former being an unusual conj. aor.

wrath. The precedence of **ὁ ἦν** over **ὁ ὤν** may be due to the emphasis of the context upon (ver. 11) the definite creative action of God. Since the **πρεσβύτεροι** worship God as the eternal (ver. 10), while the **ζῷα** acknowledge him as the **ἅγιος**, the latter epithet probably retains its O.T. sense, *i.e.*, absolute life and majestic power (xvi. 5). The trisagion occurs in the Babylonian recension (iii.) of the Shmone-Esreh, among the daily prayers of the Jewish community. See further *Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, i. 117, 118.

Ver. 9. The frequentative meaning of **δώσουσι** comes from the sense rather than from the grammar of the passage. "Whenever," etc. (*i.e.*, throughout the course of this book, v. 8 f., xi. 16 f., xix. 4) is "a sort of stage-direction" (Simcox). It would be harsh to take the words as a proleptic allusion to the single occurrence at xi. 15 f. (J. Weiss). To give or ascribe **δόξα** to God is reverently to acknowledge his supreme authority, either spontaneously and gladly (as here and xix. 7, where "honour" becomes almost "praise") or under stress of punishment (xi. 13, xiv. 7, xvi. 9) and fear of judgment. The addition of **τιμή** in doxologies amplifies the idea, by slightly emphasising the expression of that veneration and awe felt inwardly by those who recognise his **δόξα**. To fear God or to be his servants is thus equivalent upon the part of men to an attitude of pious submission and homage. To "give thanks" is hardly co-ordinate with **δ.κ.τ.**, but follows from it as a corollary (*cf.* Pss. xcvi.-xcviii.). Such worship is the due of *the living God* (vii. 2, x. 6, xv. 7), whereas to eat "meat sacrificed to idols is to worship dead gods" (Did. vi. 3, *cf.* Apoc. ii. 14, 20). The Apocalypse, however, never dwells on the danger of idolatry within the Christian church; its attention is almost absorbed by the supreme idolatry of the Emperor, which is silently contrasted in this and in other passages with the genuine Imperial worship of the Christian church. "He who sits on the throne" (a title of Osiris in *E. B. D.*) is the only true recipient of worship. *Cf.* the hymn to "Ra when he riseth": "Those who are in thy following sing unto thee with joy and bow down their foreheads to the earth when they meet thee, thou lord of heaven and earth, thou king of Right and Truth, thou creator of eternity".

Ver. 10. To cast a crown before the throne was a token that the wearer disclaimed independence; an Oriental (Parthian) token of respect for royalty (reff.). *Cf.* Spenser's *Hymne of Heavenly Beautie* (141-154) and the pretty fancy in Slav. En. xiv. 2 where the sun's crown is taken from him as he passes through the fourth heaven (before God) and given to God.

Ver. 11. An implicit refutation of the dualistic idea, developed by Cerinthus, the traditional opponent of John in Asia Minor, that creation was the work of some angel or power separate from God (Iren. i. 26, iv. 32, Hippol. *Haer.* vii. 33, x. 1). The enthusiastic assent of the **πρεσβύτεροι** to the adoration of the Creator is expressed in word as well as in action. **σύ** emphatic = the usual apocalyptic (R.J., 295, 296) emphasis on creation as a proof of God's power in

h *Cf.* 4 Esd. vi. 6, and on x. 6 below.
i Constr. *cf.* xii. 11, John vi. 57, xv. 3 (dat. instrum.).

ὅτι [h] σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα,
καὶ [i] διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν [1] καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν."

V. 1. Καὶ εἶδον [a] ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν,[2] [b] κατεσφραγισμένον

a xx. 1. b ἅπ. λεγ. N.T., *cf.* Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, 9 (Isa. xxix. 11).

[1] ουκ ησαν Q, 14, 38, 51, "created out of nothingness": A om. και εκτισθησαν, Pr., 36 om. ησαν και. For similar instances of the elision or addition of a negative, see Nestle's *Einf.*, 250-251 (E. Tr., 311-312).

[2] The strongly supported variant εξωθεν (PQ, min., S., gig., vg., Arm., Aeth., Hipp., Pr., etc., so Bousset) for οπισθεν (ℵA, 1, 14, Syr.) hardly alters the general sense of the passage, and is probably conformed to εσωθεν, *cf.* Zahn's *Einl.*, § 72, 7.

providence and claims on mankind (*e.g.* 4 Esd. iii. 4, "thou didst fashion the earth, and that thyself alone"). That God the redeemer is God the creator, forms one of the O.T. ideas which acquire special weight in the Apocalypse. Despite the contradictions of experience and the apparent triumph of Satan, the apocalypses of the age never gave way to dualism. Their firm hope was that the world, ideally God's, would become actually his when messiah's work was done; hence, as here, the assertion of his complete power over nature and nations. "Because thou didst will it (σύ, σου emphatic) they existed and were created" (act and process of creation). As an answer to polytheism this cardinal belief in God the creator came presently to the front in the second century creeds and apologies. But the idea here is different alike from contemporary Jewish and from subsequent Christian speculation, the former holding that creation was for the sake of Israel (*cf.* 4 Esd. vi. 55, vii. 11, ix. 13, Apoc. Bar. xiv. 18, 19, xv. 7, Ass. Mos. i. 12, etc., a favourite rabbinic belief), the latter convinced that it was for the sake of the Christian church (*cf.* Herm. *Vis.* ii. 4). Nor is there any evident trace of the finer idea (En. iii.-v, Clem. Rom. xx., etc.) which contrasted the irregularities and impiety of men with the order and obedience of the universe. The conception of the holy ones rendering ceaseless praise in heaven would be familiar to early Christians in touch with Hellenic ideas and associations; *e.g.*, Hekataeus of Abdera, in his sketch of the ideal pious folk, compares them to the priests of Apollo, διὰ τὸ τὸν θεὸν τοῦτον καθ' ἡμέραν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ὑμνεῖσθαι μετ' ᾠδῆς συνεχῶς (Dieterich 36 f., *cf.* Apoc. Pet. 19-20). *Test. Levi* 3 ἐν δὲ τῷ μετ' αὐτόν εἰσι θρόνοι κ. ἐξουσίαι ἐν ᾧ ὕμνοι ἀεὶ τῷ θεῷ προσφέρονται.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. The central idea of this sealed roll or doomsday book lying open on the divine hand (*cf.* Blau, *Studien zur alt-heb. Buchwesen*, 36 f., E. J. Goodspeed, *Journ. Bibl. Lit.* 1903, 70-74) is reproduced from Ezekiel (ii. 9 f.) but independently developed in order to depict the truth that even these magnificent angelic figures of the divine court are unequal to the task of revelation. Jesus is needed. For God, a motionless, silent, majestic figure, does not come directly into touch with men either in revelation or in providence. He operates through his messiah, whose vicarious sacrifice throws all angels into the shade (*cf.* the thought of Phil. ii. 5-11). For the ancient association of a many-horned Lamb with divination, *cf.* the fragmentary Egyptian text edited by Krall (*Vom König Bokhoris*, Innsbrück, 1898) and the reference to Suidas (cited in my *Hist. New Testament*,[2] p. 687). βιβλίον, which here (as in i. 11, xxii. 7-18) might mean "letter" or "epistle" (*cf.* Birt's *Ant. Buchwesen*, 20, 21), apparently represents the book of doom or destiny as a papyrus-roll (*i.e.* an ὀπισθόγραφον, *cf.* Juv. i. 6) which is so full of matter that the writing has flowed from the inside over to the exterior, as is evident when the sheet is rolled up. Here as elsewhere the pictorial details are not to be pressed; but we may visualise the conception by supposing that all the seals along the outer edge must be broken before the content of the roll can be unfolded, and that each heralds some penultimate disaster (so 4 Esd. vi. 20). There is no proof that each seal meant a progressive disclosure of the contents, in which case we should have to imagine not a roll but a codex in book form, each seal securing one or two of the leaves (Spitta). Zahn (followed by Nestle, J. Weiss, and Bruston) im-

σφραγῖσιν ἑπτά. 2. Καὶ εἶδον ἄγγελον [c] ἰσχυρὸν κηρύσσοντα ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, "Τίς ἄξιος ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ;" 3. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό. 4. Καὶ ἐγὼ ἔκλαιον πολὺ ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἄξιος εὑρέθη ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό. 5. καὶ [d] εἷς [d] ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων

c Defined by φ. μ., *cf.* Ps. ciii. 20.

d = Genit. partit.

proves upon this theory by taking **ὄπ.** with **κατεσφρ.** and thus eliminating any idea of the **βιβλίον** being **ὀπισθόγραφον**: it simply rests on (**ἐπί**) the right hand, as a book does, instead of being held **ἐν** the right hand, as a roll would be. But **ἐπὶ τ. δ.** is a characteristic irregularity of grammar; to describe a sealed book as "written within" is tautological; **ἀνοῖξαι** could be used of a roll as well as of a codex; and **ἔσωθεν** would probably have preceded **γεγρ.** had it been intended by itself to qualify the participle. A Roman will, when written, had to be sealed seven times in order to anthenticate it, and some have argued (*e.g.* Hicks, *Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the N. T.* 157, 158, Zahn, Selwyn, Kohler, J. Weiss) that this explains the symbolism here: the **βιβλίον** is the testament assuring the inheritance reserved by God for the saints. The coincidence is interesting. But the sacred number in this connexion does not require any extra-Semitic explanation and the horrors of the seal-visions are more appropriate to a book of Doom. Besides, the Apoc. offers no support otherwise to this interpretation, for the sole allusion to **κληρονομεῖν** is quite incidental (*cf.* on xxi. 7). The sealing is really a Danielic touch, added to denote the mystery and obscurity of the future (not of the past, En. lxxxix.-xc.). On the writer's further use of the symbol of the book of Doom, *cf.* below on ch. x., xi. 16-19. The silence following the opening of the last seal certainly does not represent the contents of the book (= the promised Sabbath-rest, Zahn). This would be a jejune anti-climax. Possibly the cosmic tragedies that follow that seal are intended to be taken as the writing in question. The **βιβλίον** is therefore the divine course and counsel of providence in the latter days (**ἡ πάνσοφος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος μνήμη**, Areth.). Only, while an angel read all the divine policy to Daniel (Dan. x. 21), the Christian prophet feels that Jesus alone is the true interpreter and authority, and that the divine purpose can only be revealed or realised through his perfect spiritual equipment (iii. 1, v. 6, *cf.* i. 5, ii. 27, iii. 21, xvii, 14, etc.)

Ver. 2. The **καὶ** after **ἀνοῖξαι** is either epexegetic or the mark of a hysteron proteron (*cf.* the awkward **οὔτε βλέπειν** of 3-4, unless *look* here means to look into the contents). The cry is a challenge rather than an appeal.

Ver. 3. **ὑποκάτω**, the under-world of departed spirits or of daemons. Not even angels **ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ** (*cf.* Mark xiii. 32) can discharge this function; their rôle in the Apocalypse is prominent but limited. Gunkel prefers to think of a magical background to the whole symbolism; the book defies the necromancy of the universe, but yields to the superior power of "the new god, the lord of the book". For the mythological basis of the idea of an opened heavenly book *cf.* Winckler (*Alt-orient. Forsch.* ii. 386) and Brandis (*Hermes*, 1867, 283). The triple division of the universe was originally Babylonian but it had long ago become a popular religious idea, (*cf.* Phil. ii. 10).

Ver. 4. A naïve expression of disappointment, the expectation of iv. 1 being apparently thwarted. The sense of consolation and triumph is so strong in this book that no tears are shed in self-pity. The prophet only weeps at the apparent check to revelation.

Ver. 5. **ἀνοῖξαι . . . σφραγῖδας**, *cf.* Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscr. Graec.* 790[47] (first century) **τὰς σφ. ἀνοιξάτω.** Christ's success is due to his legitimate messianic authority as a Davidic scion (**ῥίζα** = shoot or sprout on main stem, *cf.* Sibyll. iii. 396); the Davidic descent of Jesus was a tenet of certain circles in primitive Christianity (Dalman i. § 12). Possibly there is an allusion to the original bearing of the O.T. passage:—Jesus irresistible and courageous, yet in origin humble. In 4 Esdr. xii. 31, 32 the messiah's rebuke to the Roman empire is thus described: leonem quem uidisti de silva euigilantem mugientem et loquentem ad aquilam et arguentem eam iniquitatis . . . hic est unctus, quem reseruauit altissimus in finem [dierum, qui dicitur

λέγει μοι, "Μὴ κλαῖε· ἰδοὺ [e]ἐνίκησεν ὁ [f]λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς [f]Ἰούδα, [g]ἡ ῥίζα Δαυείδ, [e]ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ τὰς ἑπτὰ σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ". 6. Καὶ εἶδον ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων [h]ἀρνίον [i]ἑστηκὸς[1] ὡς ἐσφαγ-

e Constr. xv. 9 (iii. 21, Ps. Sol. iv. 13 ἐνίκησε σκορπίσαι), infin. of remote purpose (Blass, § 69, 3). f Gen. xlix. 9, Heb. vii. 14. g xxii. 16, Isa. xi. 1 = Rom. xv. 12, 1 Chron. xxviii. 4. h Diminut. preferred in Apoc. to ἀμνός of 4th gospel, etc. i Acts vii. 56, Apoc. xiv. 1.

[1] For εστηκος (APQ, min., Orig., Hipp., Lach., Al., WH, Bj., Sw., Ws.) Ti., Tr., Bs. read [Win. § 14, 5] εστηκως (ℵ1, 7, 28, 32, 87), which probably arose from dittography. Except for xviii. 10, this is the only use of the longer participial form (*cf.* Helbing, 103) in the Apocalypse (even xiv. 1—s.v.l.—reproducing the shorter form).

ex semine David]. ῥάβδος, in sense of "shoot" occurs with ῥίζα in Isa. xi. 1 (*cf.* 10; Ezek. xix. 11, 12, 14); hence the combination with the idea of "sceptre" (ἐνίκησεν, *cf.* ii. 27) in a messianic connotation (*cf.* on xxii. 16). The enigma of the world's history lies with Christ, to be solved and to be controlled. Jewish eschatology (En. xlvi. 3, xlix. 1) had already proclaimed the revealing power of messiah, who is "mighty in all the secrets of righteousness . . . and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden". John claims that Jesus is the legitimate messiah, whose power to unfold God's redeeming purpose rests upon his victorious inauguration of that purpose. The victory of Christ in v. 5 f. follows dramatically upon the allusion in iii. 21, but it is to press the sequence too far when this scene is taken to represent his arrival in heaven "just after the accomplishment of his victory" (Briggs).

Ver. 6. Christ, crucified and risen, is in the centre. To him all things bow and sing. It is prosaic to attempt any local definition, as though the author had some architectural plan in his mind (ἐν μ. = "half-way up the throne," or by repetition = "between," *cf.* Gen. i. 7), or to wonder how so prominent a figure had hitherto escaped his notice. Plainly the ἀρνίον did not originally belong to the *mise-en-scène* of iv., though the symbol may have none the less had an astral origin (= Ram, in Persian zodiac). The prophet brilliantly suggests, what was a commonplace of early Christianity, that the royal authority of Jesus was due to his suffering for men, but the framework of the sketch is drawn from messianic dogmas which tended to make Christ here a figure rather than a personality.—ἀρνίον (like θηρίον, diminutive only in form) is not taken from Jer. xi. 19 f. (LXX) by a writer who placed it in juxtaposition with "lion" owing to the resemblance of sound between אריה and *aries* (so variously Havet and Selwyn, 204-208), nor substituted (Vischer, Rauch) for the "lion" of the original Jewish source, but probably applied (*cf.* Hort on 1 Peter i. 19) to Jesus from the messianic interpretation of Isa. xvi. 1 or liii. 7, though the allusions elsewhere to the Exodus (xv. 2 f.) and the Johannine predilection for the paschal Lamb suggest that the latter was also in the prophet's mind. The collocation of lion and lamb is not harder than that of lion and root (ver. 5), and such an editor as Vischer and others postulate would not have left "lion" in ver. 5 unchanged. Christ is erect and living (*cf.* xiv. 1 and Abbott's *Joh. Vocabulary*, 1725), ὡς ἐσφαγμένον (as could be seen from the wound on the throat), yet endowed with complete power (κέρατα, Oriental symbol of force, *cf.* reff. and the rams' horns of the Egyptian sun-god) and knowledge. For ἀρνίον and ἀμνός, *cf.* Abbott, 210 f. In Enoch lxxxix. 44 f. (Gk.) David is ἄρνα prior to his coronation and Solomon "a little sheep" (*i.e.*, a lamb).—ὀφθαλμοὺς κ.τ.λ., the function ascribed by Plutarch (*de defectu orac.* 13) to daemons as the spies and scouts of God on earth. The naïve symbolism is borrowed from the organisation of an ancient realm, whose ruler had to secure constant and accurate information regarding the various provinces under his control. News (as the Tel-el-Amarna correspondence vividly shows) was essential to an Oriental monarch. The representation of Osiris in Egyptian mythology consisted of an eye and a sceptre (*cf.* Apoc. ii. 27), denoting foresight and force (Plut. *de Iside*, 51), while the "eyes" and "ears" of a Parthian monarch were officials or officers who kept him informed of all that transpired throughout the country. Else-

μένον, ἔχων [k] κέρατα ἑπτὰ καὶ [l] ὀφθαλμοὺς [l] ἑπτά, οἵ εἰσι τὰ [m] ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεσταλμένοι εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. 7. Καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ [n] εἴληφεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. 8. καὶ ὅτε ἔλαβε τὸ βιβλίον, τὰ τέσσερα ζῷα καὶ οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, [o] ἔχοντες ἕκαστος [p] κιθάραν καὶ

k After Dan. vii. 20 f., viii. 3, En. xc. 37 f., etc.
l i. 4, iv. 6, from Zech. iv. 10 (iii. 9): eyes = stars ("Αργος πανόπτης = starry heaven), s.c. 125, 298 f.
m iv. 5.
n viii. 5, *cf.* iii. 3, vii. 14, xix. 3, aoristic (Blass, § 59, 4).
o *i.e.* οἱ πρεσβ. (loose syntax)?
p xiv. 2, xv. 2.

where the seven spirits are identified with seven torches, but John is more concerned to express from time to time his religious ideas than to preserve any homogeneity of symbolism (seven eyes similarly varied in Zech. *cf.* reff.). The inconsistency cannot, in a writing of this nature, be taken as evidence of interpolation or of divergent sources, though it may be an editorial gloss. An analogous idea underlies Plutarch's explanation of the "travelling" power of Isis (*Iside*, 60), for which he adduces the old Greek etymology (= knowledge and movement, **θεὸς** from **θέειν** "to run"); and this etymology in turn (*cf.* Otto on Theoph. *ad Autolyc.* i. 4) reaches back to a star cultus.—N.B. In the Apoc. **ἀρνίον,** which is opposed to **θηρίον** and is always (except xiii. 11 f.) used of Jesus, denotes not only the atoning sacrificial aspect of Christ (v. 6, 9 f., 12, xii. 11) but his triumphant power (horned) over outsiders (xvii. 14) and his own people (vii. 16 f.). Neither the diminutive (*cf.* below, on xii. 17) nor the associations of innocence and gentleness are to be pressed (*cf.* Spitta, *Streitfragen der Gesch. Jesu*, 1907, 173 f.). The term becomes almost semitechnical in the Apocalypse. As a pre-Christian symbol, it is quite obscure. The text and origin of the striking passage in *Test. Ios.* xix. do not permit much more than the inference that the leader there (a **μόσχος**) becomes an **ἀμνός,** who, supported by Judah the lion, **ἐνίκησεν πάντα τὰ θηρία.** The virgin-birth is probably a Christian interpolation. No sure root for the symbolism has yet been found in astro-theology (Jeremias 15 f.). For attempts to trace back the idea to Babylonian soil, *cf.* Hommel in *Exp. Times*, xiv. 106 f., Havet, 324 f., and Zimmern in *Schrader*,[3] 597 f. One Babylonian text does mention the blood of the lamb as a sacrificial substitute for man, which is all the more significant as the texts of the cultus are almost wholly destitute of any allusion to the significance of the blood in sacrifice. But no influence of this on pre-Christian messianism, or of contemporary cults on this element of Christian symbolism, can be made out from the extant evidence. In any case, it would merely supply the form for expressing a reality of the Christian experience.

Ver. 7. A realistic symbol of the idea conveyed in John iii. 35, xii. 49, etc.

Ver. 8. A thrill of satisfaction over Christ's ability. "It is the manner of God thus to endear mercies to us, as he endeared a wife to Adam. He first brought all creatures to him, that he might first see that there was not a help-meet for him among them" (Goodwin). John lays dramatic emphasis on *Jesus only*. **ἐνωπ. τ. ἀ.** (as before God himself, xix. 4).—**γ. θ.**, *cf.* Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 4, **πόλις δ' ὁμοῦ μὲν θυμιαμάτων γέμει.** An essential feature in the rites of Roman sacrifice was music played on *tibicines;* the *patera*, a shallow saucer or ladle with a long handle attached, was also employed to pour wine on the altar. Harps held by living creatures who had no hands but only wings, and the collocation of a harp played by a person who is at the same time holding a bowl, are traits which warn us against prosaically visualising such visions. Hirscht compares the adoration of Rameses II. before the sun-god, the monarch's left hand holding his offering, his right grasping a sceptre and scourge. The fragrant smoke of incense rising from the hand of a worshipper or from an altar in the primitive cultus (*cf.* Ezek. viii. 2) to lose itself in upper air, became a natural symbol for prayer breathed from earth to heaven; see Philo's **τὸ καθαρώτατον τοῦ θύοντος, πνεῦμα λογικόν.—αἱ . . . ἁγίων,** probably an editorial gloss like xix. 8 *b*, suggested by the verbal parallel in viii. 3 (so, *e.g.*, Spitta, Völter, Briggs, Jülicher, J. Weiss, Wellhausen, etc.). Contrast with this verse (and ver. 4) the description of the enthusiastic seamen and passengers who "candidati, coronatique, et tura libantes," praised and blessed Augustus in the bay of Puteoli as "He by whom we live, and sail secure, and

φιάλας χρυσᾶς γεμούσας [q] θυμιαμάτων [[r] αἵ εἰσιν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων]· 9. καὶ [s] ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν [t] καινὴν λέγοντες,

"Ἄξιος εἶ λαβεῖν τὸ βιβλίον καὶ ἀνοῖξαι τὰς σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ·

ὅτι [u] ἐσφάγης καὶ [v] ἠγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ [w] ἐν τῷ [w] αἵματί σου,

[x] ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς καὶ γλώσσης καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἔθνους,

10. καὶ ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν [y] βασιλείαν καὶ [y] ἱερεῖς·

καὶ [z] βασιλεύσουσιν [1] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς."

11. Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἤκουσα [2] φωνὴν ἀγγέλων πολλῶν κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν ζῴων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν

q Ps. cxli. 2. r = ᾱ, by false attraction. s Isa. xlii. 10, Ps. xxxiii. 3, cxliv. 9, etc. t So xiv. 3, *cf.* Judith xvi. 1 (A), 13 (15), Ps. Sol. iii. 2, etc., and Eus. *H. E.* v. 28. u *Cf.* Isa. liii. 7. v See on 1 Cor. vi. 20, and below xiv. 3-4. w i. 5, *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 18-19. x vii. 9, fr. Dan. iii. 2, 4, 7, *cf.* 4 Esd. iii. 7. y i. 6, Briggs here also would omit the *καί*. z xxii. 5. a vii. 11, 1 Kings xxii. 19, *cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 22.

[1] For βασιλευσομεν (Pr., vg.), βασιλευσουσιν (ℵP, 1, min., S., etc., Bg., Ti., Ws., Holtzm., Bs., Bj., Briggs, etc.) is preferable to βασιλευουσιν (AQ, min., Syr., And[a]. Lach., Al. Tr., WH, Sw., Jacoby 448-449) in sense of Matt. v. 5.

[2] After ηκουσα Ti., Tr. (WH marg.), Bj., Sw. add ως (ℵQ**, min., Syr., Areth., etc.).

enjoy our freedom and fortunes" (Suet. *Vit. Aug.* 98.)

The scene or stage of the apocalyptical drama is occupied by an angelic and heavenly chorus, who upon this solemn and glad occasion give their *plaudite* or acclamation of glory to the Lord. The future which God rules is revealed by him through Christ; and this moves enthusiastic gratitude, till the universe rings from side to side with praise.

Ver. 9. ᾠδὴν κ. followed (14) by ἀμήν, as in the worship of the church on earth (Col. iii. 16, 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16). ᾄδουσιν (historic present) no longer to God as creator (iv. 11) but to the Lamb as redeemer, for the cost and scope and issue of his redemption. This unique and remarkable passage in early Christian literature marks the growing sense and value attaching to Jesus as being far more than a mere national messiah, in fact as the one assurance of God possessed by men, as their pledge of bliss and privilege and pardon. And this is due to his redeeming function, upon which the relationship of men to God depends. It is a further stage of the Christian development when, as in *Asc. Isa.* ix. 27-32, the vision and praise of Jesus is followed by that of the Holy Spirit (35, 36) and of God himself (37-42). The prophet John's "theology" is less advanced. Universal allegiance and homage paid not, as in the contemporary sense of the οἰκουμένη, to a Cæsar's proud pretensions, but to the sacrifice of a Christ (see G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geogr.* 478, 479) is a new thing in the world. An undivided church, gathered from the divisions of humanity, is also a new and unexpected development, to which a foil is presented by the exclusiveness voiced at the annual Jewish paschal rite, and in the daily Shema-prayer ("For Thou hast chosen *us* from amongst all nations and tongues. . . . Blessed be the Lord that chose in love his people Israel"). For ἀγοράζειν (*cf.* note on i. 5) = the buying of slaves, *cf.* Dittenberger's *Orientis Gr. Inscript. Selectae*, 338[23].

Ver. 10. An allusion not so much to the idea of xx. 4, where the literal sway of the saints (= life eternal, in substance) is confined to a certain section of them, or to xxii. 5 (on the new earth, *cf.* xxi. 1), as to ii. 26. Compare the primitive patristic notion, reflected, *e.g.*, by Vict. on i. 15: adorabimus in loco ubi steterunt pedes eius, quoniam ubi illi primum steterunt et ecclesiam confirmauerunt, *i.e.*, in Judæa, ibi omnes sancti conuenturi sunt et dominum suum adoraturi. The whole verse sets aside implicitly such a Jewish pretension as of Philo, who (*de Abrah.* 19) hails Israel as the people ὃ μοι δοκεῖ τὴν ὑπὲρ παντὸς ἀνθρώπων γένους ἱερωσύνην καὶ προφητείαν λαχεῖν.

Ver. 11. This outer circle of myriads (the following χιλιάδες is an anti-climax) of angelic retainers—a favourite trait in the later Jewish pageants of heaven—does not address praise directly to the Lamb.

μυριάδες μυριάδων καὶ [b]χιλιάδες χιλιάδων, 12. [c]λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλῃ,

"Ἄξιός [1] ἐστιν τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν τὴν δύναμιν καὶ [d]πλοῦτον καὶ [e]σοφίαν καὶ ἰσχὺν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν καὶ [f]εὐλογίαν."

13. Καὶ πᾶν κτίσμα ὃ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [g]ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα, ἤκουσα [h]λέγοντας,

"Τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ [2] καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ [i]ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

b From Dan. vii. 10, *cf.* En. xiv. 22, xl. 1, lxxi. 8, etc.
c Constr. ad sens. = λέγοντες.
d Rom. x. 12, xi. 33. Phil. iv. 19, Eph. iii. 8.
e *Cf.* on vii. 12.
f vii. 12, Sir. l. 20.
g Phil. ii. 10, Eph. i. 21, *cf.* ver. 3 and Ps. cxlv. 4, Ign. *Trall.* ix. 1.
h Irreg. apposition like xvii. 10, xix. 14, etc.
i On art. *cf.* Win. § 18, 42.

[1] **αξιος** A (Bg., Ti., WH marg., Ws.), *constr. ad sensum* [**αξιος ει**, S.], is preferable to the easier **αξιον** of ℵQ, min., Syr.

[2] **τω θρονω** AQ, min., And^c (edd.) is preferable to **του θρονου** of ℵP, 1, etc., S., Areth. (WH text, Bj.).

Ver. 12. For similar arrangements in Jewish doxologies, see Gfrörer, ii. 146-8; and, for **ἰσχ. τιμ. δόξ.** see Dan. ii. 37 (LXX). **τήν** groups together the seven words of the panegyric; honour and glory and praise are due to one whose victorious death has won him the power of bestowing incalculable riches on his people and of unriddling the future, against all opposition (Weiss). The refrain of **δύν.** is heard in xi. 17, and **δόξα** had been already associated with "wealth" and "power" (Eph. i. 18 f.) or "wisdom" (2 Cor. iii. 7 f., iv. 4, etc.) in Christ (contrast Isa. liii. 2 LXX). The act of taking the book (ver. 7) suggests the general authority and prestige of the Lamb, which is acknowledged in this doxology. The order in 12, 13 is the same as in Ps. ciii. 20-22, where the angels are followed by creation in the worship. When God's creatures and servants magnify, praise, and bless him, yielding themselves to his dominion, and acknowledging that to him all the strength and wealth and wisdom of life rightly belong, God is honoured. Christ was glorified by God (*cf.* Acts iii. 13, Rom. vi. 4, John xvii. 1) at the resurrection, when God's power raised him to eternal life; he is glorified by men in their homage and submission to him as the sole medium of redemption and revelation.

Ver. 13. From the whole creation a third doxology rises, catching up the last word (**εὐλογίᾳ**) of the preceding, and addressed—as in the primitive and distinctive confessions of early Christianity (*e.g.*, John xvii. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 5) to God and Jesus alike (vii. 10). In this chorus of praise (i. 6), by a sweep of the poet's imagination, even departed spirits and sea-monsters (**ἐπὶ τ. θαλ.**, rather than seafaring men) join—"even all that is in" earth and sea and heaven (*cf.* the title of the sun in the Rosetta inscription of 196 B.C., **μέγας βασιλεὺς τῶν τε ἄνω κ. τ. κάτω χωρῶν**). Sacrifice is on the throne of the universe; by dying for men, Jesus has won the heart and confidence of the world. Thus the praise of God the creator (ch. iv.) and the praise of Jesus the redeemer (ch. v.) blend in one final song, whose closing words indicate that the latter's prestige was not confined to a passing phase of history. The crime for which the messiah dethrones the rulers (in Enoch xlvi.) is just "because they do not praise and extol him, nor thankfully acknowledge whence the kingdom was bestowed upon them, . . . because they do not extol the name of the Lord of Spirits". In the papyrus of Ani (*E. B. D.* 3) Rā is worshipped by the gods "who dwell in the heights and who dwell in the depths"; whilst Isis and Osiris, as possessing supreme power, received honour "in the regions under the earth and in those above ground" (Plut. *de Iside*, 27). Compare the fine rabbinic saying of Rabbi Pinchas and R. Jochanan on Ps. c. 2: "though all offerings cease in the future, the offering of praise alone shall not cease; though all prayers cease, thanksgiving alone shall not cease".

14. Καὶ τὰ τέσσερα ζῷα ἔλεγον, [k] "Ἀμήν". [l] καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεσαν καὶ προσεκύνησαν.

VI. 1. ΚΑΙ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὸ ἀρνίον [a] μίαν [a] ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ σφραγίδων, καὶ [b] ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων λέγοντος ὡς φωνὴ [1]

k iv. 10, xix. 4.
l Detached "Amen" (so often in O.T.), *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 16, Just. *Apol.* i. 65, 67.
a See v. 5, etc.
b See v. 11.

[1] For φωνης (P, 1) read φωνη [harsh ex. of nom. indep.] ACQ., etc., And., Areth., Bg., Lach., Ti., Tr., Bs., Düst., Bj. [φωνῇ 7, 87, 93, WH, Sw., Ws.].

Ver. 14. The prologue is brought to a splendid close by "amen" from the four ζῷα, who have the last as they had the first word (iv. 8), followed by silent adoration from the πρεσβύτεροι. As in the liturgical practice of early Christian assemblies, so in the celestial court, the solemn chant of praise to God is succeeded by the "amen" ("ad similitudinem tonitrui . . . *amen* reboat," Jerome); Q, Areth., etc. Alf., bring this out by reading here τὸ Ἀμήν. By prefacing the struggle on earth (vi. f.) with a vision of the brilliant authority and awe of heaven (iv., v.), the prophet suggests that all the movements of men on earth, as well as the physical catastrophes which overtake them, are first fore-shadowed in heaven (the underlying principle of astrology, *cf.* Jeremias, 84 f.) and consequently have a providential meaning. In iv., v. the writer takes his readers behind the scenes; the whole succeeding tide of events is shown to flow from the will of God as creator of the universe, whose executive authority is delegated to Jesus the redeemer of his people. This tide breaks in two cycles of seven waves, the seventh (viii. 1) of the first series (vi. 1-vii. 17) issuing in a fresh cycle (viii. 2-xi. 19) instead of forming itself (as we should expect) the climax of these preliminary catastrophes in nature and humanity, disasters which were interpreted (*R. J.* 237-239) as the premonitory outbursts of an angry deity ready to visit the earth with final punishment. Observe that throughout the Apocalypse wind and fire are among God's scourges handled by angels in order to punish the earth and the waters, according to the conception preserved in Apol. Arist. 2: "Moreover, the wind is obedient to God, and fire to the angels; the waters also to the daemons, and earth to the sons of men" (*Ante-Nicene Library*, ix. 257 f.). The visitation is divinely complete, sevenfold like Ezekiel's oracles against the nations (xxv.-xxxii.). Apoc. vi.-ix. has, for its staple, little more than a poetic elaboration of Mark xiii. 8 (*cf.* 24, 25), international complications due to the scuffling and strife of peoples, and physical disasters as a fit setting for them.

The vision of the seven seals opened (vi. 1-viii. 2): vi. 1, 2, a Parthian invasion.

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. The command or invitation ἔρχου is not addressed to Christ (as xxii. 17 20). If addressed to the seer, it is abbreviated from the ordinary rabbinic phrase (*ueni et uide*) used to excite attention and introduce the explanation of any mystery. The immediate sequel (omitted only in ver. 4), καὶ εἶδον, does not, however, forbid the reference of ἔρχου to the mounted figures; hearing the summons, John looked to see its meaning and result. The panorama of these four dragoons ("ad significandum iter properum cum potentia") is partly sketched from Semitic folk-lore, where apparitions of horsemen (*cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 25, etc.: "the Beduins always granted me that none living had seen the angel visions . . . the meleika are seen in the air like horsemen, tilting to and fro," Doughty, *Arab. Deserta*, i. 449) have been a frequent omen of the end (*cf. Jos. Bell.* vi. 5; *Sib. Or.* iii. 796), partly reproduced from (Persian elements in) Zech. i. 7 f., vi. 1-8, in order to bring out the disasters (*cf.* Jer. xiv. 12, xxi. 7) prior to the last day. The direct sources of vi. and ix. lie in Lev. xxvi. 19-26; Ezek. xxxiii. 27, xxxiv. 28 f., and Sir. xxxix. 29, 30 ("fire and hail and famine and θάνατος, all these are created for vengeance; teeth of wild beasts and scorpions and serpents and a sword taking vengeance on the impious to destroy them"). An astral background, in connection with the seven tables of destiny in Babylonian mythology, each of which was dedicated to a planet of a special colour, has been conjectured by Renan (472); *cf.* Chwolson's *Die Ssabier*, iii. 658, 671, 676 f. For other efforts to associate these horsemen with the winds or the planets, see Jeremias (pp. 24 f.) and M. W. Müller in *Zeitr. f. d. neutest.*

βροντῆς, [c] "Ἔρχου". 2. Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος [d] λευκός, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων [e] τόξον· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στέφανος, καὶ ἐξῆλθε νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ. 3. Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν δευτέραν, ἤκουσα τοῦ δευτέρου ζῴου λέγοντος, "Ἔρχου". 4. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄλλος ἵππος [f] πυρρός· καὶ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ [g] ἵνα [h] ἀλλήλους [g] σφάξουσιν· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ μάχαιρα μεγάλη. 5. Καὶ ὅτε

c xvii. 1, xxi. 9, John i. 39, 46.
d Sib. Or. iii. 176, Verg. *Aen.* iii. 537 f. (Servius).
e ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
f xii. 3, ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
g *Cf.* on iii. 9.
h Mk. xiii. 8, etc., Ap. Bar. lxx. 3, 4 Esd. vi. 24, xiii. 31, Sib. Or. ii. 156.

Wiss. (1907), 290-316. But the proofs are fanciful and vague, though they converge upon the view that the colours of the steeds at least had originally some planetary significance. The series, as usual, is divided into the first four and the second three members. The general contents of vi. 1-8 denote various but not successive phases of woe (only too familiar to inhabitants of the Eastern provinces) which were to befall the empire and the East during the military convulsions of the final strife between Rome and Parthia. The "primum omen," for John as for Vergil, is a white horse, ridden by an archer.

Ver. 2. White = royal and victorious colour, *cf.* the white horse of the Persian kings (Philostr. *Vit. Ap.* i.). The triumphant figure of the mounted bowman is by no means to be identified with that of the Christian messiah or of the gospel. It would be extremely harsh and confusing to represent the messiah as at once the Lamb opening the seal and a figure independently at work. The initial period of the gospel was not one of irresistible triumph, and matters have become too acute for John to share the belief voiced in Mark xiii. 10. Besides, the messiah could hardly be described as preceding the signs of his own advent, nor would he be on the same plane as the following figures. The vision is a tacit antithesis, not an anticipation, of xix. 11 f.; the triumph of the world which opens the drama is rounded off by an infinitely grander triumph won by Christ.—**νικῶν κ. κ.τ.λ.** John was too open-eyed to ignore the fact that other forces, besides the Christian gospel, had a success of their own on earth. What is this force? Not the Roman Empire, as if the four steeds represented the first four emperors (so, variously, Renan, Spitta, Weizsäcker), but a raid of the Parthians (so most edd. from Vitringa to Erbes, Völter, Holtzm., Bousset, Bruston, Ramsay, Scott), which represented war in its most dreaded form for inhabitants of the Eastern provinces. There is no need to find any definite reference to the raid of Vonones (Wetstein) or of Vologesus who invaded Syria in 61-63 A.D. The simple point of the vision is that the Parthians would be commissioned to make a successful foray, carrying all before them. The bow was the famous and dreaded weapon of these oriental cavalry; **Νικήτωρ** was a title of Seleucus, and **νικητής** of the Persian satrap. One plausible hypothesis (developed by Erbes) refers the basis of the seal-visions to (*a*) the triumphs of Augustus and Tiberius, (*b*) the bloody feuds in Palestine under Caligula, (*c*) the famine in Syria under Claudius (Ac. xi.), (*d*) the subsequent pestilence, (*e*) the Neronic martyrs, and (*f*) the agitations of the empire under Galba, etc. (for portents *cf.* Plin. *Ep.* vi. 16, 20; Tacit. *Hist.* i. 4). But a similar collocation of portents is found in the reign of Titus; and apart from the misinterpretation of the first seal, it is arbitrary and jejune to suppose that this prophet's splendid, free reading of providence was laboriously spelt out from details of more or less recent history.

Vv. 3, 4. *The second seal opened:* A swordsman representing (red = martial colour) war and bloodshed, "is permitted to make men slay one another". The allusion to the merciless weapon (Plut. *de Iside*, 11) of the sword as Rome's national arm thus places the Parthian and Roman empires side by side (**τῆς γῆς** generally, not Judaea in particular), but the vision of war is also connected directly with the two following visions of famine (5, 6) and mortality (from pestilence, 7, 8). The seven punishments drawn up by rabbinic theology (*Pirke Aboth*, v. 11 f.) were: three kinds of famine, pestilence, noisome beasts, and captivity or exile.

Vv. 5, 6. The third seal opened = *famine.*

Ver. 5. The spectral figure of Hunger

ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν τρίτην, ἤκουσα τοῦ τρίτου ζῴου λέγοντος, "Ἔρχου". Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος μέλας, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων [k] ζυγὸν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. 6. καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων λέγουσαν,

[l] "Χοῖνιξ σίτου [m] δηναρίου, καὶ τρεῖς χοίνικες κριθῶν [h] δηναρίου· καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον καὶ τὸν οἶνον μὴ [n] ἀδικήσῃς."

7. Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν τετάρτην, ἤκουσα φωνὴν τοῦ τετάρτου ζῴου λέγοντος, "Ἔρχου". 8. καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος [o] χλωρός, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ,[1] ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ Θάνατος,

i *Cf.* Lam. iv. 8-9 (bloodlessness): *cf.* the Greek terms *αἰανής* and *αἴθοψ* for λιμός. k Prov. xvi. 11, Ezek. iv. 16, v. 1, xlv. 10. l = ἡμερήσιος τροφή (Diog. Laert. 8, 18, *cf.* Herod. vii. 251). m Gen. price (sc. πωλεῖται): *cf.* Matt. xx. 2. n Thuc. ii. 71, iv. 98, aor. of prohibition. o Hom. *Il.* viii. 479.

[1] Read **αυτω** (ℵQ, 5, And., Areth., Tr. marg.: *cf.* xiv. 4, 9, xix. 14) for **μετ αυτου** (edd.), and, after **εδοθη**, **αυτω** (Q, min., vss., Bg., Bs.) for the correction **αυτοις** (ℵACP, edd.). [In any case, the **αυτοις** refers to Death and Hades, not to the second, third, and fourth riders (Wellh.)].

holds a balance or pair of scales (ζ. literally = the beam, see reff.) for measuring bread by weight, to personify (ver. 6) bad times, when provisions became cruelly expensive. One χοῖνιξ of wheat, the usual rations of a working man for a day, is to cost twelve times its normal price, while the labourer's daily pay will not command more than an eighth of the ordinary twenty-four measures of the coarser barley. Grain is not to disappear entirely from the earth, otherwise there would be no famine. But food-stuffs are to be extremely scanty and therefore dear (*cf.* Lev. xxvi. 26; Ezek. iv. 16). These hard times are aggravated (καὶ adversative) by the immunity of oil and wine, which are, comparatively speaking, luxuries. One exasperating feature of the age would be the sight of wine and oil flowing, while grain trickled slowly into the grasp of the famishing. The best explanation of this realistic exception is to regard it as a water-mark of the Domitianic date (for details see the present writer's study in *Expos.* Oct. 1908, 359-369). In 92 A.D. Domitian had made a futile attempt to injure the cultivation of the vine in the provinces, which led to widespread agitation throughout Ionia. His edict had soon to be withdrawn, but not till it had roused fear and anger. Hence the words *hurt not the wine* have the force of a local allusion to what was fresh in his readers' minds. The point of the saying lies in the recent events which had stirred Smyrna and the surrounding townships, and which provided the seer with a bit of colour for his palette as he painted the final terrors. It is as if he grimly said: "Have no fears for your vines! There will be no Domitian to hurt them. Comfort yourselves with that. Only, it will be small comfort to have your liquid luxuries spared and your grain reduced almost to starvation point." Or, the prophet's meaning might be that the exemption of the vine would only pander to drunkenness and its attendant ills. The addition of τὸ ἔλαιον is probably an artistic embodiment, introduced in order to fill out the sketch. The cultivation of the olive accompanied that of the vine, and the olive meant smooth times. It is no era of peace; far from that, the prophet implies. But the olive, "the darling of Peace" (as Vergil calls it), flourishes unchecked, so mocking and awry are the latter days. For ἀδικεῖν = "injure" (a country), see reff., vii. 2, and Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscr. Graec.* 557. This Domitianic reference of vi. 6 was first worked out by S. Reinach (*Revue Archéolog.* 1901, 350 f.) and has been accepted by Harnack, Heinrici, Bousset, J. Weiss, Abbott, Holtzmann, Baljon, and others. There is no allusion to Jos. *Bell.* v. 13, 6, or to the sparing of gardens during the siege of Jerusalem (S. Krauss, in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift*, 1909, 81-89).

Vv. 7, 8. The fourth seal opened: *pestilence and mortality*.

Ver. 8. χλωρός, pale or livid as a corpse.—ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, for the ordinary ἐπ' αὐτόν, a grammatical variation which has no special significance. In this Dureresque vignette the spectre of Hades, bracketed here as elsewhere with Death, accompanies the latter to secure his booty

καὶ ὁ [p] ᾄδης [q] ἠκολούθει [q] αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς ἀποκτεῖναι [r] ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ἐν [s] θανάτῳ καὶ [t] ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων τῆς γῆς. 9. Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν πέμπτην σφραγῖδα, εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς [u] ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων [v] διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν [u] μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον, 10. καὶ ἔκραξαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγοντες, "Ἕως πότε, ὁ

p i. 18, xx. 13-14. Hos. xiii. 14, Isa. xviii. 5.
q xiv. 13, *cf.* Luke ix. 49.
r Instrum. Abbott, *Diat.* 2332*a*.
s xviii. 8; = pestilence (LXX).
t Rare with act. verb.
u xx. 4 (*cf.* Heb. xii. 23).
v i. 9, xii. 17.

of victims. So Nergal, the Babylonian Pluto, is not content with ruling the regions of the dead but appears as an active personification of violent destruction, especially pestilence and war, inflicting his wounds on large masses rather than on individuals (Jastrow, 66, 67). A similar duality of conception, local and personal, obtained in Semitic and Hellenic mythology (*cf. e.g.*, ix. 11); only, Death is not here personified as an angel (with Jewish theology, *cf.* Eisenmenger's *Eindecktes Jud.* i. 854 f., 862 f.). As the chief partner in this grim league, he is given destructive power over a certain quarter of the earth (τὸ τέτ. colloquially); his agents are the usual apocalyptic scourges (*cf.* Ezek. xiv. 21, Ps. Sol. xiii. 2 f., with Plut. *Iside*, 47 for the Iranian expectation of λοιμὸς καὶ λιμός as inflictions of Ahriman) against which the Jewish evening prayer was directed ("keep far from us the enemy, the pestilence, the sword, famine and affliction"). War, followed by famine which bred pestilence, was familiar in Palestine (Jos. *Antiq.* xv. 9) during the first century A.D. Indeed throughout the ancient world war and pestilence were closely associated, while wild beasts multiplied and preyed on human life, as the land was left untilled. In Test. Naphth. 8, etc., Beliar is the captain of wild beasts. Note that the prophet sees only the commissions, not the actual deeds, of these four dragoons: not until vi. 12 f. does anything happen. The first four seals are simply arranged on the rabbinic principle (Sohar Gen. fol. 91), "quodcunque in terra est, id etiam in coelo est, et nulla res tam exigua est in mundo quae non ab alia simili quae in coelo est dependeat". The four plagues (a Babylonian idea) are adapted from Ezek. xiv. 12 f. Contemporary disasters which may have lent vividness to the sketch are collected by Renan (pp. 323 f.).

Vv. 9-11. The fifth seal opened.

Ver. 9. The scene changes from earth to heaven, which appears as a replica of the earthly temple with its altar of burnt offering. As the blood of sacrifices flowed at the base of the altar (xvi. 7), the blood representing the life, the symbolism is obvious. It was mediated by rabbinic ideas of the souls of the just (*e.g.*, of Moses) resting under the divine throne of glory; *cf.* R. Akiba's saying, "quicumque sepelitur in terra Israel, perinde est ac si sepeliretur sub altari: quicumque autem sepelitur sub altari, perinde est ac si sepeliretur sub throno gloriae" (*Pirke Aboth*, 26). The omission of Ἰησοῦ after μ. may suggest that the phrase is intended to include not so much the heroic Jews who fell in the defence of their temple against Rome (Weyland) as pre-Christian Jewish martyrs (*cf.* Heb. xi. 39, 40) who are raised to the level of the Christian church, and also those Jews who had been martyred for refusing to worship the emperor (*cf.* vii. 9, xvii. 6, and Jos. *B. J.* vii. 10, 1). But the primary thought of the Christian prophet is for Rome's latest victims in the Neronic persecution and the recent enforcement of the cultus under Domitian. The general idea is derived from Zech. i. 12, Ps. lxxix. 10, and En. xxii. 5 ("and I saw the spirits of the children of men who were dead, and their voice penetrated to the heaven and complained," from the first division of Sheol).

Ver. 10. Like Clem. Rom., John is fond of δεσπότης as implying the divine might and majesty (3 Macc. iii. 29, v. 28). This severe and awe-inspiring conception (*cf.* Philo, *quis rer. div. haer.* 6) means that God will vindicate his holiness, which had been outraged by the murder of the δοῦλοι for whom he is responsible. In contemporary pagan religions throughout Asia Minor, the punishment of wrong-doing is often conceived in the same way, *viz.*, as the answer to the sufferer's appeal (*cf.* Introd. § 2), not simply as a spontaneous act of divine retribution. "How long wilt thou refrain from charging and avenging our blood upon (ἐκ as in 1 Sam. xxiv. 13, Ps. xlii. 1) those who dwell on the earth" (*i.e.*, pagans)? The bleeding heart of primitive Christendom stands up and cries, "I

[w] δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινός, οὐ [x] κρίνεις καὶ [x] ἐκδικεῖς τὸ [y] αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;" 11. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἑκάστῳ [z] στολὴ [z] λευκή, καὶ [a] ἐῤῥέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι

w = φοβερὸς κύριος (Philo), Plato, *Euthyd.* 302: *cf.* on Luke ii. 29, Acts iv. 24, Did. x. 3, Dan. iii. 37, ix. 8, etc. x 2 Kings ix. 7, 2 Chron. xxiv. 22, *cf.* Hab. i. 2, Deut. xxxii. 43, etc. y John xvi. 2. z iii. 4, 5, 18. a As ix. 4 for ἐρρήθη Attic.

have suffered". For ἐκδικεῖν αἷμα *cf.* Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscript. Graec.* 816[12] (1 cent. A.D.) ἵνα ἐγδικήσῃς τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἀναίτιον, etc.; for ἐκδ. ἐκ. (= מִן) of vengeance, *cf.* Luke xviii. 3-8 (ἀπὸ), a close parallel in thought, though this pathetic, impatient thirst for blood-revenge, which has "the full drift of Ps. xciv. below it" (Selwyn) is inferior not only to 1 Peter ii. 23 but to the synoptic wail. The Jewish atmosphere is unmistakable (*cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 36; also Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten*, 312 f.), but this does not mean that the passage was necessarily written by a Jew. In that case we should have expected some allusion to the vicarious, atoning power of the martyrs' death (*R. J.* 181). The prophet evidently anticipated further persecution, since he wrote on the verge of the end precipitated by the Domitianic policy (*cf.* on ii. 13). Such persecution follows natural disturbances, as in the synoptic apocalypse (Matt. xxiv. 6-7, 21 f.), but the outline of the fifth seal is taken from Enoch, where (xlvii.) the prayer and blood of the martyred saints "rise from the earth before the Lord of Spirits," while the angels rejoice that such blood has not been shed in vain. In En. xcvii. 3-5 the prayer of the righteous for vengeance overtakes their persecutors on the day of judgment with woeful issues (xcix. 3, 16). "Persist in your cry for judgment, and it shall appear unto you; for all your tribulation will be visited on the rulers, and on all their helpers, and on those who plundered you" (civ. 3, *cf.* xxii. 6, 7, where Abel's spirit complains of Cain).—κατ. κ.τ.λ. always in Apocalypse opposed to the saints, almost as "the world" to "the pious" in modern phraseology. This usage is largely paralleled by that of the Noachic interpolations in Enoch (see Charles on xxxvii. 5), where the phrase has either unfavourable or neutral associations. ἅγιος here (as John xvii. 11 = Did. x. 3, πανάγιος Clem. Rom. xxxv. 3, lviii. 1) applied by a comparatively rare usage (1 Peter i. 15 and Apoc. iv. 8 being dependent on O.T.) to God, whose intense holiness must be in antagonism to the evil and contradictions of the world (Titius, 9-11).

Ver. 11. The white robe assigned each (Blass, § 32, 4) of these martyr-spirits as a pledge of future and final glory (vii. 9) and a consoling proof that no judgment awaited them (xx. 4-6), is a favourite gift in the Jewish heaven (*cf.* Enoch lxii. 15 f., and *Asc. Isa.* ix. 24 f.). The intermediate state was a much debated question in apocalyptic literature, and early Christian thought fluctuates between the idea of a provisional degree of bliss (as here and, *e.g.*, Clem. Rom. i. 3, "those who by God's grace have been perfected in love possess the place of the pious, and they shall be manifested at the visitation of God's kingdom") and a direct, full entrance into heavenly privileges—especially, though neither uniformly nor exclusively, reserved for martyrs (Clem. Rom. v., Polyk. *ad Phil.* ix. 2, Heb. xii. 23, etc.); *cf.* Titius, 44-46. A cognate idea is reproduced in *Asc. Isa.* ix. 6 f., where in the seventh heaven Abel, Enoch, and the Jewish saints appear all clothed "in the garments of the upper world" (*i.e.*, in their resurrection-bodies) but not yet in full possession of their privileges, not yet seated on their thrones or wearing their crowns of glory. These are not theirs, till Christ descends to earth and ascends to heaven again.—"And they were told to rest (or wait quietly) for a little while yet," as they had been doing till the successive shocks of providence stirred them to an outburst of eager and reproachful anticipation. To rest implies to cease crying for vengeance (*cf.* iv. 8). Gfrörer (ii. 50) cites a rabbinic tradition that the messiah would not come until all souls in גוף (an intermediate resting-place of the departed?) were clothed with bodies. ἕως κ.τ.λ., this is closely and curiously reproduced, not so much from ideas preserved in the contemporary Apoc. Bar. xxiii. 4, 5 (where the end of the world comes when the predestined number of human beings is completed) as from the religious tradition also used in Clem. Rom. ii., lix., Justin (*Apol.* i. 45), and the contemporary 4th Esdras (iv. 36 f., quoniam in statera ponderauit

χρόνον μικρόν, ἕως πληρωθῶσιν[1] καὶ οἱ σύνδουλοι [b] αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ [c] ἀδελφοὶ [b] αὐτῶν οἱ μέλλοντες [d] ἀποκτέννεσθαι ὡς καὶ αὐτοί. 12. Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν ἕκτην· καὶ [e] σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο [f] μέλας ὡς σάκκος [g] τρίχινος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὅλη ἐγένετο ὡς αἷμα, 13. καὶ οἱ [h] ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔπεσαν εἰς τὴν γῆν, ὡς συκῆ βάλλει τοὺς [g] ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου σειομένη· 14. καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς

b Note repet. of poss. gen. ix. 21.
c For ethnic use (= fellows of same religious community) *cf.* *C.B.P.* i. 96 f.
d On Aeolic form, *cf.* Helbing, 73-74.
e viii. 5, xi. 13, xvi. 18, Matt. xxiv. 7, 4 Esd. vi. 14, Ap. Bar. lxx. 8, Dio Cass. lxvi. 23, etc.
f Isa. xiii. 10, l. 3, Joel ii. 3, 10, 30-31. Matt. xxiv. 29, Ass. Mos. x. 4 f.
g ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
h Isa. xxxiv. 4, Ezek. xxxii. 7-8, *cf.* Sib. Or. iii. 82, viii. 238, 413 (190).

[1] For πληρωσονται (Areth.) read πληρωθωσιν (AC, 29, vg., S., Cypr., Bg., Düst., Lach., WH, Ws., Bj., Sw., Bs.) [πληρωσωσιν ℵPQ, etc., And., Ti., Al. Tr., Holtzm.).

saecula et mensura mensurauit tempora et non commouit nec excitauit, usquedum impleatur praedicta mensura . . . quando impletus fuerit numerus similium uobis) which thinks not of mankind but of the righteous (*cf.* Apoc. Bar. xxx. 2, and Heb. xi. 40). The atmosphere of this belief goes back to the first century B.C., as in Enoch (xlvii., *cf.* ix. xxii.) "and the hearts of the holy were filled with joy that the number of righteousness had drawn nigh, and the prayer of the righteous was heard, and the blood of the righteous required, before the Lord of Spirits" (*cf.* below, ch. xi. 15 f.). The thought is repeated in Ep. Lugd. from this passage ("day by day those who were worthy were seized, filling up their number, so that all the zealous people and those through whom our affairs here had been especially established, were collected out of both churches"). It had been already developed otherwise in 4th Esdras iv. 35 f., where the seer's impatience for the end is rebuked and God's greater eagerness asserted. "Did not the souls of the righteous question thus in their chambers, saying, 'How long are we still to stay here? et quando ueniet fructus areae mercedis nostrae?' And the archangel Jeremiel answered them and said, 'When the number of your fellows is complete'." Substituting martyrs for the righteous, the author of our Apocalypse has exploited the idea thus familiar to him as a devout Jew; his first four visions come mainly through Zechariah; for the next he adapts this later post-exilic notion. The Neronic victims and their fellows occupied in his mind the place filled by the early Jewish saints in the reverent regard of contemporary Jews. As Renan notices (317 f.), this thirst for vengeance was in the air after Nero's death, shared even by Romans; one legend (Suet. *Nero*, xlviii., Dio Cass. lxiii. 28) told how, as Nero fled to his last retreat, during a thunder-peal the souls of his victims burst from the earth and flung themselves upon him.—As the safety of the physical universe rested on the safety of the righteous, according to the Jewish notion, so any massacres of the latter at once affected the stability of the world. Hence the sequence of vv. 11 and 12 f. There is no hint that these physical aberrations were temporary. Yet the following catastrophes (vii. f.) plainly presuppose a universe in its original and normal condition. It depends upon the theory adopted of the book whether this points merely to such discrepancies as are not unfamiliar in literature (especially imaginative literature), or to recapitulation, or to the presence of different sources.

Vv. 12-17. *The sixth seal opened* (*cf.* Crashaw's *To the Name of Jesus*, 220-234).

Vv. 12-14. The earthquake (reff.), darkening of sun by atmospheric disturbances, (Verg. *Georg.* i. 463 f., Lucan i. 75 f., 522 f. Compare Ass. Mos. x. 4 f.: et tremebit terra. Usque ad fines suas concutietur . . . sol non dabit lumen et in tenebras conuertet se, etc.; for Babylonian background *cf.* Schrader,[3] 392 f.), reddening of the full moon as in a total eclipse (*cf.* reff.), the dropping of stars, the removal of the sky, and the displacement of mountain and island (En. i. 6, see below on xiv. 20) are all more or less stereotyped features of the physical situation in apocalyptic eschatology, where naturally (*cf.* Jos. *Bell.* iv. 4, 5) agonies and distortions of the uni-

βιβλίον ἑλισσόμενον, [i] καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ νῆσος [1] ἐκ τῶν τόπων αὐτῶν ἐκινήθησαν· 15. καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ [k] μεγιστᾶνες καὶ οἱ [l] χιλίαρχοι καὶ οἱ [m] πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ἰσχυροὶ καὶ πᾶς δοῦλος καὶ ἐλεύθερος [n] ἔκρυψαν ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν [o] ὀρέων, 16. [n] καὶ λέγουσι τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ταῖς πέτραις,

i Jer. iv. 24, Ezek. xxxviii. 20, Nah. i. 5, *cf.* Sen. *Nat. Quaes.* iv. 26.
k xviii. 23 = the Parthian chiefs (Macedonian term)? *cf.* Dan. v. 23, LXX, Ps. Sol. ii. 36.
l On form see Win. § 8, 9.
m Jas. v. 1.
n From Hos. x. 8, Isa. ii. 10 f., vi. 16, Ezek. xxxix. 17-20, Luke xxiii. 30; a characteristic of the wicked in En. xcvii. 3, c. 4, cii. 1.
o For uncontracted form, *cf.* Helbing, 41.

[1] The πασα prefixed to νησος by S. smoothes out the constr. of παν.

verse precede some divine punishment of men (Verg. *Georg.* i. 365 f.).

Vv. 15-17. Note the sevenfold description of the effect produced on humanity (xix. 18, *cf.* xiii. 16), the Roman χιλίαρχοι (= tribuni), the riches and rank of men (ἰσχ. a dramatic touch = defiant authority, like Mrs. Browning's Lucifer: "strength to behold him and not worship him, Strength to be in the universe and yet Neither God nor God's servant"; see especially Ps. Sol. xv. 3, 4), the distinction of slaves and free as a pagan, never as an internal Christian, division; also the painting of the panic from O.T. models (reff.). Those who are now the objects of dread, cower and fly to the crags and caves—a common sanctuary in Syria (*cf.* Introd. § 8). Mr. Doughty describes a meteoric shock in Arabia thus: "a thunder-din resounded marvellously through the waste mountain above us; it seemed as if this world went to wrack. . . . The most in the mejlis were of opinion that a 'star' had fallen" (*Ar. Des.* i. 462, 463). The Hosean citation (*cf.* Jer. viii. 3) here, as in Luke, gives powerful expression to the dread felt by an evil conscience; even the swift agony of being crushed to death is preferable to being left face to face with the indignation of an outraged God. To stand (*cf.* Luke xxi. 36) is to face quietly the judgment of God (1 John ii. 28), which is impossible except after a life which has resolutely stood its ground (Eph. vi. 13) amid reaction and served God (Apoc. vi. 10, 11). The panic of kings, etc., is taken from the description of the judgment in Enoch lxii.-lxiii., where before the throne of messiah "the mighty and the kings" in despairing terror seek repentance in vain; "and one portion of them will look on the other, and they will be terrified, and their countenance will fall, and pain will seize them," at the sight of messiah. In Apoc. Bar. xxv. also the approach of the end is heralded by stupor of heart and despair among the inhabitants of the earth, while a similar stress falls (in Sap. vi. 1-9) on kings, etc., and (in En. xxxvii.-lxxi. generally) on the earth's rulers. There is no need to suspect καὶ . . . ἀρνίου (16) as an editorial gloss (Vischer, Spitta, Weyland, de Faye, Völter, Pfleiderer, von Soden, Rauch, J. Weiss, Briggs); it may be a characteristic touch designed to point the O.T. citation (for αὐτοῦ in 17 or in xxii. 3 *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 11, 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17), rather than a scribal or editorial insertion in what was originally a Jewish source.

The great day of God's wrath has come, but the action is interrupted by an *entre-acte* in vii., where as in x. 1-xi. 13, the author introduces an intermezzo between the sixth and the seventh members of the series. A change comes over the spirit of his dream. But although this oracle is isolated by form and content from its context, it is a consoling rhapsody or rapture designed to relieve the tension by lifting the eyes of the faithful over the foam and rocks of the rapids on which they were tossing to the calm, sunlit pool of bliss which awaited them beyond. They get this glimpse before the seventh seal is opened with its fresh cycle of horrors. The parenthesis consists of two heterogeneous visions, one (1-8) on earth and one (9-17) in heaven. The former (and indeed the whole section, *cf.* the ἑστῶτες of 9) is an implicit answer to the query of vi. 17, τίς δύναται σταθῆναι; it is an enigmatic fragment of apocalyptic tradition, which originally predicted (*cf.* Ezek. ix. 1 f.) God's safeguarding of a certain number of Jews, prior to some catastrophe of judgment ("Cry havoc, and let slip the winds of war!") upon the wicked. The chapter is not a literary unit with editorial touches (Weyland, Erbes, Bruston, Rauch), nor is

"Πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ κρύψατε ἡμᾶς
ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου,
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου,
17. [p] ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ,[1]
καὶ τίς δύναται [q] σταθῆναι;"

p (Luke xxiii. 30), xvi. 14, Nah. i. 6, Mal. iii. 2, Zeph. i. 14, 18, etc.
q Win. § 14, 4.

[1] **αυτων** (ℵC, 38, vg., Syr., S., Haym., etc., Ti., Tr., WH, Sw., Bj.) is an emendation of the original and difficult **αυτου** (APQ, min., Me., Arm., Aeth., And., Areth., Pr., Lach., Al., Ws., Bs.).

9-17 a continuation of vi. (Spitta). Vv. 1-8 are a Jewish fragment incorporated by the author, who writes 9-17 himself (so, *e.g.*, Vischer, Pfleiderer, Schmidt, Porter, Bousset, von Soden, Scott, Wellhausen). The fact that a selection, and not the whole, of the Jews are preserved, does not (in view of 4 Esdras) prove that a Jewish Christian (Völter, J. Weiss) must have written it. The scenery is not organic to John's proper outlook. After ver. 8 he shows no further interest in it. The winds are never loosed. The sealing itself is not described. The sealed are not seen. An apparent allusion to this remnant does occur (xiv. 1), but it is remote; John makes nothing of it; and the detached, special character of vii. 1-8 becomes plainer the further we go into the other visions. The sealed are exempted merely from the plague of the winds, not from martyrdom or persecution (of which there is no word here); one plague indeed has power to wound, though not to kill, them (ix. 4, 5). The collocation of the fragment with what precedes is probably due in part to certain similarities like the allusions to the wind (vi. 13), numbering (vi. 11), and the seals (vi. 1 f.). The real problem is, how far did John take this passage literally? This raises the question of the relationship between 1-8 and 9-17; either (*a*) both are different forms of the same belief, or (*b*) two different classes of people are meant. In the former event (*a*) John applies the Jewish oracle of 1-8 to the real Jews, *i.e.*, the Christians, who as a pious remnant are to be kept secure amid the cosmic whirl and crash of the latter days (vi. 12-17, *cf.* iii. 10 and the connexion of Nahum i. 5, 6, and 7). The terror passes and lo! the saints are seen safe on the other side (9-17). This interpretation of Christians as the real Israel or twelve tribes is favoured not only by early Christian thought (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 1, Jas. i. 1, Herm. *Sim.* ix. 17), but by the practice of John himself (*e.g.*, xviii. 4). Here as elsewhere he takes the particularist language of his source in a free symbolic fashion; only, while the archaic scenery of 1-8 suffices for a description of the safeguarded on earth, he depicts their beatified state (9-17) in ampler terms. The deeper Christian content of his vision implies not deliverance from death but deliverance through death. His saints are not survivors but martyrs. Hence the contrast between 1-8 and 9-17 is one of language rather than of temper, and the innumerable multitude of the latter, instead of being a supplement to the 144,000, are the latter viewed after their martyr-death under a definitely Christian light. The O.T. imagery of 1-8 mainly brings out the fact that the true Israel (Gal. vi. 16) is known and numbered by God; not one is lost. The alternative theory (*b*) holds that in taking over this fragment and adding another vision John meant Jewish Christians by the 144,000. The latter identification (so, *e.g.*, Prim., Vict., Hausrath, Vischer, Spitta, Hirscht, Forbes, Bousset) is less probable, however, in view of the general tenor of the Apocalypse (*cf.* Introd. § 6), for the usual passages cited as proof (*cf.* notes on xiv. 1 f., xxi. 12 and 24) are irrelevant, and while John prized the martyrs it is incredible that 9-17 was meant to prove that martyrdom was required to admit Gentile Christians even to a second grade among the elect (Weizsäcker, Pfleiderer). A Jewish Christian prophet might indeed, out of patriotic pride, regard the nucleus of God's kingdom as composed of faithful Jews, without being particularist in his sympathies. Paul himself once held this nationalist view (Rom. ix.-xi.), but it is doubtful if it represented his final position, and in any case the general conception of the Apocalypse (where Christians are the true Jews, and where particularist language is used metaphorically, just because literally it was obsolete) tells on the whole in favour of the view that 9-17 represents 1-8 read in the light of v. 9 (so, *e.g.*, de Wette, Bruston,

VII. 1. **Μετὰ τοῦτο εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς τέσσαρας γωνίας τῆς γῆς, [a] κρατοῦντας [b] τοὺς τέσσαρας [b] ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ πνέῃ ἄνεμος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μήτε ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης,**

a In a net? (like Tiamat, En. xviii. s.c.411 f.).
b Jer. xlix. 36, Ezek. xxxvii. 9, Dan. vii. 2.

Porter, Wellhausen, and Hoennicke: *das Judenchristentum*, 194 f.). Only, the general description of redeemed Christians in v. 9 is specifically applied in vii. 14 to the *candidatus martyrum exercitus*. Here as elsewhere John apparently conceives the final trial to be so searching and extensive that Christians will all be martyrs or confessors. The wonderful beauty of 9-17, whose truth rises above its original setting, requires no comment. It moved Renan (479, 480), after criticising "le contour mesquin" of the Apocalypse in general, to rejoice in the book's "symbolical expression of the cardinal principle that God is, but above all that He *shall be*. No doubt Paul put it better when he summed up the final goal of the universe in these words, *that God may be all in all*. But for a long while yet men will require a God who dwells with them, sympathises with their trials, is mindful of their struggles, and *wipes away every tear from their eyes*."

CHAPTER VII.—Ver. 1. As on the synoptic scheme (Matt. xxiv. 31), physical convulsions and human terrors are followed by a pause during which the saints are secured. It is impossible and irrelevant to determine whether the winds' blast and the sealing were already conjoined in the fragment or oral traditions which lay before this editor, or whether their combination is due to himself. They reflect the tradition underlying the synoptic apocalypse (Mark xiii. 24-27, etc., *cf.* Apoc. vi. 12-vii. 3), but here the safeguarding of the elect comes before, instead of after, the advent, and the four winds are agents of destruction instead of mere geographical points; besides, the rôle of messiah is omitted altogether. It is assumed not merely that these angels are the spirits of the four winds (Zech. vi. 5, and repeatedly in Enoch, *e.g.*, lxix. 22, "the spirits of the waters and of the winds and of all zephyrs"), but that some onset of the winds is imminent (ver. 2, *cf.* En. xviii. 22), as part of the horrors of the last catastrophe (for punitive winds, see Sir. xxxix. 28). Stray hints proving the existence of such a tradition (*cf.* Dan. vii. 2) have been collected (*cf.* *S. C.* 323 f.; *A. C.* 246, 247) *e.g.*, from Sibyll. viii. 203 f., etc., where a hurricane is to sweep the earth previous to the resurrection of the dead (trees being here singled out as most exposed to a storm's ravages). If such allusions are not mere echoes of the present passage, they would appear to indicate a runlet of eschatological tradition flowing behind more important ideas. Or are the saints like trees of God (Ps. Sol. xiv. 2, 3) never to be uprooted by a wind or onset of foes (*ibid.* viii. 6, xvii. 13)? It is no longer possible to be sure. In En. xviii 1 f. by a semi-Babylonian touch, the four winds are identified with the four pillars of the heaven and the foundations of the earth; in Apoc. Bar. vi. 4, 5, four angels with lamps are restrained by another angel from lighting them (*cf.* also *E. Bi.* 5303). There seems to be no allusion to the notion of a blast (from the sea) as a form of mortal fate (*e.g.*, Oed. *Col.* 1659, 1660; *Iliad*, vi. 345 f.); on the contrary, the idea goes back to Zech. vi. 8 (LXX), whence the prophet had already developed vi. 1-8. As xiv. 1 f. roughly answers to vii. 9 f., so the appearance of wild beasts out of the agitated sea of the nations (in Dan. vii. 1-8) corresponds to the sequence of Apoc. vii. 1-4, and xiii. 1 f.

The earth is a rectangular plane or disc on which John looks down from heaven's dome resting on it, to observe (ver. 2) a fifth angel "ascending" from the sun-rising (the east as the source of light, *cf.* on xvi. 20, the site of paradise, the sphere of divine activity?). **ζῶντος**, here (as in xv. 7; *cf.* Heb. x. 31) in O.T. sense (*cf* Deut. xxxii. 39 f.; Ezek. xx. 33; Jer. x. 10, etc.) of vitality to succour and to punish, God's "life" being manifested in his effective preservation of the saints and chastisement of their enemies or of the world in general. He lives and keeps alive. Here, as in the parent passage, Ezek. ix. 4-6 (*cf.* Exod. xii. 13 f. and the "Egyptian" character of the plagues in chap. viii.), the true **δοῦλοι** of God are distinguished by a mark denoting God's ownership. Before the crisis good and evil must be discriminated (Spitta, 80 f.). *Cf.* Ps. Sol. xv. 6 f. on the immunity of the righteous, **ὅτι τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ δικαίους εἰς σωτηρίαν, λιμὸς καὶ ῥομφαία καὶ θάνατος μακρὰν ἀπὸ δικαίων**: where-

[e] μήτε ἐπὶ πᾶν[1] δένδρον. 2. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ [d] ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου, ἔχοντα σφραγῖδα Θεοῦ [e] ζῶντος· καὶ ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις οἷς ἐδόθη [f] αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, λέγων, 3. "Μὴ [g] ἀδικήσητε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν, μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ἄχρι [h] σφραγίσωμεν τοὺς [d] δούλους τοῦ Θεοῦ [i] ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν [k] μετώπων αὐτῶν". 4. Καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐσφραγισμένων· ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες [l] χιλιάδες, ἐσφραγισμένοι ἐκ πάσης [m] φυλῆς υἱῶν [m] Ἰσραήλ·

c *Cf.* Jos. *Bell.* iii. 7, 8 and below ix. 4.
d *Cf.* xvi. 12 and on xxi. 13: Isa. xli. 2, Ezek. xliii. 2, Bar. iv. 36, v. 5.
e En. v. 1, Jub. xxi. 4.
f *Cf.* on iii. 8.

g Aor. subj. "action not yet begun," Burton, 164. h *i.e.* the angels, as Matt. xxiv. 31. For the more common *ἄχρις οὗ* or *ἄν cf.* Blass, § 65, 10. i vii. 11-12, xix. 5. k Only (in N.T.) in ix. 4, xiii. 16, xiv. 1, 9, xvii. 5, xx. 4, xxii. 4. l Irreg. indep. nom. after accus., as often in Apoc., *cf.* ix. 11, ii. 18, etc. m Only here in Apoc., except xxi. 12 (also an interpolated source ?).

[1] For **παν** (ℵP, 1, etc., Ti., Bj., Sw., WH) Lach., Tr., Al. Düst., Ws. read **τι** (CQ, min., vg., Pr.) [**επι δενδρου** A, Me., Syr., Arm., Aeth. (Bs = **δενδρον** ?): conj. Naber (deleting also **μ. τα δενδρα** in ver. 3) **επι ανυδρου**].

as these plagues hunt down the wicked, **τὸ γὰρ σημεῖον τῆς ἀπωλείας ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτῶν**. This royal, sacred sign, which in Ezekiel is the cross or Tau as the symbol of life and is here probably ליהוה, authenticates the bearers as God's property (*cf.* Herod. ii. 113, vii. 233) and places them beyond risk of loss. It identifies them with his worship and also (*cf.* on ii. 17) serves to protect them as an amulet against harm (see Deissm. 351, 352 on **φυλακτήρια** as protective marks and amulets). In *Test. Sol.* (tr. Conybeare, *Jew. Quart. Rev.* 1898, p. 34) an evil spirit declares he will be destroyed by the Saviour "whose number (**στοιχεῖον**), if anyone shall write it on his forehead, he will defeat me". Mr. Doughty also describes (*Ar. Des.* i. 171) a false Christ in Syria who declared he had God's name sculptured between his eyebrows; *i.e.* the wrinkles resembled the Arabic hieroglyph for Allah. For the religious significance of such tattooing as a mark of divine ownership see *R. S.* 316; and, for the connection of vi. 12 f. and vii. 1 f., the basal passage in Dan. xi. 40, 44, xii. 1. The parallel device of Antichrist later on (xiii. 16, etc.) shows that this sealing is something special, baptism or the possession of the Spirit (as in Paul) as the guarantee of destined bliss. A contemporary expression of the idea occurs in Clem. Rom. lix., lx.: "We will ask that the Creator of all things preserve intact to the end the appointed number of his elect throughout all the world, etc.". As Apoc. vi. 1-8 and 12 f. are free reproductions, with a special application, of the ideas underlying Mark xiii. 7, 8, 24, 25, so Apoc. vii. 1 f. is an imaginative sketch on the lines of Mark xiii. 27. The Apocalypse, however, has no room for the false messiahs of Mark xiii. 6, 22, etc. (*cf.* on Apoc. xiii. 11 f.) as a peril. See further 4 Esd. vi. 5, "Ere they were sealed who laid up the treasure of faith," and Melito (Otto ix. 432, 476) the apologist, who preserves a dual tradition of the end, including wind as well as fire = et selecti homines occisi sunt aquilone uehementi, et relicti sunt iusti ad demonstrationem ueritatis, (whilst at the deluge of fire) seruati sunt iusti in arca lignea iussu dei. But the Apocalypse like Philo, stands severely apart from the current Stoic notion, adopted in Sib. iv. 172 f.; 2 Peter, etc., of a destruction of the world by means of a final conflagration.

Ver. 4. After a pause, in which the sealing is supposed to have taken place, the writer hears that the number of the sealed is the stereotyped 144,000, twelve thousand from each of the twelve tribes of Israel (a "thousand" being the primitive subdivision of a clan or tribe, like the English shire into "hundreds"). The enumeration of these tribes (5-8) contains two peculiarities, (*a*) the substitution of Joseph for Ephraim, a variation to which we have no clue, and (*b*) the omission of Dan. The latter reflects the growing disrepute into which Dan fell; it either stands last (*e.g.* in P.; Josh. xix. 40 f.; Jud. i. 34) or drops out entirely, while it is curiously connected in the Talmud, as already in *Test. XII. Patr.* (Dan. 5), with Beliar, and in Irenæus (v. 30, 32) as in Hippolytus (*de Antichr.* 5, 6) with the

5. ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα δώδεκα χιλιάδες ἐσφραγισμένοι·
ἐκ φυλῆς Ῥουβὴν δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Γὰδ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
6. ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσὴρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Νεφθαλεὶμ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Μανασσῆ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
7. ἐκ φυλῆς Συμεὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Λευεὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰσσαχὰρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
8. ἐκ φυλῆς Ζαβουλὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰωσὴφ δώδεκα χιλιάδες·
ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμεὶν δώδεκα χιλιάδες· ἐσφραγισμένοι.

9. ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα εἶδον ὄχλον πολύν,[1] ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι [n] αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο, ἐκ [o] παντὸς ἔθνους καὶ φυλῶν καὶ λαῶν καὶ [o] γλωσσῶν, [p] ἑστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, περιβεβλημένους στολὰς λευκάς, καὶ [q] φοίνικες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν· 10. καὶ κράζουσιν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες,

"Ἡ [r] σωτηρία [s] τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ [s] τῷ ἀρνίῳ."

11. [t] Καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι [u] εἱστήκεισαν κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων, καὶ [v] ἔπεσαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ

n *Cf.* on iii. 8.
o *Cf.* v. 9.
p Irreg. appos. to plur. sense of ὄχλος.
q Nom. after (sc.) ἰδοὺ; *cf.* John xii. 13, Lev. xxiii. 40.
r See on xix. 1 and xii. 10.
s v. 13, xii. 10, xix. 1.
t v. 11-12.
u *Cf.* Win. § 13, 20.
v xi. 16.

[1] Read, for και ι. οχλος πολυς, the οχλον πολυν of A, vg., Me., Aeth., Cypr., Pr. (Lach.) [Syr. = κ. μ. τ. ειδον οχλυν πολυν ον, κ.τ.λ.].

origin of Antichrist. This sinister reputation (*cf. A.C.* 171-174, Selwyn 200-204, Erbes 77 f.), current long before Irenæus' day, rested on the haggadic interpretation of passages like Gen. xlix. 17; Deut. xxxiii. 22; and Jer. viii. 16. Andreas, commenting on xvi. 12, thinks that Antichrist will probably come from Persia, ἔνθα ἡ φυλὴ τοῦ Δάν.

Ver. 9. ἔθν. κ. φ. curious and irregular change from singular to plural. ἑστῶτες = erect, confident, triumphant. For the white robes, see on vi. 11 (the number of the martyrs being now completed). Certain religious processions in Asia Minor consisted of boys robed in white and bearing crowns of leafy boughs (Deissm. 368 f.); and in some Asiatic inscriptions νίκη is associated with the palm branch, which in one case is placed alongside of the *meta* or goal (*C. B. P.* ii. 496). The carrying of palm-branches was a sign of festal joy in the Greek and Roman (= victory at the games Liv. x. 47, Verg. *Aen.* v. 109), as well as in the Jewish world (1 Macc. xiii. 51; 2 Macc. x. 7), accompanied by the wearing of wreaths of green leaves. For the robes, see Liv. xxiv. 10: "Hadriae aram in coelo, speciesque hominum circum eam cum candida ueste visas esse". Here = "scilicet de antichristo triumphales" (Tertullian). For the numberless multitude, see Enoch xxxix. 6, where "the righteous and the elect shall be for ever and ever without number before" the messiah, in the mansions of bliss; white raiment and crowns of palm in Herm. *Sim.* viii. 2-4.

Ver. 10. "Salvation" (or, if ἡ be pressed, the salvation we enjoy) be ascribed "to our God and to the Lamb". The subordinate nature of the seven spirits (i. 4, iv. 5) is shown by the fact that no praise is offered to them throughout the Apocalypse, although in Iranian theology (Bund. xxx. 23): "all men become of one voice and praise aloud Aûharmazd and the archangels in the renovated universe".

Vv. 11-12. The angels standing around once again adore God, catching up the previous praise with "Amen," and uttering a sevenfold ascription of praise upon their own behalf, closed with another

θρόνου ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Θεῷ, 12. λέγοντες,

[w] "Ἀμήν· ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ [x] σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ [y] ἰσχὺς τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν."

13. Καὶ [z] ἀπεκρίθη εἷς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγων μοι, "Οὗτοι οἱ περιβεβλημένοι τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκάς, τίνες εἰσὶν καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον;" 14. καὶ [a] εἴρηκα αὐτῷ, "Κύριέ μου, σὺ [b] οἶδας". Καὶ εἶπέ μοι, "Οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι [c] ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης,

w Initial Amen, xix. 4, xxii. 20.
x *Cf.* v. 12; σ. and δύναμις Job xii. 13 (*cf.* Dan. ii. 20).
y As in 1 Chron. xxix. 11.
z Constr. Matt. xi. 25, Cant. ii. 10.
a Aoristic pf., v. 7.
b Ezek. xxxvii. 3, Job xxi. 15.
c Contrast Rom. ii. 8-9, and compare Apoc. iii. 10.

"Amen". The article is repeated before each substitute, as in v. 13. The divine "wisdom" is shown in the means devised by the divine power to redeem (v. 12) and deliver (vii. 14) men, in straits where no human prudence could prevail. See Clem. Rom. lx. and Ps. Sol. xvii. 25.

Ver. 13. "And one of the elders addressed me, saying"; for similar openings of a dialogue, see Jer. i. 11, Zech. iv. 2. Perhaps, like Dante (*Parad.* iv. 10-12), John although silent showed desire painted on his face. The form of inquiry resembles Homer's **τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις**, or Vergil's qui genus? unde domo?, more closely still the similar sentences which recur in Hermas. See throughout, Zech. iv. 1, 6, and *Asc. Isa.* ix. 25, 26 (and I said to the angel "For whom are these robes and thrones and crowns reserved?" And he said to me: "They shall be missed by many who believe the words of him of whom I told thee [*i.e.*, Antichrist]"; also xi. 40, uos autem uigilate in sancto spiritu ut recipiatis stolam uestram et thronos et coronas gloriae in caelo iacentes). It is the origin and character, not the number, of the company which interests the prophet.

Ver. 14. **κύριέ μου** ("Sir") the respectful address of an inferior to his superior in age or station, the **πρεσβύτεροι** being conceived as angelic beings (as in Dan. x. 17, 19, 4 Esd. iv. 3, etc.).—"Thou knowest" (and I fain would know also). The great distress is plainly the period of persecution and martyrdom (vi. 11) predicted (*e.g.*, Matt. xxiv. 21, from Dan. xii. 1) to herald the final catastrophe. It is still expected by Hermas (*Vis.* ii. 2. 7, iv. 2. 5, 3. 6); but he less religiously attributes the white garments (*i.e.*, purity of soul) to the virtues. As the crisis with its outcome of faith and loyalty in all nations (ver. 9) is to be world-wide, this passage seems to imply, although in a characteristically vague and incidental fashion (*cf.* v. 9, xiv. 6, etc.), the idea of Mark xiii. 10. But the situation of the Apocalypse is so acute, that mission operations are at a standstill. Instead of the gospel invading and pervading the pagan world, the latter has closed in upon the churches with threatening power, and in the brief interval before the end practically nothing can be looked for except the preservation of the faithful. Those "who come out of the great distress" are further described as having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; which portrays their character and conduct and at the same time explains the secret of their triumphant endurance. "Mehr gedacht als geschaut ist das Bild" (J. Weiss). The great thing is not to emerge from trial, but to emerge from it with unstained faith and conscience. And this is possible, not to man's unaided efforts, but to the sacrificial power of Christ, the experience of which forms the last line of defence in the struggle. The confessors and martyrs owed their moral purity to what they obtained through the sacrifice of Jesus. But moral purity became in this case something more intense (as the context and the emphatic language of this verse imply) than the normal Christian experience of forgiveness and holiness. By a turn of thought which is developed later by Ignatius and Tertullian (*Scorp.* xii. sordes quidem baptismate abluuntur, maculae uero martyrio candidantur), it is suggested that in their martyrdom (*cf.* Dan. xii. 10) these saints were able to make the redeeming power of Jesus peculiarly their own; the nature of their cruel sufferings identified them especially with their Lord. It is noticeable that the mystic union of the individual Christian with Christ mainly comes for-

καὶ ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτὰς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου.

15. [d] διὰ τοῦτό εἰσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ [e] λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ·
καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου [f] σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς.

16. οὐ πεινάσουσιν ἔτι, οὐδὲ διψήσουσιν ἔτι,
[g] οὐδὲ μὴ πέσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἥλιος, οὐδὲ πᾶν [h] καῦμα·

17. ὅτι τὸ ἀρνίον τὸ ἀνὰ μέσον[1] τοῦ θρόνου [i] ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς,
καὶ [g] ὁδηγήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ [k] ζωῆς πηγὰς [k] ὑδάτων,

d Reward and glory (e.g. Jer. xxxi. 9-12); Levitic privilege (Deut. x. 8, etc., cf. Ps. Sol. ii. 40). e xi. 19, xxii. 3 (worship). f Divine favour and protection, Ps. Sol. vii. 1, 5; cf. xxi. 3, John i. 14, also Lev. xxvi. 11, Isa. iv. 5, Ezek. xxxvii. 27, etc. g Ps. cxxi. 6; from Isa. xlix. 10. h xvi. 9. i Ezek. xxxiv. 23, Ps. xxiii. 1, John x. 1 f.; not Death, Clem. Rom. li. k xxi. 6, xxii. 1, 17, John iv. 10, vii. 8 (Jer. ii. 13), Cant. iv. 15.

[1] **ανα μεσον**, the true reading, is not a subtle allusion to mediatorship (Abbott, 198-199) but a loose synonym for **εν μεσω** (*cf.* Weymouth, *Journ. Philol.*, 1869, ii. 318-322): the **ζωσας** of min., Me., Syr. (**ζωην και επι** S.) is a correction of the orig. gen. of quality **ζωης** (MSS., edd.), which is thrown to the front (like **σαρκος** in 1 Pet. iii. 21) for emphasis.

ward in the Apocalypse (*cf.* xiv. 13) when the martyrs and confessors are mentioned, as if the writer held that such an experience alone could yield the deepest consciousness of communion with One who was conceived essentially as *a Lamb who had been slain, a faithful witness*, etc. (*cf.* Titius, 216, 217). On the high respect for martyrs, of which this forms an early trace, see Weinel, 142-144. At the same time it is to *the blood of the Lamb*, not to their own blood, that they owe their bliss and triumph; redemption, not martyrdom, is the essential basis of their deliverance. People might be redeemed without becoming martyrs; as, for example, either recreant Christians or those who happened to die a natural death. But no one could be a martyr without having the strength of redemption behind him.

Ver. 15. Ritual as well as pastoral traits from the O.T. fill out the conception of this final bliss with its favoured position (**ἐνώπ. θρόν.**). Note the singular tenderness of the oxymoron—*he that sitteth on the throne* (the majestic almighty God) *shall overshadow them* with a presence of brooding, intimate, care; followed by **ποιμανεῖ** here (as opposed to ii. 27) in its literal sense of tender shepherding on the part of Jesus. The messiah as shepherd was an ancient and familiar conception. This verse is partly adapted from Enoch xlv. 4-6. Unlike John i. 14, it reflects a Christian fulfilment of the Jewish anticipation (*cf.* xiii. 6, xxi. 3; Zech. ii. 10 f.; Sir. xxiv. 8 f.) that the Shekinah would return in the era of final bliss.

Ver. 16. **οὐ μή** with both fut. indicative and subjunctive (=ii. 11), in emphatic assertions. For the absence of scorching as a trait of the Hellenic Utopia, *cf.* Dieterich, 31-33. If **καῦμα** corresponds here to the sense of the Isaianic equivalent **καύσων**, the reference is to the scorching sirocco. So the Egyptian dead yearned for a cooling breeze in the next world—"Let me be placed by the edge of the water with my face to the north, that the breeze may caress me, and my heart be refreshed from its sorrows" (see Maspero, *Dawn of Civil.* p. 113).

Ver. 17. **ζωῆς** goes with **ὑδάτων** ("living waters") though prefixed for emphasis, like **σαρκὸς** in 1 Peter iii. 21 (*cf.* xvi. 3 **πᾶσα ψυχὴ ζωῆς**); a favourite Johannine idea. In Enoch xlii, xlviii, the fountains contain wisdom which is drunk by all the thirsty, though in the centre there is also "a fountain of righteousness which was inexhaustible"; elsewhere in the division of Sheol assigned to the spirits of the righteous there is "a bright spring of the water of life" (xxii, 9) in accordance with the Pythagorean belief that the dead suffered from thirst in the underworld (Luke xvi. 24, *cf.* Dieterich, 97 f.). In the familiar vignette of ancient Egyptian eschatology, the deceased kneels before Osiris who pours out to him the water of life (the motto being *that the soul may live*); *cf.* Renouf's "Hibb. Lect.," p. 141, and for "living" waters as divine, *R. S.* 127. In the ideal

καὶ [l] ἐξαλείψει ὁ Θεὸς πᾶν [m] δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν."

VIII. 1. ΚΑΙ ὅταν [a] ἤνοιξε τὴν σφραγῖδα τὴν ἑβδόμην, ἐγένετο [b] σιγὴ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὡς ἡμιώρον. 2. Καὶ εἶδον τοὺς [c] ἑπτὰ ἀγγέ-

l Isa. xxv. 8.
m Form (*cf.* xxi. 4) of nom. peculiar to Apoc. in N.T.
a ὅταν irreg. equiv. for ὅτε (Blass, § 65, 9): indic. with ὅταν (iv. 9, Mark ii. 20, Luke xiii. 28); a relative clause conditional in form but definite in force (Burton, 316).
b 4 Esd. vii. 29 f., *Zech.* ii. 13 (17), Hab. ii. 20.
c En. xx., Luke i. 19, etc.

realm of the good Shepherd-King Yima, Iranian belief saw neither hunger nor thirst for the faithful, and found no place for death (*cf.* Apoc. xxi. 4) or falsehood (Apoc. xxi. 8) of any kind (passages and parallels in Böklen, 133 f.).—ὁδηγήσει, a touch of local colour for Asiatic Christians, since sheep and shepherds were a common feature in the Lycos valley (*C. B. P.* i. 40-42); but the heaven of the Apocalypse is, in Semitic fashion, pastoral or civic, with touches of Babylonian splendour, unlike some later apocalypses, *e.g.*, that of Peter (15 f.) where the Hellenic conception of God's garden in the next world predominates (Dieterich, 19 f.).—Briggs explains the variants σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς (vii. 15) and σκ. μετ' αὐτῶν (xxi. 3), ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθ. (xxi. 4) and ἐκ τῶν ὀφθ. (vii. 17) as variant translations of ישכן בקרבם and מעיניהם; but, like ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον (xiii. 16), ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπ. (vii. 3, etc.), these are probably nothing more than rhetorical variations. Unlike the synoptic tradition (*e.g.*, Matt. ii. 6) and the fourth Gospel (x. 1, 18), the Apocalypse confines Christ's shepherding to the future life (see also ii. 26, 27). In Isa. liii. 6, 7, the wayward roving habits of sheep express the temper of God's people, whilst the patient submissiveness of a lamb for sacrifice denotes the function of God's servant; in the Apocalypse, the latter (not the former) occurs. The saints are God's flock in heaven, not on earth (contrast 1 Peter ii. 25, v. 2 f.).

Whatever elements have been employed in the following series (viii.-xi.) of trumpet-visions, no adequate data exist to prove that John has edited a Jewish or Jewish-Christian source here any more than in vi. The vision, which forms the result of the breaking of the seventh seal (viii. 1, 2), opens, after a prelude (2-5), in viii. 6 and does not close till xi. 19 (*cf.* viii. 5).

CHAPTER VIII.—Ver. 1. The opening of the seventh seal is followed by half an hour's silence in heaven: "he opened" looks back to vi. 12, the absence of subject showing that vii. is a parenthesis foreign to the seal-series in its original shape. Probably this series, like each of the others, was originally a separate oracle upon the latter days. When woven by the author into his large work, they suffered a literary treatment which has interrupted but not altogether obliterated their original form and sequence. The book of destiny is now open; what follows (viii. 6 f.) is the course of the future, which naturally corresponds at some points to the predictions already sketched proleptically in chap. vi. A brief interval, not of exhaustion but of expectation, of breathless suspense (a pause in the ecstasy, LXX of Dan. iv. 16), ushers in a preliminary series of judicial plagues heralded by seven trumpet-blasts (viii. 2-xi. 19). Half an hour (ἡμ., *cf.* Win. § 5, 22 *a* for form) may have been an ominous period; Josephus (*B. J.* vi. 5, § 3) describes a portent at the siege of Jerusalem which consisted of a bright light shining at twilight for half an hour, and the collocation of silence with reverence is illustrated by the LXX version (εὐλαβείσθω πᾶσα σάρξ) of Zech. xii. 13 and Zeph. i. 7 f. The following trumpet-series has been woven into the frame of the work by the device of making it take the place of the climax which (after vi. 17, vii. 1, 2) one would naturally expect to occur at this point. When the dénouement should take place, nothing happens; the judgment is adjourned.

Ver. 2. "The seven angels who stand before God" are introduced as familiar figures (*cf.* Lueken 36 f., *R. J.* 319 f.); they belonged to pre-Christian Judaism (Tobit xii. 15, "I am Raphael, one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One"), and are associated with trumpets (1 Thess. iv. 16). According to the Targ. on 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13 when Manasseh prayed, all the angels who superintend the entrance of prayers went and closed every approach, to prevent his petition reaching heaven; in Chag. 13 *b* the prayers of the righteous are offered by Sandalphon (*cf.* Longfellow's *Sandalphon*, and contrast Heb. vii. 25).

λους οἳ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἑστήκασι, καὶ ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς ἑπτὰ [d] σάλπιγγες. 3. καὶ [e] ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἦλθε καὶ ἐστάθη [f] ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ἔχων λιβανωτὸν [g] χρυσοῦν· καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ θυμιάματα πολλά, ἵνα δώσει[1] [h] ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων [i] πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ [k] θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν τὸ ἐνώπιον τοῦ [l] θρόνου. 4. καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων [h] ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 5. καὶ [m] εἴληφεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸν λιβα-

d 1 Thess. iv. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 52, Matt. xxiv. 31, 4 Esd. v. 4, vi. 23; cf. Josh. vi. 4, Jer. iv. 19, Zeph. i. 15-16.
e As vii. 2.
f iii. 20, vii. 1, etc. (= "at altar of burnt offering") Amos ix. 1.
g 1 Kings vii. 50.
h Dat. commodi? cf. Moult. i. 75. = "in aid of".
i Cf. Win. § 20, 11 f.
k Num. iv. 11, inner altar of incense.
l I. e. God (ix. 13).
m Aoristic pf., v. 7.

[1] The variants δωση and δω are corrections of the original δωσει (ℵAC, 1, edd.)—ινα with fut. indic. as iii. 9, etc. (Win. § 5, 17, § 13, 7, § 14, 9).

This septet of distinguished angels belongs to the circle of ideas behind i. 4, iv. 5, v. 6; but the author as usual prefers vividness and variety to homogeneity. He uses them for minatory purposes, assigning to "another angel" their characteristic function (ver. 3) in Jewish tradition. The alteration of figure at this point is deliberate. The certainty of divine decrees is suggested by the figure of seals; but now that the prophet is describing the promulgation of the actual events presaged in the book of Doom, he, like the author of 4 Esdras (? *cf.* Lat. of v. 4), employs the figure of angels with trumpets of hostile summons and shattering alarm. The final series (xv.-xvi.) in which these decrees are executed, is aptly described under the figure of bowls or vials drenching the earth with their bitter contents (*cf.* Bovon, *Nouv. Test. Théol.* ii. 503). The trumpet, as a signal for war, is naturally associated with scenes of judgment (reff.). "*Power*, whether spiritual or physical, is the meaning of the trumpet, and so, well used by Handel in his approaches to the Deity" (E. Fitzgerald's *Letters*, i. 92). Trumpet to lip, the angels now stand ready. They are set in motion by a significant interlude (3-5).

Ver. 3. Between royalty and ritual the scenery of the Apocalypse fluctuates. It is assumed (as at vi. 9), after vii. 15 perhaps, that heaven is a temple, although this is not expressly stated till xi. 19; nor is it homogeneous with the throne-description in chap. iv. λιβανωτόν ("incense," ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.) is used by mistake for the classical λιβανωτρίς (LXX, πυρ[ε]ιον or θυίσκη) = "censer," as already in an inscription of the second century B.C. (Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscript. Graec.* 588 [156]) λιβανωτίς is employed by confusion for "frankincense". Golden censers (1 Macc. i. 22) and golden bowls (φιάλαι) were among the furniture of the temple (1 Esd. ii. 13). On prayers as an offering, see Acts x. 4. The symbolism is borrowed from the temple-ritual; when the saucer of incense had been emptied over the burning coals placed on the altar of incense, the people bowed in prayer, as the fragrant cloud of smoke rose up. Wellhausen's deletion of 3 *b*, 4 as a gloss is therefore unnecessary. John is consoling the church (*cf.* on vi. 10) by the assurance that their prayers for the coming of the kingdom are not breathed in vain.

Ver. 4. As an agent of God, the angel is commissioned to ratify with Divine approval the petitions of the saints for the end; this involves retribution on the impenitent and hostile world. The prophet is sure such aspirations are in harmony with God's will.

Ver. 5. The censer, having offered incense to heaven, is now used to hurl fire upon the earth (adopted from Ezek. x. 2-7; *cf.* Lev. xvi. 12). As at the close of the trumpets (xi. 19) and the bowls (xvi. 18), physical disturbances here accompany the manifestation of God's wrath and judgment. In answer to the prayers and longings of the saints (Renan, 393), God at last visits the impenitent pagan world with a series of catastrophes (viii., ix., *cf.* ix. 4), which herald the end and also give (though in vain, ix. 20, 21) an opportunity for repentance.

Note on viii. 3-5. This episode (in dumb show) of angel and incense, though apparently isolated, is an overture for the series of judgments, of which the successive trumpet-blasts are precursors. The prayers of all the saints, which, like those of the martyrs in vi. 10, crave punishment upon God's enemies through-

νωτὸν καὶ ἐγέμισεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ ἔβαλεν [n] εἰς τὴν [n] γῆν· καὶ [o] ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ[1] καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός.

6. Καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι ἔχοντες τὰς [p] ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας ἡτοίμασαν

n vi. 13.
o Exod. xix. 16, Ezek. x. 2.
p Seven trumpets in Levitical orchestra, Neh. xii. 41, etc.

[1] **βρονται και αστραπαι και φωναι** A, 16, 38, Me., Syr. (Lach., WH marg., Al., Ws.), text ℵQ, min., vg., Arm., S., And[c], Pr., etc. (Ti., Tr., WH, Bj., Sw., Bs.).

out the earth, are supported and reinforced by the ministry of this angel, and answered at once by the succession of incidents beginning with ver. 5. This object of Christian prayers, *i.e.*, the final crisis, when Christ returns to crush his enemies and inaugurate his reign, pervaded early Christianity as a whole. At special periods of intolerable persecution, it assumed under the stress of antagonism as here a more sensuous and plastic form than the ordinary consciousness of the church would have been usually disposed to cherish; yet the common prayer of the church in any case was for the speedy end of the world (**ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος**, Did. x.). In Apoc. Mos. (tr. Conybeare, *Jewish Quart. Rev.*, 1895, 216-235) xxxiii., when the angels intercede for Adam at his ascension to heaven, they take golden censers and offer incense; whereupon smoke overshadows the very firmament. The intercession of angels on behalf of the saints, a result of their function as guardians, goes back to post-exilic Judaism with its inarticulated conception of the angels as helpful to mankind (Job v. 1. xxxiii. 23; Zech. i. 12); subsequently the idea developed into a belief that the prayers of the pious won special efficacy as they were presented to God by angels such as Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, or the seven archangels (*cf.* Tobit, *loc. cit.*; Slav. En. vii. 5; En. ix. 2-11, xv. 2, xl. 6, xlvii. 2, xcix. 3, 16, civ. 1). In Christianity this rôle was naturally absorbed by Christ, who alone ratified and inspired his people's supplications. But the old belief evidently lingered in pious circles of Jewish Christianity (*cf.* Test. Lev. 3, 5), side by side with a complete acceptance of Christ's heavenly function. The latter did not immediately or universally wither up such survivals of the older faith; popular religion tended then as now to be wider at several points than its theoretical principles (as in Origen, *Cels.* v. 4; and Tertull. *de Orat.* xii.). Plato, in *Sympos.* 202 E., makes the **δαίμονες** present men's prayers and offerings to the gods, and mediate the latter's commands and recompence to men (*cf.* Philo, *de Somniis*, i. 22, and on i. 1). See further xvii. 1, xxi. 9, for a similar state of matters in primitive Christianity with regard to the corresponding function of Jewish angels as intermediaries of revelation.

Ver. 6 f. The fresh series of disasters does not advance matters any further than the previous seal-series. Both lead up to the final catastrophe, and upon the edge of it melt into a further development which practically goes over the same ground once more. This reflects of course literary artifice, not any successive or continuous scheme of events; it is iterative not historically chronological. It is doubtful if the prophet intended to suggest the idea which occurs to a modern mind, *viz.*, that such apparent cycles seem to recur in history. At certain epochs everything seems to be working up to some mighty climax for which men look in dread or hope, and yet the world rights itself for another epoch; the dénouement fades for the time being into the far horizon; the powers of evil gather themselves afresh in other forms. Neither here nor in the previous seven cycles can the astrological reference (to the colours and characteristics of the planets, cp. *Exp. Ti.* xx. 426-427) be worked out with any plausibility.

Vv. 6-12. *The first four trumpets.*

Ver. 6. In the scheme of the trumpet-visions, as of the seal-visions, the first four are differentiated from the next three; the fifth and sixth in both cases stand by themselves and are separated by a considerable interlude from the closing seventh. It is remarkable that even the final trumpet of xi. 15 f. does not correspond to the loud trumpet-blast which according to Jewish and early Christian tradition, was to awaken the dead to resurrection or to rally the saints (Matt. xxiv. 31) at the close of the world. The Apocalypse knows nothing of this fea-

αὐτοὺς ἵνα σαλπίσωσι. 7. Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένετο [q] χάλαζα καὶ [q] πῦρ μεμιγμένα ἐν [r] αἵματι, καὶ ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς κατεκάη, καὶ τὸ [s] τρίτον τῶν [t] δένδρων κατεκάη, καὶ πᾶς χόρτος χλωρὸς κατεκάη. 8. Καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, [u] καὶ ὡς ὄρος μέγα πυρὶ καιόμενον ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης [v] αἷμα, 9. καὶ ἀπέθανε τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, τὰ [w] ἔχοντα ψυχάς, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν [x] πλοίων [y] διεφθάρησαν.

q xi. 19, xvi. 21 only, in N.T. See Ovid's *Met.* xv. 788, Exod. ix. 24, Isa. xxviii. 2, Ps. xviii. 12.
r *Cf.* Dan. v. 7, LXX.
s Ezek. xxxviii. 22, Joel ii. 30 (iii. 3).
t 4 Esd. v. 8, Isa. ii. 13. u En. xviii. 13 f., xxi. 3, cviii. 4, from Jer. ii. 25? v Exod. vii. 20-21. w False apposition (ii. 20, etc.) or ptc. used (Weiss) as a relative clause. x Isa. ii. 16. y Irreg. as ix. 12, 18.

ture, nor of the tradition (preserved by R. Akiba) that the process of the resurrection would be accompanied by seven trumpet-peals from God. The first four trumpets set in motion forces of ruin that fall on natural objects; in Sap. v. 17-23 (xvi. 17-24) the world of nature is used directly by God to punish men. The closing three concern human life, *i.e.*, the godless inhabitants of the earth. The general idea is that of the Jewish tradition (see on xv. 2) which prefaced the second great redemption by disasters analogous to those preceding the first: *cf. e.g.*, Sohar *Exod.* 4 *b*, tempore quo se reuelabit rex Messias, faciet Deus omnia ista miracula, prodigia et divinae uirtutis opera coram Israele, quae fecit olim in Aegypto, quemadmodum scriptum est Mic. vii. 15; also Jalkut *Sim.* i. 56 *b*, Targ. Jon. on Zech. x. 11, etc. The disasters remind one now and then of the Egyptian plagues (*cf.* Jos. *Ant.* ii. 14-1; also Amos iv. 4 f., Isa. ix. 7 f.). The first four visit earth, sea, waters, and the sky. Hail-showers were a traditional scourge and weapon of the divine armoury; on their association with thunderstorms see G. A. Smith's *Hist. Geog.* 64, 65.

Ver. 7. Hail and fire, as in the fourth Egyptian plague, but with the added O.T. horror (see reff.) of a shower of blood instead of rain (see Chag. 12 *b*, where the sixth heaven is the storehouse of hail, storm, and noxious vapours, enclosed within gates of fire; and specially Sibyll. v. 377, πῦρ γὰρ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν . . . βρέξει . . . πῦρ καὶ αἷμα). For similar atmospheric phenomena, see on vi. 8, 12. Portents of this abnormal nature are recorded for the seventh decade of the first century by Roman historians, but there is no need to see specific historical allusions in prophecy upon this grand scale. The sight of atmospheric fire always signified to the ancients the approach of various disasters, especially when stars fell. Wetstein cites *Bara Mexia*, 59, 1; dixit R. Eliezer, percussus est mundus, tertia nempe pars olearum, tertia pars tritici, et tertia hordei. The third is a primitive Semitic (Babylonian: Jastrow, 107 f.) division, which has its roots also in Iranian religion (Yasht, xiii. 3, Yasna, xi. 7, etc.), where the tripartite division of earth, derived originally from the threefold division of earth, atmosphere, and universe, is older than the sevenfold.—δένδρων, see Schol. (τὰ δένδρα δηλονότι) on Thuc. ii. 19 καθεζόμενοι ἔτεμνον . . . τὸ πεδίον. Pausan. ii. 365 (*cf.* iv. 166 f.) mentions among the phenomena attending earthquakes heavy rain or prolonged drought, the discolouring of the sun's disc, etc.; "springs mostly dry up. Sudden gusts sometimes sweep over the country, blowing the trees down. At times, too, the sky is shot with sheets of flame. Stars are seen of an aspect never known before, and strike consternation into all beholders."

Vv. 8, 9. A fiery mass, huge as a mountain, is flung into the sea—a description which would recall the fiery volcanic bombs familiar to inhabitants of the Egean. The catastrophe includes, as in the first Egyptian plague, the turning of water into blood and the destruction of marine animals (4 Esd. v. 7, Verg. *Georg.* iii. 541 f.), besides havoc among the shipping. Volcanic phenomena (*cf.* Introd. § 8) in the Egean archipelago (*e.g.*, at Thera) are in the background of this description, and of others throughout the book; features such as the disturbance of islands and the mainland, showers of stones, earthquakes, the sun obscured by a black mist of ashes, and the moon reddened by volcanic dust, were the natural consequences of eruption in some submarine volcano, and Thera—adjoining

10. Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, [z] καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀστὴρ μέγας καιόμενος ὡς λαμπάς, καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς [a] πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων. 11. καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὁ [b] Ἄψινθος· καὶ [c] ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων [c] εἰς ἄψινθον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων, ὅτι ἐπικράνθησαν. 12. [d] Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ [e] ἐπλήγη τὸ τρίτον τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων, ἵνα σκοτισθῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα μὴ [f] φάνῃ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς, καὶ ἡ νὺξ ὁμοίως. 13. Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ [1] πετομένου ἐν [g] μεσουρανήματι, λέγοντος φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, [h] "Οὐαί, οὐαί, οὐαὶ [i] τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [k] ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν φωνῶν τῆς σάλπιγγος τῶν τριῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν μελλόντων σαλπίζειν".

z *Cf.* Sib. Or. v. 158.
a xvi. 4, *cf.* Ps. Sol. xvii. 21, Test. Levi. 4.
b Jer. ix. 15, xxiii. 15.
c Luke xiii. 19, *cf.* Win. § 29, 2*a*.
d Exod. x. 21-22; *cf.* on vi. 12, with 4 Esd. v. 4.
e ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
f *Cf.* xviii. 23, Win. § 13, 12.
g xiv. 6, xix. 17: ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
h Imitated in 4 Esd. xv. 14-15.
i xii. 12.
k *Cf.* ver. 11; = ἀπό Matt. xviii. 7.

[1] The curious and inferior variant **αγγελου** (P, 1, etc., Arm., Vict., And., Vitringa: *unus ut aquilam*, Pr.) probably arose from a copyist's recollection of xiv. 6. Könnecke (*Emendationen zu Stellen N.T.*, 34-35) prefers the complete (so 13) reading **αγγελου ως αετου**.

Patmos—was in a state of more or less severe eruption during the first century. All this suggested the hideous colours in which the final catastrophe was painted by the imagination of pious contemporaries. In the eruption of 1573, the sea round Thera was tinted for twenty miles round, and even when the submarine volcano is quiescent, "the sea in the immediate vicinity of the cone is of a brilliant orange colour, from the action of oxide of iron". In 1707 a large rock suddenly appeared in the sea, during the eruption, and owing to noxious vapours "all fish in the harbour died".

Vv. 10, 11. The third part of all drinking waters is poisoned by a huge, noxious, torch-like meteor shooting down from the sky (Vergil's "de coelo lapsa per umbras stella facem ducens multa cum luce concurrit," Aen. ii. 693, 694). Wormwood, a bitter drug typical of divine punishment, was apparently supposed to be a mortal poison; thus Pliny (*H. N.* ii. 232) ascribes the bitterness of Lake Sannaus (Anava) in the Lycos valley to the *circa nascente apsinthio*. But this feature of the vision is taken from Iranian or Mandaean eschatology (Brandt, 584 f.), where among the signs of the end are famine, wars, a star falling from heaven and making the sea red [*cf.* Apoc. xvi. 3], and a cyclone with a duststorm. *Cf.* 4 Esd. v. 9, et in dulcibus aquis salae inueniuntur. Rivers and fountains were associated in the ethnic mind (*cf.* Neh. ii. 13) with supernatural spirits and curative properties; hence upon them this stern prophet of monotheism sees the doom of God falling. **ἐγένετο . . . εἰς**, a Hebraistic constr., common in Apocalypse and in quotations from O.T., but "decidedly rare elsewhere" in N.T. (Simcox). Springs (like those, *e.g.*, near Smyrna) and fountains naturally appeared to the ancient mind somewhat mysterious and separate; their lack of visible connexion with rivers or lakes suggested the idea that they sprang from the subterranean abyss or that they were connected with daemons. Hence their rôle in the final convulsions of nature (4 Esd. vi. 24 uenae fontium stabunt, Ass. Mos. x. 8 et fontes aquarum deficient). *Cf.* Rohrbach's *Im Lande Jahwehs und Jesu* (1901), 30 f.; for their connexion with dragons, *R. S.*, 157, 161 f., and for their bubbling as a mark of sacred energy, *ibid.* 154 f.

Ver. 12. "So as to darken a third part of them, and (*i.e.*) to prevent a third of the day from shining (**φάνῃ**, or **φανῇ**, Win.) and of the night likewise". Daylight is shortened by a third, and the brightness of an Eastern night correspondingly lessened (*cf.* the Egyptian plague of darkness). The writer either forgets or ignores the fact that he has already cleared the heaven of stars (vi. 13).

Ver. 13. An ominous introduction to the last three trumpets. An eagle, here as in Apoc. Bar. lxxvii. 17-22, lxxxvii. 1 (*cf.*

IX. 1. ΚΑΙ ὁ πέμπτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ εἶδον [a] ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [a] πεπτωκότα εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἡ κλεῖς τοῦ [b] φρέατος τῆς ἀβύσσου, 2. καὶ ἤνοιξε τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ ἀνέβη [c] καπνὸς ἐκ τοῦ φρέατος ὡς καπνὸς καμίνου μεγάλης, καὶ [d] ἐσκοτώθη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ ἀὴρ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ τοῦ φρέατος. 3. [e] Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ἀκρίδες εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐξουσία, ὡς ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν οἱ σκορπίοι τῆς γῆς· 4. καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ ἀδικήσουσιν τὸν χόρτον τῆς γῆς, [f] οὐδὲ [f] πᾶν χλωρὸν, οὐδὲ πᾶν δένδρον, εἰ μὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους [g] οἵτινες οὐκ [h] ἔχουσι τὴν

a viii. 10, xii. 9, Isa. xiv. 12, Luke x. 18.
b xi. 7, xvii. 8, xx. 1, 3, En. x., Luke viii. 31, *cf.* Gen. xxix. 2.
c Gen. xix. 28, Exod. xix. 18, Joel ii. 2, 10.
d xvi. 10. Only here in N.T. in literal sense.
e *Cf.* Schol. on Arist. *Acharn.* 150.
f Hebraistic = οὐδέν; οὐδέ synt. irreg. in final clause.
g i. 7.
h vii. 4-8.

Rest of Words of *Bar.* vii.) a messenger and herald of catastrophe (its associations are punitive and bodeful, Deut. xxviii. 49, Hos. viii. 1, Hab. i. 8, Eurip. *Rhes.* 528-536) flies in the zenith, *i.e.*, swooping exactly over the heads of men. For the eagle (Simurgh in Zoroastrianism) as the servant of Deity in ancient (Syrian) mythology, see *E. Bi.* "Cherub," § 8, and *Acts of Thomas* (Hymn of Soul, 51).—"Woe . . . for the rest of the trumpet voices." The first woe finishes at ix. 12, the second (after the interlude of x. 1-xi. 13) at xi. 14, the third apparrently at xii. 12—though as usual one series of phenomena melts irregularly at the close into another.

Chapter IX.—Vv. 1-12: *The fifth trumpet.*

Ver. 1. Stars (as σώματα ἐπουράνια) drop from heaven in the form of beasts (Enoch lxxxvi. 1 f.) and men (*ibid.* lxxxviii.) throughout Jewish apocalyptic (*cf. ibid.* xviii. 16, xxi. 1, 6, xc. 21, 24); even earlier (Judges v. 20, Job xxxviii. 7) they had been personified. On falling stars, associated as evil portents with death or divine displeasure, see Frazer's *Golden Bough* (2nd ed.), ii. 18 f. From what follows, it is possible that this angelic being who had fallen is conceived as an evil agent (reff.), permitted (ἐδόθη) to exercise malicious power on earth in furtherance of divine judgment. "The pit of the abyss" is the abode of the devil and daemons (reff. *cf. Aen.* vii. 583 f., viii. 243 f.), a subterranean chasm or waste underworld, located sometimes in the middle of the earth (Slav. En. xxviii. 3), and represented here (*cf.* xx. 1) as covered by a lid or great stone. To judge from xiii. 1, this abyss seems to contain, as in O.T., the flow of waters formerly upon the earth, and now confined (according to Jewish folk-lore) by God's decree and the magical potency of His name (*cf.* on xx. 4 and ii. 17 also *Prayer of Manasseh*, "O Lord Almighty . . . Who hast shut up the deep, τὴν ἄβυσσον, and sealed it by thy terrible and glorious name".) A fearsome cavity ("ditis spiraculum") emitting poisonous exhalations once existed near Hierapolis (Pliny, *H. N.* ii. 95). Such chasms (throughout Italy, Greece and Asia) seemed, to the superstitious, local inlets into Hades and outlets for infernal air in the shape of mephitic vapours. In Phrygia itself springs of hot vapour and smoke are a feature of the Lycos valley (*C. B. P.* i. 2, 3), and the volcanic cone in the harbour of Thera was believed to be such an aperture of hell. Fire belching from this subterranean furnace was a sure portent of the final catastrophe (4 Esd. v. 8); *cf.* Renan, 330 f., 396, *R. S.* 127, and Jeremias, 116 f.

Ver. 2. For the following description of this destructive horde of weird locusts, see Joel ii. with Driver's notes and excursus (*C. B.*) to which add the famous description of a locust-plague in Newman's *Callista* (ch. xv.). Naturally the sketch is far more idealised than that given by Joel; it often recalls the monstrous associates created by Tiamât out of the primeval abyss (Jastrow, pp. 419 f.); *i.e.*, strong warriors, "great serpents, merciless in attack, sharp of tooth. With poison instead of blood she filled their bodies. Furious vipers she clothed with terror, made them high of stature."

Vv. 3, 4. The dense smoke resolves itself into a swarm of infernal demons in the form of locusts but rendered more formidable by their additional power of stinging like scorpions. Instead of preying on their natural food (Exod. x. 15), already plagued (viii. 7) they are let loose upon men unmarked by the Divine

σφραγῖδα τοῦ [a] Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων. 5. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς [1] ἵνα [i] μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἵνα βασανισθήσονται [i] μῆνας [i] πέντε· καὶ ὁ βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς βασανισμὸς σκορπίου, ὅταν παίσῃ ἄνθρωπον.

6. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις [k] ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον,
[l] καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρωσιν [2] αὐτόν·
καὶ [k] ἐπιθυμήσουσιν ἀποθανεῖν,
καὶ φεύγει ὁ θάνατος ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

7. Καὶ τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὅμοια [m] ἵπποις ἡτοιμασμένοις εἰς [n] πόλεμον,

i Full season of locusts' activity, April to August.
k Progressive fut. Burton, 60. Contrast Phil. i. 23.
l Job iii. 21, Jer. viii. 3; see Anacr. *fr.* 51, Soph. *El.* 1007-1008, Ovid: *Ibis* 123-124, Aesch. *fr.* 314, *cf.* Sib. Or. viii. 353, Herod. vii. 46, and Eur. *Hipp.* 1047.
m Joel ii. 4.
n xii. 17.

[1] Read αυτοις (ℵA, 1, Pr.) as in vv. 3 and 4 (ℵQ), with Ti., Ws., Bs., Bj. (Lach., WH marg., Sw., ver. 5).

[2] Read ου μη (ℵAPQ, 1, etc., And., Areth.) ευρωσιν (AP, min., etc.) with Lach., Düst., WH marg., Ws., Bs., Bj. [ευρησουσιν ℵQ, min., vg., Andpal, Areth., Ti., Tr., Al. Sw., WH].

seal (though the expected blast of winds is dropped), the idea being similar to that reproduced in Ps. Sol. xiii. 1-3, 4, 5, xv. 1, 9 (see above, on vii. 3). The nations under command of Holofernes (Jud. ii. 20) are also likened by the Jewish romancer to a swarm of innumerable locusts; and from the mouth of the beast in Hermas issue ἀκρίδες πύριναι to persecute the virgin church. Josephus, too, compares the army of Simeon to locusts (*B. J.* iv. 9 7). Why are trees (vii. 1) exempted? For the reason suggested in Ps. Sol. xi. 6, 7?

Ver. 5. παίσῃ here, like ἐπάταξεν Jas. iv. 7, represents LXX, tr. of נכה in sense of reptile's bite; the scorpion with its long-fanged tail stings the prey which it has already gripped with its claws (*cf.* Sen. *Hercul.* 1218). Scorpions were a natural symbol for vicious and dangerous opponents (*cf.* Ezek. ii. 6, Luke x. 9), whose attacks were always painful and might be mortal. "The sting is not perilous. . . . The wounded part throbs with numbness and aching till the third day, there is not much swelling" (Doughty, *Ar. Des.* i. 328). But the effects were not always so mild (Arist. *H. N.* ix. 29).

Ver. 6. The withholding of death, instead of being an alleviation, is really a refinement of torture; so infernal is the pain, that the sufferers crave, but crave in vain, for death (Sibyll. iii. 208: καὶ καλέσουσι καλὸν τὸ θανεῖν καὶ φεύξετ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν). It is singular that suicide is never contemplated, although it was widely prevalent at this period in certain circles of the Empire (see Merivale's *Romans under the Empire*, ch. lxiv; Lecky's *Europ. Morals*, i. 212 f.). For its un-Jewish character see Jos. *Bell.* iii. 8. 5.

Ver. 7. Arabian poets compare locusts in head to the horse, in breast to the lion, in feet to the camel, in body to the snake, in antennæ to a girl's long, waving hair. The resemblance of the head in locusts and in horses has been often noticed (*Cavalleta, Italian*), and their hard scales resemble plates of equine armour. The rest of the description is partly fanciful ("crowns gleaming like gold," human faces; yet *cf.* Pl. *H. N.* vi. 28, Arabes mitrati degunt, aut intonsa crine), partly (vv. 8-9) true to nature (woman's hair [*i.e.*, abundant and flowing, a well-known trait of the Parthians and Persians], and lion-like teeth, scaly plates on the thorax, and rustling or whirring noises), partly (ver. 10) recapitulatory (= ver. 5; note ὁμοίας σκορπίοις, an abbreviated comparison like Homer's κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι), partly (ver. 11) imaginative (*cf.* Prov. xxx. 27). The leader of these demons is the angel of the inferno from which they issue. His name is Abaddon (*cf.* *Exp. Times*, xx. 234 f.), a Heb. equivalent for שְׁאוֹל personified like death and Hades. The final syllable of the name is taken to represent, as in Greek, a personal ending. Hence the LXX rendering ἀπώλεια pro-

καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὡς στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ,
καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων·
8. καὶ [o] εἶχαν τρίχας ὡς τρίχας γυναικῶν·
καὶ οἱ [p] ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὡς λεόντων ἦσαν·
9. καὶ εἶχον θώρακας ὡς θώρακας σιδηροῦς·
καὶ ἡ [q] φωνὴ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ὡς φωνὴ ἁρμάτων[1] πολλῶν
τρεχόντων εἰς πόλεμον.

10. καὶ ἔχουσιν [r] οὐρὰς [s] ὁμοίας[2] σκορπίοις καὶ κέντρα, καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε. 11. ἔχουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν [t] βασιλέα τὸν ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου· ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστὶ [u] "Ἀβαδδών," καὶ ἐν τῇ [v] Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει [w] "Ἀπολλύων".

12. [x] Ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία ἀπῆλθεν·
ἰδοὺ [y] ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο οὐαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

13. Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν· καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν [z] μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεράτων τοῦ [a] θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ [a] χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ [b] Θεοῦ, 14. λέγοντα τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀγγέλῳ ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα, "Λῦσον τοὺς τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους τοὺς δεδεμένους [c] ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ [d] Εὐφράτῃ". 15. Καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ [e] ἡτοιμα-

o For form, *cf.* x. 9, xi. 12. Abbott (90) compares the feminine garb of the fanatics in Jerusalem (Jos. *Bell.* iv. 9, 10).
p Joel i. 6, Sir. xxi. 2, xxxix. 30.
q Jer. xlvii. 3, Joel ii. 5.
r Ver. 19, xii. 4: ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
s Constr. xiii. 11, Matt. v. 20.
t *Cf.* Job xviii. 14.
u Job xxvi. 6, xxviii. 22.
v ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
w Constr. Blass, § 33, 1, Win. § 29, 1*b*.
x *Cf.* xi. 14, rare and irreg. Win. § 28, 2*d*.
y *Cf.* Ezek. vii. 25-26: irreg. due to Heb. fem. = Gk. neut.? Vit. ii. 98 f.
z = indef. art. viii. 13, Dan. viii. 13.
a Exod. xxx. 1-10, 1 Kings ix. 23, Ezek. xli. 22.
b *i.e.*, *θρόνου* (viii. 3).
c "At," or "beside," John iv. 6.
d xvi. 12.
e Providential sense, xii. 6, *cf.* Dan. vii. 12.

[1] After **αρματων** om. **ιππων** (so Sah., Bousset, Baljon, Könnecke p. 35) as a gloss introduced by a copyist to smooth out the sense of the O.T. citation.

[2] **ομοιας** PQ, min., And., Areth., vg. (edd.) [**ομοιοις** ℵA, 14 (Tr., WH marg.)], prim. corrupt. of **ομοια** as adverb, like **ομοιον** = **οιον** i. 13, xiv. 14 (WH)?

bably suggested the synonym Ἀπολλύων, containing a (sarcastic?) gibe at Apollo with whom the locust was associated ("uelut proprium nomen Caesaribus," Suet. *Oct.* 29); *cf.* Schol. on Aesch. *Agam.* 1085 and Plato's *Cratylus*, 404, 405. Both Caligula and Nero aped the deity of Apollo, among their other follies of this kind, as Antiochus Epiphanes had already done.

Ver. 12. A parenthetical remark of the author. **ἔρχεται** with plur. subj. following is not an irregularity due to Greek neut. as equiv. to Heb. fem. (Viteau, ii. 98-100), but an instance of the so-called "Pindaric" anacoluthon (*cf.* Moult. i. 58).

Vv. 13-21. *The sixth trumpet blast.*

Ver. 13. The golden altar of incense stands before God, as in the original tabernacle and temple; the specially solemn invocation of the angel shows that the Parthian-like invasion constitutes the climax of this series of disasters. **φωνήν**, as i. 10, x. 4, etc., the "bath qol" (Gfrörer, i. 253 f., Dalman, viii. 1).

Ver. 14. The sixth angel takes part in the action. The Euphrates had been the ideal Eastern boundary of Israel's territory: it now formed the frontier between Rome and her dreaded neighbour, the Parthian Empire (Philo, *leg. ad C.* § ii.; Verg. *Georg.* i. 509; Tac. *Hist.* iv. 51).

Ver. 15. This quartette of angels (= complete ruin, Zech. i. 18 f.) has been kept in readiness, or reserved for this occasion, though they are not to be connected (as by Spitta) with the four moments of time—*hour*, *day*, *month*, and *year*. Like the use of **δεῖ**, **μέλλει**, and **ἐδόθη**, this touch of predestined action brings out the strong providential belief running through the Apocalypse. On the rôle of destructive angels in Jewish eschatology *cf.* Charles on Slav. En. x. 3, and for the astrological basis (En. lxxxi. 10 f.) of this tradition see Fries in *Jahrb.*

σμένοι εἰς [f] τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτόν, [g] ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσι τὸ [h] τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 16. καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν στρατευμάτων τοῦ [i] ἱππικοῦ δισμυριάδες μυριάδων· ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν. 17. Καὶ [k] οὕτως εἶδον τοὺς ἵππους ἐν τῇ [l] ὁράσει, καὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ἔχοντας θώρακας [l] πυρίνους καὶ [m] ὑακινθίνους καὶ [l] θειώδεις· καὶ αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἵππων ὡς κεφαλαὶ [n] λεόντων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν [o] ἐκπορεύεται πῦρ καὶ καπνὸς

f Constr. i. 9, v. 12, xiv. 6, article grouping several substantives.
g With ἐλυθ. rather than ἡτ. despite viii. 6.
h Zech. xiii. 9, Sib. Or. iii. 544, v. 103.
i Only here in N.T.
k *i.e.*, "As is now to be described".
l Diff. sense in iv. 2. Only in Acts ii. 17 (O.T. quot.), elsewhere in N.T.
m Nah. ii. 3: on the curious variant *spineas* (= ἀκανθίνους) Pr. see Nestle's *Einführ.* 264.
n 1 Chron. xii. 8.
o (Constr. as in 1 Tim. vi. 4, Jas. iii. 10), *cf.* xi. 5, Job xli. 19-21, Joel ii. 3.

f. d. klass. Alterth. (1902) 705 f. Probably the author means that the angels set in motion the hordes of cavalry (two hundred million) described in the semi-mythical, semi-historical pageant of the next passage. But he does not directly connect the two, and it is evident that here as at vii. 1 f., we have "dream-like inconsequences" (Simcox), or else two fragments of apocalyptic tradition, originally heterogeneous, which are pieced together (at ver. 16). The four angels here do not correspond in function or locality to the four unfettered angels of vii. 1; they rather represent some variation of that archaic tradition in which four angels (perhaps angel-princes of the pagan hordes) were represented as bound (like winds?) at the Euphrates—a geographical touch due to the history of contemporary warfare, in which the Parthians played a rôle similar to that of the Huns, the Vikings, or the Moors in later ages. Since the first century B.C. a Parthian invasion of some kind had formed part of the apocalyptic apparatus so that there is no particular need to allegorise the Euphrates into the Tiber or to find the four angels in Ps. lxxviii. 49 (LXX). The bloody and disastrous Parthian campaign of 58-62 (*cf.* on vi. 2) may account for the heightened colour of the scene, whether the fragment was composed at that period, or (as is most probable) written with it in retrospect. But the entire vision is one powerful imaginative development of a tradition preserved in a Syriac Apocalypse of Ezra (published by Baethgen) which may be based on old Jewish materials: "and a voice was heard, Let those four kings be loosed, who are bound at the great river Euphrates, who are to destroy a third part of men. And they were loosed, and there was a mighty uproar." Could this be reckoned as proof of an independent tradition it would help to illumine the application of the idea in John's Apocalypse, especially if one could accept with Köhler the attractive conjecture of Iselin that ἀγγέλους represents a confusion (or variety of reading, *cf.* 2 Sam. xi. 1, 1 Chron. xx. 1) between מלאכים (= ἄγγ.) and מלכים in a Hebrew original of Apoc. ix. 15 (*Zeits. aus der Schweiz*, 1887, 64). The conjecture (Spitta, de Faye, J. Weiss) ἀγέλαι (= hosts, as in 2 Macc. iii. 18, etc.) is less likely, and ἐπὶ cannot be taken with λῦσον (Bruston). Cavalry formed a standing feature of the final terror for the Jewish imagination ever since the Parthians loomed on the political horizon (Ass. Mos. iii. 1). The whole passage was one of those denounced by the Alogi as fantastic and ridiculous (*cf.* Epiph. *Haer.* li. 34). Gaius also criticised it as inconsistent with Matt. xxiv. 7.

Ver. 16. The second woe is an irruption of fiendish cavalry.

Ver. 17. Here only the writer refers to his "vision". ἔχοντας (horse and rider regarded as one figure: in the Persian heavy cavalry horses as well as men were clad in bright plate) κ.τ.λ., "they wore coats of mail, the colour of fire and jacinth and brimstone," *i.e.*, gleaming red, dark blue, and yellow, unless ὑακ. (a favourite Oriental military colour) is meant to denote the colour of dull smoke. Plutarch, in his life of Sulla, describes the Medes and Scythians with their πυροειδῆ καὶ φοβερὰν ὄψιν (*cf.* Sir. xlviii. 9).—πῦρ, κ.τ.λ., like Job's leviathan, Ovid's bulls (Metam. vii. 104), or Diomede's horses (Lucret. v. 29, *cf. Aen.* vii. 281). They are also as destructive as Joel's locusts. The description is a blend of observation and fantastic popular beliefs. Brimstone was a traditional trait of divine wrath among people who "associated the ozonic smell which often so perceptibly accompanies lightning

καὶ θεῖον. 18. ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν πληγῶν τούτων [p] ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ τοῦ [q] πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ καπνοῦ καὶ τοῦ [q] θείου τοῦ ἐκπορευομένου ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν. 19. ἡ γὰρ ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ἐστιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν· αἱ γὰρ οὐραὶ αὐτῶν [r] ὅμοιαι ὄφεσιν, ἔχουσαι [s] κεφαλάς, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς ἀδικοῦσι. 20. Καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἳ οὐκ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν ταῖς πληγαῖς ταύταις, [t] οὐ [1] [t] μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν [u] ἔργων τῶν [u] χειρῶν αὐτῶν, [v] ἵνα [v] μὴ προσκυνήσουσι τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ εἴδωλα [w] τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ λίθινα καὶ τὰ [w] ξύλινα, [w] ἃ οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται οὔτε ἀκούειν οὔτε [w] περιπατεῖν· 21. [x] καὶ

p Plur. vb. with sing. noun (in collective sense); *cf.* on viii. 9.
q xiv. 10, xix. 20, xxi. 8.
r *Cf.* above on ver. 10.
s Sir. xxv. 15.
t xvi. 11, 21.
u Deut. iv. 28, Mic. v. 13, Ps. cxxxiv. 15, Isa. ii. 8, 20: = "idols". Philo. *vit. contempl.* § 1.
v Constr. iii. 9, Matt. xxi. 32, etc.; ἵνα μὴ of conceived result.
w From Dan. v. 4, 23, also from Ps. cxv. 4-7, etc., En. xcix. 7.
x *Cf.* xxii. 15, Apoc. Pet. 25, Ezek. xliii. 9.

[1] For (before μετεν.) ουτε (AP, 1, 36, etc., Bg., Lach.) read ου C, min., And[c, pal], Areth., WH, Bs., Bj. [ουδε ℵQ, 14, 38, 92, vg., Copt., Pesh., Syr., Cyp., Pr., etc., Ti., Al. Sw., Ws.].

discharges with the presence of sulphur" (*E. Bi.* 611). The symbolism is coloured by actual Parthian invasions (*cf.* vi. 1 f.) and by passages like Sap. xi. 18 where God punishes men by sending "unknown, newly-created wild beasts full of rage, breathing out a fiery blast or snorting out noisome smoke or flashing dread sparkles from their eyes." Mr. Bent recalls the curious superstition of the modern Therans, who during the eruptions of last century saw "in the pillars of smoke issuing from their volcano, giants and horsemen and terrible beasts".

Ver. 19. Heads attached to their serpentine tails are an allusion not only to the well-known tactics of the Parthians (*cf. Parad. Regained*, iii. 323 f.) but to a trait of ancient Greek mythology; on the altar of Zeus at Pergamos (*cf.* note on ii. 12) the giants who war against the gods are equipped with snakes (instead of limbs) that brandish open jaws. The amphisbaena of ancient mythology was often described as possessing a headed tail ("tanquam parum esset uno ore fundi uenena," Pliny: *H. N.* viii. 35).

Vv. 20, 21. The impenitence of the surviving two-thirds of men, who persist in worshipping daemons and idols (Weinel, 3, 4). Hellenic superstition (Plut. *de defectu orac.* 14) attributed to malignant daemons these very plagues of pestilence, war, and famine. Plutarch is always protesting against the excessive deference paid to such powers, and on the other hand against the rationalists and Christians who abjured them entirely.—**δαιμ.**, either the gods of paganism (LXX) or the evil spirits of contemporary superstition. In Enoch xix. 1, the spirits of the fallen angels "assuming many forms defile men and shall lead them astray to offer sacrifices to demons as to gods"; *cf.* xlvi. 7 (of the kings and rulers) "their power rests on their riches, and their faith is in the gods which they have made with their hands". (See Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5. 39, 40)—**ἀργυρᾶ**, contracted form, as in 2 Tim. ii. 20 (Helbing, pp. 34 f.).—**φαρμ.**, here in special sense of magic spells inciting to illicit lust (Artemid. v. 73), a prevalent Asiatic vice (*cf.* Greg. Naz. *Orat.* iv. 31). But in the imprecatory (*c.* 100 B.C.) inscription of Rheneia (Dittenberger, *Syll. Inscript. Graec.*[2] pp. 676 f.), punishment is invoked from **τὸν κύριον τῶν πνευμάτων** (*cf.* Apoc. xxii. 6) upon **τοὺς δόλωι φονεύσαντας ἢ φαρμακεύσαντας** the hapless girl. The three vices of the decalogue occur here (as in Matt.) in the Hebrew order, not in that of the LXX (Rom. xiii. 9; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20). *Cf.* on xxi. 8, and, for the connexion of polytheism and vice, Harnack's *Mission and Exp. of Christianity*, i. (1908), pp. 290 f. Repentance here (as in xvi. 9. 11) is primarily a change of religion, but the prophet has evidently little hope of the pagan world. There is no polemic against the Egyptian worship of animals, and, in spite of the Jewish outlook upon the *dolores Messiae*, the Apocalypse ignores family disturbances and false messiahs as harbingers of the end.—Once more (*cf.* vii. 1 f.) between the sixth (ix. 13-21) and the seventh (xi. 15-19) members of the series,

οὐ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν [x] φόνων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῶν [y] φαρμακειῶν αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῶν [z] κλεμμάτων αὐτῶν.

X. 1. ΚΑΙ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἰσχυρὸν καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, [a] περιβεβλημένον [a] νεφέλην, καὶ ἡ [b] ἶρις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ [c] πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ οἱ [d] πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς στύλοι πυρός· 2. καὶ [e] ἔχων ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ [f] βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεῳγμένον· καὶ [g] ἔθηκε τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ τὸν δεξιὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸν δὲ εὐώνυμον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 3. καὶ ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὥσπερ [h] λέων [i] μυκᾶται· καὶ ὅτε ἔκραξεν, ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν

y *Cf.* xvii. 2 with xviii. 2, 23, En. xcv. 4, also Isa. xlvii. 9 f., Mal. iii. 5, 2 Kings ix. 22.
z ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
a i. 7, xiv. 14, from Dan. vii. 13: = "cloud-wrapt" (like Horace's *Augur Apollo*).
b iv. 3.
c i. 16, *cf.* Matt. xvii. 2.
d i. 15, *cf.* Exod. xiv. 19 (LXX).
e As if ἄλλος ἀγγ. had preceded (ver. 1).
f Corrupt form of class. dimin. βιβλιδάριον.
g Sap. xviii. 16.
h Am. i. 2, iii. 4, 8, Hos. xi. 10, etc.
i ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.; of thunder Aesch. *Prom.* 1062, Arist. *Clouds*, 292.

a passage (this time of some length) is intercalated (x. 1-xi. 13), in which the personality of the seer now re-emerges (on earth, instead of in heaven). The object of x. 1-11 is to mark at once a change of literary method and a transition from one topic to another. The passage, which certainly comes from the prophet's own pen (so Sabatier, Schön, and others), looks backward and forward. Now that the preliminaries are over, all is ready for the introduction of the two protagonists (xi.-xiii.) whose conflict forms the closing act of the world's history (xv. 1-xx. 10). One of these is Jesus, the divine messiah, who has hitherto (v.-ix.) been depicted as the medium of revelation. Since his rôle is now to be more active, the prophet expressly alters the literary setting of his visions. The subsequent oracles are not represented as the contents of the book of Doom (which is now open, with the breaking of its last seal). Dropping that figure (contrast v. 2 and x. 1) the writer describes himself absorbing another roll of prophecy received from an angel. Evidently he intends to mark a new departure, and to introduce what follows as a fresh start. This new procedure is accompanied by an explicit assurance—intended to whet the reader's interest—that the Apocalypse has now reached the verge of the final catastrophe; the prophet apparently makes this eagerness to reach the goal the reason for omitting a seven-thunders vision (or source) which otherwise he might have been expected to include either at this point or subsequently. It is quite in keeping with the wider outlook and rather more historical atmosphere of xi. f., that a freer and less numerical method pervades these oracles. In short, x. 1-11 is a digression only in form. It serves to introduce not simply the Jewish fragment (xi. 1-13)—whose strange contents probably required some express ratification—but the rest of the oracles (xiii. f.), which are thus awkwardly but definitely connected with the foregoing design (through the closing trumpet-vision: x. 7 = xi. 15 f.).

Chapter X.—Ver. 1. **ἄλλον**, referring to v. 2, where another strong angel was mentioned, also in connexion with a book. The position of the seer is implied (since viii. 2?) to be no longer in heaven (*cf.* verses 4 and 8), but on earth, as the gigantic angel of light descends to him. The face and feet are described in stereotyped fashion. In Ezekiel's description of God (i. 28) the appearance of a rainbow surrounds the divine throne, as an element of the theophany in nature. Here also it is an æsthetic detail. Suetonius describes (*Vit. Aug.* 95) Augustus seeing suddenly "in a clear and bright sky a circle, like a rainbow in heaven, surrounding the sun's disc".

Ver. 2. "And in his (left? *cf.* ver. 5) hand a small booklet open" (in contrast to the larger closed book of v. 1), after Ezek. ii. 9. This colossal figure, like an Arabian jin, bestrides earth and sea. His message is for the broad world.

Ver. 3. **ὥσπερ λέων** (of God in O.T. reff.; of the messiah 4 Esd. xi. 37, xii. 31) **μυκᾶται** Theokr. *Id.* xxvi. 21, **μύκημα λεαίνης**, properly of cattle = "to bellow". **ἐλάλησαν κ.τ.λ.** = "uttered what they had to say" (*i.e.*, spoke articulately). **αἱ** (the well-known or familiar) **βρονταί** "of the apocalyptic machinery" (Alford), or a popular piece of apocalyptic prophecy (see below). *Cf.* the sevenfold voice of

φωνάς· 4. καὶ ὅτε ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταὶ ἤμελλον[1] γράφειν· καὶ ἤκουσα [k] φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, λέγουσαν [l] Σφράγισον ἃ ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἑπτὰ βρονταί, καὶ μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς. 5. Καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος, ὃν εἶδον ἑστῶτα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [m] ἦρε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, 6. καὶ [n] ὤμοσεν [n] ἐν τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, [o] ὃς ἔκτισε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, "Ὅτι [p] χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται· 7. ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἑβδό-

k i. 10 f., 19, xiv. 13, etc.
l Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4, *cf.* Apoc. Bar. xx. 3.
m Gen. xiv. 19, 22, Deut. xxxii. 40, Ezek. xx. 5.
n (Hebraic) Matt. v. 34, 36, xxiii. 16, 18, 20-22.
o Neh. ix. 6, Ps. cxlv. (cxlvi.) 6.
p = respite, ii. 21, Jos. *Bell.* iv. 3, 10, *cf.* Ezek. xii. 23-24.

[1] The double augment of **ημελλον** (ACQ, min., so Lach., Tr., WH, Ws., Swete) is better attested here than in iii. 2, *cf.* Helbing 71-72.

the Lord in thunder, Ps. xxix. The seven thunders here may be conceived loosely as the echoes of the angel's voice reverberating through the universe (Spitta, Weiss), thunder, throughout the ancient world, being especially venerated as a divine voice or warning.

Ver. 4. To seal or shut up a vision is to keep it secret from mankind, *i.e.*, in the present case (by a sequence of thought which is scarcely logical) to leave it unwritten. In a similar passage (Apoc. Bar. xx. 3) "seal" means to lay up fast in one's memory (because the realisation is not immediate); but this meaning is suggested by the context, although it might suit the present passage. The seer describes himself as prohibited by a heavenly voice (which reverence leaves as usual undefined, 4 Esd. vi. 17: Dalman viii. 1) from obeying his impulse. No reason is assigned; but the plain sense of the passage is that the author wishes (Weizs., Schön, Bs., Holtzm., Pfleid.) to justify his omission of a seven-thunder source or set of visions circulating in contemporary circles of prophecy (x. 7). In view of the authoritative character of such fragments or traditions John justifies his procedure by the explanation that he felt inspired to do so, and also to substitute other oracles. Thus in the middle, as at the opening and end of his book, he reiterates his prophetic authority. The episode may further indicate that the written contents of the Apocalypse represents merely a part of the author's actual vision (*cf.* John xxi. 25), or it may serve to heighten the effect of what is now to be introduced, or it may suggest that while the seer is to write (i. 11), he is to write only what is revealed through the medium of angels. In Slav. En. xxiii. 3, 6 the seer spends thirty days in writing the remarks of his angel-instructor. To hear **ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι** was not incompatible, however, with an **ἀποκάλυψις κυρίου** (2 Cor. xii. 1-4), *cf.* Weinel, 162 f. There was an inspiration of restraint as well as an inspiration of impulse. Thus Hermas (*Vis.* i. 3) listens with wonder to glories of God which he could not remember, "for all the words were awful, such as man cannot bear. The last words, however, I did remember; they were fit for us and mild". Possibly the seven-thunders source was of a severely punitive character (viii. 5), traversing ground which had been already (vi.-ix.) and was to be again (xv.-xvi.) covered.

Vv. 5-6. Modelling from Dan. xii. 7, the writer describes the angel's oath (by the *living* God, as usual in O.T.; *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 63), with its native gesture (*cf.* Trumbull's *Threshold-Covenant*, 78 f.) and contents. In the ancient world oaths were usually taken in the open-air (Usener, *Götternamen*, 181), before the all-seeing deities of the upper light. But here, as at iv. 17 and xiv. 7, the eschatological and the creative acts of God (the latter an outcome of His living might, as Sir. xviii. 1, En. v. 1, Acts xiv. 15, etc.) are deliberately conjoined; God's activity in creation and providence would culminate in judgment. "There shall be no further delay," or time lost. The interval of vi. 11 (Dan. xii. 7) is over: all is ripe now for the end, **ἡ συντέλεια καιροῦ**. The parallels in Slav. En. xxxiii. 2, lxv. 7, upon the abolition of seasons and periods of time are merely verbal. What engages the writer here is the usual point of importance in apocalyptic literature, *viz.*, "Is it long to the end? Is the future longer than the past" (4 Esd. iv. 44-50)?

Ver. 7. Vav consec. with the Heb.

μου ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ [q] ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, [r] ὡς [s] εὐηγγέλισεν τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφήτας". 8. Καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἣν ἤκουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πάλιν λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν, "[t] Ὕπαγε [u] λάβε τὸ βιβλίον[1] τὸ [v] ἠνεῳγμένον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἑστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς". 9. Καὶ [w] ἀπῆλθα πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, λέγων αὐτῷ

q xv. 1, John xix. 30.
r Zech. i. 6, Amos iii. 7, Dan. ix. 6, 10, etc., *cf.* Acts iii. 21. Favourite thought of sub-primitive Christianity, Col. i. 26 = Eph. iii. 1-12 = 1 Pet. i. 10-12 = Rom. xvi. 25.
s *Cf.* Gal. iii. 8. εὐαγ. as act. vb. only here and xiv. 6 (ἐπὶ accus.) in N.T.: late Greek usage.
t xvi. 1.
u v. 7: like ἀνάβα (iv. 2) an Attic form.
v Double augment, Blass, § 15, 7; Win. § 12, 7.
w *Cf.* ix. 8, xi. 12, for form.

[1] For βιβλιδαριον (Q, etc., And[a, c], Areth.) or βιβλαριδιον (ℵP, 1, etc., Al., Ti., Bs., Bj.) read βιβλιον AC, 6, 14 (Lach., Tr., WH, Sw., Ws.). The two former readings are corrections.

pf. (LXX = καὶ and fut. indic.) here by an awkward solecism (*cf.* on iii. 20) = "Then is (*i.e.*, shall be) finished the secret of God." The final consummation (inaugurated by the advent of messiah, xii.) is to take place not later than the period of the seventh angel's trumpet-blast, which *ex hypothesi* is imminent. The μυστήριον is plainly, as the context implies, full of solace and relief to God's people.—εὐηγγ. The total (exc. xiv. 6) omission of εὐαγγέλιον and the restricted use of its verb in the Apocalypse may have been due to the fact that such terms had been soiled by ignoble usage in the local Ionian cult of εὐάγγελος (*e.g.*, at Ephesus), with its oracular revelations and fellowship of *Euangelidae*. The Asiatic calendar of Smyrna contained a month called εὐαγγέλιος.—The connexion between μυστήριον = "secret purpose or counsel" (as here) and μ. = "symbol, or symbolic representation" (i. 20, xvii. 7) is due to the fact that in the primitive world the former was enigmatically conveyed by means of symbolic-representations in word, picture, or deed. As "every written word was once a μυστήριον," it was natural that the word used for the sign came to be employed for the thing signified (Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, 61). The near approach of the end had been for years a matter of confidence and joy to the Christian prophets—for it is they and not their predecessors who are specially in view. The special and solemn contribution of John's Apocalypse is to identify certain events in the immediate future with the throes out of which the final bliss was to be born. These throes include the downfall of the dragon from heaven, the subsequent climax of the Beast's influence on earth, and the assertion of God's authority over his own and against his foe's adherents (xii.-xiv. 20). The great and glad revelation is God seen in action, with his forces deployed for the final campaign which, with its issues of deliverance and triumph (xv.-xxii.), forms the climax of this book. The apotheosis of the Cæsars in their life-time—above all, of Domitian—marked the pitch of human depravity; divine intervention was inevitable.

Up to the end of ch. ix., the Apocalypse is fairly regular and intelligible; thereafter, criticism enters upon an intricate country, of which hardly any survey has yet succeeded in rendering a satisfactory account. The problem begins with ch. x. Although vv. 1-7 complete the preceding oracles by introducing their finale (7 = xi. 14 f.), while 8-11 connect more immediately with ch. xi., this forms no reason for suspecting that the oracle is composite. Spitta takes 1*a*, 2*b*-7 (except 4) as the continuation of ix., followed by xi. 15, 19, while the rest is substantially a prelude to xi. 1-13; Briggs similarly views 1*a*, 3-7 as the original transition between ix. and xi. 14, 15 *a*, 19, while x. 1 *b*-2, 8-11 (a vision of messiah) introduces the new source of xi. 1-13, xii. 18; and Rauch regards x. 1 *b*, 2 *a*, 5-7, 4, 9-11 as the opening of xi. 1-13, xii. 1-17, with x. 1-4 *a* (substantially) as the preface to xii. 18-xiii., xvi. 13-16. These analyses are unconvincing. The alleged signs of a Hebrew original (*e.g.*, ver. 7, also λέγουσί μοι and λέγει μοι in vv. 9, 11 = variant versions of ויאמר לי) are not decisive.

Ver. 8. ἡ φωνὴ (*cf.* ver. 4) left ungrammatically without a predicate, the two participles being irregularly attracted into the case of ἣν (*cf.* i. 1, iv. 11).

Vv. 9-10. The prophet absorbs the

"δοῦναί μοι τὸ βιβλαρίδιον". Καὶ λέγει μοι, [x] "Λάβε καὶ κατάφαγε αὐτό· καὶ πικρανεῖ σου τὴν κοιλίαν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ἔσται γλυκὺ ὡς μέλι". 10. Καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ βιβλαρίδιον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου, καὶ κατέφαγον αὐτό· καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ στόματί μου ὡς μέλι, γλυκύ· καὶ ὅτε [y] ἔφαγον αὐτό, ἐπικράνθη ἡ κοιλία μου. 11. Καὶ [z] λέγουσίν μοι, "Δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι [a] ἐπὶ [b] λαοῖς καὶ ἔθνεσι καὶ γλώσσαις καὶ [b] βασιλεῦσι πολλοῖς".

x For basis of this passage, *cf.* Ezek. ii. 8—iii. 3, Ps. cxix. 103, and 4 Esd. viii. 4 (absorbet ergo anima sensum et deuoret quod sapit). See Dieterich's *Mithras-Liturgie*, p. 101. y In sense of *κατέφαγον* which it echoes (*cf.* Moulton, i. 111, 115). z = "I was told" (like xi. 1, xvi. 15 impers. plur.). a *Cf.* xxii. 16, John xii. 16: = "of," "concerning". b Pleonastic, as v. 9, vii. 9, Dan. iii. 4, vii. 14, *cf.* xiii. 7.

word of God; in our phrase, he makes it his own or identifies himself with it (Jer. xv. 16). To assimilate this revelation of the divine purpose seems to promise a delightful experience, but the bliss and security of the saints, he soon realises, involve severe trials (*cf.* xi. 2, xii. 13 f., etc.) for them as well as catastrophes for the world. Hence the feeling of disrelish with which he views his new vocation as a seer. The distasteful experience is put first, in ver. 9, as being the unexpected element in the situation. (The omission of *bitterness* in LXX of Ezek. iii. 14 renders it unlikely that this additional trait of unpleasant taste is due, as Spitta thinks, to an erroneous combination of Ezek. iii. 2 and 14). The natural order occurs in ver. 10. The only analogous passage in early Christian literature is in the "Martyrdom of Perpetua" (iv. *cf.* Weinel, 196, 197). Wetstein cites from Theophrastus the description of an Indian shrub **οὗ ὁ καρπὸς . . . ἐσθιόμενος γλυκύς. οὗτος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ δηγμὸν ποιεῖ καὶ δυσεντερίαν.** Before the happy consummation (ver. 7), a bitter prelude is to come, which is the subject of national and political prophecies. In order to underline his divine commission for this task of punitive prediction, he recalls his inspiration.

Ver. 11. **λέγ. μοι,** an oblique, reverential way of describing the divine impulse, due to Aramaic idiom and common in later Biblical Hebrew (*cf.* Dalman, i., viii. 11). The series of oracles, thus elaborately inaugurated, is concerned increasingly ("again," in view of iv. 4, 15, vii. 4, 9, viii. 13, ix. 6, 16 f.) with those international movements ("kings" = **φυλαί,** or those in xvii. 10, 12) which a prophet related to the course of the divine kingdom. Strictly speaking, the revelation assimilated in x. 10, 11 opens in xii., but the intervening passage is linked to both (see below). The first part of this passage (xi. 1-2, 3-13) evidently forms part of the **βιβλαρίδιον** (*cf.* Introd. § 2). Its enigmatic contents, interrupting the trumpet-visions with edges which do not fit into the context or the rest of the Apocalypse, point to the incorporation of a special and disparate source. Any analysis is more or less hypothetical, but the writer is evidently not moving with absolute freedom. He has his own end in view, but he reaches it, here as elsewhere (*cf.* vii. 1 f.) by means of stepping-stones which originally lay in different surroundings. This is widely recognised by critics and editors, who commonly take 1-2 and 3-13 as separate oracles. Each indeed might be the torso of a larger source. But, in spite of the different descriptions of Jerusalem, the hypothesis of their original unity has much in its favour. How could so tiny a scrap of papyrus as that required for 1, 2 be preserved? Besides ver. 3 goes with ver. 2 (the prophetic mission as a counterpart to the punishment), the two periods are alike, the strange **δίδωμι**-construction occurs in both (here only in Apoc.), and the inversion of object and verb is common to both (2, 5, 6, 9, 10). To discover an oracle of the Zealots in 1, 2 (Wellhausen, Bousset, Baljon, J. Weiss) is precarious, for even if we could suppose that these passionate citizens took time to write oracles, they had not a monopoly of belief in the temple's inviolability. The latter belief conflicts with Mark xiii. 1, 2 (Ac. vi. 14); but, while this makes it extremely unlikely that the passage was adopted, or at least composed, by one of the Twelve, it does not necessarily disprove a Jewish Christian origin for the fly-leaf. Patriotism must have often swayed hope, even in face of authoritative logia. Still, a Jewish origin is more probable (so from Vischer and Sabatier to Baljon, Forbes, von Soden, Wellhausen and J. Weiss), in which case 8 *c* (**ὅπου . . . ἐσταυρώθη**), with possibly 9 *a* and

XI. 1. Καὶ [a] ἐδόθη [a] μοι [b] κάλαμος ὅμοιος [b] ῥάβδῳ, λέγων,

a x. 11.
b xxi. 15-16, Ezek. xl. 3-6, xlii. 16-19, *Zech.* ii. 1.

12 *b*, must be Christianising touches by the editor. As 8 *c* is the only place in the Apocalypse where Jesus is thus designated (contrast 4), and as the unexampled **αἱ . . . ἑστῶτες** occurs in 4, the editor may be using a previous translation of the fly-leaf. Otherwise, the repeated traces of Hebraistic idiom suggest that he translated it from an Aramaic or Hebrew original (so especially Weyland, Briggs, and Bruston) which was a Jewish (or Jewish Christian) oracle, composed towards the end of the siege in 70 A.D. between May and August (*cf.* Joseph. *Bell*, v. 12, 3) by a prophet who anticipated (*cf. S. C.*, 219, 220) that the temple and a nucleus of the God-fearing would be kept inviolate during the last *times of the Gentiles*, at the end of which anti-Christ or the pseudo-messiah would blasphemously re-assert himself in the temple (hence its preservation, 1, 2), according to one cycle of tradition (2 Thess. ii. 3, etc., *cf. A. C.* 160 f.), after murdering the two heralds of messiah. The motives and further career of the beast are omitted, if not in the source, at least by the editor. He resumes the subject afterwards (*cf.* xiii. 6), when the eschatological monster is specially identified with the imperial power. Here his main concern is with the fate of the two witnesses. Probably it was this feature of the oracle which primarily led him to adopt and adapt it, as showing how the beast or anti-christ was foiled in his attack on messiah's forerunners, just as (in xii.) the dragon is foiled in his attack on messiah himself. The other details are left standing; in their present setting they have much the same pictorial and dramatic interest as the minutiæ of the parables, and it is perhaps doubtful whether the editor linked any symbolic or allegorical meaning to them, although such can easily be attached in a variety of ways, *e.g.*, to the language of 1, 2 in the light of Barn. iv. 11, Ign. *ad Magn.* 7, etc. (so Weiss, Simcox, Swete, and others). Even the two witnesses are not to be identified with any historical figures of contemporary life, much less taken as allegorical or as typifying aspects of the church's testimony. "The vision . . . is of the nature of a superimposed photograph showing traces of many pasts" (Abbott). The original Jewish tradition which lay behind the source expected only Elijah, who should preach repentance to the pagan world, but he was occasionally furnished with a companion in Moses (on the basis of Deut. xviii. 15; *cf.* Mal. iv. 4, 5, the transfiguration-story, and possibly the two radiant saints of Apoc. Pet. 6 f.). The only other serious rival is Enoch, a grand figure in Jewish and early Christian eschatological tradition (for the curious Sir. xliv. 16, *cf. E. Bi.* 1295). Later tradition, indeed, thinking mainly of Elijah and Enoch (Gfrörer ii. 261 f.; *A. C.* 203, 211), whom antichrist in wrath slays for their witness against him, and whom God (or Michael and Gabriel) resuscitates, suggests a fairly apposite cycle of belief which may reproduce the earlier Jewish expectation out of which the materials of this fragmentary oracle have been drawn. The unique character of this expectation is illustrated, not so much by Anu and Nudimmut, Marduk's predecessors in the fight against Tiamât, as by the Zoroastrian belief that the temporary triumph of the evil spirit would be followed by the appearance of two reformers or prophets, Hushêdar and Hushêdarmâh (*S. B. E.* xxiii. 195; *cf.* Hübschmann, 227), who would act each for a millenium on earth as the precursors and heralds of their Lord, the Persian messiah. This belief is much older than the sources in which it occurs, and like several other Zoroastrian traits, it may have fused with the Jewish expectation in question, though the Zoroastrian heralds do not appear simultaneously (*cf. Encycl. Relig. and Ethics*, i. 207). Here at any rate the appearance of the two anonymous and mysterious witnesses precedes the final outburst of evil (xi. 7, xii. f.) and the manifestation of messiah (xi. 15 f., xiv. 14f.)—an idea for which no exact basis can be found in the strictly Jewish eschatology of the period. It may have grown up under the influence of this kindred trait in the adjoining province of Zoroastrian belief, unless the doubling of the witnesses was simply due to the side-influence of the Zechariah-trait (in ver. 4). Wellhausen argues from [the singular **πτῶμα** (8, 9) that the two witnesses were a duplication of the original single witness, *i.e.*, Elijah; but the singular is collective, and there is no trace of any conflation with Jonah.

CHAPTER XI.—Vv. 1, 2. "And I was given a rod (קְנֵה הַמִּדָּה) like a staff,

[a] Ἔγειρε καὶ [c] μέτρησον τὸν [e] ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας [d] ἐν αὐτῷ· 2. καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ ἔκβαλε ἔξωθεν, καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν μετρήσῃς, ὅτι [e] ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσι· καὶ [f] τὴν πόλιν τὴν [f] ἁγίαν [g] πατήσουσι μῆνας τεσσεράκοντα δύο. 3. Καὶ [h] δώσω τοῖς δυσὶ μάρτυσί [i] μου, [h] καὶ [k] προφητεύσουσιν [l] ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας [l] ἑξήκοντα, περιβεβλημένοι [1] [m] σάκκους. 4. [n] Οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ [o] αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου τῆς γῆς [p] ἑστῶτες.

c Ezek. xli. 1-2.
d John viii. 20.
e See on xvii. 17, prophetic perfect.
f xxi. 2, xxii. 19, Matt. xxvii. 53 (title of Jer. in later Judaism).
g Ps. Sol. vii. 2, xvii. 25, Luke xxi. 24; see wail of 4 Esd. vi. 56 f.
h Cf. on ix. 5.
i ii. 13.
k As 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 24.
l ver. 2, xii. 6.
m Isa. xxii. 12, Jer. vi. 26, Jas. iii. 5.
n From Zech. iv. 3, 11-14.
o Cf. Win. § 23, 5b.
p Grammat. irregularity, to emphasise personality of witnesses.

[1] For περιβεβλημενοι (ℵcC, 1, S., vg., And., Areth., Vict., Hipp., etc., so Al., Ti., Ws., Bs., Bj., Sw.) Lach., Tr., WH read the primitive corruption περιβεβλημενους (ℵ*AQP, min.), though WH suggest it may be an early error for περιβεβλημενοις.

with the words" (λέγων by a harsh attraction, *cf.* LXX of 1 Kings xx. 9, Josh. ii. 2, is left in apposition to the subject implied in ἐδόθη), "Up (or come = קוּם) and measure the temple of God and the altar (of burnt-offering, which stood outside the inner shrine) and (sc. number) those who worship there" (*i.e.*, in the inner courts, xiii. 6; for constr. *cf.* 2 Sam. viii. 3). The outer court (Ezek. x. 5) is to be left out of account (ἐκβ. = "omit" or exclude as unworthy of attention), "for it has been abandoned (or, assigned in the divine counsel) to the heathen, and (indeed) they shall trample on the holy city itself (emphatic by position, = Jerusalem) for two and forty months." In *Asc. Isa.* iv. 12 antichrist's sway lasts for three years, seven months, and twenty-seven days, but three and a half years is the conventional period for the godless persecutor to get the upper hand (*cf.* xiii. 5, after Daniel's "time, and times, and the dividing of time," *i.e.*, three and a half years, vii. 25, xii. 7). Originally this broken seven as the period of oppression reflected the Babylonian three and a half winter months (*S. C.* 309 f.; Cheyne's *Bible Problems*, 111 f.), preceding the festival of Marduk in the vernal equinox, a solstice during which Tiamât reigned supreme. Here it is the stereotyped period of the καιροὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν (Luke xxi. 24), extending to the second advent.—μετρήσῃς. To measure is here not a prelude to ruin but a guarantee of preservation and restoration (Zech. ii. 1 f.). Failure to satisfy God's standard or test means calamity for men, but when he surveys their capacities and needs in peril, it implies protection. As the context implies, this is the idea of the present measuring. It is not to be identified prosaically with "orders given to the Roman soldiers, who were encamped in Jerusalem after its destruction, not to set foot in what had been the Holy of Holies" (Mommsen).

Ver. 3. σάκκους, the simple, archaic garb of prophets, especially appropriate to humiliation (reff.). The faithful prophets who withdraw from the local apostacy to the desert in company with Isaiah (*Asc. Isa.* ii. 9 f.) are also clothed in this black hair-cloth. The voice of the divine speaker here "melts imperceptibly into the narrative of the vision" (Alford, *cf.* ver. 12). Contemporary Jewish belief (4 Esd. vi. 26) made these "witnesses" (men "who have not tasted death from their birth," *i.e.*, Enoch, Elijah) appear before the final judgment and preach successfully, but the only trace of any analogous feature in rabbinical prophecy seems to be the appearance of Moses and Messiah during the course of the Gog and Magog campaign. The reproduction of this oracle, long after its original period in 70 A.D., would be facilitated by the fact that the visions of Ezekiel and Zechariah, upon which it was modelled, both presupposed the fall of the city and temple in ancient Jerusalem (Abbott, pp. 84-88).

Ver. 4. They are further described in the terms applied by Zechariah to the two most prominent religious figures of his day, except that they are compared to two lampstands, not to one which is septiform. The idea is that their autho-

5. καὶ εἴ τις αὐτοὺς θέλει ἀδικῆσαι,
[q] πῦρ ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτῶν καὶ κατεσθίει
τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν·
καὶ εἴ[1] τις αὐτοὺς [r] θελήσῃ ἀδικῆσαι,
οὕτω δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι.
6. οὗτοι ἔχουσιν τὴν ἐξουσίαν [s] κλεῖσαι τὸν [s] οὐρανόν,
ἵνα μὴ ὑετὸς βρέχῃ τὰς ἡμέρας αὐτῶν τῆς προφητείας
αὐτῶν,
καὶ ἐξουσίαν [t] ἔχουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν [t] ὑδάτων,
στρέφειν αὐτὰ εἰς αἷμα,
καὶ [t] πατάξαι τὴν γῆν ἐν πάσῃ πληγῇ,
ὁσάκις ἐὰν θελήσωσιν.
7. Καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσι τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῶν, τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς [u] ἀβύσσου [v] ποιήσει μετ' αὐτῶν πόλεμον καὶ νικήσει αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτούς. 8. καὶ τὸ πτῶμα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς

q ix. 17, 2 Kings i. 10 f., Luke ix. 54, (Moses) Num. xvi. 35.
r For subj. with εἰ, *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 5 (Deissm. 118).
s 1 Kings xvii., Sir. xlviii. 3, Jub. xxiii. 18.
t See feats ascribed to Moses in Exod. vii. 19-21; 1 Sam. iv. 8 (Apoc. viii. 8, xvi. 3), *cf.* Jos. *Bell.* v. 9, 4.

u *Cf. Encycl. Relig. and Ethics*, i. 53-55.
v From Dan. vii. 21; divine permission (Apoc. xiii. 7)?

[1] For και ει Bl. conj. καν (from καιη ℵ*C, 1).

rity and influence are derived from God. As in ver. 7, the function of the two witnesses (*cf.* Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15) is defined as "prophecy," but no details are given.

Vv. 5, 6. In this description, borrowed from traditional features of Moses and Elijah (whose drought lasted for three and a half years, according to Luke iv. 25; James v. 17), the metaphorical expressions of passages like Jer. v. 14 and Sir. xlviii. 1 are translated into grim reality (see reff.), as in Slav. En. i. 5 and the thaumaturgic practices chronicled by Athen. iv. 129 D and Lucian (*Philopseud.* 12). These are no meek apostles of the Christian faith. To stop rain was equivalent to a punishment for iniquity (Ps. Sol. xvii. 20-22, En. c. 11, etc.)

Ver. 7. The influence of Hebraic idiom helps to explain (*cf.* xx. 7-9) the translator's "transition from futures through presents to preterites" here (Simcox). τελέσωσι (Burton, 203) indicates no uncertainty. When their work is done, they are massacred—not till then; like their Lord (Luke xiii. 31 f.), they are insured by loyalty to their task. The best comment upon this and the following verses, a description coloured by the famous passage in Sap. ii. 12-iii, 9, is Bunyan's description of the jury in Vanity Fair and their verdict. This beast "from the abyss" is introduced as a familiar figure—an editorial and proleptic reference to the beast "from the abyss" in xvii. 8 or from "the sea" (xiii. 1; the abyss and the sea in Rom. x. 7 = Deut. xxx. 13) which was (*cf. Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, i. 53 f.) the haunt and home of daemons (Luke viii. 31, etc.), unless he is identified with the supernatural fiend and foe of ix. 2, 11. (Bruston heroically gets over the difficulty of the beast's sudden introduction by transferring xi. 1-13 to a place after xix. 1-3). The beast wars with the witnesses (here, as in ix. 9 and xii. 17, Field, on Luke xiv. 31, prefers to take πόλεμον = μάχην, a single combat or battle, as occasionally in LXX [*e.g.*, 3 Kings xxxii. 34] and Lucian), and vanquishes them, yet it is the city (ver. 13) and not he who is punished. The fragmentary character of the source is evident from the fact that we are not told why or how this conflict took place. John presupposed in his readers an acquaintance with the cycle of antichrist traditions according to which the witnesses of God were murdered by the false messiah who, as *the abomination of desolation* or *man of sin*, was at feud with all who opposed his worship or disputed his authority.

Ver. 8. God's servants rejected and cast aside, as so much refuse! See *Sam. Agonistes*, 667-704. The "great city" is Jerusalem, an identification favoured

πλατείας τῆς [w] πόλεως τῆς [w] μεγάλης, ἥτις καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ [x] Αἴγυπτος,[1] ὅπου καὶ ὁ Κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη. 9. καὶ βλέπουσιν [y] ἐκ τῶν λαῶν καὶ φυλῶν καὶ γλωσσῶν καὶ ἐθνῶν τὸ [a] πτῶμα αὐτῶν ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἥμισυ, καὶ τὰ [b] πτώματα αὐτῶν οὐκ

w xiv. 8, xvi. 19, xvii.-xviii.
x Ps. cv. 38.
y *Cf.* on ii. 10 (partitive).
a Here as in 8 = collective term ("corpses"), as πρόσωπον Gen. xlviii. 20, κεφαλή Lev. x. 6.
b *Cf.* Isa. lxxviii. (lxxix.) 3, Ps. Sol. ii. 31, En. xxii. 10; 2 Kings ix. 10, and Jer. xxiii. 19.

[1] Pr. om. και Αιγυπτος (an early gloss, Haussleiter 213). Further editorial Christian additions are suspected in ητις . . . εσταυρωθη (so *e.g.*, Weyland, S. Davidson, Wellh.) or οπου . . . εσταυρωθη (so *e.g.*, Sabatier, Schön, Vischer, Pfleid., Rauch, Völter, Baljon, Bs., de Faye, Kohler, von Soden).

by (*a*) incidental O.T. comparisons of the Jews to Sodom (Isa. i. 9; Jer. xxiii. 14; so *Asc. Isa.* iii. 10), (*b*) the Christian editor's note ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη, (*c*) a passage like Luke xiii. 33, (*d*) the reference in xvi. 19, and (*e*) passages in Appian (*Syr.* 50 μεγίστη πόλις 'I.), Pliny (*H. N.* xiv. 70), Josephus (*Apion*, i. 22), and Sib. Or. (v. 154, 226, 413, written before 80 A.D.), all of which confirm this title (*cf.* the variant addition μεγάλην in Apoc. xxi. 10): it is indeed put beyond doubt by the peculiar antichrist-tradition upon which the Jewish original was based (*A. C.* 19 f., 134 f., *E. Bi.* i. 179, 180). The obscurity and isolated character of this eschatology, "an exotic growth upon the soil of Judaism" and much more in early Christianity, may be accounted for perhaps by the historical changes in the later situation, which concentrated the antichrist in anti-Roman rather than in anti-Jewish hostility. As yet, however, the seduction of the Jews by a false messiah (*cf.* John v. 43 and its patristic interpretation) was quite a reasonable expectation: see the evidence gathered in *A. C.* 166 f. Victorinus, following the Apocalypse literally (xi. 7 = xvii. 11), makes Nero redivivus beguile the Jews. The alternative to this theory has won considerable support (especially from Spitta and Wellhausen) upon various grounds; it regards *the great city* as Rome, where the two prophets are supposed to preach repentance to the heathen world and eventually to be killed. But although this suits some portions of the language well (*e.g.*, ver. 13, conversion to *God of heaven*), it is not exegetically necessary; it introduces Rome abruptly (8 *c* being of course taken as a gloss) and irregularly: nor does it explain the general contour of the oracle as happily as that advocated above. Bruston's ingenious attempt to take τ. μεγάλης with πλατείας (= Jewish justice) is quite untenable, and *the great city* is not likely to be a translator's error (Weyland), גדולה for קדושה.—πνευματικῶς (*cf.* Gal. iv. 24 f.) as opposed to σαρκικῶς ("literally," Just. Mart. *Dial.* xiv. 231 *d*) is "allegorically, or mystically."—καὶ Αἴγυπτος, not as the home of magic (*cf.* Blau's *Altjüd. Zauberwesen*, 39 f.) but as a classical foe of God's people (and Moses of old?). The connexion with the water-dragon of xii. 15 (*cf.* Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2) is obvious. Philo allegorises E. usually as a type of the corporeal and material.—ὅπου κ.τ.λ., no wonder if Christians suffer, after what their Lord had to suffer (*cf.* Matt. x. 22-25, 28 f.) at the hands of impious men. There is none of the modern's surprise or indignation at the thought of "Christian blood shed where Christ bled for men".

Ver. 9. *Cf.* 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 f., Matt. xxiii. 34 f., Job. i. 12.—ἀφίουσιν, for other N.T. assimilations of irreg. to reg. verb (Win. § 14. 16; Blass, § 23. 7), *cf.* Mark i. 34, Luke xi. 4. In Ep. Lugd. the climax of pagan malice is the refusal to let the bodies of the martyrs be buried by their friends, ὑπὸ γὰρ ἀγρίου θηρὸς ἄγρια καὶ βάρβαρα φῦλα ταραχθέντα δυσπαύστως εἶχε. The rendering of burial honours to the dead was a matter of great moment in the ancient world; to be denied pious burial meant ignominy in the memory of this world and penalties in the next. The two witnesses are treated as the murdered high priests, Ananus and Jesus, were handled by the Jewish mob in the seventh decade (Jos. *Bell.* iv. 5, 2).—βλέπουσιν, the onlookers, who evidently sympathise with antichrist (*cf.* on xvi. 12), include pagans as well as Jews (Andr.).—ἡμέρας, κ.τ.λ., three and a half as the broken seven (*cf.* on ver. 2) here in days. This trait (*cf.* on ver. 12) shows that their fate was not originally modelled on that of Jesus.

ἀφίουσιν [b] τεθῆναι εἰς μνῆμα. 10. καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [c] χαίρουσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς καὶ εὐφραίνονται· καὶ [c] δῶρα πέμψουσιν [1] ἀλλήλοις, ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ δύο προφῆται [d] ἐβασάνισαν τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 11. [e] Καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἥμισυ [f] πνεῦμα ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς,[2] καὶ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ [g] φόβος μέγας [g] ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς [h] θεωροῦντας αὐτούς. 12. καὶ ἤκουσαν[3] [i] φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης αὐτοῖς, "[k] Ἀνάβατε ὧδε". Καὶ [l] ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν τῇ [m] νεφέλῃ, καὶ ἐθεώρησαν αὐτοὺς οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν. 13. Καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐγένετο [n] σεισμὸς μέγας, καὶ τὸ [o] δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἔπεσε, καὶ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ [p] ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες ἑπτά· καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο καὶ [q] ἔδωκαν δόξαν [r] τῷ Θεῷ τοῦ [s] οὐρανοῦ.

14. [a] Ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα ἀπῆλθεν·
ἰδοὺ ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη ἔρχεται ταχύ.

15. Καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, [t] λέγοντες,

c Ps. cv. 38, Neh. viii. 10, 12, Esth. ix. 19, 22.
d Sap. ii. 12, 14-15, 1 Kings xviii. 17.
e From Ezek. xxxvii. 5, 10.
f xiii. 15, = הַיִּים רוּחַ (Gen. vi. 17).
g Gen. xv. 12.
h Only here in Apoc.
i *Par. Lost*, vi. 29-36.
k Win. § 13, 22. Such unusual -α forms of sec. aor. are textually untenable however in vi. 16, xvii. 6, and xviii. 19.
l 2 Kings ii. 11.
m Acts i. 9.
n vi. 12, Matt. xxvii. 51.
o ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
p *Cf.* on iii. 4, Num. i. 20, 28; Deissm. 196-197, Abbott 91-93.
q xvi. 9, 11, Jer. xiii. 16, Dan. ii. 18, 44, Isa. xxv. 3.
r *Cf.* as ix. 12, and xii. 12.
s Only here and xvi. 11 (citation from Dan. ii. 19), in N.T.:= אֱלָהּ שְׁמַיָּא.
t Constr. ad sensum.

[1] Ti., Bs., Bj. read πεμπουσιν (ℵ*P, Arm., Tic., Spec., etc.). The vss. on the whole favour the futures in 9-10.

[2] Read εν (om. εν CP, 1, etc., Tr., WH ?) αυτοις A, min. (5), Arm., vg., And[a], Lach., Al. Ti., Ws., Bs. (*cf.* Luke ix. 46), which has been early improved into εις (ℵQ, etc., Bj.) or επ (min. 5) αυτους.

[3] For ηκουσαν (ℵ*ACP, vg., Ti., Tr., WH, Ws., Sw., Bj.) ηκουσα (ℵcQ, etc., Me., And., Areth., Tic.) is read by some (*e.g.*, Al., de Wette, Düst., Bs., Lind., Wellh.).

Ver. 10. So far from laying it to heart that the godly perish, men are hyperbolically represented as congratulating one another on getting rid of these obnoxious prophets with their vexatious words (3) and works (6), which hitherto had baffled opposition (4, 5). Another naive Oriental touch is that their victims exchange presents in order to celebrate the festive occasion.

Ver. 12. After being resuscitated, they ascend in a cloud (like Enoch and Jesus) before the eyes of their enemies (unlike Jesus).

Ver. 13. On earthquakes as a punishment for sin, *cf.* Jos. *Ant.* ix. 10, 4= Zech. xiv. 5, and (for Sodom) Amos iv. 11. The beast, as in 2 Thess. ii. 9-12, gets off scatheless in the meantime, though his tools are punished or terrified into reverence (Jonah iii. 5-10).—ὀνόματα ἀ. Briggs ingeniously conjectures that this is a clumsy version of אַנְשֵׁי שְׁמוֹת =men of name or fame (*cf.* 1 Chron. v. 24, Num. xvi. 2). From this point till xvi. 19 and xx. 9 Jerusalem seems to be ignored among the wider political oracles, except incidentally at xiv. 20 (see note), where another erratic block from the same or a similar cycle of eschatological tradition breaks the surrounding strata of prediction.

The ample and proleptic style of the next passage shows that the author has left his source in order to resume matters with (14-18) the seventh trumpet-blast or third woe, which ushers in the final stage (1 Cor. xv. 52) of the divine purpose (x. 7=xii.-xx). But what immediately follows is, by anticipation, a celestial reflex of the last judgment which is characteristically deferred till "the various underplots of God's providence" (Alford) are worked out. The announcement of it starts an exultant song of praise in heaven.

Ver. 15. The rout of Satan (xii. 10 and xx. 4-10) means the absolute messianic

"Ἐγένετο ἡ [u] βασιλεία τοῦ [u] κόσμου τοῦ [v] Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ
[w] Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ,
Καὶ [x] βασιλεύσει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

16. [y] Καὶ οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι οἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ κάθηνται[1] ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν, [z] ἔπεσαν [a] ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ Θεῷ, λέγοντες,

17. "[b] Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, [c] Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,
ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν,
ὅτι [d] εἴληφας τὴν δύναμίν σου τὴν μεγάλην,
καὶ [d] ἐβασίλευσας.

18. καὶ τὰ ἔθνη [e] ὠργίσθησαν,
καὶ ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου,
καὶ ὁ [f] καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν [f] κριθῆναι,
καὶ [f] δοῦναι τὸν [g] μισθὸν [h] τοῖς δούλοις σου τοῖς [h] προφήταις,
καὶ τοῖς [i] ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς [k] φοβουμένοις τὸ [k] ὄνομά σου, [l] τοῖς
μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις,[2]
καὶ [m] διαφθεῖραι τοὺς διαφθείροντας τὴν γῆν."

u Sing. only here := β. ἐπι τ.κ., xvii. 18, cf. Obad. 21.
v (Possess. genit.) from Ps. ii. 2, 6, quot. also in Acts iv. 26; cf. Ps. xxii. 29, and Isa. lii. 7-8; God's reign again in Apoc. xix. 6.
w Ps. (x.) 16; cf. on Acts iii. 18, Dalman i. § 11, 1.
x Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14, quot. in Luke i. 33.
y Cf. Isa. xxv. 9.
z iv. 10, v. 8, 14.
a vii. 11. b Common at open. of votive inscriptions (Asia Minor). c i. 8, xvi. 7, xviii. 8, xix. 6. d Inceptive aor. cf. Luke xv. 32, 1 Cor. iv. 8, Burton 54. From Ps. xcii. xciii.) 1 where, as 2 Sam. xvi. 8, ἐβασ.="is king". e xii. 17. From Ps. ii., xcviii. xcix., *κύριος ἐβασίλευσε, ὀργιζέσθωσαν λαοί*. f Constr. Rom. ix. 21 (*ἐξουσία . . . ποιῆσαι*); = *ἵνα κριθῶσιν κ.τ.λ.* See Esth. ii. 12 *οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ καιρὸς κορασίου εἰσελθεῖν*. g xxii. 12 (not elsewhere in Apoc.). h x. 7; prophets and saints = Christendom, as i. 1-2, cf. on xviii. 20 and 24. From Dan. ix 6, 10, etc. i Always in Apoc.=Christians, never angels (cf. xiv. 10). k Here only, N.T.; cf. xiv. 7, xv. 4, and on xix. 5; also 2 Cor. vii. 1. l Ps. cxv. 13: quot. in xiii. 16, xix. 5, xx. 12. m viii. 9, cf. on xix. 2. For double sense of word("destroy" and "corrupt") compare Eng. usage of "ruin".

[1] For **καθημενοι** (AP, 1, etc., Al. Lach., WH, Sw., Ws., Bs.) Ti., Tr., Bj. rightly read (οι) **καθηνται** ℵ*CQ, etc., Syr., S., And[c], Areth., vg., Pr.
[2] Lach., Tr., WH, Sw. read **τους μικρους και τους μεγαλους** (ℵ*AC).

(ὁ Χ. only in these sections = "messiah" in the eschatological sense) authority of God, as the destruction or submission of paganism (*cf.* ver. 13) means the true coming of the eschatological **βασιλεία** (*cf.* xix. 1-6, after Rome's downfall). The apocalyptic motto is not so much "The Lord reigns," as "The Lord is to reign". Meanwhile he overrules, and every preliminary judgment shoots the pious mind forward to anticipate the final triumph. Linguistically **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** might mean here as in Hab. iii. 13 God's chosen people, but the usage of the Apocalypse puts this out of the question. There is no need to delete the words here as a gloss (so, *e.g.*, Baljon, von Soden, Rauch) or the similar phrase in En. xlviii. 10 (with Dalman).

Ver. 17. **ὁ ἐρχόμενος** is naturally omitted from this paean; God has already come! The variation of order in i. 4 and iv. 8 has no occult significance. The phrase *Lord God* is considered by Philo (on Gen. vii. 5) specially applicable to seasons of judgment; *Lord* precedes *God*, since the former signifies not beneficence but "royal and destructive power".

Ver. 18. **ὀργ.** = defiant rage (*cf.* xvi. 11), not the mere terror of vi. 17, at the messianic **ὀργή**. The prophets are as usual the most prominent of the **ἅγιοι**. If the **καὶ** after **ἁγίοις** is retained, it is epexegetic (as in Gen. iv. 4, Gal. vi. 16), not a subtle mark of division between Jewish and Gentile Christians (Völter) or (in a Jewish source) saints and proselytes. The same interpretation (for **φοβ.** *cf.* Introd. § 6) must be chosen, if **καὶ** is omitted (as, *e.g.*, by Bousset and Baljon), but the evidence is far too slight to justify the deletion.—**διαφθ.** "When Nero perished by the justest doom/Which ever the destroyer yet destroyed" (Byron). Contrast the exultant tone of this retrospective thanksgiving with the strain

19. Καὶ [n] ἠνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ,
καὶ ὤφθη ἡ [o] κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ·

n On form, see Deissm. 189.
o Heb. ix. 4: elsewh. = Noah's ark in N.T.

of foreboding which is sounded in xii. 12 before the actual conflict.

Ver. 19 introduces xii. 1-18; all that the prophet can speak of, from his own experience (*cf.* xiii. 1, 11, **εἶδον**), are the two **θηρία** on earth, but their activity in these latter days is not intelligible except as the result of mysterious movements in heaven. The latter he now outlines (*cf.* **ὤφθη** xi. 19, xii. 1, 3. By whom?) in order to comfort Christians by the assurance that the divine conqueror of these **θηρία** was in readiness to intervene. The celestial (contrast xi. 1) **ναός**, presupposed in the scenery of iv.-vi., is now mentioned for the first time; its opening reveals the long lost **κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης**, and is accompanied by the usual storm-theophany, marking a decisive moment. Jewish tradition had for long cherished the belief (*cf.* on ii. 17) that the restoration of the people (gathered by God, *cf.* xiv. 1 f.) in the last days would be accompanied by the disclosure of the sacred box or ark (in a cloud; *cf.* here the lightning and thunder) which, together with the tabernacle and the altar of incense, had been safely concealed in Mount Nebo. So, *e.g.*, Abarbanel (on 1 Sam. iv. 4: haec est arca quam abscondit ante uastationem templi nostri et haec arca futuro tempore adueniente messia nostro manifestabitur). Epiphanius repeats the same rabbinical tradition (**καὶ ἐν ἀναστάσει πρῶτον ἡ κιβωτὸς ἀναστήσεται**). The underlying idea was that the disappearance of the ark from the holy of holies (Jer. iii. 16; 4 Esd. x. 22; Jos. *Bell.* v. 5. 5) was a temporary drawback which had to be righted before the final bliss could be consummated. This legend explains the symbolism of the Jewish Christian prophet. The messianic crisis is really at hand! The dawn may be cold and stormy, but it is the dawn of the last day! The spirit and content of the passage are transcendental; it is prosaic to delete **ἐν τ. ὁ.** (Spitta, and Cheyne in *E. Bi.* i. 309) and refer the vision to the earthly temple in Jerusalem. Like the author of Hebrews, this writer views heaven under the old ritual categories; besides, the originals of the sacred things were supposed to exist in the heaven of God (Heb. viii. 5).

This overture leads up to two sagas (xii. and xiii.) which explain that the present trouble of Christians was simply a final phase of the long antagonism which had begun in heaven and was soon to be ended on earth. It is the writer's task "not only to announce the future but also (i. 19) to convey a right understanding of that present on which the future depends" (Weiss). Hence the digression or retrospect in xii. 1 f. is only apparent. Hitherto only hints of persecution have been given; now the course, methods, and issues of the campaign are unfolded. The messianic position of Jesus is really the clue to the position of affairs, and it is of the utmost (**μέγα**, ver. 1 = weighty and decisive) moment to have all events focussed in the light of the new situation which that position has created. So much is plain. But that the source (or tradition) with its goddess-mother, persecuting dragon, celestial conflict, and menaced child, did not emanate from the prophet himself is evident alike from its style and contents; these show that while it could be domiciled on Jewish Christian soil it was not autochthonous (*cf.* Vischer, 19 f.; Gunkel, *S. C.* 173 f.). The imagery is not native to messianism. It bears traces of adaptation from mythology. Thus, where it would have been apposite to bring in the messiah (ver. 7), Michael's rôle is retained, even by the Christian editor, while the general oriental features of the mother's divine connexion and her flight, the dragon's hostility and temporary rout, and the water-flood, are visible through the Jewish transformation of the myth into a sort of allegory of messiah, persecuted by the evil power which he was destined to conquer. "In reality it is the old story of the conflict between light and darkness, order and disorder, transferred to the latter days, and adapted by spiritualisation . . . to the wants of faithful Jews" (Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 80). While the vision represents the messianic adaptation of a sun-myth, it is uncertain what the particular myth was, and whether the vision represents a Jewish source worked over by the prophet. In the latter case, the Christian redactor's hand is visible perhaps in 4 *a* and 5 (**πρὸς τ. θ. αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* v. 6), certainly in 11 (which, even apart from *the Lamb*, interrupts the sequence) and 17 *c*, if not

p iv. 5, viii. 5 f., xvi. 18-21.
q Individual (as vi. 14, etc.), not generic as Mark xiii. 8.

καὶ ἐγένοντο [p] ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ [q] σεισμὸς καὶ χάλαζα μεγάλη.

also in the whole of 10-12. If, in addition to this, the source was originally written in Hebrew, traces of the translator are to be found (so Gunkel, Kohler, and Wellhausen, after Ewald, Bruston, Briggs, and Schmidt) in 2 (**βασ. τεκεῖν**, *cf.* 1 Sam. iv. 19 חרה ללדת), 5 (**υἱὸν ἄ.** = בן זכר), 6 (**ὅπου . . . ἐκεῖ** = אשׁר שם), 8 (**κ. οὐκ ἴ.** = וְלֹא יכל *cf.* 14 and on iii. 8), 9 (*the old serpent* = הנחשׁ הראשׁון or הקדמוני), possibly 10 (**κατήγωρ** = קטיגור), and 12 (**κατέβη**, *cf.* **ἐβλήθη** of 10 = ירד). But whether the source was written or not, whether (if written) it was in Greek or not, and whether it was Jewish or Jewish-Christian, the clue to the vision lies in the sphere of comparative religion rather than of literary criticism. Its atmosphere has been tinged by the international myth of a new god challenging and deposing an older, or rather of a divine hero or child menaced at birth—a myth which at once reflected the dangers run by the seed sown in the dark earth and also the victory of light (or the god of light) over darkness, or of light in the springtide over the dead winter. The Babylonian myth of Marduk, which lacks any analogous tale of Marduk's birth, does not correspond so aptly to this vision (*cf.* Introd. § 4 *b*), as does the well-known crude Egyptian myth (Bousset); Isis is a closer parallel than Ishtar, and still closer perhaps at one point is the **κουροτρόφος** of Hellenic mythology, who was often represented as *uirgo coelestis*. But, if any local phase of the myth is to be assumed as having coloured the messianic tradition used by John, that of Leto would be particularly intelligible to Asiatic readers (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Pfleiderer, *Early Christ. Conception of Christ*, 56 f., after Dieterich's *Abraxas*, 117 f.; Maas, *Orpheus*, 251 f.). The dragon Python vainly persecuted her before the birth of Apollo; but she was caught away to a place of refuge, and her divine child, three days later, returned to slay the monster at Parnassus. This myth of the pregnant and threatened goddess-mother was familiar not only in Delos but throughout the districts, *e.g.*, of Miletus and Magnesia, where the fugitive goddess was honoured on the local coinage. Coins of Hadrian's reign associate the myth with Ephesus (**ΕΦΕΣΙΩΝ ΛΗΤΩ**). At Hierapolis, "the story of the life of these divine personages formed the ritual of the Phrygian religion" (*C. B. P.* i. 91 f.); the birth of a god is associated with Laodicea, one coin representing an infant god in the arms of a woman (Persephone); while in the legend of Rhea, as Ramsay points out (*C. B. P.* i. 34), Crete and Phrygia are closely allied (*cf.* also *Sib. Orac.* v. 130 f.). All this points decisively to the Hellenic form of the myth as the immediate source of the symbolic tradition (so, *e.g.*, J. Weiss, Abbott, 99), though here as elsewhere in the Apocalypse the obscurity which surrounds the relations between Jewish or early Christian eschatology and the ethnic environment renders it difficult to determine the process of the latter's undoubted influence on the former. Fortunately, this is a matter of subordinate importance. The essential thing is to ascertain not the soil on which such messianic conceptions grew, but the practical religious object to which the Christian prophet, as editor, has freely and naively applied them. His design is to show that the power of Satan on earth is doomed. Experience indeed witnesses (12-17) to his malice and mischief, but the present outburst of persecution is only the last campaign of a foe whose efforts have been already baffled and are soon to be crushed in the inexorable providence of God. The prophet dramatically uses his source or tradition to introduce Satan as a baffled opponent of the messiah (*cf.* on xi. 7), who is simply making the most of his time (ver. 12). *Moriturus mordet.* Once this cardinal aim of the piece is grasped —and the proofs of it are overflowing— the accessory details fall into their proper place, just as in the interpretation of the parables. In all such products of the poetical and religious imagination, picturesque items, which were necessary to the completeness and impressiveness of the sketch, ar· not to be invested with primary significance. Besides, in the case of an old story or tradition which had passed through successive phases, it was inevitable that certain traits should lose much if not all of their meaning.

XII. 1. Καὶ [a] σημεῖον μέγα ὤφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ [b] περιβεβλημένη τὸν [b] ἥλιον—καὶ ἡ σελήνη ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῆς,

a Matt. xxiv. 30, parll. Matt. ii. 2.
b Ps. civ. 2.

"These ancient *traits*, fragments of an earlier whole, which lack their proper connexion in the present account, and indeed are scarcely intelligible, as they have been wrested from the thought-sequence of the original writer, reveal to the expert the presence of an earlier form of the story" (*S. C.* p. 6.)

CHAPTER XII.—The procedure of the writer here is very much the same as in ch. xi. (see above). The oracle of xii. is not an allegorising version of history, nor an exegetical construction of O.T. texts, nor a free composition of the author, but the Christianised reproduction of a Jewish source (possibly from the same period as the basis of xi. 1-13, or at least from the same βιβλαρίδιον), or at any rate a tradition, which described the birth of messiah in terms borrowed from such cosmological myths as that of the conflict between the sun-god and the dragon of darkness and the deep. The psychological origin of such a Jewish adaptation would be explained if we presupposed a tradition similar to that of the later Talmud (Jer. *Berach.* fol. 5, 1) which described the messiah as born at Bethlehem and swept away from his mother by a storm-wind, just after the fall of Jerusalem. But this messiah is merely removed, not raised to heaven. And as we have no clear evidence that the stress of 68-70 A.D. excited such a messianic hope among the Pharisees, it is hazardous to use this (as *e.g.*, Jülicher and Wellhausen still do) to prove that the date of the source is the same as that of xi. 1 f. The structure of the passage is equally ambiguous. 4 *a* presupposes something equivalent to ver. 7-9, while 13-16 is an expansion or variant of 6; and yet 13 is the natural sequel to 9 (12). These features have led to a variety of literary reconstructions. Spitta, *e.g.*, takes ver. 6 as the Christian editorial anticipation of 13 f., and finds another Christian touch in ver. 11 (Weyland in 11 and 17 *c*). J. Weiss puts 1-6 and 13-17 together, regarding 7-12 as an independent continuation of the third woe (editorial notes in 3, 11, and 17). Wellhausen (*Analyse*, 18 *f*) bisects the oracle into two parallel but incomplete variants (A = 1-6, B = 7-9, 13, 14), with 15-17 as an editorial conclusion. Others (*e.g.*, Schön and Calmes) find a Christian editor only in 10-12 (with 17 *c* of course), while Weizsäcker regards 13-18 as the expansion of 1-12 (a Jewish-Christian fragment of 64-66 A.D.). Some of the incoherencies of the description are due, however, to the alterations necessitated by messianic belief in the circle of such ethnic traditions. The latter made the mother's flight precede the child's birth (as in 4, 5). But, on the messianic scheme, it was the child's birth which roused the full fury of the enemy and turned it into an outburst of baffled revenge upon the mother (6, 13 f.), after the child's escape. Furthermore, this activity of the devil on earth had to be accounted for by his dislodgement from heaven, as a result of the messianic child's elevation to heaven (7 f.). Hence the apparent inconsistencies, the shifting standpoint, and the amount of repetition and confusion are due to the presence of a messianic conception employing terms of earlier and inadequate mythology for its own purposes, rather than to any literary rearrangement such as the transposition of part of the trumpet-visions to 7-12 (Simcox, J. Weiss). The interest of the prophet in this source or tradition, as in that of xi. 1-13, centres in the outburst of the evil power which shows that the end is imminent. There the beast's attack on messiah's heralds is ultimately foiled. Here the dragon's attack on messiah himself is not only defeated but turned into a rout which obliges him to shift the scene of his campaign to a field where his deputies are presently to be annihilated.

Vv. 1-2. ἐν τ. οὐ. almost = "in the sky" (*cf.* ver. 4.). A Greek touch: *cf.* Hom. *Iliad*, ii. 308, ἔνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα· δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινός (*i.e.* fiery-red). Here as elsewhere mythological traits of the original source are left as impressive and decorative details. The nearest analogy is the Babylonian Damkina, mother of the young god Marduk and "queen of the heavenly tiara" (*i.e.*, the stars, *cf.* Schrader, pp. 360, 361). For Hebrew applications of the symbolism *cf.* Gen. xxxvii. 9, 10 and Test. Naph. 5 (καὶ Ἰούδας ἦν λαμπρὸς ὡς ἡ σελήνη καὶ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ἦσαν ιβ´ ἀκτῖνες). The Egyptian Osiris was also wrapt in a flame-coloured robe—the sun being the "body" of deity (Plut. *de Iside*,

καὶ [c] ἐπὶ [c] τῆς [c] κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέρων δώδεκα—2. καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα· καὶ [d] κράζει [1] [d] ὠδίνουσα καὶ βασανιζομένη [e] τεκεῖν. 3. Καὶ ὤφθη ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἰδοὺ [f] δράκων [g] πυρρὸς μέγας, ἔχων [h] κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ [i] κέρατα δέκα· καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ [k] διαδήματα· 4. καὶ ἡ οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν. καὶ ὁ δράκων [l] ἕστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς τῆς μελλούσης [m] τεκεῖν,

c Only here in Apoc. is ἐπί with gen. of κεφαλή.
d Isa. xxvi. 17, Mic. iv. 10.
e Obj. infin. of "desire implied in preced. ptcc" (Burton, 389).
f Ezek. xxix. 3; only in Apoc. in N.T.
g cf. vi. 4.
h Ps. lxxiv. 13-14.
i From Dan. vii. 7.
k Only in Apoc. in N.T., cf. xix. 12, xiii. 1.
l For form cf. Win. § 14, 14.
m τεκεῖν incorrectly for τίκτειν; τέκῃ (cf. xi. 7), on mood see Burton, 303, 305.

[1] Read και (ℵC, Aeth., Pr., S., etc.) κραζει (ℵAP, 1, etc., Hipp.), edd.

51). The original figure was that of Israel personified as a pregnant goddess-mother, but it probably represented to the prophet the true Israel or Zion of God (Wernle, 276-288) in which his Christ had been born (*cf.* John xvi. 21, with John xiv. 30, also En. xc. 37). The idealisation was favoured by the current conceptions of Zion as pre-existent in heaven (*cf.* xix. 8, xxi. 8, and Apoc. Bar. iv. = widow) and as a mother (4 Esd. ix. 38-x. 59). The prophet views the national history of Israel as a long preparation for the anguish and woe out of which the messiah was to come. "Tantae molis erat *Christianam* condere gentem" (Grotius). The idea is echoed in Ep. Lugd., where the church is "the virgin mother". The virgin-birth falls into the background here as in the Fourth Gospel, though for different reasons. The messiah of Apoc. xii. is not the son of Mary but simply born in the messianic community, and the description is no more than a transcendental version of what Paul notes in Rom. ix. 4, 5. The editor's interest lies not in the birth of messiah so much as in the consequences of it in heaven and earth. At the same time the analogies discovered between Cerinthus and this passage (by Völter and others) are wholly imaginary (Kohlhofer, 53 f.).

Ver. 3. **πυρρός**: Vergil's serpents which attack Laokoon have blood-red crests, and Homer's dragon has a blood-red back, but here the trait (*cf.* above) is reproduced from the red colour of Typhon, the Egyptian dragon who persecuted Osiris (Plut. *de Iside*, 30-33). The seven heads are taken from the seven-headed hydra or mušmaḫḫu of Babylonian mythology. The devil's deputy in xiii. 1 (= the composite mušruššu of Babylonia) has the same equipment of horns and heads, but the diadems adorn his horns. Here, to John's mind at any rate (*cf.* ver. 9), the dragon is not equivalent to any contemporary pagan power like Pompey (Ps. Sol. ii. 29) or the king of Babylon.

Ver. 4. The symbolism is a reminiscence of an ætiological myth in astrology (*cf.* the *cauda* of the constellation Scorpio) and of the primitive view which regarded the dark cloud as a snake enfolding the luminaries of heaven in its hostile coils (Job iii. 8, xxvi. 13, with A. B. Davidson's notes). Thus the Iranians (*S. B. E.* iv. p. lxxiii., Darmesteter) described the fiend as a serpent or dragon not on the score of craftiness but "because the storm fiend envelops the goddess of light with the coils of the cloud as with a snake's fold". The same play of imagination would interpret eclipses and falling stars, and, when the pious were compared to stars (as in Egyptian theology, Plut. *de Iside*, 21), it was but a step to the idea of Dan. viii. (*cf.* Sib. Or. v. 512 f., the battle of the stars), where Antiochus Epiphanes does violence to some devout Israelites who are characterised as stars flung rudely down to earth (*i.e.*, martyred, 1 Macc. i.) Originally, this description of the dragon lashing his tail angrily and sweeping down a third of the stars probably referred to the seduction of angels from their heavenly rank (so 8-9) to serve his will (Weiss). But John, in recasting the tradition, may have thought of the Danielic application, *i.e.*, of the devil succeeding in crushing by martyrdom a certain number of God's people. In this event, they would include at least, if they are not to be identified with, the pre-Christian martyrs of Judaism (*cf.* Heb. xi. 32 f. Matt. xxiii. 35).—**ἕστηκεν**, a conventional posture of the ancient dragon *cf. e.g.*, Pliny, *H. N.* viii. 3, "nec flexu multiplici ut reliquae serpentes cor-

ἵνα ὅταν [m] τέκῃ τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς [n] καταφάγῃ. 5. Καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱόν ἄρσενα,[1] ὃς μέλλει [o] ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ [o] σιδηρᾷ· καὶ [p] ἡρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ. 6. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ [q] ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ [r] τρέφωσιν αὐτὴν [s] ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἑξήκοντα.

n Matt. ii. 16-20, Luke xiii. 30-31, Acts iv. 25-27.
o ii. 27, xix. 15; *cf.* Sib. Or. viii. 196 f.
p Acts viii. 39, 1 Thess. iv. 17, 1 Cor. xii. 2, 4.
q Matt. ii. 13, *cf.* Ps. Sol. xvii. 9.
r (= τρέφεται, 14) for constr. see x. 11, Win. § 5, 20 f., Moult. i. 58-59. How? with heavenly food, like ancient Israel (Ps. lxxviii. 24, cv. 40)?
s *Cf.* on xi. 2-3.

[1] Read **αρσενα** P, 95, Meth., And[bav] (Ws., Bs.) for the solecistic **αρσεν** (AC, Lach., Ti., Tr., Al. Sw., WH) [**αρρενα** (the Attic form, Thumb 77, Helbing 20) ℵQ, 1, etc., Areth., Bj.]: **α.** (Vict.) or **υ.** (Pr.) a redundant gloss? Wetstein cites a verbal parallel from Aristoph., *Eccles.*, 549-550 (**ἄρρεν γὰρ ἔτεκε παιδίον . ἠκκλησία;**). *Cf.* Cooke's *North Semitic Inscript.*, 221-222.

pus impellit, sed celsus et erectus in medio incedens"; *ibid.* viii. 14, for serpents devouring children. The mother of Zoroaster had also a vision of wild beasts waiting to devour her child at its birth. This international myth of the divine child menaced at birth readily lent itself to moralisation, or afforded terms for historical applications, *e.g.*, the abortive attack on Moses, the prototype of messiah (Baldensperger, 141, 142) at his birth (Ac. vii. 20 f.) and the vain efforts of Herod against the messiah. The animosity of Pytho for Leto was due to a prophecy that the latter's son would vanquish him.

Ver. 5. In accordance with the rabbinic notion which withdrew messiah for a time, the infant, like a second Moses, is caught up out of harm's way. He has no career on earth at all. This is intelligible enough in a Jewish tradition; but while no Christian prophet could have spontaneously depicted his messiah in such terms, even under the exigencies of apocalyptic fantasy, the further problem is to understand how he could have adopted so incongruous and inadequate an idea except as a pictorial detail. The clue lies in the popular messianic interpretation of passages like Ps. ii. where messiah's birth is really his inauguration and enthronement. The early application of this to Jesus, though not antagonistic to an interest in his historic personality, tallied with the widespread feeling (*cf.* note on i. 7) that his final value lay in his return as messiah. *Natiuitas quaedam eius ascensio*: "The heavens must receive him" (Acts iii. 21) till the divine purpose was ripe enough for his second advent. This tendency of primitive Jewish Christianity serves to explain how John could refer in passing to his messiah in terms which described a messiah, as Sabatier remarks, *sans la croix et sans la mort*, and which even represented his ascension as an escape rather than a triumph. The absence of any allusion to the Father is not due so much to any reluctance on the prophet's part to call Jesus by the name of *Son of God* (*cf.* ii. 18), which pagan usage had profaned not only in such mythical connexion but in the vocabulary of the Imperial cultus, as to the fact that the mythical substratum always gave special prominence to the mother; the goddess-mother almost invariably displaced the father in popular interest, and indeed bulked more largely than even the child.

Ver. 6. **ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.**, = **ὑπό** of agent (so Acts ii. 22, iv. 36, etc., Ps. Sol. xv. 6, and a contemporary inscription in Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscr.* 655[8] **συντετηρημένα ἀπὸ βασιλέων καὶ Σεβαστῶν**) only here in Apocalypse. On the flight of the faithful to the wilderness, a stereotyped feature of the antichrist period, *cf. A. C.* 211 f. Apocalyptic visions, particularly in the form of edited sources or adapted traditions, were not concerned to preserve strict coherency in details or consistency in situation. Thus it is not clear whether the **ἔρημος** was conceived to exist in heaven, or whether heaven is the background rather than the scene of what transpires. What follows in 7-12 is the description (from the popular religious version of the source) of what John puts from a definitely Christian standpoint in iii. 21, v. 5, where (as in *Asc. Isa.* Gk. ii. 9-11) the downfall of Satan is ascribed to Jesus himself.

7. Καὶ ἐγένετο [t]πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· ὁ [u]Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος, καὶ ὁ δράκων ἐπολέμησε καὶ [v]οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, 8. [w]καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν,[1] οὐδὲ [x]τόπος [x]εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. 9. καὶ ἐβλήθη ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, [y]ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, [z]ὁ καλούμενος "Διάβολος," καὶ "ὁ [z]Σατανᾶς," ὁ [a]πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, [b]ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. 10. καὶ ἤκουσα [c]φωνὴν [c]μεγάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν

t Foll. by loose infin. of explanation (*cf* Moult. i. 217-218).
u From Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1, *cf.* Jude 9.
v Matt. xxv. 41; evil beings in heaven, Asc. Isa. vi. 9 f.
w *εἰς οὐδὲν δέον συνέβη τελευτῆσαι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν* (Papias, cit. Andr.).
x xx. 11, *Par. Lost*, vi. 56 f.
y Isa. xxvii. 1.
z xx. 2.
a ii. 20, xx. 3, 8, 10.
b From Slav. En. xxix. 5.
c xi. 15, xix. 1.

[1] Read ισχυσεν (Ps. xii. 5, LXX) A, etc., Me., Aeth., And^c (WH, Ws., Sw., Bs.), [verb agreeing as in LXX with principal subject, *cf.* Vit., ii. 114 f.].

Ver. 7. **ἐγένετο . . . τοῦ π.** (= ותהי מלחמה בשמים להלחם), the nomin. makes this rare use of the genit. infin. even more clumsy and irregular than the similar constr. with accus. in Acts x. 25 (where see note). The sense is plain, and it is better to put the constr. down to syntactical laxity than to conjecture subtle reasons for the blunder or to suggest emendations such as the addition of **ἐγένετο** to **πόλεμος** (Vit. i. 168), or of **ἦσαν** or **ἐγένετο** before **ὁ Μ. κ. οἱ ἄγ. αὐτοῦ** (Ws., Bousset), the latter being an irregular nomin., or the alteration of **πολ.** to **ἐπολέμησαν** (Düst.) or the simple omission of **πόλεμος . . . οὐρανῷ.** For **πολ. μετὰ** *cf.* Thumb 125 (a Copticism ?). In the present form of the oracle, the rapture of messiah seems to have stimulated the devil to fresh efforts, unless we are meant to understand that the initiative came from Michael and his allies. The devil, as the opponent of mankind had access to the Semitic heaven, but his rôle here recalls the primitive mythological conception of the dragon storming heaven (*A. C.* 146-150). Michael had been for over two centuries the patron-angel or princely champion of Israel (**ὁ εἷς τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων ὃς ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγαθῶν τέτακται,** En. xx. 5; *cf. A. C.* 227 f.; Lueken 15 f.; Volz 195; *R. J.* 320 f., and Dieterich's *Abraxas*, 122 f.). As the protector of Israel's interests he was assigned a prominent rôle by Jewish and even Christian eschatology in the final conflict (*cf.* Ass. Mos. x. 2). For the theory that he was the prince-angel, *like a son of man* (Dan. vii. 13) who subdued the world-powers, *cf.* Grill 55 and Cheyne 215 f. More generally, a celestial battle. as the prelude of messiah's triumph on earth, forms an independent Jewish tradition which can be traced to the second century B.C. (*cf.* Sibyll. iii. 795-807, 2 Macc. v. 2-4; Jos. *Bell.* vi. 5, 3).—**καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ.** The only allusion in the Apocalypse (*cf.* even xx. 11 with Matt. xxv. 41) to the double hierarchy of angels, which post-exilic Judaism took over from Persia (Bund, iii. 11). In the Leto-myth, Pytho returns to Parnassus after being baffled in his pursuit of the pregnant Leto.

Ver. 9. **Δράκων** and **ὄφις** are in the LXX interchangeable terms for the leviathan or sea-monster of mythology, who is here defined as *the old serpent* (a rabbinical expression, *cf.* Gfrörer, i. 386-389); so Tiâmat, the primaeval rebel, as dragon and serpent (*cf.* Rohde's *Psyche*, 371) had been identified in JE's paradise-story with the malicious and envious devil (Sap. ii. 24; En. xx. 7; Test. Reub. 5). The opponent of God was the adversary of man (*cf.* Oesterley's *Evol. of Mess. Idea*, 176 f.). Two characteristic traits of Satan are blended here: (*a*) cunning exercised on men to lure them into ruin (**πλανῶν, κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 11, xi. 3), and (*b*) eagerness to thwart and slander them before God (ver. 10, *cf.* En. xl. 7; Zech. iii. 1 f.). The second is naïve and archaic, of course, in a Christian apocalypse.

Ver. 10. **κατήγωρ** (קטיגור) is the counterpart to the rabbinic (Lueken 22) title of **συνήγορος** given to Michael as a sort of Greatheart or advocate and protector of men (En. xl. 9). The Aramaic derivation of the word (Win. § 8. 13) is not absolutely necessary, as the papyri show that it might have sprung up on Greek soil (*cf.* Thumb, 126; Rademacher,

"Ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ [d] σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις
καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ [e] Χριστοῦ
αὐτοῦ·
ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν,
ὁ [f] κατηγορῶν αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ
νυκτός.
11. καὶ αὐτοὶ [g] ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν [h] διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου,
καὶ διὰ τὸν [i] λόγον τῆς [i] μαρτυρίας αὐτῶν,
καὶ [k] οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ἄχρι [k] θανάτου.
12. [l] διὰ τοῦτο [m] εὐφραίνεσθε [n] οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς [n] σκηνοῦντες.
[o] οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν,
ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων θυμὸν μέγαν,
εἰδὼς ὅτι [p] ὀλίγον καιρὸν ἔχει."

13. Καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ δράκων ὅτι ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐδίωξε τὴν γυναῖκα [q] ἥτις ἔτεκε τὸν ἄρσενα. 14. καὶ [r] ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ αἱ δύο πτέρυγες τοῦ [r] ἀετοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, ἵνα πέτηται εἰς τὴν ἔρημον

d *Cf.* on xix. 1; here alm. = "victory" (1 Sam. xix. 5, Ps. xx. 7, and Luke i. 71) ישועה
e xi. 15, *cf.* xx. 4, 6 (final editor's hand).
f From Jub. xlviii. 15, 18.
g 1 John ii. 13-14. Rom. viii. 33-34, 37-39.
h iv. 11.
i i. 2, vi. 9.
k ii. 10, John xii. 25, Acts xx. 24.
l *i.e.*, over 9-10, not 11.
m Isa. xlii. 10 f., xliv. 23, xlix. 13.
n xviii. 20, Ps. xcvi. 11; only here (Apoc.) in plural.
o viii. 13, *cf.* Sib. Or. iii. 323.
p = 3½ years (6, 14), *cf.* xx. 3.
q *Cf.* on i. 7.
r viii. 2, xi. 1, etc., *cf.* Arist. *Hist. Nat.* x. 1, Hor. *Od.* iv. 4. 1, 9, Plut. *Timol.* xxvi., Jos. *Ant.* xii. 4, 10, Aesch. *Choeph.* 239 f., and Dan. vii. 4.

Rhein. Mus. lvii. 148). On the accuser's rôle *cf. Sohar Levit.* fol. 43 (ille semper stat tanquam delator coram rege Israelis) and the prayer of Jub. i. 20: "let not the spirit of Beliar rule over them to accuse them before thee and to turn them deceitfully from all the paths of righteousness" (where both traits are combined, *cf.* above on 9).

Ver. 11. This sentence, like ver. 7, suggests that earth's history is the reflex and outcome of transactions in heaven, on the common principle of Jalkut Rub. (on Exod. xiv. 7): "there was war above (in heaven) and war below (on earth), and sore was the war in heaven". Satan's dislodgment from heaven is another (*cf.* on xi. 19) sign of messiah's approaching victory (*cf.* Yasna xxx. 8). What Jesus had already seen in his own victory over daemons (Matt. xii. 24 f.; *cf.* J. Weiss, *Predigt Jesu*, 28 f., 89 f.), John hails from another standpoint, as inaugurating the messianic age. *Vexilla regis prodeunt.* How readily the mythological trait could be moralised is evident from a passage like Rom. viii. 33 f., of which Apoc. xii. 11 is a realistic variant. In the background lie conceptions like that of En. xl. 7 where the fourth angel of the Presence is heard "fending all the Satans and forbidding them to appear before the Lord of Spirits to accuse men". Ver. 11 chronologically follows ver. 17, but the author, by a characteristic and dramatic prolepsis, anticipates the triumph of the martyrs and confessors, who refute Satan's calumnies and resist his wiles. In opposition to the contemporary Jewish tradition (Ap. Bar. ii. 2, xiv. 12; 4 Esd. vii. 77, etc.), it is not reliance on works but the consciousness of redemption which enables them to bear witness and to bear the consequences of their witness. This victory on earth depends on Christ's previous defeat of evil in the upper world (Col. ii. 15; *cf.* above on ii. 10, also xxi. 8) which formed its headquarters.

Ver. 12. **εὐφραίνεσθε**, *cf.* the Egyptian hymn in honour of Rā, the sun-god: "Rā hath quelled his impious foes, heaven rejoices, earth is delighted".—**οὐαὶ κ.τ.λ.** This desperate and last effort of Satan is a common apocalyptic feature (*cf. e.g.*, 4 Esd. xiii. 16 f.; Ap. Bar. xxviii. 3, xli. 1, lxxv. 5; Mark xiii. 21; Did. xvi.), which John identifies later with the Imperial cultus.

The dragon's pursuit of the woman (13-17) resumes and expands the hint of ver. 6.

Ver. 14. "The two wings of a huge griffon-vulture" (**τοῦ** either generic ar-

εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς, [s] ὅπου τρέφεται [s] ἐκεῖ καιρὸν καὶ [t] καιροὺς καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ [u] ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ὄφεως. 15. καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμόν, ἵνα αὐτὴν [v] ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ. 16. καὶ ἐβοήθησεν ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς καὶ κατέπιε τὸν ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. 17. καὶ [w] ὠργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἀπῆλθε [x] ποιῆσαι [x] πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ [y] σπέρματος αὐτῆς, τῶν [z] τηρούντων τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [a] ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.

s ver. 6. t Dan. vii. 25 (Theod.), xii. 7; = dual (Win. § 27, 5). u Hebraism (מפני הנחש) = "safe from". v ἅπ. λεγ. N.T. With ἐποίησεν = ἀπόερσεν (Hesych. on *Iliad*, vi. 348). "To get her swept away by the stream". w xi. 18 = "waxed wroth". x xi. 7. y *Cf.* 2 John 1, 4, 13; also 1 Pet. i. 1-2, iv. 12 f. z 1 John ii. 3, iii. 22, 24, 1 Cor. vii. 19. a vi. 9, xiv. 12, xix. 10, etc.

ticle, or a Hebraism, or more likely an allusion to the mythological basis). In traditional mythology the eagle opposed and thwarted the serpent at all points (*cf.* reff.). In the Egyptian myth the vulture is the sacred bird of Isis (Hathor). Any allusion to Israel's deliverance (as in Exod. xix. 4; Deut. xxxii. 11) is at best secondary.

Ver. 15. Another mythological metaphor for persecution or persecutors, like "torrents of Belial" (Ps. xviii. 4). As the primaeval dragon was frequently a sea-monster, from Tiâmat onwards, his connexion with water (*cf.* on viii. 10) was a natural development in ancient (*cf.* Pausan. v. 43 f.) and even Semitic (*e.g.*, Ps. lxxiv. 4; Ezek. xxix., xxxii.) literature. The serpent in the river was, for Zoroastrians, a creation of the evil spirit (Vend. i. 3).

Ver. 16. The dragon is unexpectedly baffled by the earth, as the woman's ally, which swallows the persecutors like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num. xvi. 30-32). This enigmatic detail has not yet been paralleled from Jewish or early Christian literature, for *Protev. Jacobi*, 22 (cited by Selwyn, 7-9) is even more remote than 4 Esd. xiii. 44. Probably it was retained from the astrological setting of the original myth: Cetos, the aquatic dragon of the southern heavens, which astrologically is a watery region, casts forth the river of Êridanos, which is swallowed up in the zodiac as it flows down the heavens into the underworld.

Ver. 17. The baffled adversary now widens his sphere of operations.—τ.λ. an apocalyptic term = the *derelicti* or *relicti* of 4 Esdras (*cf.* Volz, 319). These represent to the Christian editor the scattered Christians in the Empire; by adding this verse (or at least καὶ ἐχ. . . . Ἰησοῦ) to the source, he paves the way for the following saga of xiii. which depicts the trying situation of Christians exposed to the attack of the devil's deputies. The devil keeps himself in the background. He works subtly through the Roman power. This onset on the faith and faithfulness of Christians by the enforcement of the Imperial cultus is vividly delineated in Ep. Lugd. which incidentally mentions the experience of Biblias who, like Cranmer, repented of a recantation. "The devil, thinking he had already swallowed up B., one of those who had denied Christ, desired to condemn her further by means of blasphemy, and brought her to the torture [*i.e.*, in order to force false accusations from her lips]. . . . But she, reminded by her present anguish of the eternal punishment in Gehenna [*cf.* Apoc. xiv. 9 f.], contradicted the blasphemous slanderers, confessed herself a Christian, and was added to the order of the martyrs." Blandina, the heroic slave-girl, survived several conflicts ἵνα νικήσασα τῷ μὲν σκολιῷ ὄφει ἀπαραίτητον ποιήσῃ τὴν καταδίκην.

The keynote of the situation hinted in xii. 17 f. is struck in xiii. 2. *The dragon* has given *his authority to the beast;* what God's people have now to contend with is no longer the O.T. Satan merely (xii. 9, 10) but his powerful and seductive delegate on earth. In the Imperial cultus the Christian prophet could see nothing except a supreme and diabolically subtle manœuvre of Satan himself (*cf.* on xiii. 1 and 5). The Danielic prophecy was at last on the verge of fulfilment! Mythological and cosmological elements (*S. C.* 360 f.) were already present in the Danielic tradition, but the prophet (or the source which he edits) readapted them to the historical situation created by the ex-

18. Καὶ [b] ἐστάθην [1] ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης, XIII. 1. καὶ εἶδον ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον, ἔχον κέρατα δέκα καὶ κεφαλὰς ἑπτά, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ δέκα διαδήματα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτοῦ [a] ὀνόματα βλασφημίας. 2. καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ εἶδον ἦν [b] ὅμοιον [c] παρδάλει, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς [d] ἄρκου, καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ὡς στόμα λέοντος. [e] καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην. 3. καὶ [f] μίαν ἐκ τῶν κεφαλῶν αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐσφαγμένην εἰς θάνατον·

b On form, *cf.* Helbing, 98-99.
a *Cf.* xvii. 3.
b From Dan. vii. 4-6.
c Here only, N T.: *cf.* Ign. *Rom.* v. λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα.
d On form, *cf.* Win. § 5, 31, Helbing, 21-22.
e Dan. vii. 6, *cf.* Matt. iii. 8, 9, etc.
f xvii. 7-8.
Sc. εἶδον.

[1] For εσταθην (PQ, Me., S., etc., And., Areth. so Ti., Al., S. Davidson, Ew., Ramsay, Briggs, Gunkel, J. Weiss, Bs., Bj., etc.), Lach., Tr., Düst., Hofm., WH, Ws. (p. 5), Sw., Holtz., Hirscht, read εσταθη (ℵAC, 87, 92, vg., Arm., Aeth., Spec., Haym., Tic.), as if the dragon awaited the rise of the beast. But of this there is no hint in the context. A new start is made here, and what follows is (unlike xii.) a personal vision of the seer who is now dealing with present-day actualities. The variant seems due to an erroneous attempt to deepen the continuity of the two oracles (which is expressed in xii. 17*a* and xiii. 2*c*).

pectation of Nero's return from the under world and the enforcement of the Imperial cultus. For the hypothesis of a Caligula-source in this chapter, *cf.* Introd § 6.

xii. 18-xiii. 18: the saga of the woman and the red dragon (a war in heaven) is followed by the saga of the two monsters from sea and land (a war on earth), who, with the dragon, form a triumvirate of evil. First (xii. 18-xiii. 10) the monster from the sea, *i.e.*, the Roman Empire.

Ver. 18. The scene is the sea-shore, *ex hypothesi*, of the Mediterranean (*Phædo*, 109 *b*, 111 *a*, etc.), *i.e.*, the West, the whole passage being modelled on Dan. vii. 2, 3, 7, 8, 19-27, where the stormy sea from which the monsters emerge is the world of nations (*cf.* 4 Esd. xi. 1: ecce ascendebat de mari aquila, also xiii. 1).

Chapter XIII.—Ver. 1. His ten horns first become visible. The prophet has shifted the diadems from the heads to the horns (thereby altering their number, of necessity), since he wishes to stamp the heads (*i.e.*, the Roman emperors, *cf.* Sib. Or. iii. 176; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 47) with the blasphemous names. Hence the ten horns (successive monarchs in the Danielic oracle) are superfluous here, except as an archaic, pictorial detail in the sketch of this polycephalous brute. Such grotesque, composite monsters were familiar figures in Persian and Babylonian mythology. The blasphemous title of *divus*, assumed by the emperors since Octavian (Augustus = σεβαστός) as a semi-sacred title, implied superhuman claims which shocked the pious feelings of Jews and Christians alike. So did θεός and θεοῦ υἱός which, as the inscriptions prove, were freely applied to the emperors, from Augustus onwards. The imperial system, especially with its demand for imperial worship, appeared the embodiment of irreverence and profane infatuation (ver. 6). This calm usurpation of divine honours was inexplicable except on the supposition (ver. 2) that the empire was a tool or agent of the devil himself. Much had happened since Paul wrote Rom. xiii. 1-6, and even since Asiatic Christians had received the counsel of 1 Peter ii. 13 f.

Ver. 2. The empire gathered up all the obnoxious qualities of Israel's former oppressors: craft, lust of blood, and vicious energy. Hence the combination of traits from Daniel's four beasts: general appearance that of a fierce panther, feet like a bear's (*i.e.*, plantigrade), jaws like a lion's (of devouring strength)—a Palestinian (Hos. xiii. 7, 8) picture of a perfect beast of prey, raging and ravening, before whom the church, like Dryden's milk-white Hind, "was often forced to fly, And doom'd to death, though fated not to die".—καὶ ἔδωκεν κ.τ.λ., connecting the empire with the dragon of xii. and stamping it as Satanic (*cf.* Lueken, 22 f.; Weinel, 11-12), as a weird and wild messiah of the devil on earth.

Ver. 3. The prophet sees in the empire an extraordinary vitality which adds to its fascination. Disasters which would suffice to ruin an ordinary state, leave

[g] καὶ ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου [g] αὐτοῦ ἐθεραπεύθη, καὶ [h] ἐθαυμάσθη ὅλη ἡ γῆ [h] ὀπίσω τοῦ θηρίου. 4. καὶ προσεκύνησαν [i] τῷ δράκοντι ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ,[1] καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ λέγοντες,

"τίς [k] ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ;

"καὶ τίς δύναται πολεμῆσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ;"

5. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα [l] λαλοῦν μεγάλα καὶ βλάσφημα·[2]

καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία [m] ποιῆσαι μῆνας [n] τεσσαράκοντα δύο·

6. καὶ ἤνοιξε τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας πρὸς τὸν θεόν,

g *i.e.*, the person denoted by *μίαν* or the beast. h xvii. 8; pregn. constr. "went after him in wonder". *Cf.* Acts viii. 9-11. Antithesis to John xi. 48-49. i Apart from this verse, *προσκ.* in Apoc. takes the dative only with God or angels (xix. 10). k xviii. 18, Exod. xv. 11, Jud. vi. 2, Ps. cxiii. 5, etc. l *Cf.* En. v. 4, xcviii. 7-8, ci. 3, cii. 6, 4 Esd. xi. 43, Ps. xii. 4. m From Dan. viii. 12, 24, xi. 28, 30, 32; pregn. Heb. use = "exercise" or "practise" (intrans.), with *ἐξ.* not *μῆνας* (Jas. iv. 13). n xi. 2.

[1] For **το θηριον** (A 79, And[a], Ws., WH marg., Bs.) read **τω θηριω** (ℵCPQ, etc., And[c], Areth., edd.). [The acc. is conformed to general usage of **προσκ.** with **θηριον**, see ver. 8, 12, xiv. 9, 11, xx. 4.]

[2] Read **βλασφημα** A, 12, 28, 34, 35, 47, 79, 87, And., etc. (Lach. Al. Ws.): the idiomatic **ποιησαι** has been early improved by the addition of **ο θελει** (ℵ) or **πολεμον** (Q, And[c], Areth.), and Naber conj. **σημεια ποιησαι**.

Rome as strong as ever, thanks to her marvellous recuperative power. The allusion is not to the murder of Cæsar (so *e.g.*, Bruston, Gunkel, Porter), nor to the illness of Caligula (Spitta), but (so Düsterdieck, O. Holtzmann, B. Weiss, etc.) to the terrible convulsions which in 69 A.D. shook the empire to its foundations (Tac. *Hist.* i. 11). Nero's death, with the bloody interregnum after it, was a wound to the State, from which it only recovered under Vespasian. It fulfilled the tradition of the wounded head (Dan. viii. 8). So 4 Esd. xii. 18 (where the same crisis is noted) "post tempus regni illius [*i.e.*, Nero's] nascentur contentiones non modicae et periclitabitur ut cadat et non cadet tunc, sed iterum constituetur in suum initium"; also Suet. *Vesp.* 1 and Joseph. *Bell.* iv. 11, 5, vii. 4, 2 (Rome unexpectedly rescued from ruin by Vespasian's accession). The vitality of the pagan empire, shown in this power of righting itself after the revolution, only added to its prestige. The infatuation of loyalty, expressing itself in the worship of the emperor as the personal embodiment of the empire, grew worse and worse. A comparison of 3 *a* with 12 (*cf.* 18) shows, however, a further allusion, *viz.*, to the Nero redivivus belief (*cf.* Introd. § 5). This is not developed until xvii., but already the beast is evidently identified in a sense with one of its heads, who is a travesty (3 *a* = v. 6) of the Lamb, *i.e.*, an antichrist. The context would certainly read quite naturally without 3 *a*, but it is implied in 12 (and 18), and none of the numerous attempts to analyse the chapter into source and revision is of any weight, in view of the general style and characteristics. These indicate the author's own hand. Even the translation-hypothesis (*e.g.*, Bruston, Gunkel) leads to arbitrary handling. See Introd. § 6.

Ver. 4. All that had transpired—Nero's own death heralding a return, and the collapse of his dynasty proving no fatal blow to the empire—had simply aggrandised the influence of Rome. The Caesar-cult which characterised it is dubbed a worship of Satan by the indignant prophet. The hymn to the incomparable and invincible beast is a parody of O.T. hymns to God. In the following description (vv. 5-8) two traits are blended: insolent blasphemy towards God and almost irresistible powers of seduction over men. Both are adapted from the classical sketch of Antiochus Epiphanes (in Dan. vii. 8, 20, 25, xii. 7), the prototype of that anti-divine force whose climax had been reached, as the prophet believed, in the divine pretensions of the Caesars.

Ver. 5. "Big and blasphemous (or abusive; 2 Peter ii. 11) words." So Apoc. Bar. lxvii. 7: "surget rex Babylonis qui destruxit nunc Sionem et gloriabitur super populo et loquetur magna in corde suo coram Altissimo".

Ver. 6. The days of Antiochus (Dan. viii. 10-12) have returned. On the claims

βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ [τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦντας].

7. καὶ [o] ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [p] ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς·

καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ [q] ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ [q] ἔθνος.[1]

8. καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν [r] αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,

[s] οὗ οὐ [t] γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς [τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου] ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

9. [u] εἴ τις ἔχει οὖς, ἀκουσάτω.

o Cf. John xix. 10-11, and below on xvii. 17.
p xi. 7. Fulfilment of Dan. vii. 21.
q Dan. v. 19, vii. 23.
r Constr. ad sensum, "the beast, or his Imperial representative *pro tem.*" Cf. Tiridates to Nero (Dio Cass. lxiii.): "I come to worship thee, my God, as Mithras".
s Referring to each individual of πάντες.
t Dan. xii. 1; *cf.* Ep. Jer. 6, Addit. Esth. xiii. 14, xiv. 3-10.
u ii. 7, etc.

[1] The omission of 7*a* in ACP, 1, 12, 14, 92, Arm. (zoh.), Iren., And[p], And[bav] (so Spitta) is due to homoioteleuton.

of the emperor, see Introd. § 6, and Sib. Or. v. 33, 34 (Nero **ἰσάζων θεῷ αὐτόν**), Asc. Isa. iv. 6-8, x. 13, etc.—**τοὺς . . . σκηνοῦντας**, an exegetic gloss defining **σκήνη** (*cf.* xii. 7, 12). The temple in Jerusalem is no longer the scene and object of the beast's blasphemy.

Ver. 7. In Enoch xlvi. 7 the rulers and kings "make themselves masters of the stars of heaven [*i.e.*, the righteous], and raise their hands against the Most High". The beast's world-wide authority goes back to the dragon's commission (2) but ultimately to divine permission (so in 5). There is a providence higher even than the beast.

Ver. 8. Standing on the verge of this crisis (note the change to the future tense), the prophet anticipates the almost universal success of the Cæsar-cult (*cf.* iii. 10). Only the elect will be able to resist its appeal (*cf.* Matt. xxiv. 25). As in the O.T., the consciousness of predestination is made a moral lever (*cf.* xvii. 8). The rest of mankind who succumb to the cult are plainly not on the celestial burgess-roll or register. *Cf.* the instructive second-century gloss on Acts v. 39. As a rule the faithless in life are deceived (2 Th. ii. 2-10; *Asc. Isa.* iv. 7, 8), but here the Imperial cultus occupies the place of the false prophet in Mark xiii. 12, etc,—**τοῦ ἀ. τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου**, which transfers to Christ the possession of the divine register of citizens in the heavenly state, is usually taken as a scribe's gloss (after xxi. 27 where the position of **ἀρνίου** is less difficult). Elsewhere *the book of life* appears by itself. In any case, **ἀπὸ κ. κ.** goes with **γέγραπται**, not **ἐσφαγμένου**.

Ver. 9. The prophet's *nota bene* introduces (ver. 10) what is either (*a*) a demand for patience and non-resistance, or (*b*) an encouragement to it. (*a*) "Be patient. If captivity is your destiny from God, accept it. *If any one is* (destined) *for captivity, to captivity he goes* (in God's order, **ὑπάγει** in a future sense). Show your patient faith in God by abstaining from the use of force" (*cf.* Matt. xxvi. 52). This interpretation (rejecting **συνάγει** or **ἀπάγει** in 10 *a*) is preferable to (*b*) that which reads (or even understands; with B. Weiss) **συνάγει, ἀπάγει,** or **ὑπάγει** (so some cursives and versions) in 10 *a*, and thus finds in the words a promise of requital rather than an appeal for endurance. The fate inflicted on Christians will recoil on their persecutors (*cf.* xiv. 12). Imprisonment or captivity and death were the normal fates of the age for criminals who refused to invoke the emperor's genius (*cf.* Jos. *Bell.* iii. 10. 10, vi. 8. 2, Philo: *de Flacc.* 11, *leg. ad Gaium*, 32). A variation of this meaning would be: use force, and you (Christians) will suffer for it. The whole stanza is written for saints who, like Sigurd, are not born for blenching.—**ὧδε κ.τ.λ.** Josephus (*Bell.* iii. 5. 8, etc.) had just given, from prudential motives, a similar warning to Jews against participating in any anti-Roman movement. It was always hard to disabuse the Oriental mind of the idea that religious faith must be bound up with fate and fighting. *Cf.* Introd. § 6.

10. [v] εἴ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν,
εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει·
εἴ τις ἐν [w] μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτενεῖ,
δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν [w] μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι·
[x] ὧδέ ἐστιν ἡ [y] ὑπομονὴ καὶ [z] ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων.

11. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ εἶχε κέρατα δύο [a] ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ, καὶ [b] ἐλάλει ὡς δράκων. 12. καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου [c] πᾶσαν ποιεῖ [d] ἐνώπιον [e] αὐτοῦ· καὶ [f] ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς [g] ἐν αὐτῇ κατοικοῦντας [f] ἵνα προσκυνήσουσι τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου [e] αὐτοῦ· 13. καὶ ποιεῖ [h] σημεῖα μεγάλα ἵνα καὶ [i] πῦρ ποιῇ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 14. καὶ [k] πλανᾷ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [l] διὰ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι [m] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θηρίου, λέγων τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι

v Gen. ix. 6, Jer. xv. 2 (LXX).
w Ionian form (Win. § 8, 1; *cf.* Thumb, 68 f.)?
x *Cf.* ver. 18; Win. § 23, 1. "Here is room for."
y See on i. 9, also xiv. 2. "Et quo contemptius abuteretur patientia hominum" (Suet. *Dom.* 11).
z Sec. article usually omitted. Win. § 18, *7b*. For idea, *cf.* 4 Macc. xvi. 18-23, etc. For form, *cf.* *Class. Rev.* 1904, 108-109, Helbing, 31-32.
a Chap. ix. 10; from Dan. viii. 3; *cf.* Matt. vii. 15, of which this passage forms an apocalyptic application.
b Gen. iii. 15, *cf.* 1 Macc. i. 30.
c *Cf.* Win. § 20, 11 f.
d Ver. 14, xix. 20.
e *Cf.* on iii. 8.
f *Cf.* iii. 9 (xiii. 15).
g With ἐν, here only.
h xvi. 14, xix. 20, so (Beliar) Sib. Or. iii. 63-74, 2 Thess. ii. 9, Mark xiii. 22, etc.
i xi. 5; as false Elijah.
k ii. 20, Deut. xiii. 2-4. En. lxvii. 7.
l *Cf.* xii. 2 (διὰ = dat. instrum.).
m By his authority, or at his instigation (*cf.* Num. iii. 6, etc.).

Vv. 11-18: the Imperial *alter ego* or the second beast, a monster from the land (identified afterwards with the traditional "false prophet," xvi. 13, xix. 20, xx. 10). This mythological figure is not any individual like Simon Magus or Alexander of Abonoteichos or Apollonius of Tyana or Balaam redivivus, but a personification of some order or institution devoted to the interests of the empire on its religious side, *i.e.*, the priests of the Cæsar-cult in the provinces and especially (*cf.* Introd. § 6) in Asia Minor, where the local dignitaries acted through the Diet of Asia in order to superintend and popularise the cult (so Holtzm., Pfleid., Charles, Bartlet, Porter, Bousset, Forbes, Swete). The following description brings out the cunning, suavity, and arrogance of this sacerdotal power.

Ver. 11. ἐκ τῆς γῆς—the mythological trait is applied geographically to Asia Minor (*i.e.*, the East). Here again the cosmological antithesis has been transformed into a political application. The marine monster cannot exercise dominion over the land except through an intermediary ἐκ τῆς γῆς. *Cf.* Apoc. Bar. xxix. 4, where the two beasts, leviathan and behemoth, rise from the sea and the land, as in the ancient Semitic and Babylonian mythology the dry land and the deep were the habitations of the two primeval monsters (En. lx. 7 f., 4 Esd. vi. 49 f.), who represented the chaos-opponent of heaven. The mild appearance of the beast (ὁμ. ἀρν. does not mean that he deceived men with the name of the Lamb) is accompanied by a plausible appeal (*cf.* Weinel, 21 f.). The allusion (ver. 12), borrowed from the older dragon-myth, is to the seductive inducements held out by the Beast to Christians, such as considerations of loyalty, patriotism, self-interest, and the like. These are backed by (ver. 13) miracles, which together with magic are also connected with Nero redivivus in *Asc. Isa.* iv. 9-11 (*cf.* *A. C.* 175 f.). The deceptive influence of miracles was a sure sign of the end, in early Christian literature (*cf.* the lines of the πρεσβύτης cited by Irenæus, i. 15, 6). Most Oriental cults practised such tricks lavishly, and constant warnings against them were heard (*cf.* Weinel 9; Friedländer, iii. 458 f., 521 f.).

Ver. 14. As Beliar sets up "his image before him in every city" (*Asc. Isa.* iv. 11, after 10 = "and there will be the power of his miracles in every city and region"), so here the εἰκών or bust of the emperor as the Neronic antichrist representing the empire (*cf.* the hint repeated from ver. 12 *c*) is brought forward along with the statues of the gods to receive offerings of wine and incense

εἰκόνα τῷ θηρίῳ [n] ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ ἔζησε. 15. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, ἵνα καὶ [o] λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου, καὶ [p] ποιήσει [1] ἵνα [q] ὅσοι ἂν μὴ προσκυνήσωσι τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου [p] ἀποκτανθῶσι. 16. καὶ [p] ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχούς, καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους, [p] ἵνα [r] δῶσιν αὐτοῖς [s] χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς [t] χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς [t] δεξιᾶς, ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ [u] μέτωπον αὐτῶν, 17. [καὶ] [v] ἵνα μή τις δύνηται [2] [w] ἀγοράσαι ἢ πωλῆσαι, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων τὸ χάραγμα, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου, [x] ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. 18. [x] ὧδε ἡ [y] σοφία ἐστίν. ὁ ἔχων

n Cf. on αὐτόν (8).
o Acts xvi. 16.
p Cf. ver. 12. Double use of ποιεῖν, the ἵνα . . . ποιῇ (epexeg. of μεγάλα) of ver. 13 (with πῦρ displaced for emphasis) = ὥστε ποιεῖν of result (Burton, 322).
q Dan. iii. 5-7, 15.
r Indef. plur. as x. 11, xvi. 15 (= "they get").
s xiv. 9-11, xvi. 2, xix. 18-20 (vii. 3, ix. 4), cf. Ps. Sol. xv. 30.
t Cf. *Assuan Papyri* (K, 4. 6).
u Cf. Jos. *Ant*. iii. 7. 6. Or neck? Ps. Sol. ii. 6.
v = Infin. epexeg. 1 John v. 20, etc. Burton, 198, 213.
w 1 Macc. xiii. 49.
x xvii. 9, cf. 4 Esd. vi. 10 ζήτει, Ἔζρα.
y only here in Apoc., of human quality; cf. v. 12, vii. 12.

[1] **ποιησει** ℵ (min.), Syr., Tr. marg., WH marg., Ws.: for **την εικονα** (A, min., Lach. Al. Bs.) Ti., Tr., WH, Ws., Bj., Sw. read **τη εικονι** (ℵPQ, etc., Hipp., Areth.). Little is to be said for WH's conj. that **τη γη** has been either lost after or displaced by **αυτη** (**αυτω**).

[2] Lach., Ti., Bj. om., Al. WH, Bs., Sw. bracket, the **και** of ℵcAPQ, etc., vg., Arm., Aeth., Areth., Haym.: the irreg. **δυναται** is read by PQ, min. (Ws., WH marg., Bs.).

from the citizens. For the naïve identification of such images with the deities they represented see Friedländer, iii. 500 f.—**λέγων = κελεύων** (Blass § 72, 5).

Ver. 15. The statue is made to speak, in order to work on the credulity and awe of the worshippers. The trick was well within the reach of contemporary magic (*cf*. Valer. Maxim. i. 8. 3-5), and later tradition attributed it to Simon Magus (Clem. *Recogn*. iii. 47, *cf*. Clem. *Hom*. ii. 32), while similar ventriloquism was practised by Apollonius of Tyana and Egyptian sorcerers at Caligula's court. *Cf*. Lucian's **αὐτόφωνοι χρησμοί** (*Alex*. 26).—**ἀποκτανθῶσιν**, *cf*. the scutcheon of Captain Pope in Bunyan's *Holy War*—"the stake, the flame, and the good man in it".

Vv. 16, 17. Detection was inevitable, for the very coins were stamped (Matt. xxii. 19) with the head of the Cæsar, the gods, or Rome itself, and the prophet apparently expected that genuine Christians would refuse to sanction idolatry and condone blasphemy by handling such emblems of profanity (*cf*. Ign. *ad Magn*. 5, **δύο νομίσματα, ὃ μὲν θεοῦ, ὃ δὲ κόσμου**). Only abject, servile devotees of the cultus will stoop to that! Irenæus has a similar allusion (iv. 30. 2) to those who carried money "cum inscriptione et imagine Cæsaris".—**μέτωπον**. This highly figurative allusion is to the habit of marking soldiers and slaves with a conspicuous tattoo or brand (*cf*. Lucian, *Dea Syra*; 3 Macc. ii. 29, where the Alexandrian Jews are branded with the mark of Dionysius; also on Gal. vi. 17); or, better still, to the religious custom of wearing a god's name as a talisman (*cf*. Deissmann, 349 f.). The general sense of the prediction is that the faithful will be shut up to the alternative of starving or of coming forward to avow their prohibited faith, so subtly and diabolically does the cultus of the emperor pervade all social life. Another solution is to think of the **χάραγμα** or red stamp, which was essential to all documents of exchange (Deissmann, 240 f.); it consisted of a red seal with tho emperor's name or effigy. Ramsay (*Seven Letters*, pp. 106 f.) takes the whole description as a symbolic and rather sarcastic way of referring to a boycotting demand that every Asiatic Christian should somehow "stamp himself overtly and visibly as loyal, or be disqualified from participation in ordinary social life and trading". Probably the passage is a figurative and unqualified expression for conspicuous loyalty to the Imperial cult. In Ep. Lugd. the devil is said to work against Christ by "excluding us from houses, baths, and markets, and also by forbidding any one of us to appear anywhere".

Ver. 18. "Now for wisdom"—skill to penetrate the secret of the cryptogram

νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστί, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι [1] ἑξήκοντα ἕξ.

[1] **χξϛ'**, *i.e.*, **εξακοσιοι (-αι) εξηκοντα εξ** (ℵAPQ, etc., Iren., Vict., Pr.), but **χιϛ'**, *i.e.*, **εξακοσιοι δεκα εξ** (C, 5, 11, Tic., Spec., "quidam sequentes idiotismum" apud Iren.). See on xiv. 20, and Zahn, § 75, n. 5. "There is no doubt but that 616 given in the Jerusalem codex is the original Armenian reading" (Conybeare).

which would reveal the features of the dread opponent. This cryptic method was a favourite apocalyptic device, due partly to prudential reasons, partly to the desire for impressiveness; Orientals loved symbolic and enigmatic modes of expression in religion (*cf.* Apoc. Bar. xxviii. 1, 2; Sib. Or. i. 141 f.; Barn. ix. 8, burlesqued by Lucian in *Alex.* 11). The prophet here drops the rôle of seer for that of hierophant or cabbalist. He invites his readers to count the name or number of the Beast, *i.e.*, to calculate a name whose letters, numerically valued on the fanciful principles of Gematria, would amount to 666. For John and his readers the Beast was primarily the foreign power which opposed the divine kingdom, *i.e.*, in this case, the Roman empire. But the drift of the present oracle is the further identification of the empire with the emperor, or rather (ver. 3) with one emperor in particular. Hence the prophet throws out the hint which will solve his riddle: the number of **τοῦ θηρίου** is **ἀριθμὸς ἀνθρώπου**, *i.e.*, of a historic personality. **'Ανθρώπου** does not require **τινός** or **ἑνός** before it to bring this out. The only intelligible sense of the words is "a human number," *i.e.*, not a number which is intelligible (for no other kind of number would be worth mentioning) but one which answered to an individual. Hence it is a matter of comparative indifference what the number of the Beast originally meant —**TEITAN** (so recently Abbott 80 f. = Titus, Teitous), **Η ΛΑΤΕΙΝΗ (ΙΤΑΛΗ) BACILEIA** (Clemen), **ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟC**, רום קיסר (= 616), קיסר רומים (= 666), Nimrod (נמרד בן כשׁ, Bruston), or any other (*cf.* Cheyne's *Traditions and Beliefs of Anc. Israel*, p. 248). This generic number is expressly identified or equalised by John with the number of an individual, *viz.*, Nero Cæsar (קסר נרון), the Greek letters of which yield 666. The defective writing of קסר (without the yod) is not unexampled. Besides, the abbreviated form would gain, at a very slight expense, this telling and symetrical cipher. Furthermore, when the last letter of Neron is dropped, this Latinised spelling brings the total value of the name to 616, the very variant which puzzled Irenæus. Gunkel's proposal תהום קדמוניה (primal chaos = Tiamat) suffers from several flaws; it omits the article, it employs a feminine ending which is not used in adjectives of this type, and "primal" is not a conventional epithet of mystery (*cf.* G. F. Moore in *Journ. Amer. Oriental Society*, 1906, 315 f.). Besides, as Gunkel admits, there are no Babylonian parallels to xiii. 11-17. Thus, while the application of the term is obvious, its origin is obscure. The basis of such contrivances (which became popular in Gnostic circles) was twofold: (*a*) *gematria*, which, using Greek and Hebrew letters to denote numbers, could often turn a name into a suggestive cipher; (*b*) *isopsephia*, which put two words together of the same numerical value (*cf.* for instances of **ἰσόψηφα**, Farrar 468 f. and Corssen). Probably the number of the Beast belonged to tradition. John plays upon it in order to disclose the shuddering climax of his oracle, that the final foe of the saints was Nero redivivus. The particular number 666 was specially apt as a symbol for this anti-divine power, since it formed a vain parody of the sacred number seven (Gfrörer notes further the ominous usage of 18 = 6 + 6 + 6 in Judges iii. 14, x. 8; Jerem. xxxii. 1, lii. 29; Luke xiii. 1, etc.), always falling short of it. In Sib. Or. i. 324 f. 888 represents Christ, and Origen (on Ezek. iv. 9) remarks, apropos of the present passage, **ἐστὶν ὁ ἀριθμὸς οὗτος πάθους σύμβολον καὶ κακώσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος τῇ ἕκτῃ ἡμέρᾳ πεπονθότος**. Irenæus explains the suitability of the number as "in recapitulationem uniuersae apostasiae eius, quae facta est in sex millibus annorum" (*adv. Haer.* v. 28, 2). Thus the very number 666 by itself, may have been significant of the anti-divine power. The Neronic application would intensify and concentrate its meaning for John's readers who were initiated. And such calculations, as the Pompeii *graffiti* prove, were familiar even

XIV. 1. Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ [a] ἀρνίον [a] ἑστὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος Σιών, καὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ [b] ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ἔχουσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ [c] γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν. 2. [d] καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς φωνὴν ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῆς μεγάλης· καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἣν ἤκουσα ὡς [e] κιθαρῳδῶν κιθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις αὐτῶν. 3.

a v. 6.
b vii. 4; *cf.* Zech. xiv. 5.
c iii. 12, Ezek. ix. 4.
d i. 15, xix. 1, 6.
e ἅπ. λεγ. NT. xviii. 22.

to Greek-speaking inhabitants of the empire. The Pergamos-inscriptions furnish analogous instances.

CHAPTER XIV. The prophet again breaks off to point his readers across the sombre vista opened up by this oracle of the θηρίον, not to the church as an oasis and asylum on earth but to the glad sure hope of the faithful after death. How can the θηρίον be met? Who (ver. 8) can hold out against such seductions? By way of answer to such doubts and fears the prophet raises the veil of the future for a moment to reveal the heavenly (*cf.* xiii. 15, xiv. 3) survivors of the conflict (xiv. 1-5); whereupon he rapidly sketches the doom of Rome and the pagan world by way of contrast (6-20). The latter passage, in its present form and site, gives a proleptic outline of catastrophes described later on (*cf.* xiv. 7 = xix. 1-6, xiv. 8 = xviii. 2, 3, etc.). The two supreme motives for patient loyalty on the part of the saints (ver. 12) are, (*a*) negatively, fear of the fate reserved for the unbelieving (xiv. 8-11), and, (*b*) positively, the bliss in store for the loyal (ver. 13, *cf.* 1-5).

Vv. 1-5, introduced as a foil to what precedes and as an anticipation of xxi.-xxii., is "a sort of Te Deum" (Wellhausen), a vision of the Lamb no longer *as slain* but triumphant (militant on the mount of Olives, Zech. xiv. 3 f., against the nations = Apoc. xi. 8, 18), attended by the *élite* of the redeemed who had worshipped him, not the Emperor, during their life-time. The Jewish tradition underlying this oracle seems to have been cognate to that of En. i. 4 f. (Greek), reflected already in vii. 1-8; it showed the rallying of the faithful remnant at mount Zion (Joel ii. 32; Isa. xi. 9-12) after the throes of the latter days (*cf.* on xi. 19). In terms of this John pictures the Christians who appear with Jesus their messiah upon earth (*cf.* v. 10, xx. 4-6). Verses 1-5 thus hint faintly and fragmentarily at the belief that, before the general judgment and recompense of the saints (xi. 18, xx. 11 f.), the vanguard who had borne the brunt of the struggle would enjoy a special bliss of their own. The prophet does not stop to elaborate this independent anticipation of xx. 4-6, but hurries on (6 f.) to depict the negative side, *viz.*, the downfall of the enemy. When Caligula first attempted to enforce his worship on the Jews, the pious flung themselves on the ground, "stretching out their throats" in their readiness to die sooner than let their God be profaned (Jos. *Bell.* ii. 10, 4; *Ant.* xviii. 8, 3). John desiderates an equally dauntless temper in Christians, though they could not hope to avert, as the Jews had done, the imperial propaganda of the false prophet (xiii. 16 f.; *cf.* 2 Thess. ii.). Martyrdom (xiv. 13, *cf.* xiii. 15) was all that the majority could expect. But loyalty would bring them ultimate triumph. The passage is not simply Christian but from the hand of the prophet himself.

Ver. 1. Instead of the beast, the Lamb; instead of the beast's followers and their mark, the Lamb's followers with the divine name; instead of the pagan earth, mount Zion. The vision is based on an old Jewish apocalyptic tradition, copied by the Christian editor of 4 Esdras (ii. 42) but already present in the Jewish original (xiii. 35: ipse [*i.e.*, Messias] stabit super cacumen montis Sion, 39 et quoniam uidisti eum colligentem ad se aliam multitudinem pacificam, hae sunt decem tribus), which apparently described (*cf.* Joel ii. 32) a further cycle of the tradition underlying vii. 1-8. The appearance of this manlike messiah on mount Zion was accompanied by the manifestation of the celestial Zion (postponed here till xxi.). Thus, xiv. 1-5 is, in some respects, a companion panel to vii. 9 f., though the retinue of messiah are painted in more definitely Jewish colours. They are distinguished for their testimony borne against the Imperial cultus and the contaminations of the pagan world.

Ver. 3. Who sing the new song? angels or the redeemed? In v. 9 it is chanted not before the living creatures and elders but by them; here it is not originally sung by the redeemed (as in xv. 3 and 4 Esd. ii. 42) but is intelligible to them and to them alone. Their experi-

καὶ [f] ᾄδουσιν [g] ᾠδὴν [1] καινὴν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· [h] καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο μαθεῖν τὴν ᾠδὴν εἰ μὴ αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες, [i] οἱ ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

4. [k] οὗτοί εἰσιν οἳ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν· παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν.

[k] οὗτοι οἱ [m] ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν [n] ὑπάγει.

[k] οὗτοι [o] ἠγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων [p] ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ [καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ].

5. καὶ [q] ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ [q] εὑρέθη ψεῦδος· [r] ἄμωμοί εἰσιν.

f *i.e.*, the angels.
g Jud. xvi. 13.
h *cf.* ii. 17, xix. 12.
i constr. ad sensum (as v. 13, xi. 4, etc.)
k Triple οὗτοι an apoc. formula (*cf.* Jude 12, etc.).
l *cf.* Just. *Apol.* i. 15, Matt. xix. 12, Eus. *H.E.* v. 24 (Melito τὸν εὐνοῦχον), 2 Clem. xii. 2, *C.I.G.* 3098 (παρθένοι ἱερατείας, in ethnic sense).
m Matt. xvi. 24-25, Joh. xxi. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 21-22. Quoted (in *Ep. Lugd.*) of the martyr Vettius Epagathus.
n as in Mark vi. 56 (indic.).
o 2 Pet. ii. 1.
p *cf.* Schol. on Eurip. *Orest.* 96.
q 1 Pet. ii. 22, Isa. liii. 9, Zeph. iii. 13, Ps. xiv. 1 f., xxx. 2.
r Jude 24; *cf.* Col. i. 22, 1 Pet. i. 19, Heb. ix. 14 (sacrificial).

[1] Ti. (Al.), Ws., Bj. rightly om. ως (with ℵPQ, etc., Me., Pesh., Aeth., Arm., Orig., Method., And[c, pal], Areth., Pr.) before ωδην, as an echo of ver. 2.

ence enabled them to enter into its meaning. This privilege is due to (vv. 4-5) their previous character and conduct. This inner circle are ascetics, παρθένοι. *i.e.*, not merely unmarried or free from sexual vice but celibates (*cf.* Cheyne, *Orig. Psalter*, 446; Hoennicke, *das Judenchristentum*, 1908, 130 f.; Baldensperger, 109; von Dobschütz, 39 f., 228, 261); *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 32. The prevailing Jewish respect for marriage did not check a tendency to celibacy which was by no means confined to the Essenes or Therapeutae. Even Methodius, who allegorises the seven heads of xii. 3 into the seven deadly sins and the stars of xii. 2 into heretics, takes this phrase literally, in the sense of virginity not simply of purity (so Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 2); and, although the touch is too incidental to bear pressing, it is unmistakable (*cf.* Introd. § 6). In the popular religion of Phrygia there was a feeling (expressed in the eunuchism, *e.g.*, of the priests at Hierapolis) that one came nearer to the divine life by annihilating the distinction of sex, while in the votive inscriptions of Asia Minor (*C. B. P.* i. 137) marriage is not recognised as part of the divine or religious life. This atmosphere of local feeling, together with the lax moral conscience of the popular religion, would foster the religious tendency to regard celibates as pre-eminently near to God.—ἀκολουθοῦντες: either a historic present to secure vividness (ἀκολουθήσαντες, syr. S), in which case the allusion is to their earthly loyalty (reff.), or, more probably (in view of ὑπάγει, pres.), a description of their heavenly privilege and position (*cf.* vii. 17), borrowed from Egyptian religion where the "followers of Horus," the divine and victorious son of Osiris, were a series of celestial kings who were supposed to have reigned during the earlier dynasties. To be among the "followers of Horus" was an equivalent for immortal life. *Cf. E. B. D.* 101: "Let me rise up among those who follow the great God; I am the son of Maūti, and that which he abominateth is the spirit of falsehood [*cf.* Apoc. xiv. 5]. I am in triumph!"—ἀπό in 3, 4 is equivalent to the partitive ἐκ (*cf.* v. 9).—ἀπαρχή: they form the firstfruits of mankind for God; others are to follow, but these are the *élite*, they have a prestige all their own. The idea of priority shades into that of superiority, though in a very different way from that of Rom. xi. 16. Dr. Rendel Harris (in *Present Day Papers*, May, 1901) describes the interest and excitement at Jerusalem during the early days of summer when "the first ripe figs were in the market. When one's soul desires the vintage or the fruitage of the summer . . . the trees that are a fortnight to the fore are the talk and delight of the town."—καὶ τ.ἀ., usually taken as a scribe's gloss. Elsewhere the saints are redeemed by, not for, the Lamb (v. 9).

Ver. 5. ἄμωμοι, "unblemished" (a ritual term), possibly contains a sacrificial tinge, like ἀπαρχή in some of the inscriptions (= gift to deity), *cf.* Thieme's *Inschriften von Magnesia*, 26. These

6. Καὶ εἶδον [s]ἄλλον[1] ἄγγελον πετόμενον ἐν [t]μεσουρανήματι, ἔχοντα [u]εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον [v]εὐαγγελίσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς [w]καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [x]καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ φυλὴν καὶ γλῶσσαν καὶ λαόν, 7. [y]λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ,

"[z]φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ [a]δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν,
ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ·

s here and 15, 17 f., perhaps like the idiomatic use of ἀ. in Plato, = προσέτι, cf. use of ἕτερος in Dan. viii. 13, etc.

t viii. 13. u a genuine gospel (*cf.* Gal. i. 8). v 1 Pet. i. 25; for contr. John xvi. 12. w *Cf.* Luke xxi. 35. x x. 11, xiii. 7, and (for *καί* epexeg,) xi. 18, xiii. 12. y *cf.* iv. 1, etc. z xi. 18, Fear *God*, not the beast, *cf.* Xen. *Mem.* iv. 19. a xi. 13.

[1] **αλλον** is more likely to have been omitted (so ℵ*Q, Orig., etc., Bs.), owing to the difficulty of reference (x. 1, xi. 15) than to have been inserted. For **αγγελον** J. Weiss conj. **αετον**.

adherents are redeemed. But in another aspect their qualities of purity and guilelessness form a sweet sacrifice to God. A Christian not only may be redeemed but may sacrifice himself in the interests of the Redeemer.—**ψεῦδος**. In view of xxi. 8, 27, xxii. 15 it is superfluous to think of prophets or teachers specially (Weinel, 146-148) in this connexion, although the gifts of utterance and prophecy were particularly associated with asceticism (En. lxxxiii., cviii., etc.) in the early church of the first century; *e.g.*, "the whole yoke of the Lord" in Did. vi. may refer to celibacy (in which case **τέλειος** would be equivalent to **ἄμωμος** here). *Cf.* the discussion of reasons, in a Babylonian incantation (Zimmern, *die Beschwörungstafeln Shurpu*, 5, 6), why the sufferer was punished. "Has he for 'no' said 'yes', | For 'yes' said 'no'? . . . Was he frank in speaking | but false in heart? | Was it 'yes' with his mouth | but 'no' in his heart?" The Assyrian idiom for loyalty is "true speech in the mouth of the people," neither rebellious nor seditious talk.

Vv. 6-20: the fearful doom of the impenitent pagans is announced in a triple vision of angels (ver. 6-13), whereupon a proleptic summary of the final judgment on the world follows (ver. 14-20). In 6-13, 12-13 and **καὶ ἐν τ. ἀ.** (10) are the only specifically Christian touches; but the latter need not even be a scribal gloss, and 6-11 is intelligible as the outburst of a vehement Jewish Christian apocalyptist. The stylistic data do not justify any hypothesis of an edited source. The first angel (6-7) announces (**εὐαγγελίσαι** here, and perhaps also in x. 7, in neutral sense of LXX, 2 Sam. xviii. 19-20; Dio Cass. lxi. 13) to the universe the news that the divine purpose is now to be consummated, but that there is still (*cf.* xi. 3) a chance to repent (implicit, *cf.* Mark i. 15). The sterner tone of viii. 13-ix. 21 is due to the fact that men were there accounted as strictly responsible for their idolatry and immorality. Here the nations are regarded in the first instance as having been seduced by Rome into the Imperial cultus (8-9); hence they get a warning and a last opportunity of transferring their allegiance to its rightful object. The near doom of the empire, of which the prophet is convinced even in the hour of her aggrandisement (xiii. 8), is made a motive for urging her beguiled adherents to repent in time and her Christian victims to endure (xiv. 12). The substance of this proclamation is not much of a gospel, and the prophet evidently does not look for much result, if any. Its "pure, natural theism" (Simcox) is paralleled by that of Rom. ii. 5 f.

Ver. 6. **πετόμενον**: angels begin to fly in the Jewish heaven about the beginning of the first century B.C. (En. lxi. 1).

Ver. 7. **ποιήσαντι κ.τ.λ.** Since he who has created has the right to judge his creatures, as well as to receive their worship (*cf.* iv. 11 f., etc).—**ὥρα** = the fixed (*cf.* 15), **καιρός** the fit, moment for action. Contrast with this summons Lucan's fulsome appeal to Nero (i. 57 f.): "librati pondera cœli Orbe tene medio," etc. The second angel of the trio announces the faults and fall of (ver. 8) Rome as a second Babylon. The prophet quotes from the postexilic oracle appended to Jeremiah (Jer. li. 7-8).—**θυμός** has probably the double sense carried by the English term "passion". As history proves, the Cæsar cult fairly intoxicated people, especially in the East. In Asia Minor it became a perfect passion with many communities. They will find it a different kind of passion, the prophet

καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ [b] ποιήσαντι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ [c] θάλασσαν καὶ [c] πηγὰς ὑδάτων."

8. καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος δεύτερος[1] ἠκολούθησε λέγων,
"[d]Ἔπεσεν [d] ἔπεσε [e] Βαβυλὼν ἡ [f] μεγάλη·
[g] ἣ ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου [τοῦ θυμοῦ] τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς πεπότικε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη."

9. καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος τρίτος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, "Εἴ τις προσκυνεῖ [h] τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ λαμβάνει χάραγμα ἐπὶ [i] τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα [h] αὐτοῦ,[2] 10. [k] καὶ αὐτὸς [l] πίεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κεκερασμένου [m] ἀκράτου ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασανισθήσεται ἐν πυρὶ καὶ [n] θείῳ ἐνώπιον ἀγγέλων [o] ἁγίων

b Emphatic; as against xiii. 4, 12, 15, *cf.* above on x. 6, and further, Ps. cxlvi. 6, Deut. xxxii. 3; with Acts iv. 24, xiv. 15.
c viii. 10, xvi. 4. an irreg. omission of article, see Win. § 18, 7d.
d aor. of "what has just happened" (so xviii. 2), Moult. i. 135; *cf.* Isa. xxi. 9.
e 1 Pet. v. 13.
f Dan. iv. 27 (30), Jer. li. 58.
g Seductive influence of idolatry (as in xiii. 2, Jer. l. 2).
h xiii. 12-17.
i gen. as vii. 3, etc.
k he, as well as Babylon; *cf.* on iii. 20.
l Jer. xxv. 17-19, 27-29, xxxii. 1, also Ps. lxxv. 9, Ps. Sol. viii. 15. See below at xvi. 19, xix, 15.
m *cf.* Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 6, 1, xviii. 9, 8, etc.
n *Cf.* on ix. 18.
o As Mark viii. 38, Acts x. 22, etc.

[1] The tautological **δευτερος** goes either before (AQ, 1, etc., Areth., Lach., Tr., Al., WH, Sw., Bj.) or after (ℵ^cc CP, min., Me., Pesh., Arm., etc., Ti., Ws.) **αγγελος. του θυμου** (om. fuld. 1, 96, Tic., Pr., Cassiod.) as at xviii. 3 (om. S., Pr.) a gloss [Bl., § 35, 6]? Cp. xvii. 2.

[2] **η . . . αυτου** (om. S.) a gloss? (Bj., *cf.* xiii. 16).

grimly writes, drawing on a powerful O.T. figure; the passion of God's hot indignation will be forced down their throats, like a bitter draught (ver. 10). **θυμός**, however, besides translating a Hebrew equivalent for "fury" (Isa. li. 17 f.), is occasionally a LXX rendering for the analogous idea of "venom" or "poison" (חֵמָה or רֹאשׁ, *cf.* Job xx. 16), and this would yield a good sense here.

Vv. 9-11. The third angel proclaims that the deliberate adherents of the Imperial cultus are to be held responsible for their actions, and punished accordingly. The object is that these votaries may be "scared into faith by warning of sin's pains". The plea of force (xiii. 12) is no excuse (*cf.* Matt. x. 28).

Ver. 10. **κεκερασμένου** here as in xviii. 6 by oxymoron = "poured out," the original meaning of "mixed" (with water) being dropped. The torture (depicted from Isa. xxxiv. 9, 10) is inflicted *before the holy angels* (who evidently sit as assessors at the judgment, En. xlviii. 9), **ἁγίων** being either an *epitheton ornans* or an allusion to xii. 8-9. Normally the prophet refrains from introducing such spectators of doom (xix. 20, xx. 10-14). "Fire is the divine cruelty of the Semitic religions" (Doughty), but the torment which Judaism designed for fallen angels and apostates is assigned here to the worshippers of the Cæsars. The Apocalypse is silent upon agents of torture; they are not the angels, much less the devil (who is himself punished, xx. 10). But, like 4 Esd. vii. [ver. 36] ("the furnace of Gehenna shall be disclosed and over against it the paradise of delight"), John locates the place of torment over against the place of rest. For such grim popular fancies Enoch (xxvii. 2, 3, xlviii. 9, xc. 26, 27) is mainly responsible; there (as in Clem. *Hom.* xvii.) the tortures proceed under the eyes of the righteous, though (especially in the later fragments, as in John's Apoc.) the moralisation of the idea has advanced, until Gehenna vanishes from the scene of bliss. "It is impossible for us to understand how such a sight could be compatible with heavenly happiness" (Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 344; *cf.* Lecky's *European Morals*, ii. 225 f.), but the psychological basis of the ghastly expectation can be verified in the cruder types of primitive and modern religion. Most critics delete **καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου** as another gloss (*cf.* on ver. 4); the position of Jesus after the angels is not unexampled (*cf.* i. 4, 5), even if *before the holy angels* were not

[καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου]· 11. καὶ ὁ καπνὸς τοῦ [p] βασανισμοῦ αὐτῶν [q] εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων [r] ἀναβαίνει· καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν [s] ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ [t] εἴ τις λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ." 12. [u] Ὧδε ἡ [u] ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν· οἱ [v] τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς [w] τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν [x] πίστιν Ἰησοῦ.

13. καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [y] λεγούσης "Γράψον, Μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ [z] ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀπάρτι·

Ναί, [a] λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα, [b] ἵνα [c] ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν κόπων αὐτῶν·

[d] τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν."

p by metonymy = *βασάνου* (*cf.* xviii. 7, 10, 15).
q xx. 10.
r xviii. 9, xix. 3, Isa. xxxiv. 10.
s Grim contrast to iv. 8.
t = ὅστις (ὃς ἄν), Win. § 24, 16.
u xiii. 10.
v xii. 17; nom. indep., as i. 5, etc.
w not of men (Acts iv. 19).
x ii. 13; *cf.* Rom. iii. 22, 26, Mark xi. 22, etc. (object. gen.), *cf.* Seeberg's *der Katech. d. Urchrist.* 167 f.
y Contrast x. 4.
z 1 Th. iv. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 18; *cf.* Sap. iv. 7-12. Frequentative (Moult. i. 114).
a ii, 7, etc.; *cf.* xxii. 16-17.
b Pract. = ὅτι (*cf.* John viii. 56, ix. 2, etc.), xxii. 14.
c (Isa. lvii. 1-2) like sec. fut. pass. of *καίω*. *cf.* Jannaris, *Hist. Greek Gramm.* 1991.
d *Cf.* Sir. xiv, 19.

taken (Bs., Baljon) as a periphrasis for the divine presence (Luke xii. 8, 9, xv. 10).

Ver. 12. The prospect of this fearful and imminent retaliation is not only a warning to weak-minded Christians but a consolation to the loyal. To be a saint is to obey God and to believe in Jesus at all costs. Contemporary Jews took a similar encouragement: "if ye endure and persevere in his fear, and do not forget him, the times will change over you for good, and ye will see the consolation of Zion" (Apoc. *Bar.* xliv. 7). John's words **τηρ. τ. ἐντολὰς τ. θ.** are an answer to the complaint and claim that God's commandments were being neglected by every one except the Jews (*cf.* the plaintive cry of 4 Esd. iii. 33: "I have gone hither and thither through the nations and seen their abundance, though they remember not thy commandments"; 32, "Is there any other nation that knoweth thee save Israel? yet their reward appeareth not, and their labour hath no fruit").

Ver. 13. The approaching climax of retribution upon pagan Rome affects the dead as well as the living. The latter are encouraged to hold on in hope; the former are brought nearer their reward (*cf.* vi. 11, xi. 18). **Ἀπάρτι** goes with **μακάριοι** (note here and in Clem. Rom. xlvii. the first application of **μ.** to the dead saints) rather than with **ἀποθνήσκοντες**, and **οἱ ἐν κ. ἀποθ.** (which is timeless, like **προσκ. τ. θ.** in ver. 11) denotes all who die in the faith, loyal to their Lord, *i.e.*, primarily martyrs and confessors (*cf.* xiii. 8, 15). They die "in His fellowship, as it were in His arms" (Beyschlag). Like Paul (in 1 Thess. iv. 15), though on different grounds, the writer is controverting a fear (*cf.* 4 Esd. xiii. 24) that at the advent of messiah those who survived on earth would have some advantage over those who had already died. "Yea, saith the Spirit"—ratifying what has been said—"happy to rest from their labours" (*i.e.*, their Christian activities, not the special form of their death for the faith). So far as the sense is concerned, it matters little whether **ἵνα κ.τ.λ.** depends on **μακάριοι** or **ἀποθνήσκοντες**. Both constructions are grammatically legitimate, though the former is perhaps closer. The point of the passage (note **πνεῦμα** and **γράψον**, as in i.-iii., xxii. 6 f.) is that the bliss of death for a Christian consists not in mere rest from labour but in a rest which brings the reward of labour. While death brings the rest, the reward cannot be given till the final judgment. Consequently the near prospect of the latter is welcome, among other reasons, because it means the long-deferred recompense (xi. 18) for the faithful dead. So far from being forgotten (ii. 2 f., 19, 23, etc.), their **ἔργα** accompany them to judgment and —it is implied—receive their proper reward there (*cf.* Milton's fourteenth sonnet). The bliss of the departed therefore depends upon two grounds: their **ἔργα** are not to be overlooked, and the interval of waiting is now (**ἀπάρτι**) brief. The fourth degree of bliss in 4 Esd. vii. [95] is that the departed spirits of the just understand "the rest which, gathered in their chambers [*cf.* Apoc. vi. 9-11] they can enjoy now with deep quietness, guarded by angels, as well as the glory

14. καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ νεφέλη [e]λευκή, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενον [f]ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, [g]ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ

e *Cf.* Abbott, 206 f.
f i. 13; *cf.* Dalman i. § ix. 2.
g *Cf.* on ii. 20, iii. 12, and λέγων (7) or οἱ τηρ. (12) above.

which still awaits them in the latter days". John does not share the current pessimistic belief (*cf.* Apoc. *Bar.* xi.-xii. 4, Verg. *Aen.* i. 94 f., with Isa. lvii. 1 f.) that death was preferable to life, in view of the overwhelming miseries of the age. His thought is not that death is happier than life under the circumstances, but that if death came in the line of religious duty it involved no deprivation. The language reflects Gen. ii. 2 (with **κόπων** put for **ἔργων**), but while it is true enough, it is hardly apposite, to think of the dead as resting from works (Heb. iv. 9), no more being needed. The root of the passage lies not in the Iranian belief (Brandt, 423 f., Böklen, 41) that the soul was escorted by its good deeds to bliss in another world (*cf.* Maas, *Orpheus*, 217 f.), but in the closer soil of Jewish hope (*cf.* Bacher's *Agada d. Tannaiten*,[2] i. 399 f.; Volz 103) as in En. ciii. 2, 3, Apoc. Bar. xiv. 12, 13, and Pirke Aboth vi. 9 (hora discessus hominis non comitantur eum argentum aut aurum aut lapides pretiosi aut margaritae, sed lex et opera bona). In 4 Esd. vii. 35 (where, at the resurrection of the dead, "the work shall follow and the reward be disclosed") *opus* may be a Hebraism for "recompense" (Ps. cix. 20 **ἔργον**, *cf.* 1 Ti. v. 25). Contemporary Jewish eschatology also took a despairing view of the world (*cf.* 4 Esd. iv. 26-33). But while the dead are pronounced "blessed," *e.g.*, in Apoc. Bar. xi. 7, it is because they have not lived to see the ruins of Jerusalem and the downfall of Israel. Better death than that experience! Death is a blessing compared with the life which falls upon times so out of joint (x. 6 f.). The living may well envy the dead. In John's Apocalypse, on the other hand, the dead are felicitated because they miss nothing by their martyrdom. Yet life is a boon. No plaintive, weary cry of *Weltschmerz* rises from the pages of this Apocalypse.—**ἀναπαύω** in the papyri means relief from public duties or the "resting" of land in agriculture (*cf.* U. Wilcken's *Archiv f. Papyrusforschung*, i. pp. 157 f.).

Vv. 14-20, in their present position, are a proleptic and realistic summary of the final judgment, representing as a divine catastrophe what xvi.-xvii. delineate as the outcome of semi-political movements (*cf.* xviii. after xvii.). The strange picture of messiah (14 f., contrast i. 10 f., xix. 11 f.), the absence of any allusion to the Beasts (9-11) or to the Imperial cultus, the peculiar angelology, and the generally disparate nature of the scene as compared with the context, point to the isolated character of the episode. The abrupt mention of *the city* (20) suggests that the tradition belonged to the cycle underlying xi. 1-13 (*the city*, 13), and several critics (*e.g.*, Spitta, Erbes, Weyland, Völter, Schön, Briggs, Rauch) regard it variously as a finâle to the oracles of that chapter. But the connexion is one of tradition rather than of literary unity. The data of style and content leave it uncertain even whether the episode goes back to a source or a tradition, whether it is Jewish (so especially Sabatier, Pfleiderer, and Rauch) or Jewish Christian (Schön, Erbes, Bruston, J. Weiss, etc.), and, if Jewish Christian, whether it was written by the author of the Apocalypse (Weizsäcker) or not. The least obscure feature is the victory of the messiah over antichrist and his legions (not of an angelic judgment on Israel, J. Weiss) in the vicinity of Jerusalem (*cf.* xi. 13, xiv. 1 f., and xx. 9) at the end of the world, an expectation of which we have another variant apparently in xix. 11 f. Probably the prophet inserts the episode here in order to repeat, in a graphic and archaic, although somewhat incongruous fashion, the final doom of which he has just been speaking and to which he is about to lead up (xv.-xx.) through a fresh series of catastrophes. "If one might venture to wish to discard as an interpolation any part of the attested text of the Apocalypse, it would be this passage. How can it be understood of anything but the final judgment? Yet it comes here as anything but final. . . . The earth goes on just as before" (Simcox). But here, as often elsewhere, the clue lies partly in the vivid inconsequence of dream-pictures, partly in the preacher's desire to impress his hearers, and partly in the poetic, imaginative freedom of his own mind.

Ver. 14. This royal, judicial figure is evidently the messiah (drawn from Dan. vii. 13, which had been already interpreted thus in En. xxxvii.-lxxi. and 4

[h] στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ δρέπανον ὀξύ. 15. καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν [i] ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, κράζων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τῷ καθημένῳ [k] ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης,

> "Πέμψον [l] τὸ δρέπανόν σου καὶ θέρισον,
> ὅτι ἦλθε ἡ [m] ὥρα [m] θερίσαι,
> ὅτι ἐξηράνθη ὁ θερισμὸς τῆς γῆς."

16. καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐθερίσθη ἡ γῆ.

17. καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἔχων καὶ αὐτὸς δρέπανον ὀξύ. 18. καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ [n] θυσιαστηρίου, ὁ ἔχων [1] ἐξουσίαν [o] ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός, καὶ ἐφώνησε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τῷ ἔχοντι τὸ δρέπανον τὸ ὀξὺ λέγων,

h xix. 12.
i xi. 19 (heavenly temple).
k *Cf.* Dalm. ix. 2.
l Mark iv. 29.
m Constr. ix. 10, xi. 6, *cf.* Mark xiii. 28 parl. Herm. *Sim.* iv. 2, Sib. Or. i. 387.
n viii. 3-5: prayers of martyrs?
o Angels of snow, hail, thunder, lightning, fire, etc., in Jub. ii. 2. Here = viii. 5, the angel of fire.

[1] Before εχων Lach., Al., Tr. (marg.), Ws. [WH], [Sw.] add the ο of AC, vg., Syr., S.

Esd. xiii.). The crown (omitted in i. 13 f.) was a familiar appurtenance of deity in Phrygia (*e.g.*, of Apollo); for the cloud as the seat of deity, *cf.* Verg. *Aen.* ix. 638-640, etc.

Ver. 15. **ἄλλος ἄγγελος**, as in ver. 6. The alternatives are (*a*) to translate "another, an angel" (אחר מלאך) which might be the sense of the Greek (*cf. Od.* i. 132, Clem. *Protrept.* ix. 87. 3) but is harsh, or (*b*) to take the figure of ver. 14 as an angel (Porter) and not as the messiah at all (which, in the face of i. 13, is difficult). The subordinate and colourless character of the messiah is certainly puzzling, and tells against the Christian authorship of the passage. Messiah is summoned to his task by an angel, and even his task is followed up by another angel's more decisive interference. He seems an angelic figure (*cf.* on xix. 17), perhaps *primus inter pares* among the angels (so En. xlvi. 1: "and I saw another being [*i.e.*, the Son of Man] whose countenance had the appearance of a man, and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels"). The conception was inconsistent with John's high Christology, but he may have retained it, like so much else, for its poetic effect, or as part of a time-honoured apocalyptic tradition. That the messiah should receive divine instructions through one of his comrades (Heb. i. 6, 9; *cf.* Zech. ii. 3, 4) was perhaps not stranger than that he should require an angel in order to communicate with men (i. 1). **πέμψον κ.τ.λ.** The double figure of judgment (harvest and vintage) is copied from the poetic parallelism of Joel iii. 13; the independent rendering of שלח by **πέμψον** and **ἔβαλεν**, and the change of agent from messiah (14-16) to an angel (17-20, so Mark xiii. 39 f.), show that the writer is using the Hebrew of that passage (where God does the reaping).

Ver. 16. The **δρέπανον** (only here, xiv. 14-19, in Apocalypse; *cf. C. B. P.* ii. 652 f. for a Phrygian inscription **καὶ τὸ ἀρᾶς δρέπανον εἰς τὸν ὗκον αὐτοῦ**) is represented as a living thing, probably like the **δρέπανον πετόμενον** of Zech. v. 1 (Wellhausen). The classical use of reaping to symbolise death and destruction is too common to need illustration. "The harvest of the earth is ripe and dry," but this ripeness of paganism for judgment (Jer. li. 33) is re-stated dramatically (17-20) in a parallel O.T. symbol from the wine-press. The angelic *mise-en-scène* recalls that of viii. 3-5. Unlike the harvest-symbol, the vintage-symbol is worked out vividly (*cf.* Gen. xlix. 11; Isa. lxiii. 1 f.).

Ver. 18. **πυρός.** The figure of this angel (=Jehuel in rabbinic tradition, Gfrörer, i. 369) has an Iranian tinge. The justice of the punishment is attested by its origin in the purpose of one who corresponded to the Persian Amshaspand (*cf.* on i. 4), Ashem Vahishtan, who presided over fire and at the same time symbolised the closely allied conceptions of goodness, truth, and right in Zoroastrian mythology (*cf. H. J.*, 1904, 350).

p Lk. vi. 44.
q xix. 15, *cf.* Ezek. xxxv. 6.
r = an oblong trough or tub, *cf.* Zech. xiv. 10.
s *cf.* Jos. *Bell.* iv. 6, 3, vi. 2, 1, vi. 6, 3, etc.
t The red juice of the vine (Deut. xxxii. 14).
u John xi. 18, xxi. 8 (*cf.* Blass, 95): at most a Latinism (only here in this sense in Apoc.).

"Πέμψον σου τὸ δρέπανον τὸ ὀξύ,
καὶ ᵖ τρύγησον τοὺς βότρυας τῆς ἀμπέλου τῆς γῆς,
ὅτι ἤκμασαν αἱ σταφυλαὶ αὐτῆς."

19. καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ἄγγελος τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἐτρύγησε τὴν ἄμπελον τῆς γῆς καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς ᵠ τὴν ʳ ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν. 20. καὶ ᵠ ἐπατήθη ἡ ληνὸς ˢ ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ᵗ αἷμα ἐκ τῆς ληνοῦ ἄχρι τῶν χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων, ᵘ ἀπὸ σταδίων χιλίων ἑξακοσίων.[1]

[1] And. (comm.), reading (with 79) χιλ. εξακ. εξ. [διακοσιων, ℵ, 26, S.], explains the number symbolically as the perfection of wickedness; 1000 being the most perfect of numbers, the deluge occurring in the 600th year of Noah, and the creation (now stained and corrupted) being completed on the 6th day.

A similar representation of an angel speaking from the fire in connexion with providence occurs in Chag. 14 *b*.

Ver. 19. The ungrammatical **τὸν μέγαν** may be due to the fact that **ληνός** is occasionally masculine (Win. § 8. 10; Helbing, 46), or—by a rough *constr. ad sensum*—to apposition with **τὸν θυμόν** (understood).

Ver. 20. The heathen are stamped and crushed till their blood gushes out of the wine-press to the height of a horse's bridle and to the extent of about two hundred miles. This ghastly hyperbole, borrowed partly from Egyptian (wine = the blood of those who fought against the gods) and partly from Jewish eschatology (En. c. 3: "and the horses will walk up to the breast in the blood of sinners, and the chariot will be submerged to its height"), happens to be used later by the Talmud in connexion with the carnage at Bether (*cf.* Schlatter's *Die Tage Trajans*, p. 37; also Sib. iii. 633 f.; 4 Esd. xv. 35; Sil. Ital. iii. 704). The place is to be a veritable Senlac (sang lac).—**ἀπό κ.τ.λ.**, probably a round number (see crit. note) compounded out 4 and its multiples (like 144,000 out of 12), to denote completeness (Vict. = per omnes mundi quattuor partes). After the fall of Rome (xiv. 8 f.), the rest of the world (*ex hypothesi* impenitent, xiv. 6-8) is ripe for the traditional (Dan. ix. 26) judgment. The same sequence is reproduced roughly and on a larger scale in xvii.-xviii. (fall of Rome) and xix.-xx. (doom of other nations). This parallelism and the sense of the Joel passage militate against the attractive idea that xiv. 14-16 is the ingathering of the saints (so Alford, Milligan, Bruston, Briggs, Titius, Gilbert, and Swete).—**ἔξωθεν κ.τ.λ.** This fearful vengeance is located by Jewish tradition in some valley (of Jehoshaphat = Yah judges?) near Jerusalem (Joel), on the mount of Olives (Zech. xiv. 4), or in Palestine generally (Dan. xi. 45; *cf.* below on xvi. 16), *i.e.*, as a rule in close proximity to the sacred capital, where the messiah was to set up his kingdom.

After this partial anticipation of the final catastrophe, the Apocalypse returns to a fuller and independent description of its processes (xv. 2-4 = xiv. 1-5, xv. 1, 5-xvi. = xiv. 6-11, 14-20). The panorama of the prelude is once more sevenfold, but this time seven angels (under the control of God, xvi. 9) drench the earth with plagues from seven bowls which are brimming with the divine anger. The vision is a poetical expansion of Lev. xxvi. 21 (**προσθήσω ὑμῖν πληγὰς ἑπτὰ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν**, *cf.* 18, 24, 28). The plagues, like Habbakuk's theophany, recall the Egyptian plagues (Exod. vii.-x.), but their description is less impressive than the previous cycles of punishment. Like the seven trumpets (viii. 2-5), they are introduced by a scene in heaven (xv. 2-4); ver. 1 is merely a title or frontispiece to what follows (5 f.), since the angels do not become visible till 5 (*cf.* viii. 1-2, 6), and do not receive their bowls till 7. This **θαυμαστόν** (awe-inspiring) **σημεῖον** is the sequel (**ἄλλο**) to that of xii. 1 f., and the plagues are final (1 **ἐσχάτας**), in contrast to the trumpet-plagues (ix. 20), as they represent the wrath of God which can no longer be repressed (xvii.-xix. = the working out of these plagues, *cf.* xvi.

XV. 1. Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ μέγα καὶ [a] θαυμαστόν, ἀγγέλους ἑπτὰ ἔχοντας πληγὰς ἑπτὰ τὰς ἐσχάτας, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς [b] ἐτελέσθη ὁ [c] θυμὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2. καὶ εἶδον ὡς θάλασσαν [d] ὑαλίνην μεμιγμένην πυρί, καὶ τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ [e] θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τοῦ [e] ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ἑστῶτας [f] ἐπὶ τὴν [g] θάλασσαν τὴν [g] ὑαλίνην, ἔχοντας [h] κιθάρας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. καὶ [i] ᾄδουσι τὴν ᾠδὴν [k] Μωυσέως τοῦ [l] δούλου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου, [m] λέγοντες,

a *Cf.* Exod. xv. 11.
b x. 7.
c vi. 17, xi. 18.
d iv. 6, same scene (*cf.* ver, 7) substantially.
e xiii. 17, xiv. 11.
f Elsewhere in Apoc. (v. 13, vii. 1, x. 2, 5, 8) ἐπὶ τῆς θ.
g *Cf.* use of *δρακόντων* in Ps. lxxiv. 14, LXX. (Apoc. xiii. 2, 11, and 1 Macc. iv. 6 f.).
h v. 8, xiv. 2.
i xiv. 3.
k On form, *cf.* Win. § 5, 20 c, Helbing, 59.
l *Cf.* Heb. iii. 5-6.
m From *Song of Three Child.* 4. For sequence of thought, see Jude, 5 f.

12 f., xix. 19, xvii. 1). Like ch. xvi., to which it forms an overture, xv. is not the revision of a Jewish source (so especially Spitta, Ménégoz, and Schmidt) but Christian (Briggs, Erbes) and the work of the Apocalyptist himself (Sabatier, Schön, Bousset, etc.)

Vv. 2-4. An interlude like xix. 1 f. The manifestation of divine judgment (4) evokes reverence (contrast xvi. 11) and praise from the saints in heaven.

Ver. 2. **νικ. ἐκ κ.τ.λ.**, "those who came off conquerors from"—another pregnant use of **ἐκ** (*cf.* ii. 21, viii. 11) combining the ideas of victory over (*cf.* on ii. 7) and deliverance from. A possible Latinism (*cf.* Livy viii. 8, uictoriam ferre ex aliquo; xlv. 38, aliquis est Romae qui triumphari de Macedonis nolit?)? The prophet paints the downfall of the Roman persecutor in terms of the Jewish tradition preserved, *e.g.*, in Targ. Jerus. (on Exod. xii. 42) which singled out four memorable nights, that of the creation, that on which God's promise of a son came to Abram, that of the tenth Egyptian plague, and that on which the world is ended (when Moses appears in a cloud from the wilderness and messiah in a cloud from Rome, led by the Word of the Lord). *Cf.* Schemoth Rabba on Exod. xii. 2: ex quo Deus mundum suum elegit, determinauit principium mensis redemptionis, quo liberati sunt Israelitae ex Aegypto, et quo liberabuntur futuro saeculo. In time as well as in method (*cf.* on viii. 6, and 1 Cor. x. 1-11) the two redemptions, Mosaic and messianic, are to correspond.—**πυρί**, a truly Red sea, red with the glow of God's wrath. Like Pharaoh and his host (Exod. xv. 5, 10=Apoc. xviii. 21) the persecutors of God's people in these latter days not only fail to effect their purpose, but are themselves destroyed by God's vengeance (*cf.* xvi. 2). The faithful get through their sea of troubles, resisting threats and persuasions, and now stand safe at (*i.e.*, on the shore of) the heavenly sea. "Duteous mourning we fulfil / In God's name; but by God's will / Doubt not the last word is still / victory" (D. G. Rossetti). Here, as at xii. 11 the thrill of triumph is enhanced by the fearful odds against which the saints had to contend. Apparently the world is now tenanted by pagans only, God's faithful having been removed. Hence the plagues are all-embracing (contrast vii. 1 f.). *Cf.* xx. 4.

Ver. 3. As in Exod. xiv.-xv. Moses leads Israel in a song of praise to God over the dead Egyptians, so, after Rome's downfall (xiv. 8 f., ver. 2) the faithful are led by their captain (xii. 11, xiv. 1, 4, *cf.* Heb. ii. 12), in a chant of triumph and gratitude. (Note the lack of any reference to their own sufferings. Their interest is in the great work of God.) For messiah as a second Moses in Jewish tradition, *cf.* Gfrörer, ii. 328 f. The song on the Red Sea had already been adapted to the worship of the Therapeutae (Philo, *de uit. contempl.* § xi.)—**τὴν ᾠδὴν τ. ἀ.** There is a continuity in redemption, which unites the first deliverance to the final. True to his cardinal idea of the identity of God's people (Christians being the real Israel, *cf.* on i. 6), the prophet hails Jesus as the Christian Moses who, at the cost of his life, is commissioned by God to deliver the new Israel from their bondage to an earthly monarchy. The lyric with its Hebrew parallelisms is a *Vorspiel* of the succeeding judgments; it resembles (*cf. E.Bi.* 4954) the benediction after the Shema of Judaism ("a new song did they sing to Thy name, they that were delivered, by the seashore; together did all praise and own Thee as King, saying, 'Yahveh shall reign world without end'"), and is al-

"Μεγάλα καὶ [n] θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου,
Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ [o] παντοκράτωρ·
[p] δίκαιαι [q] καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ [r] ὁδοί σου,
ὁ [s] βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν.[1]
4. [s] τίς οὐ μὴ [t] φοβηθῇ, Κύριε, καὶ δοξάσει τὸ ὄνομά σου;
ὅτι μόνος [u] ὅσιος·
ὅτι [v] πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἥξουσι καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν [w] ἐνώπιόν σου·
[x] ὅτι τὰ δικαιώματά σου ἐφανερώθησαν."

n ver. 1, 1 Chron. xvi. 8-12, etc.
o i. 8.
p From Ps. cxlv. 17. Zech. viii. 8 LXX, Dan. iii. 27-28, iv. 37.
q *Cf.* on xvi. 7.
r Deut. xxxii. 4, Isa. xxvi. 8, LXX, *cf. Sam. Agon.* 293 f.
s From Jer. x. 6-7 (om. LXX), Zech. xiv. 9; *cf.* on xi. 18. An instance of Col. iii. 16.
t aor. due to "emphat. negative or rhetorical nat. of question" (Burton, 172, *cf.* Lk. xviii. 7).
u only here and xvi. 5 (N.T.) of God; *cf.* Deut. xxxii. 4, Ps. Sol. x. 6. From Ps. cxlv. 17.
v Ps. lxxxvi. 9, Mic. vii. 15 f.
w iii. 5, xvi. 9.
x = "Because;" δικ. = xix. 8 (diff. sense).

[1] The **αγιων** of the Textus Rec. represents a tr. of *sctorum* (a corruption of *sclorum*) = **εθνων** of ℵ[ca]APQ, min., Me., Arm., Aeth., And., Areth., Cypr., Amb., Pr. (edd.), which has been conformed, in **αιωνων** (ℵ*C, vg., Syr., S., so Selwyn, WH), to 1 Tim. i. 17 (*cf.* En. ix. 4, Tob. xiii. 6, 10, Clem. Rom. lv., lxi.).

most entirely composed of O.T. phrases. Adoration is its theme, stirred by the sense of God's justice. Similarly the famous hymn to Shamash, the Assyrian god of justice, which represents one of the highest reaches in ancient religious literature (Jastrow, pp. 300, 301): "Eternally just in the heavens are thou, / Of faithful judgment towards all the world art thou." Most editors take the phrase **καὶ τὴν ᾠδ. τ. ἀ.** as a gloss; but if the song has nothing to do with the Lamb, it is as silent on Moses. Since the whole section comes from the pen of the general author, and since the collocation of the two **ᾠδαί** (equivalent of course to a single hymn) is awkward mainly in appearance, while the omission of the *Lamb's Song* would leave the section incomplete, it seems better to regard it as original rather than as a scribe's addition like xiv. 10, etc. As in xiv. 1, 3, the Lamb is among his followers, yet not of them.

Ver. 4. God's holiness is the reason why his name must be feared and magnified, especially when its effects are visible in the reverent homage of all nations to God (a hyperbolical statement in view of xvi. 9, etc.) at the sight of his "deeds of judgment" (**δικαιώματα** = judicial sentences, here of condemnation and penalty) inflicted on the world (*cf.* Dan. ix. 14 f.). The absolute and unique (note the prophet's insertion of **μόνος**) reign of Yahveh was a traditional tenet of Mosaism; indeed for Orientals generally the power which formed their ideal source of righteousness and justice partook necessarily of a monarchic character (*R. S.* 74 f.). To the Semites it appeared that the perfection of their god as a just king formed a ground for his ultimate sovereignty over the nations of the world. The O.T. outlook and the phraseology warn us not to press the poetical language too closely here; otherwise (*cf.* xiv. 6, 7) it would contradiet, *e.g.*, the characteristic idea of the author that the bowl-plagues, instead of producing penitence and submission, ended in defiant blasphemy.—**ἐνώπιόν σου**, here a reverential periphrasis, it being considered in the later O.T. literature, the Targums, and the N.T. (occasionally) more respectful to worship and pray *before* the royal god than directly *to* him (Dalman, i. viii. 5). For the whole conception of this dual song see Targ. Jonath. on Isa. xxvi. 1 and Targ. Schir Haschirim i. 1; the latter reckons ten songs altogether, (1) Adam's at his forgiveness, (2) that of Moses and the Israelites at the Red Sea, (3) that of the Israelites, when the spring of water was given them, (4) that of Moses at his death, (5) Joshua's at Gibeon, (6) that of Barak and Deborah, (7) Hannah's, (8) David's, (9) Solomon's, and (10) that which the children of the captivity are to sing when the Lord frees them. It tallies with this expectation that the new song of the Apocalypse (v. 9, xiv. 3) is always a song of Christ's redemption.

5. [y] καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ [z] ἠνοίγη ὁ ναὸς τῆς [a] σκηνῆς τοῦ [a] μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· 6. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ πληγὰς [b] ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, [c] ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον [1] καθαρὸν [d] λαμπρὸν καὶ [e] περιεζωσμένοι περὶ τὰ στήθη ζώνας χρυσᾶς. 7. καὶ ἓν ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζῴων ἔδωκε τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις ἑπτὰ [f] φιάλας χρυσᾶς [g] γεμούσας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ [h] τοῦ ζῶντος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. 8. καὶ [i] ἐγεμίσθη ὁ ναὸς καπνοῦ ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ· [k] καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἄχρι τελεσθῶσιν αἱ ἑπτὰ [l] πληγαὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων.

XVI. 1. Καὶ ἤκουσα μεγάλης [a] φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ λεγούσης τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις, "Ὑπάγετε καὶ [b] ἐκχέετε τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν [c] γῆν." 2. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ ἐγένετο [d] ἕλκος κακὸν καὶ πονηρὸν [e] ἐπὶ [f] τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου

y Fresh stage in vision, see on iv. 1.
z already in xi. 19.
a See Acts vii. 44 (only).
b xiv. 15, 17.
c xix. 8, 14.
d *cf.* Acts x. 30 (i. 10).
e Gold belts, as i. 13.
f v. 8 f.
g xiv. 10, Ezek. xxii. 31.
h i. xviii.; *cf.* on vii. 2.
i Isa. vi. 4.
k Exod. xix. 21, xl. 34-35, 1 Kings viii. 10-11, also 2 Chron. vii. 2. (*cf.* 2 Chron. vii. 3 with ver. 2 above and iv. 10).
l ver. 1

a Of God (Isa. lxvi. 6), *cf.* xv. 8. b For form, *cf.* Win. § 13, 23. c viii. 5, Jer. x. 25, *Zeph.* iii. 8, Ps. lxix. 24. d Exod. ix. 10-11, Deut. xxviii. 35, Job ii. 7, Luke xvi. 21. e *Cf.* Luke i. 65, iii. 2. f xiii. 15-17, xiv. 9-10.

[1] For the **λινον** (**λινους** ℵ, **λινουν** min., Lat.) of PQ, Syr., S., And., Arm., Areth., etc. (Al., Ws., Ti., Bs., Bj., Sw.), Lach., Tr., Düst., WH, Sp. read the transcriptional (**ΛΙΘΟΝ** for **ΛΙΝΟΝ**) error **λιθον** AC, 38 mg., 48, 90, etc. (from LXX of Ezek. xxviii. 13 ?—**λινον** being commonly used of flax, not of flaxen garments. *Cf.* Nestle's *Einf.*, 263).

xv. 5-xvi. 1: the introduction to the seven bowls or plagues.

Ver. 5. The temple in heaven is here "the tent (or tabernacle) of witness," as it represents God's judicial revelation and presence; its contents and the movements of which it forms the source, are evidence of God's covenant with his people.

Ver. 6. These heavenly beings are magnificent creatures, robed in gold and light (a Hellenic conception, Dieterich, 38 f.) and linen (to denote their honourable and sacred office: so the scribe of judgment, Ezek. ix. 2, and the angel in Dan. x. 5, xii. 6). Plutarch (*de Iside*, 3, 4) explains that the linen surplice was affected by Egyptian votaries of Isis for religious reasons; *e.g.*, the bright smiling colour of flax, its freedom from lice, and the smooth, cleanly material it yielded.

Vv. 7, 8. The **φιάλαι**, shallow bowls or saucers, do not exhale a smoke (like the censer of viii. 4) grateful to God; they are filled with poisonous, hot, bitter wine, while the smoke pours from the divine majesty, whose intense holiness (ver. 4, as in O.T. theophanies) is breaking out in judgments against human sin (**δόξα**=the divine **δύναμις** in action or expression). Smouldering fires of indignation are now on the point of bursting into punishment from the arsenal of anger. Hence, till the plagues are over, God's presence is unendurable (as in Enoch xiv. 18 f.). This emphasis on the unapproachable, austere majesty of God is consonant with the general religious feeling reflected in the Apocalypse (*cf.* on i. 2).

Chapter XVI.—Vv. 2-21.—The series (first three **εἰς**, last four **ἐπὶ**) of these plagues as usual consists of four and three; the former, as in the seals, affecting earth (*i.e.*, votaries of the Imperial cultus), sea, waters, and the sun. The special object of the writer in this passage (*i.e.*, to introduce the doom of Rome and the worshippers of the Emperor) leads him to vary the materials drawn from the Egyptian plagues which had been already used in the corresponding series of the trumpet-visions (viii.-ix.) by defining precisely the victims of the first plague as worshippers of the Beast, by substituting the throne and realm of the Beast in the fifth plague for mankind in general, in the sixth by connecting the Parthian invasion with the Beast

καὶ [f] τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ. 3. [g] καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· [h] καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα [i] ψυχὴ ζωῆς ἀπέθανεν, [k] τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. 4. καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ [l] εἰς τοὺς ποταμοὺς καὶ τὰς [l] πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων· καὶ [m] ἐγένετο αἷμα. 5. καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ [n] ἀγγέλου τῶν [n] ὑδάτων λέγοντος,

"[o] Δίκαιος εἶ,
[p] ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν, ὁ [q] ὅσιος,
[r] ὅτι ταῦτα ἔκρινας·
6. ὅτι [s] αἷμα [1] [t] ἁγίων καὶ [t] προφητῶν [s] ἐξέχεαν,
καὶ αἷμα αὐτοῖς ἔδωκας [u] πεῖν·
[v] ἄξιοί εἰσιν."

7. καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος,

"Ναί, [w] Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ [x] παντοκράτωρ,
[y] ἀληθιναὶ καὶ δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις σου."

g Exod. vii. 17, 21, *cf.* En. lx. 16.
h xi. 6. The whole, not a third (as in viii. 8-9).
i Gen. i. 30 (LXX); *cf.* Win. § 22, 18*b*.
k *Cf.* Suet. *Calig.* 49. Irreg. oppos. to ψ.
l viii. 10 f., Exod. vii. 19-24, Ps. lxxvii. 44.
m Verg. *Georg.* i. 485.
n John v. 4; of wind (Apoc. vii. 1) of fire (xiv. 18).
o Ps. cxix. 137 f. cxlv. 17; *cf.* Job, xxxvii. 23.
p xi. 17.
q (vocative), *cf.* xv. 4; of Jesus, Heb. vii. 26.
r God's rights, shown in judgments, Ps. Sol. ii. 16 f., 38 f., viii. 27, etc.
s xvii. 6, xix. 2. Ps. lxxix. 2-3, Is. xlix. 26, Sib. Or. iii. 212, Ps. Sol. viii. 23).
t xi. 18, xviii. 24.
u *Cf.* John iv. 7, 9; for form in papyri, *cf.* Deissmann, 182-3, Helbing, 11.
v iii. 4; from Sap. xviii. 4 (of Egyptians), asyndeton = "as they deserve".
w Rare (xi. 17, xv. 3) use of vocative in Apoc.
x xv. 3.
y xix. 1-2, Ps. xix. 9: ἀληθ. = just, synonym for δικ. as John viii. 16, Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6, 26, So below, xix. 2, and Isa. lix. 4, LXX.

[1] The Hebraistic (= דמים) αιματα of ℵ, 36, 39 is preferred here and at xviii. 24 by Ti., Bs., Swete.

itself, in the seventh by introducing Rome's fall among the physical disasters, and in the prologue by making the plagues come from God's initiative without intercession (as viii. 3 f.). How far these new touches are original or due to the influence of current traditions no longer extant, it is impossible to determine. This series of plagues is simply a free adaptation, with modifications and applications, of that in viii.-ix.; the prophet wishes to emphasise, by the genuinely Semitic method of recapitulation (*cf.* Gen. xli. 32; Ps. lxii. 11, etc.), the sure and speedy approach of judgment.

Ver. 2. The sixth Egyptian plague, "a noisome and painful ulcer" (the punishment of the impious and rebellious, according to Philo, *de Execr.* v. 6) breaks out on the adherents of the Cæsar-cult.

Ver. 3. "Coagulated blood," fatal to animal life (as in first Egyptian plague). This plague is final, as compared, *e.g.*, with that of viii. 8.

Vv. 4-7. No more drinking water. The justice of this particular plague is acknowledged by (5-6) the angel of the element in question and by (7) the altar (personified here, in line of vi. 9, 10, and viii. 3, or of xiv. 18), which echoes the angel's cry.

Ver. 5. **ὅσιος** and **δίκαιος** are used together of God in hieratic inscriptions of dedication throughout Asia Minor, possibly under Jewish influence. **Δίκαιος**, often a title of messiah (see on iii. 1 and Beer's note on En. xxxviii. 2), is reserved here for God. Retribution is the outcome of God's intense holiness or majesty (*cf.* vi. 10, xv. 4) asserting itself on behalf of his people (xv. 3, xix. 2, *cf.* iii. 7) and in self-vindication.

Ver. 6. The retribution once threatened on Jerusalem and the Jews (Matt. xxiii. 35) is now transferred apparently to Rome, the later antagonist of the faith (*cf.* on xviii. 24). Once the Romans made Christian blood run like water. Now, by the irony of providence, they shall find nothing but blood to drink. This moral vengeance (*cf.* Hawthorne's *House of the Seven Gables*), with its grim equivalence between sin and sin's punishment (xi. 18, xiii. 10, xviii. 7; *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 12, etc.) is not pushed, however, into the grotesque and elaborately Dantesque details, *e.g.*, of the Apocalypse of Peter.—**ἐξέχεαν** (the verb runs all through this chapter, and this chapter only), *cf.* Dittenberger's *Sylloge Inscript. Graec.* 816[7] (1 cent. A.D.) **ἐγχέαντας τὸ ἀναίτιον αἷμα ἀδίκως**.—**ἁγ. κ. πρ.**, all

8. καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ἥλιον· καὶ [z] ἐδόθη [a] αὐτῷ [b] καυματίσαι [c] τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐν πυρί· 9. καὶ ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι [d] καῦμα μέγα, καὶ [e] ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τὰς πληγὰς ταύτας, καὶ οὐ μετενόησαν [f] δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν. 10. καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν [g] θρόνον τοῦ θηρίου· καὶ ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ [h] ἐσκοτωμένη· καὶ [i] ἐμασῶντο τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν [k] ἐκ τοῦ [l] πόνου 11. καὶ ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν θεὸν [m] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκ τῶν [l] πόνων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑλκῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ [n] μετενόησαν [n] ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν. 12. καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ [o] τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν μέγαν [o] Εὐφράτην· [p] καὶ [q] ἐξηράνθη τὸ ὕδωρ [p] αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἑτοιμασθῇ ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου. 13. καὶ εἶδον [r] ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ [s] ψευδοπροφήτου πνεύματα [t] τρία [u] ἀκάθαρτα, ὡς [v] βάτραχοι· 14. εἰσὶ γὰρ πνεύματα δαιμονίων [w] ποιοῦντα σημεῖα ἃ ἐκπορεύεται ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς

z Constr. vi. 4, etc.
a *i.e.* the sun.
b Contrast vii. 16 with this scorching.
c generic, or with ref. to 2, 6.
d vii. 16; ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.
e ix. 20-21.
f Inf. of conceived result or tendency (Burton, 371), *cf.* v. 5; usually with ὥστε. The hope of xiv. 6 f., xv. 4 is disappointed.

g xiii. 2; = kingdom, Prov. xvi. 12, xx. 28, xxv. 5.
h viii. 12, Ps. cv. 28, Exod. x. 21 f.
i Sc. οἱ τῆς βασ.; *cf.* Apoc. Pet. 28-29.
k = ἀπό Mt. xvi. 26.
l xxi. 4, Just. *Apol.* i. 8.
m xi. 13, Dan. ii. 19.
n ii. 21-22.
o ix. 14; see Gen. xv. 18, Deut. i. 7, etc. On abs. of article, *cf.* Win. § 15, 5*b*, § 20, 9*c*.
p *Cf.* Josh. iii. 17, *Zech.* x. 11.
q Isa. xi. 15, xliv. 27.
r Position of phrase "one of several traces of a tendency to attempt the rhetorical order of ordinary Greek" (Sx.). Dragon here seen by seer for first time (*cf.* xii. 1, xiii. 1).
s xiii. 11.
t Contrast to three angels of xiv. 6 f.?
u Mark i. 26, etc.
v For frogs as specially odious agents of Ahriman, *cf.* Plut. *de Iside*, 46; source of plagues and death (*SBE.* iv. 203). For irreg. constr., *cf.* ἔχων in xiv. 14.
w xiii. 13, xix. 20, Matt. xxiv. 24, 2 Th. ii. 9.

prophets are ἅγιοι, but all ἅγιοι are not prophets.

Ver. 9. Failure to honour the true God, a note of the heathen spirit (as in xi. 13, xiv. 7; Rom. i. 28). See Introd., § 6. For the general idea, *cf.* 2 Clem. ix.: "while we have opportunity of being healed, let us give ourselves over to God the healer, giving him a recompense. And what recompense? Repentance from a sincere heart. . . . Let us give him eternal praise."

Vv. 10-11. The ninth Egyptian plague of darkness (due to the eclipse, *cf.* viii. 12?) falls on Rome, aggravating the previous pains of the Romans (ver. 2) and driving them into exasperation and fresh blasphemy instead of repentance. The repetition of 11 *b*, after 9, is characteristic of Oriental impressiveness (*cf.* Jer. xxx. 2, xxxi. 1, etc.), but it sums up the effect of the first four plagues.

Vv. 12-16. To facilitate the invasion of the empire (xvii. 12, 16) by the Parthians (ix. 14 f.) under Nero redivivus (*cf.* xix. 19), as in 4 Esd. xiii. 43-47 to let the ten tribes return in safety from captivity, the Euphrates is to be dried up in the latter days, like the Jordan before Joshua or the Euphrates itself when Cyrus captured Babylon (Herod. i. 191).

Ver. 13. **βάτραχοι**, perhaps a reminiscence of the second Egyptian plague, but probably an Iranian touch; the frog was a special agent of Ahriman in the final contest (*cf.* reff., *H. J.* 1904, 352, and Hübschmann, 230, 231). According to Artemidorus (ii. 15) frogs represent **γοήτας καὶ βωμολόχους**, and they were naturally associated with serpents (*cf.* Plut. *Pyth.* 12) as amphibious.

Ver. 14. "They are (not, these are) spirits of daemons". These devilish imps muster God's opponents to the final conflict. The fierce invasion of *the kings of the east* seems to give an impetus to *the kings of the world*. Antichrist's power extends to these (*cf.* xi. 10). "As the Lord sent his apostles to all the nations, so shall he (*i.e.*, Antichrist) send false apostles" (Hippol. vi. *cf. A. C.* 188 f.). The sources of the tradition lie in *Addit. Esther*, xi. 6 f., where the two dragons cry, and at their summons all nations gather to do battle against the righteous nation; also in the belief that Israel's foes muster against her in the latter days (xvii. 14, xix. 17-20,

x xvii. 14, xix. 19-21.
y Only here (*cf.* i. 10, vi. 17?) in Apoc.
z Ver. 7.
a iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20.
b iii. 3, 1 Th. v. 2.
c iii. 18; *cf.* Lk. xii. 36-37.

οἰκουμένης ὅλης, συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς [x] εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς [y] ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ [z] παντοκράτορος. [15. "Ἰδοὺ [a] ἔρχομαι[1] ὡς [b] κλέπτης. μακάριος ὁ γρηγορῶν καὶ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ [c] γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ βλέπωσι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ."] 16. καὶ [d] συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον [e] Ἑβραϊστὶ [f] Ἁρμαγεδών.[2] 17. καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν [g] ἀέρα· καὶ ἐξῆλθε φωνὴ μεγάλη ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου

d Sc. δαιμόνια. e ix. 11. f *Cf.* *SC* 263 f: = הַר מְגִדּוֹ; Megiddo, a classic scene of rout for Israel's foes (*cf.* xix. 11, 14 = Judg. v. 20), like the plain of Chaeronea, an Ἄρεως ὀρχήστρα.
g ix. 2 (*Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, i. 252 f. and Rohde's *Psyche*, 415 f., 548 f., 609 f.), haunt and home of spirits, etc., Philo, *de gig.* § 2, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12, Yasht. xiii. 12-13, and Plut., *de Iside* 26.

[1] The variant ερχεται (א*, 38, 47, S., Pr.) is an attempt to smooth out the abruptness of this interjected warning, which echoes the synoptic tradition rather than the Jewish law that it was a deadly offence for a priest to lack "complete and clean apparel" (Sanh., 83, 1, *cf.* Selwyn, 197). The extreme awkwardness of the verse in its present setting suggests that it is an interpolation or misplaced gloss, which has crept into the text owing to the above association of ideas (so, *e.g.*, Vischer, Spitta, Schön, Völter, Rauch, Weyland, von Soden, Simcox, Briggs). Beza transferred it to precede iii. 18, Könnecke (*Emendationen zu Stellen N.T.*, 35-37) to between iii. 3*a* and 3*b*, when it would complete the ἰδού series of ii. 22, iii. 9, 20.

[2] Αρ Μαγεδων (אA, min., And., Ar.) is preferred by WH (313) and Swete.

xx. 7-10; after Ezek. xxxviii-xxxix.; Zech. xiv. 2 f.; En. lvi, xc.; Sib. Or. iii. 310-322, 663-674). In Asc. Isa. iv. Beliar, in the guise of Nero, comes "and with him all the powers of this world, and they will hearken to him in all that he desires" (*cf.* below on xvii. 13, 17). These demonic spirits are not crushed till the day of judgment (En. xvi. 1 ἕως τῆς κρίσεως τῆς μεγάλης, Jub. x., Matt. viii. 29). The three locusts which issne from the mouth of the Beast in Hermas, *Vis.* iv. 1. 6, belong to the conception of Apoc. ix. 1.

Ver. 16. A double thread of tradition is woven into this strand of prophecy, (*a*) that of a last conflict of the world-powers with God and the messianic people (*cf.* xvii. 14, xix. 19) and (*b*) that of Rome's ruin by the Parthians under Nero redivivus. The two were originally distinct, but the apocalyptist naturally twists them together, although he never clears up their relationship. Here 13-16 is an enigmatic summary of what is variously depicted further on. But, though an erratic block in its present setting, it may have been placed here by the final editor, in his characteristically proleptic manner. Strictly speaking, the sixth plague is confined to ver. 12.—Ἁρμαγεδών, where the messianic Josiah will triumph, is (*a*) either to be located in mythology rather than in geography, as a mount where the final conflict of the gods is to be fought out (so fallen angels in En. vi. 5, 6 at mount Hermon)— in which case the phrase is a survival of some apocalyptic myth no longer intelligible to John (Gunkel, Bousset)—or (*b*) to be taken as an allusion to the hills near the plain (in the light of Judges v. 18, 19, iv. 6, 12, 14; Ezek. xxxviii. 8, 21, xxxix. 2, 17). By gematria the name is equivalent to רומה הגדולה (Ewald, Hausrath), but neither this nor the proposal to take הַר as a corruption of עִיר (city, so Hitzig, Hilgenfeld, Forbes), much less of עֲרָא (Aram. = ארץ, Völter), is natural. *Cf.* for further etymological and mythological suggestions, Nestle (Hastings, *D. B.* ii. 304, 305), Cheyne (*E. Bi.* i. 310, 311), and Legge and Cheyne in *Proc. Society of Bibl. Arch.* 1900, ii. 2. Bruston's interpretation (Ερμα = ἀνάθεμα, Γεδᾶν, *cf.* Num. xiv. 45, xxi. 3; Judges xx. 45) is far-fetched, but there may be some link between this obscure fragment of tradition and the cycle of Gog and Magog (*cf.* Cheyne in *E. Bi.* ii. 1747, 1748).

17-21: the seventh bowl and plague as the climax of all.

Ver. 17. The temple (xi. 19) and the throne (viii. 3) are again blended in one scene. In Isa. lxvi. 6 the divine ven-

λέγουσα, "[h] Γέγονε". 18. καὶ [i] ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαί καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ [k] σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας, [l] οἷος οὐκ ἐγένετο ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τηλικοῦτος σεισμὸς οὕτω μέγας. 19. καὶ [m] ἐγένετο ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη [m] εἰς τρία μέρη, καὶ αἱ πόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔπεσαν· καὶ [n] Βαβυλὼν ἡ [n] μεγάλη [o] ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, δοῦναι αὐτῇ τὸ [p] ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ [q] θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. 20. [r] καὶ πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγε, καὶ [s] ὄρη οὐχ εὑρέθησαν. 21. καὶ [t] χάλαζα μεγάλη ὡς [u] ταλαντιαία καταβαίνει ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· καὶ [v] ἐβλασφήμησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θεὸν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς τῆς χαλάζης· ὅτι [w] μεγάλη ἐστὶν ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς σφόδρα.

h xxi. 6, *cf.* Ezek. xxxix. 8.
i iv. 5.
k viii. 5, xi. 13, 19, Jer. xxiii. 19.
l From Ass. Mos. viii. 1, Dan. xii. 1, *cf.* Matt. xxiv. 21 and Shaks. *Jul. C.* i. 3.
m *Cf.* Win. § 29, 2*b*.
n Jer. li. 58, Dan. iv. 30. o xviii. 5, Acts x. 31. The false concord ἐμν. δοῦναι is due to writer's loose use of infin., *cf.* ver. 9. p Isa. li. 17, Jer. xxv. 15. q *Cf.* xiv. 8, 10. r vi. 14, xx. 11. s Judith, xvi. 15, Sir. xvi. 19, etc. t Exod. ix. 18-25, Ezek. xiii. 11, Sib. iii. 690 f. u ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.; figur. = "colossal". v verr. 9-11. w μέγας for the fifth time in 17-21.

geance is heralded by φωνὴ ἐκ ναοῦ, φωνὴ Κυρίου ἀνταποδιδόντος ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις.

Ver. 18. The conventional storm-theophany brings on an exceptionally severe earthquake, which (ver. 19) shatters Jerusalem into three parts and entirely overthrows the pagan cities. Rome's more awful ruin is attributed in xvii. 16 to the invasion of Oriental hordes (*cf.* xvi. 12); here the allusion to her downfall is proleptic (= xvii. 2, xviii. 6 f.), as a climax to the foregoing catastrophe. Probably *the great city* is Jerusalem (so *e.g.*, Andr., Bengel, Simcox, B. Weiss, J. Weiss), as in xi. 8. She is distinguished from the Gentile cities as Rome also is singled out from her allies and adherents. Being primarily guilty, Rome-Babylon is reserved for a special fate. The whole passage is enigmatic and obscure. Did the earthquake destroy the inhabitants of Jerusalem? and why? The allusion must be to some form of the tradition underlying xi. 1-13 and xiv. 18-20, or to that of Zech. xiv. 4, 5. Both earthquakes and invasions had been combined already in the O.T. eschatology (*cf.* Isa. xiii. 13 f.; Hag. ii. 21 f.); both perils were real, at this period; and, in delineating both dangers with a free, poetic imagination, the prophet aims as usual at impressiveness rather than at any systematic regularity. For earthquakes in Jerusalem, *cf.* G. A. Smith's *Jerusalem*, i. pp. 61 f.—ἐμνήσθη: neither magnificence nor age wins oblivion for an empire's crimes against the moral order.

Ver. 20. Here, as at vi. 14, the removal of hills tallies with the Iranian belief (shared by later Jewish Christian apocalyptic, *cf.* Böklen, 131 f.) that mountains as the work of Ahriman would disappear with him (*S. B. E.* v. 129), leaving the earth in its ideal state of a smooth plane on which mankind could dwell in unity of speech and intercourse, free from barriers. The collocation of mountain and island (so vi. 14) is possibly a relic of the ancient point of view, for which (*i.e.*, for dwellers in the West) these formed the apparent source of the sun's rising, where his light first became visible.

Ver. 21. Even an abnormal hail-shower (*cf.* the fourth Egyptian plague) fails to bring pagans to their senses. ὡς ταλ., *i.e.*, literally about sixty times the weight of even the enormous hailstones (μνααῖαι) which Diodorus Siculus (xix. 45) records. In En. lx. 17 the "spirit of the hail is a good angel," *i.e.*, amenable to God's orders.

The obscurity of chapter xvii. springs mainly from the differences of tradition and outlook which are reflected in the canonical text. The threefold interpretation of the Beast as the Imperial power (so xiii.), as Nero redivivus (ver. 8) and as (11) the eighth king (the two latter being applications of the same idea) is accompanied by a twofold explanation of the seven heads (geographical = 9, historical = 10), and of the woman's support (1, 3, 15). The eschatological tradition of Babylon as the supreme anti-divine world-power is applied to Rome, and this involves the re-interpretation of some details (*e.g.* 15, 18), while the tradition of the Beast as antichrist is further overlaid by the special tradition of Nero redivivus in that capacity. This dual Beast (as Völter first recognised; *cf.* Charles's *Ascensio Isaiæ*, pp. lx.-lxi.) is not merely the Imperial power (as in xiii. 3) but incarnate

a xxi. 9.

XVII. 1. Καὶ ἦλθεν εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας, καὶ [a] ἐλάλησε μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων "Δεῦρο, δείξω σοι τὸ

in an Imperial personality of infernal and supernatural character, which attacks not only the Christian messiah (14) but Rome itself (16-17). The latter trait is unmistakably due to the legend of Nero redivivus, apart from which the oracle is unintelligible. Such variations have left traces in the structure of the passage, which point to some process of editorial revision, but it is difficult to disentangle the original source or sources, or even to determine their precise character and period. Ver. 14 is certainly out of place, for the allies of the Beast could not destroy Rome after they themselves had been destroyed by the messiah and his allies. It is thus either proleptic or inserted by the Christian writer in his (Jewish) source (so *e.g.*, Vischer, Charles, Briggs, von Soden). Other traces of this editor might be found in 6 *b*, 8 (9 *a* ?), and 15, and the Jewish character of the source (so Vischer, Weyland, Schmidt, Sabatier, Ménégoz, etc.), would be confirmed by the absence of any polemic against the Imperial cultus. It would be a Vespasianic oracle, inspired by a passion for revenge on Rome for her cruel, recent treatment of the Jewish people. When the source is regarded as Christian (as *e.g.*, by Erbes, Völter, and Schön), ver. 11 would be an addition inserted under Domitian to bring it up to date (so Harnack, *Texte u. Unters.* II. iii. 134 f.; *Chronologie*, 245, 246, followed by Briggs, Gunkel, J. Weiss, etc.; *cf.* Introd. § 7). But even so, the structure of the passage is involved. Vv. 9-11 are not vision but calculation or exposition (*cf.* xiii. 18). The *waters* of ver. 15 are never seen (*cf.* 1, 3), and the professed explanation (ver. 7) follows a loose order (beast = 8, heads = 9-11, horns = 12-14, waters = 15, horns again = 16-17, and finally the woman = 18). The reference to the woman, however, is thrown late in order to introduce the following doom-song (*cf.* *kings* in 18, xviii. 3, 9, and *great* in 18, xviii. 2), and a similar motive accounts for the irregular position of 16-17 after 14, Rome's fall, though viewed from different angles, being the main object before the writer's mind at the moment. The defeat of 14 is taken up, in its true position, afterwards (xix. 11-21). Ver. 15 (an echo of xvi. 19 *b*) is probably thrown in at this point, to contrast dramatically the revolt [16] of Rome's supporters against her. Thus, except for 9-11, there are sufficient psychological reasons to account partially for the order and contents of the oracle; but source-criticism is required to clear up the passage, in the more or less extensive theories of one source (edited in 6, 9 *a*, 14-15, so J. Weiss; or variously in 8, 12-14, with some words in 6, 9, 11, so *e.g.* Pfleiderer, Baljon, Bousset and Forbes) or even two sources (Jewish, A = 3-4, 6 *b*-7, 10, B = 11-13, 16 *b*-17, Wellhausen's *Analyse*, 26 f.), for which the linguistic idiosyncrasies (double use of γέμειν, 3-4, precedence of object over verb 13, 16, 18, οἱ κ. τ. γ. 2, and the construction βλ. τ. θ. ὅτι ἦν, 8) afford some basis. The main problem is to explain how the various strata of tradition overlap; *e.g.*, in 8, 12 f., the beast is Nero redivivus, an infernal power of evil, whereas in 11 Domitian seems identified with Nero the beast. It is hard to believe that one and the same writer could simultaneously regard Domitian as a second Nero and expect Nero redivivus as a semi-supernatural power. In any case the stress falls on the Beast rather than on the woman, and on the eschatological prediction, not on the historical application. It is a fairly open question whether 8 or 11 is the editorial mortar super-imposed upon the earlier tradition. Upon the whole, one of the least unsatisfactory solutions is to take 11 as a Domitianic gloss by the Christian editor, who has also added 6 *b* (if not all of 6) and 14 to a Vespasianic oracle (possibly of Jewish origin) in xvii. 4 f. which anticipated the downfall of persecuting Rome at the hands of Nero redivivus and his Eastern allies. No hypothesis is free from difficulties. But the general Domitianic reference of the Apocalypse and the presence of the Nero redivivus saga must be worked in somehow, and some hypothesis on the above lines seems to do most justice to the literary structure of this chapter as well as to the data of the book in general. It is impossible to determine how far the Christian editor worked over his source. That the difficulties of the oracle arise mainly from the presence of an earlier source (*cf.* Introd. § 7), which John has revised slightly and brought up to date, is axiomatic, however.

κρίμα τῆς [b] πόρνης τῆς μεγάλης, [c] τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ [d] ὑδάτων πολλῶν·

2. μεθ᾽ ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν
 [e] οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς,
καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν [f] οἱ [g] κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν
 ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς."

3. καὶ [h] ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς ἔρημον [i] ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ εἶδον γυναῖκα καθημένην ἐπὶ θηρίον [k] κόκκινον, γέμοντα ὀνόματα [1] βλασφημίας, ἔχον κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ κέρατα δέκα. 4. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν [l] περιβεβλημένη [m] πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον, καὶ [m] κεχρυσωμένη χρυσίῳ

b *Cf.* on xiv. 8.
c From Jer. li. 13.
d *i.e.* peoples (ver. 15).
e Visits of Herod, Tiridates, etc.
f Note irreg. change of constr., Win. § 22, 8.
g xiv. 8; omitting usual ἐπί.
h *Cf.* on xxi. 10.
i i. 10, iv. 2, xxi. 10.
k xviii. 12, 16; *cf.* Matt. xxvii. 28 (colour of Roman soldier's mantle).
l xii. 1.
m xviii. 16, ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.

[1] γεμον ονοματων (min., Hipp., S., And., Areth.) and γεμον ονοματα (ℵcQ, min., Bj.) seem corrections of the unusual (in this book) and harsh *constr. ad sensum* γεμοντα ονοματα ℵ*AP, Lach., Ti., WH, Sw., Bs. [γεμον τα ονοματα, as in ver. 4, Tr., Al., Düst., Ws.]: for the εχον of Q, 1, etc., Syr., And., Areth. (Lach., Al., Bj., Ws.), Ti., WH marg., Bs. read εχοντα (ℵP) and WH εχων (A, min.).

The double object of the oracle is (*a*), by a re-editing of the tradition of xiii. to represent Rome in her Imperial pride, before describing her downfall, and (*b*) to define more precisely the final appearance of the last foe. The chapter could readily be spared as isolated (Simcox), but this only proves that the author is again working upon disparate materials which he inherited. The oracle contains (1-6) a vision of the Harlot (by way of foil to xii. 1-6 and especially xxi. 9 f.) and the Beast, with (7-18) an explanation of the vision.

CHAPTER XVII.—Ver. 1. A fresh vision commences (*cf.* iv. 1), still punitive (xvi. 1), but with an exchange of angelic cicerones (as Slav. En. xxi.). The Beast which has already (in xiii.) done duty as the empire is now the support of the capital. Rome, personified (so Sib. Or. iii. 46-92, before 80 A.D.) as a feminine figure, rides on a beast of the same colour, like a Bacchante on the panther, or like the Syrian Astarte on a lion.

Ver. 2. Tyre's commercial intercourse with the nations (Isa. xxiii. 17) and Assyria's political intrigues, by which her statecraft fascinated and seduced other states (Nah. iii. 4) are both described by the same figure. Local and national cults, as a rule, were left undisturbed by the Romans; and indeed Oriental superstitions often reacted powerfully on Rome itself. But fresh conquests meant the extension of Rome's intoxicating and godless suzerainty.

Ver. 3. The wilderness was the traditional site of visions, but there may be an allusion here to Isa. xxi. 1 or even to the Roman Campagna (Erbes). The woman in xii. is in the desert to be delivered from the dragon; the woman here is in the desert to be destroyed by the Beast. κόκκινον "crimson or scarlet," = luxurious and haughty splendour (Mart. ii. 39; Juv. *Sat.* iii. 283 and xiv. 188 for purple). The Beast which in xiii. 1 bore the names of blasphemy upon its head, now wears them spread over all its body. Baldensperger (15-16) conjectures a similar reference to Rome in En. lii. (*seven* hills?); here at any rate the author is sketching the Roman Empire in its general magnificence and authority under the Cæsars, and the inconsistencies in his description (waters and wilderness, seat on waters, seat on the Beast) are natural to this style of fantastic symbolism. It is curious that no attack is directed against the polytheism of the Empire. *Cf.* Cebes' *Tabula*: "Do you see a woman sitting there with an inviting look, and in her hand a cup? She is called Deceit; by her power she beguiles all who enter life and makes them drink. And what is the draught? Deceit and ignorance." The mounting of divine figures on corresponding beasts is a Babylonian trait (*S. C.* 365).

Ver. 4. κεχρυσ. goes by an awkward zeugma with λίθῳ (collective) καὶ μαργαρίταις; "with ornaments of gold and precious stones and pearls" (like

καὶ [n] λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ [n] μαργαρίταις, ἔχουσα [o] ποτήριον [o] χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτῆς γέμον [p] βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς [q] πορνείας αὐτῆς, 5. καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῆς ὄνομα [r] γεγραμμένον ([s] Μυστήριον),[1] "Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, ἡ [t] μήτηρ τῶν πορνῶν καὶ τῶν βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς." 6. καὶ εἶδα τὴν γυναῖκα [u] μεθύουσαν ἐκ τοῦ [v] αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. καὶ [w] ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτὴν [w] θαῦμα μέγα. 7. καὶ εἶπέ μοι ὁ ἄγγελος, "Διατί ἐθαύμασας; ἐγὼ ἐρῶ σοι τὸ μυστήριον τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ βαστάζοντος αὐτὴν τοῦ ἔχοντος τὰς ἑπτὰ κεφαλὰς καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα. 8. τὸ θηρίον [x] ὃ εἶδες ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς [y] ἀβύσσου καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν [x] ὑπάγει. καὶ [z] θαυμασθήσονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τὸ [a] βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς [b] ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, [c] βλε-

n xviii. 12, 16, Ezek. xxviii. 13, 16.
o Jer. li. 7; cf. Milton's *Comus*, 67 f.
p xxi. 27, cf. Lev. xviii. 26-29, Sap. xii. 23-24 xiv. 11 (= customs of idolatry).
q *Cf.* Sap. xiv. 12.
r Sc. ἦν.
s 2 Th. ii. 7.
t Jer. l. 11-12.
u *Cf.* Isa. xxxiv. 17, xlix. 26.
v xviii. 24.
w ἅπ. λεγ. N.T. (contrast xiii. 3); for Attic ἐθαυμάσθην.
x Diabolic antithesis to divine figure of iv. 8.
y ix. 1.
z xiii. 3 (Blass, § 18, 3).
a iii. 5.
b xiii. 8.
c Irreg. gen. absol. or appos. to ὧν, as μελλ. Acts xxvi. 22.

[1] μυστηριον = the explanatory gloss of a reader, from ver. 7 (Könnecke, 37).

Ezekiel's doomed prince of Tyre). The harlot in *Test. Jud.* xiii. 5 was also decked ἐν χρυσίῳ καὶ μαργαρίταις and poured out wine for her victims. Rome is pronounced luxurious, licentious and loathsome. Here, as in the contemporary 4 Esd. iii. 2, 29, it is felt to be a mystery that prosperity and permanence should belong to a state flaunting its impiety and oppression, not merely enjoying but propagating vice.

Ver. 5. Roman *filles de joie* wore a label with their names thus (Juv. vi. 123). μυστήριον (which hardly belongs to the title itself) indicates that the name is to be taken πνευματικῶς (xi. 8), not literally; "a name written which is a symbol," or a mysteriously significant title.—μήτηρ κ.τ.λ., Rome, the natural focus of Oriental cults in general, is charged with fostering all the superstitious and vicious practices of her subjects.—βδελ. (partly justified by a perusal of Petronius and Apuleius) is an apt rebuke if it comes from the prophet of a religion which one Roman historian classed among the *atrocia aut pudenda* which disgraced the capital (Tacit. *Ann.* xv. 44).

Ver. 6. *Cf.* Nahum's "bloody city" (of Assyrian cruelty to prisoners, iii. 1), and for the metaphor Cic. *Phil.* ii. 24, 29, or Suet. *Tiberius*, 59, or Pliny, *H. N.* xiv. 28, "quo facile intelligatur ebrius jam sanguine ciuium, et tanto magis eum sitiens," also Jos. *Bell.* v. 8, 2. When a Jewish source is postulated, καὶ . . . Ἰησοῦ is bracketed (*e.g.*, by Vischer, Spitta, S. Davidson, Briggs, Charles and others) as from the hand of the later Christian editor, who here, as in xviii. 24 (Mommsen), is thinking of the condemnation of provincial prisoners to fight with gladiators or wild beasts in the arena of the capital. The ἅγιοι of the source would thus be defined as, or supplemented by, Christian martyrs. They are not contaminated, like the rest of men, but their purity is won at the expense of their life. The Jewish martyrs would be those killed in the war of 66-70, primarily. The whole verse, however, might be (*cf.* xviii. 24) editorial; it is the contaminations, rather than the cruelties, of Rome which absorb the interest of this oracle.

Vv. 7-18. An explanation of the vision, cautiously but clearly outlining the Nero-saga.

Ver. 8. As the Beast seen by the seer cannot be described as non-existent, it must denote here (as in xiii. 3 f., though differently) not the empire but the emperor, or one of its own heads. Such an identification was natural in the ancient world especially, where a king and his capital or state were interchangeable terms. The emperor, here Nero redivivus (*cf.* the saying of Apollonius, cited in Philostr. *Vit. Apol.* iv. 38: "Regarding this wild beast," *i.e.*, Nero, "I know not how many heads he has"), embodied the empire. The Beast is a sort of *revenant*. To rise from the abyss was the conven-

πόντων τὸ θηρίον ὅτι ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστι καὶ παρέσται. 9. [d] ὧδε ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἔχων σοφίαν. αἱ ἑπτὰ κεφαλαὶ ἑπτὰ [e] ὄρη εἰσίν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται [f] ἐπ' αὐτῶν. 10. καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτά εἰσιν· οἱ πέντε ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἔστιν, ὁ ἄλλος οὔπω ἦλθε· καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ, [g] ὀλίγον αὐτὸν [h] δεῖ μεῖναι. 11. καὶ τὸ θηρίον ὃ ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι, καὶ αὐτὸς [i] ὄγδοός ἐστι, καὶ [k] ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστι, καὶ εἰς [l] ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει. 12. καὶ τὰ δέκα [m] κέρατα ἃ εἶδες δέκα [m] βασιλεῖς εἰσίν, οἵτινες βασιλείαν

d xiii. 18
e *Cf.* Sib. Or. ii. 18, Ῥώμης ἑπταλόφοιο.
f *Cf.* iii. 8 and xii. 6; also 1 Kings xiii. 25 (LXX).
g vi. 11.
h xx. 3.
i *Cf.* 2 Pet. ii. 5.
k In and after them, so Dan. vii. 8, 24.
l Ver. 8.
m Dan. vii. 20, 24.

tional origin of the Beast (*cf.* xi. 7) even in the primitive tradition; the Nero-antichrist, however, introduces the fresh horror of a monster breaking loose even from death. True, he *goes to perdition* eventually, but not before all except the elect have succumbed to the fascination of his second advent. The Beast of the source here is evidently the antichrist figure of xi. 7 (also a Jewish source) transformed into Nero redivivus. There is less reason to suspect the hand of the Christian editor in 8 (Bousset) than in 9 *a* (J. Weiss).

Ver. 9. **ὄρη**, *cf.* Prop. iii. 11, 57 ("Septem urbs alta iugis, quae praesidet orbi"), Verg. *Georg.* ii. 534.

Ver. 11. Bruston takes **καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά ἐστιν** as a translation of ומן השבעה הוא, in the sense that the eighth was more (or greater) than the seven, *i.e.*, realising more fully the ideal of the Beast. But even were the case for a Hebrew original clearer than it is, such an interpretation is forced. The verse is really a parenthesis added by John to bring the source up to date. Domitian, the eighth emperor, under whom he writes, is identified with the true Neronic genius of the empire; he is a revival and an embodiment of the persecuting Beast (*cf.* Eus. *H. E.* iii. 17, Tert. *Apol.* 5: portio Neronis de crudelitate, *de pallio* 4: a sub-Nero) to the Christian prophet, as he proved a second Nero to some of his Roman subjects (*cf.* Juvenal's well-known sneer at the *calvus Nero*). This does not mean that John rationalises Nero redivivus into Domitian, which would throw the rest of the oracle entirely out of focus. Domitian, the eighth emperor, is not explained as *the Beast which was and is not and is to come up out of the abyss* (ver. 8), but simply as *the Beast which was and is not;* no allusion is made to his term of power, and the concluding phrase **καὶ εἰς ἀπ. ὑπάγει** is simply the conventional prophecy of doom upon persecutors; it need not be a post-factum reference to D.'s murder in 96. He *belonged to the seven*, as he had been closely associated with the Imperial power already (Tac. *Hist.* iii. 84, iv. 2, 3; *cf.* Jos. *Bell.* iv. 11, 4). The enigmatic and curt tone of the verse shows that either from prudence ("some consideration towards *the one who is* beseems even a prophet," Mommsen), or more probably from pre-occupation in the grim, ulterior figure of the Neronic antichrist, the prophet does not care to dwell minutely on the emperor's personality as an incarnate Nero. He does not even allude to the suspicion, voiced by his contemporaries (4 Esd. xi. 12) that Domitian had made away with Titus. His vision is strained, like that of his source, to the final and supernatural conflict; the Satanic messiah, the Beast who is to return from the abyss, bulks most prominently on the horizon. The absorbing interest of the oracle, even in its edited form, is eschatological. John simply puts in a few words, as few as possible, to bring this Vespasianic source up to date, since the death of Titus had not been followed by the appearance of the Nero-antichrist. The latter is still and soon to come however! John thoroughly shares, though he expands and applies, the prediction of his source. The addition he makes to it in ver. 11 must on no account be taken as if it meant the substitution of "Domitian = Nero redivivus" for the supernatural expectation of the latter. There is certainly some awkwardness in the juxtaposition of Domitian as a second Nero and of Nero redivivus, but this was inevitable under the circumstances.

Vv. 12-18: the campaign of Nero and his vassal-kings against Rome, which is slain by an arrow feathered from her own wings.

Vv. 12, 13. This political application of the *ten horns* probably means either the Parthian satraps of xvi. 12. reckoned

οὔπω [n] ἔλαβον, ἀλλ' ἐξουσίαν ὡς [o] βασιλεῖς μίαν ὥραν λαμβάνουσι μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου. 13. [p] οὗτοι μίαν γνώμην ἔχουσι, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ διδόασιν.

14. [p] οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἀρνίου πολεμήσουσι,
καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον νικήσει αὐτούς,
ὅτι [q] Κύριος κυρίων ἐστὶ καὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλέων—
καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ [r] κλητοὶ καὶ [r] ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί."

15. καὶ λέγει μοι, "Τὰ [s] ὕδατα ἃ εἶδες, οὗ ἡ πόρνη κάθηται, λαοὶ καὶ ὄχλοι εἰσὶν καὶ ἔθνη καὶ γλῶσσαι. 16. καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες καὶ τὸ θηρίον οὗτοι μισήσουσι τὴν πόρνην, καὶ ἠρημωμένην ποιήσουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ [t] γυμνήν, καὶ τὰς [u] σάρκας αὐτῆς [v] φάγονται, καὶ αὐτὴν [w] κατακαύσουσιν ἐν πυρί. 17. ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν γνώμην αὐτοῦ, καὶ [x] ποιῆσαι μίαν γνώμην, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν τῷ

n = Eng. perfect, Burton, 52.
o Like Sargon's allies, Isa. x. 8 (*cf.* xxiii. 8).
p *Cf.* on xiv. 4.
q See on xix. 16; Deut. x. 17, Ps. cxxxvi. 3, Dan. ii. 37, 47, 2 Macc. xiii. 4, En. ix. 4, etc.
r *Cf.* 2 Pet. i. 10.
s Ver. 1.
t *Cf.* Ezek. xvi. 37-39, etc.
u Plur. = fleshy parts of body, 2 Kings ix. 36, etc.
v xix. 18, Ps. xxvii. 3, Mic. iii. 2 f.; on form (Hellenistic fut. of ἐσθίω) *cf.* Win. § 13, 6.
w xviii. 8, 18, Lev. xxi. 9, Nah. iii. 15.
x *Cf.* Cic. *pro Milone*, 33.

'in round numbers, who occupied a royal position in the estimation of the East (so, *e.g.*, Eichhorn, de Wette, Bleek, Bousset, Scott, J. Weiss, Baljon, Wellhausen), or ("chefs d'armée," Havet) the governors of the (ten senatorial) provinces, holding office for (μίαν ὥραν) one year (so Ewald, Hilg., Hausrath, Mommsen, B. Weiss, Hirscht, Briggs, Selwyn, B. W. Henderson ["the number *may* be derived from Daniel. In any case it is a round number, and the seer did not go round counting the number of the Roman provinces"]), unless it is to be left as a vague description of the allies (Weizs., Holtzm., Swete). Philo (*de leg. ad Caium* xxxiv.) notes the facilities possessed by proconsuls for starting revolutions, especially if they commanded powerful armies such as those stationed on the Euphrates to protect Syria.

Ver. 14. An abrupt and proleptic allusion to xix. 11-21; the Christian messiah is the true *King of kings* (a side reference to the well-known Parthian title). This is the first time that John brings the Lamb on the scene of earthly action. He now appears at the side, or rather at the head, of his followers in the final crisis, not in a struggle preceding the sack of Rome. He and Satan (as represented by the empire) are the real protagonists. Note the share assigned to the faithful in this victory (after ii. 26, 27). The war fought on their behalf by the Lamb is their fight also (*cf.* on xix. 14); its success rests on the divine election and their corresponding loyalty (*cf.* xii. 11, xiii. 8; a Zoroastrian parallel in Yasht xiii. 48; the favourite description of the saints in Enoch as "chosen [and] righteous"; and *Passio Perpetuae*, xxi., "o fortissimi martyres! o uere uocati et electi in gloriam Domini nostri Jesu Christi"). The redeeming power of Christ, together with the adoration which he alone can rightfully claim, make his cause more than equal to the empires of the world (*cf.* the thought of Isa. liii. 12).

Ver. 15. The woman impiously rivals God (κύριος ἐπὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν, Ps. xxix. 3, *cf.* 10).—ὄχλοι is substituted for the more common φυλαί, perhaps with an allusion (after Ezek. xvi. 15, 25, 31) to Rome's imperial rapacity.

Ver. 16. Rome perishes at the hands of Nero and his ruthless allies—a belief loudly echoed in the Talmud. In Sib. *Or.* iv. 145, 350 f. the East then and thus regains the treasures of which the Oriental provinces had been despoiled.—γυμνὴν . . . πυρί, the doom of a Semitic harlot (Ezek. xxiii. 45 f., xxviii. 17, 18). But no details of the disaster are given.

Ver. 17. The remarkable unanimity and obedience of the usurping vassals, which welds them into an avenging instrument, can only be explained on supernatural grounds. A divine overruling controls all political movements (*cf.* xi. 2, xiii. 5, 7), according to the determin-

θηρίῳ, ἄχρι [y] τελεσθήσονται οἱ λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ. 18. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἣν εἶδες ἔστιν ἡ πόλις ἡ [z] μεγάλη, ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν [a] βασιλέων τῆς γῆς."

y x. 7.
z xvi. 19, xviii. 10, Verg. *Eclog.* i. 19, 24.
a Ps. ii. 2, lxxxix. 28.

ism of apocalyptic tradition (Baldensperger, 58 f.). The irony of the situation is that the tools of providence are destroyed, after they have unconsciously served their purpose (as in Isa. x. 12 f.). The Imperial power, hitherto the usual support of Rome, is to prove her deadly foe; John's stern philosophy is that one partner in this hateful union is employed to ruin the other. Not long before this prophecy appeared, Vitellius and Vespasian in the person of their partisans had ravaged Rome; in the near future Nero's allies were to fight, like Coriolanus, against their "cankered country, with the spleen of all the under-fiends". —**μίαν κ.τ.λ.** The same tradition, on a simpler scale, appears in 4 Esd. xiii. 33, 34 where, at the revelation of God's Son, "every man shall leave his own land and their battles against one another; and a countless multitude shall assemble together, desiring to come and fight against him". The dualism of God and Satan is not absolute; even the latter's manœuvres are made to subserve some providential design.

Ver. 18. The dramatic climax of the oracle: the great harlot is—Rome, domina Roma, the pride and queen of the world! *Cf.* Spenser's *Ruines of Rome*, 360 f. ("Rome was th' whole world, and al the world was Rome"). For the probable position of xix. 9 *b*-10 at this point in the original form of the Apocalypse, see below (*ad loc.*).

After a prelude on the doom of this second and western Babylon (xviii. 1-3) two sublime songs follow: one of triumph in heaven (4-8) one of wailing on earth (9 f.). Both are modelled in semi-strophic style upon the earlier taunt-songs (*cf.* Introd. § 4) over Tyre and Babylon (*cf.* also Apoc. Bar. lxxxii. 3-9). But the severe invective against Rome reveals the shuddering impression which this marvel and mistress of the world made upon the conscience of her provincial subjects, Jewish or Christian. They were half fascinated, even as they felt repelled, by the sight of her grandeur. This magnificent doom song (9 f.) like that of Apoc. Bar. xii. (*cf.* xiii.), however, celebrates her downfall, partly on grounds which might be justified from contemporary pagan authors (*cf.* Renan's *Apôtres*, ch. xvii.). Vv. 24 (note the sudden change from **σοί** to **αὐτῇ**) and 20 (in whole or part) are Christian editorial insertions, (*a*) either by some scribe or editor after the Apocalypse was completed, or (*b*) by John himself in an earlier source (Jewish or from his own hand). The presence of a special source is suggested by *e.g.*, the unexampled use of **οὐαί** (*cf.* on ver. 16, and *Oxyrh. Fragment of Uncan. Gospel*, 31), the large number of **ἅπαξ εὑρημένα** (**στρήν.** 3, **διπλόω** 6, **διπλόος**, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 17, **στρην.** 7 and 9, **σιρικοῦ**, **ἐλεφ.**,**σιδήρου**, **μαρμάρου** and **θύϊνον** in 12, **κινν.**, **ἄμωμον**, **σεμίδ.**, **ῥεδῶν**, and **σωμάτων**, [in this sense] in 13, **ἀπώλετο** (14), **ἐργάζονται** [in this sense in Apoc.] in 17, **τιμ.** 19, **ὁρμ.** 21, **μουσ.**, **σαλπιστῶν**, **κιθαρῳδῶν** [only in xiv. 2] 22, **ὀπώρα** and **λιπαρά**, 14) and rare terms, for which the special character of the contents can hardly account. Differences of outlook also emerge; *e.g.*, xviii. 9 f. is out of line with xvii. 17 and xvi. 13 f., xviii. 1-3 (Rome long desolate) hardly tallies with xviii. 9 f. (ruins still smouldering, *cf.* xix. 3), and the kings of xviii. 9, 10 lament, whereas in xvii. 16 they attack, Rome. These inconsistencies (Schön, Schmiedel) might in part be set down to the free poetic movement of the writer's imagination, working in dramatic style and oblivious of matter-of-fact incongruities like the *sauve qui peut* of 4; just as the lack of any allusion to the Imperial cultus, the Lamb, or the martyrs (exc. 20 and 24) does not necessarily denote a Jewish origin. But the cumulative effect of these features points to 20 and 24 as insertions by John in a Jewish (*cf. e.g.*, the special emphasis on the trader's point of view, 11-17) Vespasianic source which originally formed a pendant to that underlying xvii. (so variously in detail but agreeing on a source, probably Jewish—Sabatier, Rauch, Spitta, Weyland, Bousset, J. Weiss, Schmidt, Baljon, Pfleid., Wellhausen, von Soden, de Faye, Calmes). The original breathed the indignant spirit of a Jewish apocalyptist against the proud empire which had won a temporary triumph over the city and people of God. John applies it to the Rome which was also responsible for the persecutions. The tone of it

[a] XVIII. 1. Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην· [b] καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐφωτίσθη [c] ἐκ τῆς [d] δόξης αὐτοῦ. 2. καὶ ἔκραξεν ἐν ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ λέγων,

"[e] Ἔπεσεν [e] ἔπεσε Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη,
καὶ ἐγένετο [f] κατοικητήριον δαιμονίων,
καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου,
καὶ φυλακὴ παντὸς [g] ὀρνέου [g] ἀκαθάρτου καὶ μεμισημένου·

3. ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ [h] οἴνου [τοῦ [i] θυμοῦ] τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς πέπωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,
καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ' αὐτῆς [k] ἐπόρνευσαν,
καὶ οἱ ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς [m] δυνάμεως τοῦ στρήνους αὐτῆς ἐπλούτησαν."

4. καὶ ἤκουσα ἄλλην φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν,
"[n] Ἐξέλθατε, ὁ [n] λαός μου, [o] ἐξ αὐτῆς,
ἵνα μὴ [p] συγκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς,
καὶ [q] ἐκ τῶν πληγῶν αὐτῆς ἵνα μὴ [q] λάβητε·

5. ὅτι [r] ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
καὶ [s] ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἀδικήματα αὐτῆς.

a From Zech. ix. 3-5 (Tyre), etc.
b Ezek. xliii. 2,
c See viii. 13, xvi. 11, 21.
d *Cf.* Acts xii. 7, and on Apoc. i. 16, iv. 1.
e xiv. 8, Jer. li. 8.
f From Isa. xxxiv. 11-15, *cf.* Spenser's *Ruines of Time*, 121-134.
g *Cf.* xix. 17-21. ἅπ. λεγ. N.T. See Deut. xiv. 12-19, Chag. 3*b*.
h xiv. 8, Jer. xxv. 15, 27, li. 7.
i *Cf.* on xiv. 8.
k xvii. 2, Isa. xxiii. 17, *cf.* Sib. Or. iii. 357 f.
l Ezek. xxvii. 9-25.
m Jos. *Ant.* iii. 2, 4, = "money, means".
n Acts xviii. 10: collect. subst. hence plur. vb. *cf.* Jo. vi. 22, etc.
o Gen. xix. 14-15, Num. xvi. 26; from Isa. xlviii. 20, Jer. l. 8, li. 45, etc.
p By succumbing to her fascinations, and thus sharing her fate.
q *Cf.* 1 Jo. iv. 13.
r *Cf.* Bar. i. 20. Suggested by Jer. li. 9. *Accumulata peruenerunt* (Bgl.).
s xvi. 19.

has been severely censured, as if it breathed a malignant orgy of revenge. "It does not matter whether Jewish or Christian materials are the ultimate source. He who takes delight in such fancies is no whit better than he who first invented them" (Wernle, p. 370). So far as this is true, it applies to xix. 17-21 (or 14-20) rather than to xviii. But the criticism must be qualified; see notes on xviii. 7 and 20. There is smoke in the flame, but a profound sense of moral indignation and retribution overpowers the mere vindictiveness of an unpatriotic fanatic who exults to see his oppressor humiliated.

CHAPTER XVIII.—1-3: an angelic proclamation of Babylon's fate (*cf.* xiv. 8) in terms of Isa. xiii. 19-22, xxxiv. 14 (demons of the desert, the Mazzikin of Jewish demonology, familiar to Babylonian magic), Jer. l. 30, li. 37, Zeph. ii. 15, etc. "Be of good cheer, O Jerusalem . . . Miserable are the cities which thy children served, miserable is she who received thy sons. For as she rejoiced at thy fall and was glad at thy ruin, so shall she grieve at her own desolation. Yea I will take away her delight in her great crowds, and her vaunting shall turn to mourning. For fire from the Everlasting shall come upon her for a length of days, and for long shall she be inhabited by demons" (Bar. iv. 30-35). **ἐκ κ.τ.λ.** "by (*cf.* ver. 19) the wealth of her wantonness" traders profited; *i.e.*, by the enormous supplies which the capital required to satisfy her demands (στρῆνος, -ιάω from the New comedy and colloquial usage).—**δόξα** in ver. 1 denotes the flashing brilliance which, according to the primitive collocation of life and light, accompanied the heavenly visitants to earth or the manifestation of a divine presence (xxi. 11, 23, xxii. 5); see the valuable paragraphs in Grill, pp. 259-271.

Vv. 4-8. A song of exulting in heaven, addressed first to the faithful (ver. 4) and then (ver. 6) to the enemies who execute God's vengeance.

Ver. 4. **ἐξέλθατε** (*cf.* Apoc. Bar. ii. 1), which in the source referred to the Jewish community at Rome, is an artistic detail, retained like several in ch. xxi., although the historical meaning and application was lost in the new situation. *Cf.* the opening of Newman's essay on *The Benedictine Centuries*.

Ver. 5. Plutarch (*de sera uindict.*

6. [t] ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ ὡς καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέδωκεν,
καὶ διπλώσατε τὰ [u] διπλᾶ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς·
ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ [v] ᾧ ἐκέρασε,
κεράσατε αὐτῇ διπλοῦν.
7. ὅσα [w] ἐδόξασεν αὐτὴν καὶ [x] ἐστρηνίασε,
τοσοῦτον δότε αὐτῇ βασανισμὸν καὶ πένθος.
[y] Ὅτι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει [z] ὅτι 'Κάθημαι βασίλισσα,
καὶ χήρα οὐκ εἰμί καὶ πένθος οὐ μὴ ἴδω,'
8. διὰ τοῦτο [a] ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ [b] ἥξουσιν αἱ πληγαὶ αὐτῆς,
[c] θάνατος καὶ πένθος καὶ λιμός·
καὶ ἐν πυρὶ [d] κατακαυθήσεται.
ὅτι [e] ἰσχυρὸς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ κρίνας αὐτήν.
9. καὶ κλαύσουσιν καὶ κόψονται ἐπ' [f] αὐτὴν οἱ [g] βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, οἱ μετ' αὐτῆς πορνεύσαντες καὶ στρηνιάσαντες, ὅταν βλέπωσι τὸν

t Jer. xvi. 18, l. 15, 29, Ps. cxxxvii. 8.
u Æsch., *Ag.* 537: = "amply sufficient," Isa. xl. 2, lxi. 7 f., Zech. ix. 12.
v Rare attract. of rel. pron.
w Arrogance, *cf.* Ps. Sol. i. 3-6, ii. 33-35, iv. 28.
x 1 Ti. v. 11.
y = "because" (susp. ὅτι.).
z From Zeph. ii. 15, *cf.* Ovid., *Met.* vi. 193-195 (Niobe), 4 Esd. xi. 43.
a Lucret. iii. 898-899, Eur. *Herc. Fur.* 509-510, *Hec.* 285, Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 235; *cf.* Job i. 13-19, Isa. x. 17.
b Isa. xlvii. 9, Ezek. xxviii. 18.
c *Cf.* on vi. 8.
d xvii. 16, Jer. l. 31-32.
e Jer. l. 34.
f Diff. sense, i. 7.
g xvii. 2, xviii. 3; *cf.* Isa. xxiii. 5.

15) is strong upon the solidarity of a city, which is liable to be punished at any time for past offences.—κολλᾶσθαι ("Heaped up to the sky are her sins") in the familiar sense of *haerere* = to follow close upon, or to cleave, the idea being that the mass of sins actually presses on the roof of heaven. The figure would be different if, as Holtzm. conjectures, κολλ. referred to the gluing together of the leaves composing a roll; the record of Rome's sins would form so immense a volume that when unrolled it would reach the very heavens. "Et ascendit contumelia tua ad altissimum, et superbia tua ad fortem" (4 Esd. xi. 43).

Ver. 6. The foes of Rome (unless ἀπόδοτε κ.τ.λ., is a rhetorical apostrophe) are invited to serve her with the retribution promised to the first Babylon (see reff.).—διπλώσατε, *cf. Oxyrh. Pap.* iii. 520[6]. Ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ, κ.τ.λ. *Cf.* Apoc. Bar. xiii. 8 (to Romans), "Ye who have drunk the strained wine, drink ye also of its dregs, the judgment of the Lofty One who has no respect of persons".

Ver. 7. It is probably at this point that the passage drifts over from the conception of a voice heard (ver. 4) to that of direct utterance on the part of the prophet; unless we are to suppose that the voice speaks till the close of ver. 20 (a similar instance in ch. xi.). Imperial Rome is imperious and insolent; haughty self-confidence is the sin of the second Babylon as of the first (see Isa. xlvii. 5, 7, 8, imitated in this passage). *Cf.* (bef. 80 A.D.) Sibyll. v. 173, where the impious and doomed city is upbraided for vaunting "I am by myself, and none shall overthrow me". A similar charge of arrogance was brought by Ezekiel against the prince of Tyre (xxviii. 2 f., *cf.* xxvi., xxvii. throughout with the present passage), and by the Jewish author of Apoc. Bar. xii. 3 against Rome. To the Semitic as to the Hellenic conscience, the fall of a haughty spirit always afforded moral relief. Nothing so shocked the ancient conscience as overweening presumption in a state or an individual, which was certain ultimately to draw down upon itself the crashing anger of heaven.

Ver. 8. This drastic, ample punishment, though executed by subordinates in xvii. 16, 17, is here (as in 5, 20) regarded on its divine side. God is strong, as well as guilty, glorious Rome (ver. 10, *cf.* on vi. 15); and his strength is manifested in the huge shocks of history, as well as in creation (iv. 11, v. 13). Rome's proud disregard of all that was mutable in human conditions is visited with condign retribution. The prophet sees not a decline and fall but a sudden collapse (10, 16, 19).

Vv. 9-20: the wailing on earth, by kings (9, 10), merchants (at length, 11-16), and seafaring men (17-20), imitated from the finer and more elaborate

[h] καπνὸν τῆς πυρώσεως αὐτῆς, 10. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἑστηκότες διὰ τὸν [i] φόβον τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς, λέγοντες,

"Οὐαί, οὐαί, [k] ἡ πόλις ἡ [l] μεγάλη,
Βαβυλὼν ἡ πόλις ἡ [m] ἰσχυρά,
ὅτι μιᾷ ὥρᾳ ἦλθεν ἡ κρίσις σου."

11. καὶ οἱ [n] ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς κλαίουσι καὶ πενθοῦσιν ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅτι τὸν [o] γόμον αὐτῶν οὐδεὶς ἀγοράζει οὐκ ἔτι· 12. γόμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ [p] λίθου [p] τιμίου καὶ μαργαριτῶν καὶ βυσσίνου καὶ [q] πορφύρας καὶ [r] σιρικοῦ καὶ [s] κοκκίνου· καὶ πᾶν ξύλον θύϊνον καὶ πᾶν [t] σκεῦος ἐλεφάντινον καὶ πᾶν σκεῦος ἐκ ξύλου τιμιωτάτου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου καὶ [u] μαρμάρου· 13. καὶ [v] κιννάμωμον καὶ ἄμωμον καὶ θυμιάματα καὶ [w] μύρον καὶ [x] λίβανον καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ σεμίδαλιν καὶ σῖτον καὶ κτήνη καὶ πρόβατα καὶ [y] ἵππων καὶ

h xiv. 11. i proximus ucalegon ardet? k *Cf.* on ver. 16. l xvi. 19. m Ῥώμη robur (Bgl.); see below, ver. 21. n Isa. xlvii. 15: "merchants," not κάπηλοι "pedlars or hucksters" (Sir. xxvi. 29). o "Ship's freight" (Ac. xxi. 3), "wares". p See xvii. 4; *cf.* Plin., *H. N.* xxxvii. 12. q Friedländer, iii. 46 f. r Tac., *Ann.* ii. 33, Verg., *Georg.* ii. 121. s xvii. 4. t = "article". u Fried., iii. 65-66. v Prov. vii. 17, Lucan, x. 165 f., En. xxx. 3. w Jo. xi. 2, xii. 3, 5. x Matt. ii. 11. y Genitive depend. on γόμον (sc).

passages in Ezek. xxvi.-xxviii, where kings (xxvi. 15-18), traders (very briefly and indirectly, xxvii. 36), and mariners (xxvii. 29-36) are all introduced in the lament over Tyre's downfall. Contrast the joy of the three classes in ver. 20. A triple rhythm pervades (*cf.* 2, 3, 6, 8, 14, 16, 19) but does not dominate this grim doom-song, somewhat after the well-known structure of the Semitic elegy. But the three laments are all characteristic. The kings are saddened by the swift overthrow of power (10), and the reverse of fortune; the merchants (11, 16) by the loss of a profitable market, the mariners by the sudden blow inflicted on the shipping trade (ver. 19).

Ver. 12. **βυσσίνου** (sc. **ἱματίου**) = "of fine linen"; from **βύσσος** the delicate and expensive linen (or cotton) made out of Egyptian flax (Luke xvi. 19); **σιρικοῦ** = "silk," muslin, or gauze, chiefly used for women's attire (Paus. iv. 110 f.); **πᾶν ξύλον θύϊνον** = "all citron (citrus)-wood," a fragrant, hard, dark brown, expensive material for furniture, exported from N. Africa. Note the extensive range of Roman commerce to supply the needs of luxury (interea gustus elementa per omnia quaerunt, Juv. xi. 14; pearls, *e.g.*, from Britain as well as Red Sea), also the various demands in order: ornaments, wearing apparel, furniture, perfumes (for personal and religious use), food, and social requirements. Wets. cites a rabbinic saying: decem partes diuitiarum sunt in mundo, nouem Romae et una in mundo uniuerso.

Ver. 13. "Cinnamon," an aromatic spice (the inner bark of the tree) exported from E. Asia and S. China; **ἄμωμον**, aromatic balsam for the hair, made from the seeds of some Eastern shrub (Verg. *Ecl.* iv. 25, "assyrium uolgo nascetur amomum; from Harran, Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2, 2)—for the form, *cf.* Levy's *die Semit. Fremdwörter im Griech.* (1895), p. 37; **θυμιάματα**, "incense," in its ingredients of aromatic spices; **λίβανον** = "frankincense," a fragrant gum-resin exported from S. Arabia (Isa. lx. 6, Jer. vi. 20); enormous quantities of perfume were employed by the Romans, chiefly in the care of the body, but also to mix with wine at their banquets (*e.g.*, Juv. vi. 303, etc.; *E. Bi.* 5320); **σεμίδαλιν** = "fine flour," wheaten meal (LXX for סלת, *cf.* Deut. xxxii. 14; Ps. lxxxi. 16) of the choicest kind; wine, flour, and incense were all used in sacrifices. **ῥεδῶν**, a Gallic word = four-wheeled "carriages" used by the well-to-do (*cf.* Jerome on Isa. lxvi.). **σωμάτων** = "slaves" (later Greek, dropping the qualifying adj. **δούλων** or **οἰκετικῶν**, *cf.* Deissm. 160, Dittenberger's *Sylloge*,[2] 845, etc.). **καὶ ψυχὰς** (reverting awkwardly to accus.) **ἀνθρώπων** = "and souls of men" (from Ezek. xxvii. 13, "they traded the persons of men for thy merchandise": **ἐνεπορεύοντό σοι ἐν ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων**, LXX, *cf.* 1 Chron. v. 21). The double expression is strange. If **καὶ** is not to be taken as "even," identifying both, we must suppose that some distinction is intended, and that of the

ῥεδῶν καὶ [z] σωμάτων καὶ ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων. 15. οἱ ἔμποροι [a] τούτων οἱ πλουτήσαντες ἀπ' αὐτῆς, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν [b] στήσονται διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς κλαίοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες, 16. λέγοντες,

"Οὐαί, οὐαί, [c] ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη,
ἡ περιβεβλημένη [d] βύσσινον καὶ πορφυροῦν καὶ κόκκινον,
καὶ [e] κεχρυσωμένη ἐν χρυσίῳ καὶ [f] λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ μαργαρίτῃ·
ὅτι μιᾷ ὥρᾳ ἠρημώθη ὁ τοσοῦτος πλοῦτος."

17. [g] καὶ πᾶς [h] κυβερνήτης καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἐπὶ πόντον[1] πλέων καὶ ναῦται καὶ ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν [i] ἔστησαν 18. καὶ ἔκραξαν βλέποντες τὸν καπνὸν τῆς πυρώσεως αὐτῆς, λέγοντες, [k] "τίς ὁμοία τῇ πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ;" 19. καὶ [l] ἔβαλον χοῦν ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκραξαν κλαίοντες καὶ πενθοῦντες, λέγοντες,

"Οὐαί, οὐαί, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη,
ἐν ᾗ [m] ἐπλούτησαν πάντες οἱ ἔχοντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
ἐκ τῆς [n] τιμιότητος αὐτῆς,
ὅτι μιᾷ ὥρᾳ ἠρημώθη."

20. [o] "Εὐφραίνου ἐπ' αὐτῇ, [p] οὐρανέ,
καὶ οἱ [p] ἅγιοι καὶ οἱ [q] ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ προφῆται,
ὅτι ἔκρινεν ὁ Θεὸς [r] τὸ κρίμα ὑμῶν [s] ἐξ αὐτῆς."

z (LXX), Gen. xxxiv. 29, Tob. x. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 11, *cf.* Jos. *Ant.* xix. i. 10.
a *i.e.*, Wares mentioned in 12-13.
b Ver. 10, Ezek. xxvii. 30-31.
c Nom. for dat. after οὐαί (accus. viii. 13, xii. 12), *cf.* 10, 19. Here only in Apoc.
d Ver. 12, xix. 8, 14, (pecul. to Apoc. in N.T.).
e xvii. 4.
f Ver. 12.
g Isa. xxiii. 14, Ezek. xxvii. 27, 29.
h Acts xxvii. 11.
i Note change to aor. from future (9, 11, 15).
k xiii. 4 (ironical contrast).
l From Ezek. xxvii. 30, (Heb.), Jos. vii. 6 (LXX).
m Ezek. xxvii. 33.
n Abstr. for concrete, "her costly treasures" (see on ver. 3).
o Deut. xxxii. 43, Isa. xliv. 23, Ass. Mos. x. 10.
p xii. 12, *cf.* xvi. 8.
q Only here and xxi. 14, in Joh. lit.
r xvii. 1, xix. 2.
s vi. 10, Ps. cxix. 84.

[1] For the unexampled ΤΟΠΟΝ (*cf.* Ac. xxvii. 2) read ΠŌΤΟΝ (Nestle, *Theol. Ltzg.*, 18, 97, 274, *Einführ.*, 135, E. Tr. 168; so Baljon and Gwynn) which was apparently read in some form by Copt., Pr. (omnis super mare nauigans). A similar confusion occurs in Judith vi. 21, and conversely κατα Ποντον has supplanted κατα τοπον in Eus., *H. E.* iv. 15, 2.

two σωμάτων is the more specific. Prostitutes, or female slaves, or gladiators, or even grooms and drivers (ἵπποι καὶ ἱππεῖς, Ezek. xxvii. 14) have been more or less convincingly suggested as its meaning. Slave-dealing (Friedländer, iii. 87 f.; Dobschütz, 266-269) was a lucrative trade under the empire, with Delos as its centre, and Asiatic youths especially were in large demand as pages, musicians, and court-attendants. Thousands of captives, after the siege of Jerusalem, were sent into slavery by the Roman government; and early Christians at this period (Clem. Rom. lv.) voluntarily went into slavery either as substitutes for others or "that with the price got for themselves they might furnish others with food".

Ver. 17. ἐργάζονται κ.τ.λ. = "whose business is on the sea". The passage reflects the importance of Rome especially for the trade of the Levant. Pliny (*H. N.* vi. 101, xii. 84) gives the large figures of Oriental imports and their cost, adding sarcastically *tanti nobis deliciae et feminae constant* (Friedländer, iii. 48-51). The regret of the mariners for the grandeur that was Rome passes rapidly into a sense of commercial loss.

Ver. 20. This verse interrupts the sequence of 19 and 21 in which the ruin of Rome is illustrated by the dramatic action of the angel. The awkward shift from description to an apostrophe, and the evidently Christian tone of the cry, betray an editor's hand. His object is to render explicit the moral reasons why Christians should delight in the downfall of the city. He writes in the same triple rhythm as the source, and his hand is to be seen in the whole verse not simply in

21. καὶ ἦρεν εἷς ἄγγελος [t] ἰσχυρὸς λίθον ὡς μύλον μέγαν καὶ ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν λέγων,

"Οὕτως [u] ὁρμήματι βληθήσεται Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη πόλις,

[v] καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἔτι.

22. καὶ φωνὴ [w] κιθαρῳδῶν καὶ μουσικῶν καὶ αὐλητῶν καὶ [x] σαλπιστῶν

οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,

καὶ πᾶς τεχνίτης πάσης τέχνης

οὐ μὴ εὑρεθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,

καὶ φωνὴ [y] μύλου

οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,

t v. 2; see above, ver. 10.
u Neh. ix. 11, 1 Macc. iv. 8 (*cf.* Isa. xxviii. 2): "with sudden onset or impetus," suiting action to word.
v Ezek. xxvi. 21.
w xiv. 2, Isa. xxiv. 8, Ezek. xxvi. 13; *cf.* 1 Macc. iii. 45, Suet. *Nero*, 40-41, *Domit.* 4.
x Win. § 13, 4.
y Fr. Jer. xxv. 10 (Heb.), *cf. Aen.* i. 726, Bar. ii. 23 f.

καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι. The voice from heaven is thus made to pass into a closing apostrophe to heaven and its inhabitants (*cf.* xi. 18), imitated from Jer. li. 48 (Heb.). John seems to assume that all had a case against Rome as victims of her cruelty, probably in the main as martyrs and confessors. "Apostles," omitted in ver. 24, has here (as in ii. 2) its wider sense (otherwise xxi. 14), but it must include Peter and Paul (Zahn, *Einleit.* § 39, n. 4).—ὅτι κ.τ.λ. = "for God has judged her with your judgment," *i.e.*, vindicated you (done you justice, given you your due) by exacting vengeance upon her. She who once doomed you is now doomed herself (*cf.* xvi. 6).—εὐφραίνου. *Cf.* En. lxii., where the kings and rulers condemned by messiah to eternal torment are to be "a spectacle for the righteous and his elect; they will rejoice over them because the wrath of the Lord of spirits resteth upon them, and his sword is drunk with their blood"; also Isa. xxx. 29, for the call to exult over a fallen oppressor. A Parisian workman, who was looking down at the corpse of Robespierre, was overheard to mutter, with relief, "Oui, il y a un Dieu".

Vv. 21-24: a rhythmic song of doom, introduced by a symbolic action partly imitated from Jer. li. 63, 64.

Ver. 21. Rome's fall will be irrevocable and sudden and violent, as a powerful angel shows dramatically by seizing a huge boulder and flinging it into the sea. *Cf.* the analogous description of Babylon's collapse in Sib. Or. v. 158, 163, 174. The reiterated emphasis on Roman luxury is notable. Later literature, as Friedländer observes (iii. 9-17), tended to a conventional exaggeration of the luxurious civilisation under the Empire; judged by modern standards, at any rate, it was not particularly extravagant. This denunciation of wealth and ease, however, is apposite in a source which reflects the age of Nero, since it was under Nero, rather than under Vespasian or Domitian, that Roman luxury during the first century of our era reached its zenith. The oracle breathes the scorn felt by simple provincials for the capital's wanton splendour, and indeed for the sins of a pleasure-loving civilisation. But it is religious poetry, not a prose transcript of the contemporary commercial situation. *Cf.* Dill's *Roman Society*, pp. 32 f., 66 f.

Ver. 22. μουσικῶν "minstrels or musicians" (1 Macc. ix. 41); the occurrence of the generic term among the specific is certainly awkward and would favour the rendering "singers" (Bengel, Holtzm.) in almost any other book than this. On these musical epithets see Friedländer, iii. 238 f.; the impulses to instrumental music at Rome during this period came mainly from Alexandria. For coins stamped with Nero as harpist see Suet. *Nero*, xxv. φωνὴ μύλου, the daily accompaniment of Oriental life. The sound of the mill meant habitation, but in the desolation of Rome no more pleasant stir of mirth or business would be heard (Isa. xlvii. 5). The fanatic Jesus, son of Ananus, who howled during the siege of Jerusalem and for four years previously (Jos. *Bell.* vi. 5, 3) "woe to Jerusalem," denounced upon her "a voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the temple,

23. καὶ φῶς [z] λύχνου
οὐ μὴ φάνῃ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι,
καὶ φωνὴ [y] νυμφίου καὶ [a] νύμφης
οὐ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι·
14. καὶ ἡ [b] ὀπώρα σου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς [c] ψυχῆς
ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ,
καὶ πάντα τὰ [d] λιπαρὰ καὶ τὰ [e] λαμπρὰ
[f] ἀπώλετο ἀπὸ σοῦ,
καὶ οὐκέτι [1] οὐ μὴ αὐτὰ εὑρήσουσιν.
23. [g] ὅτι [h] οἱ ἔμποροί σου ἦσαν οἱ [i] μεγιστᾶνες τῆς γῆς,
ὅτι ἐν τῇ [k] φαρμακίᾳ σου ἐπλανήθησαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.
24. [l] καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ [m] αἷμα προφητῶν καὶ ἁγίων εὑρέθη,
καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς."

z viii. 12.
a Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9, xxxiii. 11.
b Jer. xlvii. 10, = "the ripe fruit" (on form and breathing, *cf.* Thumb, 19).
c *Cf.* Win., § 22, 18*b*, and for genit., *ibid.*, § 30, 12*g*.
d = "sumptuous" (living on fat of land); Isa. xxx. 23, Neh. ix. 35.
e "All things rich and radiant," *cf.* Jas. ii. 2-3.
f Ps. cxli. 5 Did. xvi. 5. Only here in Apoc.
g From Ezek. xxvii. 21, Isa. xxiii. 8.
h Predic. with article, Win. § 18, 8g.
i vi. 15.
k ix. 21, Isa. xlvii. 9-12, Nah. iii. 4.
l xvi. 6; *cf.* Isa. xxvi. 21, Job xvi. 18.
m xvii. 8, Ezek. xxiv. 7-9. On sing. here and xvi. 12 (v. l, αιματα), *cf.* Win. § 27. 4c.

[1] "Possibly S. [**ουκετι αυτα βλεψεις και αυτα**] here preserves the true text, and the rest" [*i.e.*, **αυτα ευρησουσι** = ℵACP, vg., Syr., **ευρης** = Q, min., **ευρησεις** = 1, 37, 96, etc., **αυτα** after **ευρ.** And.] "have lost the words by homoioteleuton" (Gwynn).—Here between the last **ετι** and the first **οτι** of 23 is the original place of ver. 14 (so Beza, Vitringa, Volkmar, Baljon, Weiss, and Könnecke) which got into its canonical position between 13 and 15 owing to the error of some early copyist, whose eye confused **οτι εμποροι σου** with **οι εμποροι τουτων**.

a voice against bridegrooms and brides, and a voice against the whole people".

Ver. 23. Contrast the **εὑρέθη** of 24 with the **εὑρήσουσιν** of ver. 14 which in its canonical position is an erratic boulder. **φαρμακίᾳ**, primarily in the figurative O.T. sense already noticed (harlotry and magic spells, as in Yasna ix. 32). But a literal allusion is not to be excluded, in view of the antipathy felt by pious Jews and early Christians to magic and sorcery. As Rome represented the existing authorities under whose aegis these black arts managed to flourish, and as they were generally bound up with religion, it would not be unnatural to charge the Empire with promoting sorcery (Weinel 10).—**ἐπλαν.** "Commerce, as having regard to purely worldly interests, is called harlotry" [Cheyne on Isa. xxiii. 17]. Sorcery, witchcraft, "fornication," and the persecution of the righteous, are all manifestations of the lawlessness practised by Beliar working in men and kings (Asc. Isa. ii. 4, 5).

Ver. 24. Again, as at ver. 20, the change of style (here from an apostrophe to a description) and spirit (xvii. 6) marks an insertion by the final editor, unless the verse originally lay after ver. 3. The triple rhythm corresponds to that of ver. 20. Rome has now succeeded Jerusalem (Matt. xxiii. 35, etc.) as the arch-enemy of the faithful. The climax of her iniquities is couched in terms of the primitive Semitic idea (Gen. iv. 10) that exposed and discovered blood is a cry for vengeance [2 Macc. viii. 3 f.]; blood violently shed wails till it is appeased by the punishment of the murderers. By a natural hyperbole, Rome is held responsible for the murders, judicial and otherwise, of saints and prophets and the slain of Israel in general—substituted here for the "apostles" of ver. 20, probably to include the Jews killed in the recent war as well as pre-Christian martyrs like the Maccabees of whom Augustine finely says: ***nondum quidem erat mortuus Christus, sed martyres eos fecit moriturus Christus*** (Heb. xi.-xii. 1). Rome here is the last and worst exponent of persecution. Her collapse is attributed to their blood drawing down God's utter retribution. "My blood be on the inhabitants of Chaldea, shall Jerusalem say" (Jer. li. 35, imprecating successfully the divine revenge, vv. 36, 49). As Chrysostom called psalm cix. a

XIX. 1. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν [a] μεγάλην ὄχλου πολλοῦ ἐν τῷ [b] οὐρανῷ [c] λεγόντων,

"Ἀλληλουϊά·

[d] ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ [e] θεοῦ [e] ἡμῶν·

2. ὅτι [f] ἀληθιναὶ καὶ [f] δίκαιαι αἱ [f] κρίσεις αὐτοῦ·

ὅτι ἔκρινε τὴν πόρνην τὴν μεγάλην,

a Ver. 6, vii. 9.
b Cf. Jer. li. 48.
c Irreg. appos. to collective ὄχλου.
d vii. 10, xi. 15, xii. 10 (see note).
e Cf. Joh. xx. 17 Apoc. iii. 12, below 5-6.
f xv. 3; cf. on xvi. 7.

prophecy in the shape of a curse, this vehement, sensitive oracle against Rome's insolence and cruelty may be termed a curse in the form of a prophecy. A similar idea underlay the view of certain pious people who, according to Josephus (*cf.* Eus. *H. E.* ii. 23. 20-21), considered the fall of Jerusalem a retribution for the foul murder of James the Just nearly ten years before.

The doom-song is followed by an outburst of celestial triumph (xix. 1-8) in answer to xviii. 20. The conclusion as well as the commencement of the victory (xii. 12 f.) is hymned in heaven. The stern, exultant anthem, which is morally superior to the delight voiced by En. xlvii. 4, forms an overture to the final movement of the Apocalypse, as well as (like vii. 9 f., xiv. 1-5) a relief to the sombre context. 8 *b* is a prosaic editorial gloss, probably due to the liturgical use of the book, and the last clause of 10 (ἡ γὰρ . . . προφητείας) might be the same (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 56), as many editors think, were it not for the genuinely Johannine ring of the words. In any case it is an after-thought, probably (so Baljon, Barth, etc.) added by the author himself, in order to bring out here what is brought out in xxii. 9 by the explicit mention of the prophets, since ἐχ. τ. μ. Ἰησοῦ alone would mean Christians in general. The presence of 9 *b*-10 here, however, is not motived as at xxii. 8, 9, where it comes in naturally at the finale of the revelations and after a distinct allusion (xxii. 1) to the revealing angel. Here the angel of the second λέγει (at least) has not been mentioned since xvii. 1, 7, 15, and no reason at all is given for the superstitious impulse to worship. The passage is certainly Johannine, but probably misplaced (like xviii. 14, etc.). Can it have originally lain at the end of xvii., where the hierophant angel is speaking (*cf.* also xvii. 17, *words of God* and xix. 9 *b*)? Such technical dislocations and derangements are common enough in primitive literature (*cf.* my *Historical New Testament*, pp. xxxix. 676, 690). The passage must have been shifted to its present site either by accident or more probably by a scribe who saw that the similar assurance in xxi. 5, xxii. 6 related primarily to future bliss rather than to judgment; perhaps he also took the first λέγει not as a divine saying (*cf.* xxi. 5) but as angelic (xxii. 6, *cf.* i. 10, 11, 19, and note on xxii. 10), and sought to harmonise the same order as in xiv. 13 (command to write, beatitude, asseverance). Otherwise 1-10 is a unity as it stands. The change of situation in 1-3, 4-10 does not prove any combination of sources; it is simply another of the inconsequences and transitions characteristic of the whole book. The marriage-idea of 7, 8 is a proleptic hint which is not developed till later (xxi.), while the supper (9) is only mentioned to be dropped—unless the grim vision of 17-21 (for which *cf.* Gressmann's *Ursprung d. Isr.-jüd. Eschatologie*, 136 f.) is meant to be a foil to it (so Sabatier and Schön).

CHAPTER XIX.—Ver. 1. Here only in N.T. (after the ruin of sinners, as Ps. civ. 35) the liturgical hallelujah of the psalter and synagogue worship occurs. In vv. 1, 3, and 6 it stands as usual first, an invocation = "praise Jah"; but in ver. 4 it is responsive, as in Pss. civ.-v., cxv.-cxvii. (the latter being sung at the passover; *cf.* Apoc. xix. 7).

Ver. 2. ἔφθειρεν, as the first Babylon had been denounced for her depraving influence by Jeremiah (li.) xxviii. 25, τὸ ὄρος τὸ διεφθαρμένον τὸ διαφθεῖρον πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. The impatient cry of vi. 10 has now been answered. God "has avenged the blood (*i.e.*, the murder) of his servants at her hand (*i.e.*, on her)," the LXX rendering (*e.g.*, in 2 Kings ix. 7, καὶ ἐκδικήσεις τὰ αἵματα τῶν δούλων Κυρίου ἐκ χειρὸς Ἰεζάβελ) of the Heb. idiom נקם דם מיד = to exact punishment from a murderer. The idea is substantially that of Ps. Sol. iv. 9, viii. 29-31. As ἀληθ. καὶ δικ. are a characteris-

[g] ἥτις [h] ἔφθειρε τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς,
καὶ [i] ἐξεδίκησε τὸ αἷμα τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς."

3. καὶ δεύτερον [k] εἴρηκαν,
"Ἀλληλουϊά·
καὶ ὁ [l] καπνὸς αὐτῆς ἀναβαίνει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

4. καὶ [m] ἔπεσαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες, καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῷα, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ τῷ [n] καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ λέγοντες, [o] "Ἀμήν· Ἀλληλουϊά." 5. καὶ [p] φωνὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου ἐξῆλθε λέγουσα,
"[q] Αἰνεῖτε τῷ θεῷ [p] ἡμῶν πάντες οἱ [r] δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ,
καὶ [s] οἱ φοβούμενοι αὐτὸν [t] οἱ μικροὶ καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι."

6. καὶ ἤκουσα ὡς φωνὴν [u] ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ ὡς φωνὴν [v] ὑδάτων πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν [v] βροντῶν ἰσχυρῶν, λέγοντες,[1]
"Ἀλληλουϊά·
ὅτι [w] ἐβασίλευσε Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ὁ [x] παντοκράτωρ.

g "For that she" (i. 7, xii. 13, etc.). h xi. 18, xviii. 23. i vi. 10, xviii. 20, Deut. xxxii. 43, Ps. lxxix. 10. k aoristic pf. (as v. 7, vii. 14, xix. 3), of past action with no thought of existing result (Burton, 80, Blass, § 59, 4). l xiv. 11, xviii. 9, 18, Ps. civ. 35, Isa. xxxiv. 9-10. *cf.* Nah. i. 9. m v. 8, 14, on form *cf.* Helbing, 63-64. n v. 13, Isa. vi. 1. o vii. 12, xxii. 20, From Ps. cvi. 48 (Heb.). p Of Christ (iii. 12, Joh. xx. 17)? q Fr. Jer. xx. 13 (*αἰνέσατε αὐτῷ*, tr. of "Hallelujah"); *αἰν.* with dat. only here in N.T. r Ps. cxxxiv. 1, cxxxv. 1, Ps. Sol. ii. 41. s Ps. xxii. 23, cxxxv. 20; see above xi. 18. t xi. 18. u Ver. 1. v xiv. 2, Ezek. i. 24. w xi. 15, 17, Ps. xciii., xcv.-xcix. x i. 8.

[1] **λεγοντες** (as iv. 1) Q, min., And[c], Tic. (WH marg., Al., Ws., Bs.) [**λεγοντων** AP, min., gig., And[a], Pr., Lach., Ti., Tr., WH, Bj., Sw.].

tically ample expression for "equitable," it is in the context rather than in the language of the passage (Ritschl, *Rechtf. und Versöhn.* ii. 118, 119) that we must find the thought of God being shown to be the real and righteous Saviour of the saints by his infliction of punishment on their persecutors.

Ver. 4. After the long interlude of judgments on the earth, the **πρεσβύτεροι** and **ζῷα** (incidentally mentioned in xi. 16, xiv. 3) re-appear upon the scene, though for the last time, to take part in the chorus of praise over Rome's ruin. The cradle-song of the future is the dirge of Rome. The drama now centres mainly round the city of God, and the earlier temple-scenery of the Apocalypse (iv.-xi. xv. 5-xvi. 17) passes almost wholly out of sight.—**Ἀμήν**: the initial (and primitive) use of **ἀμήν**, social (*e.g.*, 1 Kings i. 36) as well as liturgical, which gravely assents to the preceding words of another speaker.

Ver. 5. The O.T. expression *servants of God* implied (*R. S.* 69 f.) not simply membership in a community of which God is king, but special devotion to his service and worship. It was not associated with any idea of "slavery to a divine despot," but was originally confined in the main to royal and priestly families (*cf.* i. 5) which had a special interest in primitive religion and which were near to the god of the tribe or nation. Hence, in the broader and later sense of the term, the "servants of God" are all those who live in pious fear of him, *i.e.*, yielding him honour and obedience. John, pre-occupied with judgment, views the faith of the Lord as equivalent practically to his fear; unlike most early Christian writers, who (1 Peter i. 17, 18, etc.) carefully bring forward the complementary element of love. Lowly confidence rather than warm intimacy is this prophet's ideal of the Christian life towards God. See Did. iii., iv.; Barn. iv. 11; Herm. *Mand.* x. 1, xii. 4, 6.

Ver. 6. S ingeniously but awkwardly punctuates after "Hallelujah," connecting **ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**, with the subsequent **χαίρωμεν**.—**ἐβασίλευσε κ.τ.λ.** A sublimated version of the old watchword **ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΗΜΩΝ** which had been the rallying cry of pious Jews and especially of the Pharisees (*e.g.*, Ps. Sol. xvii. 1, 2, 38, 51, ii. 34-36, v. 21, 22) during the conflict with Roman aggression. This divine epithalamium is the last song of praise in the Apocalypse. At this point also the writer reverts for a moment to

7. [y] χαίρωμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιῶμεν,
καὶ [z] δώσομεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῷ·
ὅτι [a] ἦλθεν ὁ [b] γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου,
καὶ ἡ [c] γυνὴ αὐτοῦ [a] ἡτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν.

8. καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ἵνα [d] περιβάληται [d] βύσσινον [e] λαμπρὸν καθαρόν [· [f] τὸ γὰρ βύσσινον τὰ [g] δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν]."

9. καὶ [h] λέγει μοι, "[i] Γράψον, [i] Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου [k] κεκλημένοι." Καὶ λέγει μοι, "[l] Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι

y Ps. cxviii. 24; *cf.* Mt. v. 12.
z xi. 13.
a Proleptic, as xi. 18.
b xxi. 2, 9.
c "Bride" (Mt. i. 29).
d Ver. 14, Ez. xvi. 10.
e xv. 6, *cf.* Bar. v. 1-3, and—for conn. of light and right—2 Cor. vi. 14.
f *Cf.* Matt. xxii. 11-12, vii. 12, = xxii. 37 f.
g Contrast ἀδικ. xviii. 5.
h *i.e.*, the angel of xvii. 1; implied, as in Zech. i. 7, 9 (LXX)?
i xiv. 13, Lk. xiv. 15.
k Matt. xxii. 2-3; *cf.* Dalm. i. § 1, c. 5*b*.
l xxi. 5, xxii. 6; *cf.* Dan. viii. 26, x. 1, xi. 2, xii. 7. Also Lk. xxi. 22.

the Lamb, absent since xvii. 14 from his pages, and absent again till xxi. 9.

Ver. 7. A proleptic allusion to the triumphant bliss as a marriage between the victorious messiah and his people or the new Jerusalem (*cf.* Volz, 331). The conception is primarily eschatological (Weinel, p. 137; *cf.* Mechilta on Exod. xix. 17) and is so employed here. The marriage-day of Christ and his church is the day of his second advent. This is the more intimate and tender aspect of the divine **βασιλεία**. But, as a traditional feature of the Oriental myth (Jeremias, 45 f.) was the postponement of the deity's wedding until he returned from victory (*i.e.*, after vanquishing the darkness and cold of the winter), the religious application turns first of all to the overthrow of messiah's foes (xix. 11 f.).—**ἀγαλλιῶμεν**, act. as in 1 Peter i. 8 (*cf.* Abbott, *Diatessarica*, 2,689).

Ver. 8. "Yea, she is (has been) permitted to put on" (for **διδόναι ἵνα** *cf.* ix. 5, Mark x. 37), epexegetic of **ἡτοιμ. ἑαυτήν** (Isa. lxi. 10). "Uides hic cultum gravem ut matronae, non pompaticum qualis meretricis ante (xvii. 4) descriptus," Grot. In the following gloss (see above) the rare use of **δικαιώματα** (= "righteous deeds") is paralleled by Bar. ii. 19 (**τὰ δικ. τῶν πατέρων**) and by an incidental employment of the sing. in this sense by Paul (see on Rom. v. 18). Moral purity and activity, which are the conditions of future and final bliss, are (as in vii. 14, xiv. 4) defined as the outcome of human effort, although of course their existence must be referred to God (**ἐδόθη**), and their success to the aid of Christ (*loc. cit.*); see on i. 4-6. Ignatius similarly (*Eph.* x.) describes the saints as "robed entirely in the commandments of Christ". The connexion of thought is the same as that in Matt. xxi. 43, xxii. 2, 11-14. For 8 *b* see the fontal passage from Sohar (cited by Gfrörer, ii. 184, 185): traditum est, quod opera bona ab homine hoc in mundo peracta, fiant ipsi uestis pretiosa in mundo illo.

Ver. 9. The saints are the Bride, but—by a confusion inevitable when the the two cognate figures, apocalyptic and synoptic (Matt. xxii. 2 f.), are combined—they are also the guests at the wedding. (The bliss of the next world is termed "the Banquet" in rabbinic writings, which interpret Exod. xxiv. 11 as though the sight of God were meat and drink to the beholders). Like the Greek **πόλις**, the church is composed of members who are ideally distinguishable from her, just as in En. xxxviii. 1 the congregation of the righteous is equivalent to the new Jerusalem. With the idea of 7-9, *cf.* Pirke Aboth, iv. 23: This world is like a vestibule before the world to come; prepare thyself at the vestibule that thou mayest be admitted into the **τρικλίνιον**.—**ἀληθ.** either "real" as opposed to fanciful and delusive revelations, or (if **ἀληθ. = ἀληθής**) "trustworthy words of God" (Dan. ii. 9) emphasising the previous beatitude (like **ναί, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα** xiv. 13). Originally the words (see above) gravely corroborated all the preceding threats and promises (*cf.* xvii. 17), despite their occasionally strange and doubtful look. It is a common reiteration in apocc. (*cf.* reff.), underlining as it were the solemn statements of a given passage. See, *e.g.*, Herm. *Vis.* iii 4, "that God's name may be glorified, hath this been revealed to thee, for the sake of those who are of doubtful mind, questioning in their hearts whether this is so or not. Tell them it is all true, that there is nothing but truth in it, that all is sure and valid and founded". In Sanhed. Jerus. Rabbi Joc-

ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ[1] εἰσίν." 10. καὶ ἔπεσα ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ· καὶ λέγει μοι, "[m] Ὅρα [m] μή· σύνδουλός σού εἰμι καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν [n] ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ· [o] τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον [· [p] ἡ γὰρ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ ἐστι τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας]."

11. καὶ εἶδον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠνεῳγμένον,
καὶ ἰδοὺ [q] ἵππος λευκός,

m (xxii. 9), sc. ποιήσῃς, *cf.* Eur., *Phœn.* 293.
n xii. 17.
o 1 Cor. xiv. 25.
p 1 Cor. xii. 3.
q *Cf.* vi. 2 for language.

[1] Bousset and Könnecke om. του θεου, but if the grammatical harshness of the text is an insuperable difficulty, the solution is to read (Beng., Lachm., Ws.) οι before αληθινοι (with A, 4, 48, S.).

hanan declares, with reference to Dan. x. 1, that a true word is one which has been already revealed by God to the council of the heavenly host.

Ver. 10. Jewish eschatology at this point has much to say of the return of the ten tribes and the general restoration of Zion's children from foreign lands but these speculations were naturally of no interest to the religious mind of the Christian prophet. As hitherto the command to write has come from Christ, the seer perhaps thinks that this injunction also proceeds from a divine authority (Weiss), but his grateful and reverent attempt to pay divine homage to the *angelus interpres* (*cf.* xxii. 8) is severely rebuked. The author's intention is to check any tendency to the angel-worship which—(whether a Jewish practice or not, *cf.* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5, 41; Lightfoot on Col. ii. 18; and Lueken, 4 f.)—had for some time fascinated the Asiatic churches here and there. If even a prophet need not bow to an angel, how much less an ordinary Christian? A contemporary note of this polemic is heard in Asc. Isa. vii. 21 (Christians): et cecidi in faciem meam, ut eum (the *angelus interpres*, who conducts Isaiah through the heavens) adorarem, nec siuit me angelus, qui me instruebat, sed dixit mihi ne adores nec angelum nec thronum. In Asc. Isa. ii. 11 the angelic cicerone even rebukes the seer for calling him Lord: οὐκ ἐγὼ κύριος, ἀλλὰ σύνδουλός σού εἰμι. The repetition of this scene (xxii. 8 f.), due to the Oriental love of emphasis by reduplication, is significant in a book where angels swarm (*cf.* Dan. ii. 11).—ἡ γὰρ κ.τ.λ., "for the testimony or witness of (*i.e.*, borne by) Jesus is (*i.e.*, constitutes) the spirit of prophecy". This prose marginal comment (see above) specifically defines the brethren who hold the testimony of Jesus as possessors of prophetic inspiration. The testimony of Jesus is practically equivalent to Jesus testifying (xxii. 20). It is the self-revelation of Jesus (according to i. 1, due ultimately to God) which moves the Christian prophets. He forms at once the impulse and subject of their utterances (*cf.* Ignat. *Rom.* viii.; *Eph.* vi.). The motive and materials for genuine prophecy consist in a readiness to allow the spirit of Jesus to bring the truth of God before the mind and conscience (*cf.* iii. 14, 22). The gloss even connects in a certain way with τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον. Since angelic and human inspiration alike spring from the divine witness of Jesus, therefore God alone, as its ultimate source, deserves the reverence of those whom that inspiration impresses. The prestige of the prophets lies in the fact that any one of them is, as Philo called Abraham, σύνδουλος τῶν ἀγγέλων. An angel can do no more than bear witness to Jesus. Furthermore, there is an implicit definition of the spirit of prophecy (xi. 7, etc.) in its final phase as a revelation of Jesus Christ. Even the O.T. prophetic books, with which the Apocalypse claims to rank, were inspired by the spirit of the pre-existent Christ (see on 1 Pet. i. 11; Barn. v. 6). But now, by an anti-Jewish and even anti-pagan touch, no oracular or prophetic inspiration is allowed to be genuine unless it concerns Jesus who is the Christ. Such is the triumphant definition or rather manifesto of the new Christian prophecy.

Vv. 11-21: a second vision of doom, on the Beast and his allies (in fulfilment of xii. 5). Their fate (17-21) follows a procession of the angelic troops (11-16, contrast ix. 16 f.). The connexion of this and the foregoing volume (7-9) is mediated by the idea that

καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτὸν [r] καλούμενος [s] πιστὸς καὶ
[t] ἀληθινός,
καὶ [u] ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνει καὶ πολεμεῖ·
12. οἱ δὲ [v] ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ φλὸξ πυρός,

r iii. 14. s In sense of Deut. vii. 9, xxxii. 4 (LXX); cf. Ps. Sol. xvii. 4-5, and Isa. xliii. 3 (LXX). t Cf. on xvi. 7, Dan. ii. 45, iii. 27 f. (LXX). u Ps. xcvi. 13: twofold function of Semitic king (1 Sam. viii. 20). v ii. 18.

the marriage of the warrior-messiah (*cf.* En. lx. 2; 4 Esd. xii. 32, xiii. 38; Apoc. Bar. xxxix., xl., lxx.) cannot take place till he returns from victory (so in the messianic psalm xlv.). Now that the preliminary movements of the enemy (xvii. 16, 17) are over, the holy war of xvii. 14 begins, which is to end in a ghastly Armageddon. This passage and the subsequent oracle of xx. 1-10 reproduce in part a messianic programme according to which the *dolores Messiae* (*cf.* Klausner: *mess. Vorstellungen d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten*, 1904, 47 f, and Charles on Apoc. Bar. xxvii. 1) are followed by messiah's royal advent on earth (here sketched in part from Sap. xviii. 4-25) to found a kingdom of the just (*i.e.*, Israel) who are raised for this purpose. Israel supplants Rome as the world-power (Bar. xxxix.). Her period of superiority opens with the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple, and closes with a crushing defeat of Gog and Magog, who are led by an incarnate villain ("dux ultimus," xl.), but are finally vanquished by the aid of the ten tribes who return to take part in this campaign. Death and Satan then are annihilated, and eternal bliss ensues. Like Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 20 f., John modifies this scheme of tradition freely for his own Christian ends. He introduces a realistic expansion of the messianic age into three periods: (*a*) a victory of messiah (mounted, like Vishnu, on a white horse for the last battle) and his ἅγιοι (*cf.* xiv. 20) over the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the world, who—as already noted—turn their attention to the saints after crushing Rome (11-21); (*b*) an undisturbed reign of Christ and his martyrs (xx. 1-6), evidently in Palestine; (*c*) the final defeat of Gog and Magog, with Satan their instigator (xx. 7-10). There is little or nothing specifically Christian in all this section (except xx. 4-6, *cf.* xix. 13), but the general style betrays the author's own hand, and there is no reason to suppose that a Jewish source in whole or part (so *e.g.*, Vischer, Sabatier, de Faye, Weyland, Spitta, von Soden) underlies it. The sequence of the passage with xvi. 13-16, 18-20 is due to a common cycle of tradition, rather than to any literary source (Schön). It is a homogeneous finale written by the prophet, in terms of current eschatology, to round off the predictions at which he has already hinted. Moralising traits emerge amidst the realism, but it is impossible to be sure how far the whole passage (*i.e.*, 11-21) was intended to be figurative.

Vv. 11-16. messiah and his troops or retinue: Jesus to the rescue (*cf. Samson Agonistes*, 1268 f.). The following description of a semi-judicial, semi-military hero is painted from passages like Isa. xi. 3-5 (where messiah, instead of judging by appearances, decides equitably: πατάξει γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ: his breath slays the wicked: his loins are girt δικαιοσύνῃ and ἀληθείᾳ), the theophany of Hab. iii., and the sanguinary picture of Yahveh returning in triumph from the carnage in Idumea (*cf.* ver. 13 with Isa. lxiii. 1-6). On the connexion of this celestial Rider with the Rider in 2 Macc. iii., *cf.* Nestle in *Zeits. f. alt. Wiss.* 1905, pp. 203f.

Ver. 11. The military function of the messiah is known even to the philosophic Philo, who (*de praem. et poen.* 15-20) represents him incidentally as καὶ στρατραρχῶν καὶ πολεμῶν ἔθνη. The victory of messiah over the earthly foes of God's kingdom meant the triumph of the kingdom, according to Jewish and Jewish Christian hopes; but owing to the increased spiritualisation of the latter, this nationalistic tradition was laid side by side with the wider hope of an eternal, universal judgment upon dead and living. The latter was originally independent of the earlier view, which made the culmination of providence for Israel consist in the earthly subjugation of her foes. The prophet John, by dividing God's foes into the two classes of Rome and Rome's destroyers, preserves the archaic tradition and also finds room for the Gog and Magog tradition later on.

Ver. 12. διαδήματα πολλά, bec. he is king of kings (Ptolemy on entering Antioch put two diadems on his head, that of Egypt and that of Asia, (1 Macc. xi. 13);

καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ [w] διαδήματα [w] πολλά·
[x] ἔχων [y] ὄνομα γεγραμμένον ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός·
13. καὶ [x] περιβεβλημένος ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον [1] [z] αἵματι·
καὶ κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, [a] "Ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ."

w Contrast xii. 3, xiii. 1.
x Loosely resuming the construction of ver. 11.
y *Cf.* on ii. 17. z Dat. *cf.* Joh. xxi. 8. a Art. with pred. irreg. after ὄνομα (as vi. 8, viii. 11, etc.).

[1] **βεβαμμενον** (AQ, min., Ar., edd.) is preferable to **ρεραμμενον** (Hort, Swete)—the conjectural origin of the variants **περιρεραμμενον** (ℵ*) **ερραμενον, ρεραντισμενον**, etc.—which is probably a corruption of it or due to dittography with **γεγραμμενον**.

cf. the ten golden diadems of royalty in ancient Egypt). Once crowned with thorns, Jesus is now invested with more than royal rank (*cf.* Barn. vii. 9, where Jesus, once accursed, is shown crowned). Eastern monarchs wore such royal insignia when they went into battle (*e.g.*, 2 Sam. i. 10). Jesus has far more than the four (of a good name, of the law, of the high priesthood, of the divine kingdom, Targ. Jerus. on Deut. xxxiv.) 5 or three (omitting the first) which Jewish tradition assigned to Moses (see Pirke Aboth, iv. 13, vi. 5; Joseph. *Bell.* i. 2, 8, prophetic, priestly, and royal honours). — **ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* Ep. Lugd., "when Attalus was placed on the iron seat and the fumes rose from his burning body, he was asked, 'What name has God?' 'God,' he answered, 'has not a name as man has." Contrast **ὃ οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.**, with Matt. xi. 27. The earlier words, **πιστ. κ. ἀληθ.**, are a description of the messiah's character and function, rather than a title. At this debût, which is the only event in the Apocalypse at all corresponding to the second advent (i. 7), the messiah's judicial power is practically restricted to the external work of crushing the last pagan opposition to God's cause on earth; it becomes therefore almost military. The divine commandant of the saints is "faithful and true," as he loyally executes the divine purpose and thus exhibits fidelity to the interests of the faithful. The sense remains unchanged, whether the two adjectives are taken as synonyms, or **ἀληθ.** assigned its occasional meaning of "real". Even in the latter case, to be real would mean to be trustworthy.

Ver. 13. "Dipped in blood" (*i.e.*, the blood of his foes): from the "crimsoned garments" of Yahveh in Isa. lxiii.; *cf.* also ver. 15 with "I have trodden the wine-press. . . . Yea, I trod them in mine anger (**κατεπάτησα αὐτοὺς ἐν θυμῷ μου**), and trampled them in my fury," etc. Add Targ. Palest. on Gen. xlix. 11, "How beauteous is the King Messiah! Binding his loins and going forth to war against them that hate him, he will slay kings with princes, and make the rivers red with the blood of their slain, and his hills white with the fat of their mighty ones, his garments will be dipped in blood, and he himself like the juice of the wine-press." The secret name denotes his superiority to all appeals; it indicates that the awful and punitive vigour of his enterprise made him impervious to the invocations of men. This is no Logos who dwells among men to give light and life; it is a stern, militant, figure of vengeance attacking the rebellious. Hence his name is mysterious; for "the identity, or at least the close connection between a thing and its name, not only makes the utterance of a holy name an invocation which insures the actual presence of the deity invoked, it also makes the holy name too sacred for common use or even for use at all" (Jevons' *Introd. Hist. Relig.* 361). The passage reflects certain phases of later messianic belief in Judaism, which had been tinged by the Babylonian myth of Marduk, Ea's victorious son, to whom divine authority was entrusted. Marduk's triumph was explained by Babylonian theologians as caused by the transference to him of the divine Name (so Michael, En. lxix. 14). 13 *b* may be a Johannine gloss upon the unknown name of ver. 12 (*cf.* Phil. ii. 9, 10), under the influence of passages like Heb. iv. 15, Sap. xviii. ("Thine all-powerful Logos leapt from heaven out of the royal throne, as a stern warrior into the midst of the doomed land, bearing the sharp sword of Thine unfeigned commandment"), and Enoch xc. 38 (*cp.* however Beer, *ad loc.*). —**κέκληται**, perf. of existing state, "the past action of which it is the result being left out of thought" (Burton, 75). If the above explanation of the mysterious name

14. καὶ τὰ [b] στρατεύματα τὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [c] ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἐφ' [d] ἵπποις λευκοῖς,
[e] ἐνδεδυμένοι [f] βύσσινον λευκὸν καὶ καθαρόν.
15. καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἐκπορεύεται [g] ῥομφαία ὀξεῖα, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ [h] πατάξῃ τὰ ἔθνη·
καὶ αὐτὸς [i] ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ·
καὶ αὐτὸς πατεῖ [k] τὴν ληνὸν [l] τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος.
16. καὶ ἔχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον [1] καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν [m] μηρὸν αὐτοῦ ὄνομα γεγραμμένον,
"[n] ΒΑϹΙΛΕΥϹ ΒΑϹΙΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΟϹ ΚΥΡΙΩΝ".

b xvi. 14-16. c As in xiv. 4? differently xvii. 14 (*cf.* Yasht xiii. 12-19 for heavenly aid of certain Fravashis), *cf. Par. Lost*, vi. 880-884. d Ver. 11. e Constr. ad sensum. f Ver. 8. g From Dan. ix. 25; see i. 16, ii. 12. 10, 27 f. = "sword-belt" (Spitta). h Isa. xi. 4, (quoted Ps. Sol. xvii. 39), En. lxii. 2, *cf.* 4 Esd. xiii. i ii. 27, xii. 5. k xiv. 20, Jud. iii. 13. l xiv. 10, xvi. 19. m ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.; n Κυρ. κυρ. a Babylonian title of Marduk. xvii. 14, 1 Ti. vi. 15.

[1] A om. **επι το ιματιον και** (S. = "written on garments which were on his thigh"). Wellh. conj. **επι τον ιππον**. *Cf. E. Bi.*, 2517.

be correct, the author's idea was evidently forgotten or ignored by some later editor or copyist of the Johannine school, who inserted this gloss in order to clear up the obscure reference, and at the same time to bring forward the transcendent name widely appropriated by that school for Christ in a pacific and religious sense (so nearly all critical editors). In any case the two conceptions of the Apocalypse and the Fourth gospel have little or nothing in common except the word. But the introduction of this apparently illogical sequence between 12 and 13 might be justified in part by *E. B. D.* 94, "I am he that cometh forth, advancing, whose name is unknown; I am Yesterday, and Seer of millions of years is my name". The application of such titles to Jesus certainly gives the impression that these high, honourable predicates are "not yet joined to his person with any intrinsic and essential unity" (Baur); they are rather due to the feeling that "Christ must have a position adequate to the great expectations concerning the last things, of which he is the chief subject". But their introduction is due to the semi-Christianised messianic conceptions and the divine categories by which the writer is attempting to interpret his experience of Jesus. Backwards and forwards, as pre-existent and future, the redeemer is magnified for the prophet's consciousness.

Ver. 15. **αὐτός**—The victory of the messiah is single-handed ("I have trodden the wine-press alone"); *cf.* on ver. 13, and Sap. xviii. 22, Ps. Sol. xvii. 24-27, where the word of messiah's mouth is the sole weapon of his victory (an Iranian touch as in *S. B. E.* iv. p. lxxvii. f., the distinguishing excellence of Zoroaster is that his chief weapon is spiritual, *i.e.*, the word or prayer). This fine idea, taken originally from Isaiah, was reproduced, naturally in a more or less realistic shape, by the rabbis who applied it to Moses at Exod. ii. 11 (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 23), and by apocalyptists (2 Thess. ii. 8; Ap. Bar. xxxvi. f., liii. f.; 4 Esd. x. 60 f., and here) who assigned an active rôle to the messiah in the latter days. The meaning of the sword-symbol is that "the whole counsel of God is accomplished by Jesus as a stern judgment with resistless power" (Baur). Thus the final rout of the devil, anticipated in xii. 12, is carried out (i.) by the overthrow of his subordinates (mentioned in ch. xiii.) here, and then (ii.) by his own defeat (xx. 10), although in finishing the torso of ch. xii. (Bousset) the prophet characteristically has recourse to materials drawn from very different cycles of current messianic tradition.

Ver. 16. "And on his garment and (*i.e.*, even) upon his thigh"; on that part of the robe covering his thigh, he has a title of honour written. Some Greek statues appear to have had a name written thus upon the thigh (Cicero mentions one of Apollo marked in small silver letters, *Verr.* iv. 43). Messiah, like many of the Assyrian monarchs, bears a double name. *King of kings*, a Persian (Æsch. *Persæ*, 24; Ezra vii. 12) and Parthian title of royalty, which in

17. Καὶ εἶδον [o] ἕνα ἄγγελον ἑστῶτα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ· καὶ ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων πᾶσι τοῖς [p] ὀρνέοις τοῖς πετομένοις ἐν μεσουρανήματι, "Δεῦτε συνάχθητε εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τὸ μέγα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 18. ἵνα [q] φάγητε σάρκας βασιλέων καὶ σάρκας χιλιάρχων καὶ σάρκας [r] ἰσχυρῶν καὶ σάρκας ἵππων καὶ τῶν καθημένων ἐπ' αὐτῶν καὶ σάρκας πάντων [s] ἐλευθέρων τὲ καὶ δούλων καὶ μικρῶν καὶ μεγάλων." 19. καὶ εἶδον τὸ [t] θηρίον καὶ τοὺς [u] βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν συνηγμένα ποιῆσαι [v] τὸν πόλεμον μετὰ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος αὐτοῦ. 20. καὶ [w] ἐπιάσθη τὸ θηρίον, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ [x] ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης ὁ [y] ποιήσας τὰ σημεῖα [y] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, ἐν οἷς ἐπλάνησε τοὺς λαβόντας τὸ χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ· ζῶντες ἐβλήθησαν οἱ δύο εἰς τὴν [z] λίμνην τοῦ [z] πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης

o viii. 13; an angel of the sun in Asc. Is. iv. 18.
p xviii. 2.
q xvii. 16.
r *Cf.* on vi. 15.
s xiii. 16.
t xiii. 1.
u xvii. 12, Ps. ii. 2.
v xvi. 14 (the final struggle of xvi. 12-16).
w Cant. ii. 15, Doric for ἐπιέσθη.
x xvi. 13.
y xiii. 11-17.
z xx. 10, 14. Isa. xxx. 33, Dan. vii. 11; *cf. Par. Lost*, i. 62-69.

the Apocalypse is the prerogative of messiah as the true Emperor was applied to Marduk as the conqueror of chaos and the arbiter of all earthly monarchs (*cf.* Zimmern in *Schrader*,[3] 373 f.).

Vv. 17-21: the rout and destruction of the Beast and his adherents, modelled upon Isaiah lvi. 9 f. and Ezekiel's description of the discomfiture of prince Gog (xxxix. 17-21), where beasts as well as birds are bidden glut themselves with carrion (4). This crude aspect of the messianic triumph had commended itself to Jewish speculation on the future (see En. xc. 2-4); it reflects the intense particularism of post-exilic Judaism in certain circles, and also the semi-political categories which tended to dominate the eschatology. In Asc. Isa. iv. 14, the Lord also comes with his angels and troops to drag into Gehenna Beliar and his hosts.

Ver. 17. **ἐν ἡλίῳ**, a commanding and conspicuous position.

Ver. 18. In the ancient world, this was the worst misfortune possible for the dead—to lie unburied, a prey to wild birds. On the famous "stele of the vultures" (bef. 3000 B.C.) the enemy are represented lying bare and being devoured by vultures, while the corpses of the royal troops are carefully buried.

Ver. 20. This marks the culmination of many previous oracles: the messiah meets and defeats (xvi. 13 f.) the beast (*i.e.*, Nero-antichrist, xi. 7, xiii. 1 f.) and the false prophet (*i.e.*, the Imperial priesthood = second beast of xiii. 11 f.) and their allies (*the kings of the earth*, *cf.* xi. 9, 18, xiv. 8, xvi. 14, xvii. 12 f.), according to a more specific form of the tradition reflected in xiv. 14-20. Possibly the ghastly repast of ver. 21 is a dramatic foil to that of ver. 9. At any rate there is a slight confusion in the sketch, due to the presence of heterogeneous conceptions; whilst one tradition made messiah at his coming vanquish all the surviving inhabitants of the earth, who were *ex hypothesi* opponents of God's people (*cf.* ii. 26, 27, xi. 9 f., xii. 9, xiv. 14 f., xvi. 13-16, xix. 17 f.), the prophet at the same time used the special conception of a Nero-antichrist whose allies were mainly Eastern chiefs (ix. 14 f., xvi. 12, xvii. 12 f.), and also shared the O.T. belief in a weird independent outburst from the skirts of the earth (xx. 8). Hence the rout of nations here is only apparently final. See on xx. 3. The lake of fire, a place of torment which burns throughout most of the apocalypses (Sibyll. ii. 196-200, 252-253, 286, etc.; Apoc. Pet. 8), was lit first in Enoch. (sec. cent.) where it is the punishment reserved for Azazel on the day of judgment (ix. 6) and for the fallen angels (xxi. 7-10) with their paramours. The prophet prefers this to the alternative conception of a river of fire [Slav. En. x.]. The whole passage reflects traditions such as those preserved (*cf.* Gfrörer ii., 232 f.), *e.g.*, in Targ. Jerus. on Gen. xlix. 11 and Sohar on Lev.-Exodus (miracula, uariaque et horrenda bella fient mari terraque circa Jerusalem, cum messias reuelabitur), where the beasts of the field feed for one year, and the birds for seven, upon the carcases of Israel's foes. The supreme penalty

a From Sib. Or. iii. 696-7.

ἐν θείῳ. 21. καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῇ ῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου, τῇ ἐξελθούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ· [a] καὶ πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα ἐχορτάσθησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν.

inflicted on the opponents of Zoroastrianism is that their corpses are given over to the corpse-eating birds, *i.e.*, ravens (Vend. iii. 20, ix. 49). *Cf.* Introd. § 4 *b*.

The messiah who forms "the central figure of this bloodthirsty scene," written like the preceding out of the presbyter's "savage hatred of Rome" (Selwyn, 83) has a semi-political rather than a transcendental role to play. The normal Christian consciousness (*cf.* xxii. 12) viewed the return of Jesus as ushering in the final requital of mankind; but in these special oracles (*cf.* xvii. 14) where a semi-historical figure is pitted against Christ on earth, the latter is brought down to meet the adversary on his own ground—a development of eschatology which is a resumption of primitive messianic categories in Judaism. The messiah here is consequently a grim, silent, implacable conqueror. There is no tenderness in the Apocalypse save for the pious core of the elect people, nothing of that disquiet of heart with which the sensitiveness of later ages viewed the innumerable dead. Here mankind are naïvely disposed of in huge masses; their antagonism to the messiah and his people is assumed to have exposed them to ruthless and inexorable doom. Nor do the scenic categories of the tradition leave any room for such a feeling as dictated Plutarch's noble description (*De Sera Uind.* 555 E. F.) of the eternal pangs of conscience. Upon the other hand, there is no gloating over the torments of the wicked.

Now that the destructive work of messiah is over, the ground seems clear for his constructive work (*cf.* Ps. Sol. xvii. 26 f.). But the idiosyncracies of John's outlook involve a departure from the normal tradition of Judaism and early Christianity at this point. Satan, who survives, as he had preceded, the Roman empire, still remains to be dealt with. The third vision of doom, therefore (xx. 1-10) outlines his final defeat, in two panels: (*a*) one exhibiting a period of enforced restraint, during which (for 2, 3 and 4-7 are synchronous) messiah and the martyrs enjoy a halcyon time of temporal and temporary bliss, (*b*) the other sketching (7-10) a desperate but unavailing recrudescence of the devil's power. The oracle is brief and uncoloured. It rounds off the preceding predictions and at the same time paves the way for the magnificent finalé of xxi.-xxii., on which the writer puts forth all his powers. But it is more than usually enigmatic and allusive. "Dans ces derniers chapitres les tableaux qui passent sous nos yeux n'ont plus la fraicheur vivante de ceux qui ont précédé. L'imagination ayant affaire à des conceptions absolument idéales et sans aucune analogie avec les réalités concrètes de la nature, est naturellement moins sûre d'elle-même, et ne parvient plus aussi facilement à satisfaire celle du lecteur" (Reuss). Ingenious attempts have been made (*e.g.*, by Vischer, Spitta, and Wellhausen) to disentangle a Jewish source from the passage, but real problem is raised and solved on the soil of the variant traditions which John moulded at this point for his own Christian purposes. In the creation-myth the binding of the chaos-dragon or his allies took place at the beginning of the world's history (*cf.* *Prayer of Manass.* 2-4). As the dragon came to be moralised into the power of spiritual evil, this temporary restraint (*cf.* on ver. 2) was transferred to the beginning of the end, by a modification of the primitive view which probably goes back to Iranian theology (*cf.* Stave, 175 f., Baljon, Völter, 120 f., Briggs, etc.). The conception of messiah's reign as preliminary and limited on earth was not unknown to Judaism (*Encycl. Relig. and Ethics*, i. 203 f.) or even to primitive Christianity (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 21-28, where Paul develops it differently). But the identification of it with the sabbath of the celestial week (which was originally non-messianic, *cf.* Slav. En. xxxii. xxxiii.) and the association of it with the martyrs are peculiar to John's outlook. A further idiosyncracy is the connection between the Gog and Magog attack and the final manœuvre of Satan. The psychological clue to these conceptions probably lies in the prophet's desire to provide a special compensation for the martyrs, prior to the general bliss of the saints. This may have determined his adoption or adaptation of the chiliastic tradition, which also conserved the archaic hope of an earthly

XX. 1. Καὶ εἶδον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα τὴν [a] κλεῖν τῆς [a] ἀβύσσου καὶ [b] ἅλυσιν μεγάλην ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ. 2. καὶ [c] ἐκράτησε τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, [d] ὅς ἐστι διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν [e] χίλια ἔτη, 3. καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον καὶ [f] ἔκλεισεν καὶ [f] ἐσφράγισεν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ [g] πλανήσῃ ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη, ἄχρι τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη· μετὰ ταῦτα δεῖ λυθῆναι αὐτὸν [h] μικρὸν χρόνον. 4. καὶ εἶδον [i] θρόνους—καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ' αὐτούς, [k] καὶ κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς—καὶ τὰς [l] ψυχὰς τῶν [m] πεπελεκισμένων [n] διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ,

a i. 18, ix. 1; *cf.* Rom. x. 7, 4 Esd. iv. 8.
b Mk. v. 3 f.
c Mk. vi. 17.
d xii. 9.
e = a Day of God, Jub. iv. 29, 2 Pet. iii. 8; *cf. E. Bi.* iii. 3096-7.
f From Dan. vi. 17 and *Bel and Dragon* (Theod.) 14.
g xiii. 14, xvi. 13, 2 Th. ii. 9-10, *cf.* Weinel, 21.
h xvii. 10.
i Never in Apoc. = "angels"; *cf.* Matt. xix. 28 = Luke xxii. 30.
k 1 Cor. vi. 2, Sap. iii. 8.
l vi. 9 = "persons," sc. εἶδον.
m Mt. xiv. 10, Acts xii. 2, Rom. viii. 35, Clem. Rom. v.-vi. (ἅπ. λεγ. N.T.).
n i. 9.

reign for the saints without interfering with the more spiritual and transcendent outlook of xx. 11 f. His procedure further enabled him to preserve the primitive idea of messiah's reign [4] as distinct from that of God, by dividing the final act of the drama into two scenes (4 f., 11 f.).—With the realistic episode of 1-3, angels pass off the stage (except the angel of xxi. 9 f. and the *angelus interpres* of xxii. 6-10), in accordance with the Jewish feeling that they were inferior to the glorified saints to whom alone (*cf.* Heb. ii. 4) the next world belonged. There is no evidence to support the conjecture (Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, 233) that ἄγγελον in ver. 1 represents "an already corrupt text of an older Hebrew Apocalypse, in which *mal'āk* was written instead of *mīkā'ēl*" (*cf.* above on xii. 7).

Chapter XX.—Vv. 1-3. The dragon is flung by an angel, not by God or messiah, into the pit of the abyss which formed his original haunt (*cf.* on ix. 1), and there locked up, like an Arabian jin, so as to leave the earth undisturbed for the millenium. The prophet thus welds together two traditions which were originally independent. The former echoes Egyptian (*E. B. D.* 4, "thine enemy the serpent hath been given over to the fire, the serpent-fiend hath fallen down headlong; his arms have been bound in chains . . . the children of impotent revolt shall never more rise up") and especially Parsee eschatology (Hübschmann, 227 f.) which held that one sign of the latter days was the release of the dragon Dahâka—once bound fast at mount Demavend—to corrupt the earth and eventually to be destroyed prior to the advent of the messiah and the resurrection of the dead. The Iranian view was that Fredun could not kill the serpent, whose slaughter was reserved for for Sâme (Bund. xxix. 9). But John abstains from giving any reason for the devil's reappearance. He simply accepts the tradition and falls back (ver. 3) piously upon the δεῖ of a mysterious providence. Some enigmatic hints in a late post-exilic apocalypse (Isa. xxiv. 21, 22, the hosts on high and the kings on earth to be shut up in the prison of the pit but—after many days—to be visited, *i.e.*, released), upon which John has already drawn, had been developed by subsequent speculation (*cf.* the fettering of Azazel, En. x. 4 f., liv. 5 f.) into the dogma of a divine restraint placed for a time upon the evil spirit(s); see *S. C.* 91 f., Charles' *Eschatology*, 200 f.—ἔθνη. Strictly speaking, the previous tradition (xix. 18, 21) left no inhabitants on earth at all. Such discrepancies were inevitable in the dovetailing of disparate conceptions, but the solution of the incongruity here probably lies in the interpretation of ἔθνη as outlying nations on the fringe of the empire (8) who had not shared in the campaign of Nero-antichrist and consequently had survived the doom of the latter and his allies (*cf.* xviii. 9).

Vv. 4-6. The millennium.

Ver. 4. θρόνους, tribunal-seats for the assessors of the divine judge (as in Dan. vii. 9, 10, 22, of which this is a replica). The unnamed occupants (saints including martyrs? as in Daniel) are allowed to manage the judicial processes (so Dan. vii. 22, where the Ancient of days τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν ἁγίοις Ὑψίστου) which constituted a large part of Oriental government. But no stress is laid on this incidental remark, and the subjects of

[o] καὶ [o] οἵτινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν τὸ θηρίον οὐδὲ τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν· καὶ [p] ἔζησαν καὶ [q] ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ [r] τοῦ Χριστοῦ χίλια ἔτη· 5. οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν [s] οὐκ ἔζησαν [t] ἄχρι τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη. αὕτη ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη. 6. Μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων [u] μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ· ἐπὶ τούτων [v] ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἔσονται [w] ἱερεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ [x] βασι-

o Defining or expanding, not specifying (as i. 7) some of the previous class.
p "Came to life," as ii. 8.
q Constative aor. Moult. i. 130.
r xi. 15, xii. 10.
s Isa. xxvi. 14.
t *Cf.* Blass, § 65, 10.
u xxi. 8, Joh. xiii. 8; *cf.* Mt. xxiv. 51.
v ii. 11, xxi. 8.
w i. 6.
x v. 10, Isa. lxi. 6.

this sway are left undefined; they are evidently not angels (Jewish belief, shared by Paul). Such elements of vagueness suggest that John took over the trait as a detail of the traditional scenery. His real interest is in the martyrs, for whom he reserves (*cf.* Eus. *H. E.* vi. 42) the privilege assigned usually by primitive Christianity either to the apostles or to Christians in general. They are allotted the exclusive right of participating in the messianic interregnum.—**πεπελεκισμένων**, beheaded by the lictor's axe, the ancient Roman method of executing criminals (*cf.* Introd. § 6). Under the empire citizens were usually beheaded by the sword. The archaic phrase lingered on, like our own "execution". Here it is probably no more than a periphrasis for "put to death". Even if **καὶ οἵτινες** meant a second division, it must, in the light of xi. 7, xiii. 15, denote martyrs and confessors (who had suffered on the specific charge of refusing to worship the emperor).—**χίλια ἔτη**, tenfold the normal period of human life (Plato, *Rep.* 615), but here = the cosmic sabbath which apocalyptic and rabbinic speculation (deriving from Gen. ii. 2 and Ps. xc. 4) placed at the close of creation (*cf.* Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, 316 f.; Bacher's *Agada d. Tann.*[2] i. 133 f.; *E. Bi.* iii. 3095-3097; *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, i. 204 f., 209). John postpones the **παλιγγενεσία** till this period is over (contrast Matt. xix. 28). He says nothing about those who were living when the millenium began, and only precarious inferences can be drawn. Does ver. 6 contain the modest hope that he and other loyal Christians might participate in it? or does the second (**καὶ οἵτινες**) class represent (or include) the living loyalists (so, *e.g.*, Simcox, Weiss, Bousset)? The latter interpretation involves an awkward ambiguity in the meaning of **ἔζησαν** (= *came to life*, and also *continued to live*), conflicts with **οἱ λ. τ. νεκρῶν** (5) and **ψυχὰς** (4), and is therefore to be set aside, as 5-6 plainly refer to both classes of 4. A third alternative would be to suppose that all Christians were *ex hypothesi* dead by the time that the period of xx. 1 f. arrived, the stress of persecution (*cf.* on xiii. 8 f.) having proved so severe that no loyalist could survive (*cf.* below, on ver. 11).

Ver. 6. An interpolated explanation of the preceding vision. **Ἅγιος**, if a continuation of **μακ.**, must almost be taken in its archaic sense of "belonging to God". The ordinary meaning reduces the phrase to a hysteron proteron, unless the idea is that the bliss consists in holiness (so Vendidad xix. 22, "happy, happy the man who is holy with perfect holiness"). "Blessed and holy," however, was a conventional Jewish term of praise and congratulation (*cf.* Jub. ii. 23).—**ὁ δεύτ. θάνατος κ.τ.λ.** According to the Hellenic faith recorded in Plutarch (in his essay on "the face in the moon's orb"), the second death, which gently severs the mind from the soul, is a boon, not a punishment. But John's view reflects the tradition underlying the Iranian belief (Brandt, 586 f., 592) that the righteous were exempt from the second death (defined as in xxi. 8). The clause **ἀλλ' . . . Χριστοῦ** refers to the permanent standing (i. 6, v. 10 *a*) of these risen martyrs not only during but after the millennium; otherwise it would be meaningless, since the danger of the second death (as the penalty inflicted on all who are condemned at the final assizes) does not emerge until the millennium is over. The subsequent clause **καὶ βασιλεύσουσι κ.τ.λ.** is independent, referring back to the special and temporary privilege of the first resurrection and the millennium. For this reason it is precarious to infer from **ἔσονται ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (elsewhere **τῷ θεῷ**) that the occupation of these saints is the mediation of divine knowledge to the

λεύσουσι μετ' αὐτοῦ χίλια ἔτη. 7. καὶ ὅταν τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη, [y] λυθήσεται ὁ Σατανᾶς [z] ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς αὐτοῦ, 8. καὶ ἐξελεύσεται [a] πλανῆσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὰ [a] ἐν ταῖς τέσσαρσι γωνίαις τῆς γῆς, τὸν [b] Γὼγ καὶ τὸν Μαγώγ, συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, ὧν ὁ ἀριθμὸς

y Ver. 3.
z *Cf.* i. 5.
a vii. 1, *cf.* Isa. xi. 12, Ezek. vii. 2.
b *Cf.* Winckler's *Alt-Orient. Forsch.* ii. 160 f., and *E. Bi.* 4331 f.

ἔθνη whom Satan is temporarily prevented from beguiling. The likelihood is that the phrase simply denotes as elsewhere the bliss of undisturbed access to God and of intimate fellowship. John ignores the current belief that the loyal survivors on earth would be rewarded (*cf.* Dan. xii. 12; Ps. Sol. xvii. 50, etc.), which is voiced in Asc. Isa. iv. 14-16, but he reproduces independently the cognate view (Asc. Isa. iv. 16 f.) that "the saints will come with the Lord with their garments which are (now) stored up on high in the seventh heaven [*cf.* Apoc. vi. 11] . . . they will descend and be present in this world" (after which the Beloved executes judgment at the resurrection). He, retains, however, not only the general resurrection (12) but the variant and earlier idea (*cf.* 4 Esd. vii. 26 f.) of a resurrection (ἔζησαν, 4) confined to the saints. He calls this *the first resurrection* not because the martyrs and confessors who enjoyed it had to undergo a second in the process of their final redemption but because it preceded the only kind of resurrection with which sinners and even ordinary Christians had anything to do (Titius, 37-40; Baldensperger, 74, 79 f.).—**καὶ βασιλεύσουσι,** apparently on earth. This would be put beyond doubt were we to take the view of the risen martyrs' occupation which has been set aside above. But, even apart from this, in the light of all relevant tradition and of the context, the earth must be the sphere of the millennium; Christ might of course be conceived to execute his sovereignty from heaven, but, though ver. 9 denotes a different cycle of tradition from 4-6, it is put on the same plane, and the vision of 4 (*cf.* 1) is evidently this world. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς would be more in keeping with this context than with that of v. 10, where again the refrain of xxii. 5 (κ. β. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων) would be more appropriate.—**χίλια ἔτη.** This enigmatic and isolated prediction has led to more unhappy fantasies of speculation and conduct than almost any other passage of the N.T. It stands severely apart from the sensuous expectations of current chiliasm (fertility of soil, longevity, a religious carnival, etc.), but even its earliest interpreters, Papias and Justin, failed to appreciate its reticence, its special object, and its semi-transcendent atmosphere. For its relevance, or rather irrelevance, to the normal Christian outlook, see Denney's *Studies in Theology*, pp. 231 f., and A. Robertson's *Regnum Dei*, pp. 113 f. When the millennium or messianic reign was thus abbreviated into a temporary phase of providence in the latter days, the resurrection had to be shifted from its original position prior to the messianic reign; it now became, as here, the sequel to that period.

Vv. 7-10: As Baligant, lord of the pagans, issues from the East to challenge Charlemagne and be crushed, Satan emerges from his prison for a short period (3) after the millennium, musters an enormous army of pagans to besiege the holy capital, but is decisively routed and flung into the lake of fire to share the tortures of his former agents. The tenses shift from future (7-8, 10 *b*) to aorist (9-10 *a*) the latter (*cf.* xi. 11) being possibly due to the influence of Semitic idiom.

Ver. 8. Satan's return to encounter irretrievable defeat upon the scene of his former successes (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου ἐτῶν Ezek. xxxviii. 8), is an obscure and curious feature, borrowed in part from earlier beliefs in Judaism (Gog and the Parthians both from the dreaded N. E., Ezek. xxxviii. 4), but directly or indirectly from a legend common to Persian and Hellenic eschatology: in the former the evil spirit has a preliminary and a final defeat, while in the latter the Titans emerge from Tartarus only to be conclusively worsted (Rohde, *Psyche*, 410 f.). No explanation is given of how Satan gets free. In the Iranian eschatology (Brandt, 590 f.) the serpent breaks loose at the call of Angra Mainyô (God's opponent), seduces a part of mankind and persecutes the rest, till he is overcome by the messiah, who then proceeds to raise the dead. But as John identifies the serpent with Satan, such a

[c] αὐτῶν ὡς ὁ [d] ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης. 9. καὶ ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸ [e] πλάτος τῆς γῆς, καὶ [f] ἐκύκλευσαν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν [g] ἠγαπημένην· καὶ [h] κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ

c Pleonastic (*cf.* iii. 8, etc).

d Gen. xxii. 17, xxxii. 12, Heb. xi. 12, on form (omitting initial ψ) *cf.* Helbing, 22.

e Hab. i. 6, Ezek. xxxviii. 11.

f 2 Kings vi. 14.

g See iii. 9, and on xxi. 7; Ps. lxxviii. 68, lxxxvii. 2, Jer. xi. 15.

h Ezek. xxxviii. 22. xxxix. 6, 2 Kings i. 10, Zech. xii. 9, Isa. xxvi. 11.

theory was plainly out of the question. At any rate, Satan wins adherents for this fresh attempt from those barbarian hordes who survived the downfall of the Roman empire (xix. 17-21). They are called "Gog and Magog," after the traditional opponents who were to be defeated by the redeemed Israel of the latter days, according to the faith of Judaism (Ezek. xxxviii.-xxxix.). Jerusalem, the navel and centre of the earth (Ezek. xxxviii. 12) as messiah's residence, is besieged; but, like Gog of old, the invaders are consumed by the divine fire, whilst Satan is consigned for ever to the lake of fire, where he lies writhing among his worshippers, as a punishment for seducing men. This is at once a reminiscence of the Iranian eschatology (Hübschmann, 231), where the serpent is flung into molten metal as his final doom, in order to rid earth of his presence, and also a reflection of Enoch liv. (lxvii. 7) where the four angels grip the hosts of Azazel on the last day and "cast them into a burning furnace, that the Lord of Spirits may take vengeance on them for leading astray those who dwell on earth".

Ver. 9. **παρεμβολή**, either camp (as in O.T., *e.g.*, Deut. xxiii. 14) or army (Heb. xi. 34), the saints being supposed to lie in a circle or leaguer round the headquarters of the messiah in Jerusalem, which—by an association common in the ancient world (*e.g.*, Nineveh, "the beloved city" of her god Ishtar)—is termed his beloved city. The phrase is an implicit answer (*cf.* on iii. 9) to the claim of contemporary Judaism which held to the title of "God's beloved" as its monopoly (Apoc. Bar. v. 1, xxi. 21, *cf.* Sir. xxiv. 11). In the Hebrew Elias-apocalypse of the 3rd century (*cf.* Buttenwieser, *E. J.* i. 681-2), where Gog and Magog also appear after the millennium to besiege Jerusalem, their annihilation is followed by the judgment and the descent of Jerusalem from heaven. This tradition of xx. 4-10 therefore belongs to the cycle from which xi. 1-13 (xiv. 14-20) was drawn; Jerusalem, freed from her foes and purified within, forms the headquarters of messiah's temporary reign, tenanted not simply by devout worshippers but by martyrs (*cf.* xiv. 1-5, on mount Zion). Yet only a new and heavenly Jerusalem is finally adequate (xxi. f.); it descends after the last punishment and judgment (xi. 15 f.=xx. 10 f.). Wetstein cites from the Targ. Jonath. a passage which has suggested elements in this and in the preceding (xi. 17-21) vision: a king rises in the last days from the land of Magog, et omnes populi obedient illi; after their rout by fire their corpses lie a prey to wild beasts and birds. Then "all the dead of Israel shall live . . . and receive the reward of their works". In the highest spirit of the O.T., however, John rejects the horrible companion thought (En. lxxxix. 58, xciv. 10, xcvii. 2) that God gloats over the doom of the damned. An onset of foreign nations upon Jerusalem naturally formed a stereotyped feature in all Jewish expectations of latter-day horrors; here, however, as the city is *ipso facto* tenanted by holy citizens, the siege is ineffective (contrast xi. 1 f.). Neither here nor in xix. 21 are the rebellious victims consigned at death to eternal punishment, as are the beast, the false prophet, and Satan. The human tools of the latter die, but they are raised (xx. 11 f.) for judgment (ver. 15), though the result of their trial is a foregone conclusion (xiii. 8, xiv. 9-10). In En. lvi., from which this passage borrows, Gog and Magog are represented by the Medes and the Parthians from whom (between 100 and 46 B.C.) a hostile league against Palestine might have been expected by contemporaries. But the destruction of the troops is there caused by civil dissensions. In our Apocalypse the means of destruction is supernatural fire, as in 2 Thess. i. 8, ii. 8, 4 Esd. xii. 33, xiii. 38-39, Ap. Bar. xxvii. 10, Asc. Isa. iv. 18 (where fire issues from the Beloved to consume all the godless); the Parthians also appear some time before the end, in the penultimate stage when the Roman empire and its Nero-antichrist make their last attack. But the prophet is still left with the orthodox eschatological tradition of Gog

κατέφαγεν αὐτούς· 10. καὶ ὁ διάβολος ὁ [i] πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν [k] λίμνην τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ θείου, ὅπου καὶ τὸ θηρίον καὶ ὁ ψευδοπροφήτης· καὶ [l] βασανισθήσονται ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

11. Καὶ εἶδον [m] θρόνον [n] μέγαν [o] λευκὸν
καὶ τὸν καθήμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν,
οὗ ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου [p] ἔφυγεν ἡ γῆ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός,
καὶ [q] τόπος οὐχ εὑρέθη [q] αὐτοῖς.

12. Καὶ εἶδον τοὺς νεκρούς, τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικρούς,
ἑστῶτας ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου,
καὶ [r] βιβλία ἠνοίχθησαν·

i = ὃς ἐπλάνα (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28).
k xix. 20, En. xc. 20-25; *cf.* Mt. xiii. 41-42, xxv. 41 (No mention of fate of devil's angels, in Apoc.).
l xiv. 11.
m *Cf.* iv. 2, Dan. vii. 9.
n As distinct from those of iv. 4, xx. 4.
o = unsullied justice?
p xvi. 20, xxi. 1, Isa. xiii. 13, xxiv. 19-20.
q From Dan. ii. 35.
r Dan. vii. 10, Mal. iii. 16, Jer. xvii. 1. *Encycl. Relig. and Ethics*, ii. 792-795.

and Magog, an episode (consecrated by the Ezekiel-prophecy and later belief) which he feels obliged to work in somehow. Hence his arrangement of Satan's final recrudescence in juxtaposition with the Gog and Magog outburst (*cf.* on xvi. 16, and Klausner's *messian. Vorstellungen d. jüd. Volkes im Zeit. d. Tannaiten*, pp. 61 f.). The latter, an honoured but by this time awkward survival of archaic eschatology, presented a similar difficulty to the Talmudic theology which variously put it before, or after, the messianic reign (Volz, pp. 175 f.). In his combination of messianic beliefs, John follows the tradition, accepted in Sib. Or. iii. 663 f., which postponed the irruption till after messiah's temporary period of power.

xx. 11-xxii. 5. The connexion of thought depends upon the traditional Jewish scheme outlined, *e.g.*, in Apoc. Bar. xxix.-xxx. (*cf.* 4 Esd. vii. 29, 30) where the messiah returns in glory to heaven after his reign on earth; the general resurrection follows, accompanied by the judgment. Developing his oracles along these current lines, the prophet now proceeds to depict his culminating vision of the End in three scenes: (i.) the world and its judgment (xx. 11-15), (ii.) the new heaven and earth (xxi. 1-8), centring round (iii.) the new Jerusalem as the final seat of bliss (xxi. 9-xxii. 5). The last-named phase was associated in eschatology (Sib. Or. v. 246 f., 414 f.) with the return of Nero redivivus and the downfall of Babylon which preceded the sacred city's rise. The destruction of hostile forces, followed by the renovation of the universe, is essentially a Persian dogma (Stave, 180 f.), and is paralleled in the Babylonian mythology, where after the defeat and subjugation of Tiâmat in the primeval age creation commences. From this point until xxi. 9 f., Jesus is ignored entirely.

Vv. 11-15. The moral dignity and reticence with which this sublime vision of the last assize is drawn, show how the primitive Christian conscience could rise above its inheritance from Jewish eschatology. The latter spoke more definitely upon the beginning of the end than upon the end itself (*cf.* Harnack's *History of Dogma*, i. 174).

Ver. 11. John hints where Isaiah is explicit (vi. 1). Nothing is said about the uselessness of intercession; *cf.* 4 Esd. vii. [102 115] 33: "and the Most High shall be revealed upon the judgment-seat, and compassion shall pass away, long-suffering shall be withdrawn". Enoch xc. 20 sets up the throne near Jerusalem, and most apocalypses are spoiled by similarly puerile details. Compare with 11 *b* the tradition in Asc. Isa. iv. 18 where the voice of the Beloved (*i.e.*, messiah) at the close of the millennium rebukes in wrath heaven and earth, the hills and cities, the angels of the sun and moon, "and all things wherein Beliar manifested himself and acted openly in this world". John's Apocalypse, however, follows (yet *cf.* xxii. 12) that tradition of Judaism which reserved the judgment for God and not for the messiah (4 Esd. vi. 1-10, vii. 33 f. anti-Christian polemic?) although another conception (En. xlv. 3, lxix. 27 etc.; Ap. Bar. lxxii. 2-6) assigning it to the messiah had naturally found greater favour in certain Christian circles.

Ver. 12. The books opened in God's court contain the deeds of men, whose

καὶ ἄλλο [s] βιβλίον ἠνοίχθη, ὅ ἐστιν τῆς ζωῆς·
καὶ ἐκρίθησαν οἱ νεκροὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις,
[t] κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.
13. Καὶ ἔδωκεν ἡ [u] θάλασσα τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ,
καὶ ὁ [v] θάνατος καὶ ὁ [w] ᾅδης ἔδωκαν τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς·
καὶ ἐκρίθησαν ἕκαστος
κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν.

s iii. 5, xiii. 8, xvii. 8, En. xlvii. 3, cviii. 3, *cf.* Eurip. *Fragm.* 488. t 2 Cor. v. 10, Rom. ii. 2-11. Jo. v. 28-29. u For anc. Gk. idea of sea preventing dead from passing into Hades, *cf.* Radermacher's *Das Jenseits im Mythos d. Hellenen* (1903) 74 f. v i. 18, Isa. xxvi. 19. w vi. 8, *cf.* Charles on En. lxiii. 10.

fate is determined by the evidence of these "vouchers for the book of life" (Alford); the latter volume forms as it were a register of those predestinated to eternal life (*cf.* Gfrörer ii. 121 f., and below on ver. 15). The figure of books containing a record of man's career was a realistic expression of Jewish belief in moral retribution, which prevailed especially in eschatological literature (*e.g.*, Jubil. xxx.; Enoch. lxxxix.-xc.; Dan. vii. 10, etc.) after the exile. "And in these days I saw the Head of days, when he had seated himself upon the throne of his glory, and the books of the living were opened before him" (Enoch xlvii. 3; *cf.* Driver's *Daniel*, p. 86). It is obvious, from ver. 15, that the resurrection is general (as Dan. vii. 20; 4 Esd. vi. 20, vii. 32; Test. Jud. 25; Test. Benj. 10; Apoc. Bar. 7, etc.; *cf.* Gfrörer, ii. 277 f.; and Charles's *Eschatology*, 340 f.), in opposition to the primitive and still prevalent belief which confined it to the righteous (*E. Bi.* 1390). Hence the books contain not the good deeds alone of the saints (the prevalent Jewish idea, *cf.* Charles on En. li. 1; Mal. iii. 16; Jub. xxx.; Ps. lvi. 8, etc.), nor bad deeds alone (Isa. lxv. 6; En. lxxxi. 4; *cf.* En. xc. 20; Apoc. Bar. xxiv. 1) but good and bad deeds alike (as Dan. vii. 10; Asc. Isa. ix. 20 f.). This again tallies with the Iranian faith (Hübschmann, 229), according to which, at the command of Ormuzd, the righteous and the wicked alike were raised for their recompense. Here the tribunal is a throne, before which the king's subjects have to answer for their conduct; rebels are punished and the loyal get the reward of good service (*cf.* xxii. 12, etc.). **γεγραμμ.**, by whom? Jewish speculation conjectured Raphael as the recording angel (En. xx. 3) or a band of angels (Slav. En. xix. 5); but the Jewish idea of the heavenly tables (**πλάκες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ**) is omitted in the Apoc., nor is there the slightest mention of those living at the era of judgment. Did John mean that none would survive (*cf.* ver. 5)? Or were any survivors to be taken directly to heaven at the coming of Christ, as in Paul's primitive outlook (see on 1 Th. iv. 16-17)?

Ver. 13. See Pirke Aboth, iv. 32: "Let not thine imagination assure thee that the grave is an asylum" (for, like birth and life and death, judgment is appointed before the King of the kings of kings). "And the earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell therein in silence, and the secret chambers shall deliver up those souls (of the righteous, iv. 35) that were committed unto them," 4 Esd. vii. 32—reproducing, as here, Enoch li. 1, "and in those days will the earth also give back those who are treasured up within it, and Sheol also will give back that which it has received, and hell will give back that which it owes". Also En. lxi. 5 where the restoration includes "those who have been destroyed by the desert, or devoured by the fish of the sea and by the beasts". Evidently drowned people are supposed not to be in Hades; they wander about or drift in the ocean (Achill. Tat. v. 313), **μηδὲ εἰς ᾅδου καταβαίνειν ὅλως**. According to the prophet's conception (*cf.* xiii. 8, xiv. 9 f.) the fate of pagans must have been a foregone conclusion, when the Imperial cultus was made the test of character; in which case "the scene before the white throne is rather a final statement of judgment than a statement of final judgment" (Gilbert). But the broader allusion to *works* here shows that the prophet is thinking of the general ethical judgment, which embraced issues wider than the particular historical test of the Emperor-worship. —**ᾅδης κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* Plutarch's (*de Iside*,

14. Καὶ ὁ [x] θάνατος καὶ ὁ ᾅδης ἐβλήθησαν εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός·

[οὗτος ὁ θάνατος [y] δεύτερός ἐστιν, ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός] [1]

15. καὶ εἴ τις οὐχ εὑρέθη ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ τῆς ζωῆς γεγραμμένος, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός.

x 1 Cor. xv. 26, Isa. xxv. 8, 4 Esd. vii. 31.
y Cf. on Luke xii. 4-5.

[1] Om. **ουτος . . . πυρος** with eight minn., Me., Arm. (Aug.), Andbav, Pr., Haym. as a marginal gloss [so, *e.g.*, Krüger, (*Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1897, 31), von Soden, Bousset (?), and Wellhausen (with 14*a* and 15)], perhaps displaced from its original position after 15, where it would suit the context (Haussleiter, 212-213), since there is no question of the second death except for human beings. The misplacement was probably due to the attraction of **θανατος** in 14.

29) derivation of Amenthes, the Egyptian name for Hades, as "that which receives and gives". As in Slav. En. lxv. 6 and the later Iranian Bundehesh (*S. B. E.* v. 123 f.), the resurrection of the body is not mentioned, though it is probably implied (*cf.* En. li. 1, lxii. 14 and Matt. xxvii. 52 f.).

Ver. 14. Death as Sin's ally must be destroyed along with Sin, while Hades, the grim receptacle of Death's prey (the intermediate rendezvous for the dead, except for martyrs, *cf.* vi. 10), naturally ceases to have any function. This was the cherished hope of early Christianity as of Judaism (Isa. xxv. 8). John's idea of the second death is much more realistic and severe than the Hellenic or the Philonic (*cf. de Praem. et Poen.* § 12, etc.).

Ver. 15. In Enoch (xxxviii. 5, xlviii. 9) the wicked are handed over by God to the saints, before whom they burn like straw in fire and sink like lead in water. The milder spirit of the Christian prophet abstains from making the saints thus punish or witness the punishment of the doomed (*cf.* on xiv. 10). In Apoc. Pet. 25 the souls of the murdered gaze on the torture of their former persecutors, crying **ὁ θεὸς, δικαία σου ἡ κρίσις.** These features, together with those of torturing angels (Dieterich, 60 f.) and Dantesque gradations of punishment (Dieterich, 206 f.), are conspicuous by their absence from John's Apocalypse. There is a stern simplicity about the whole description, and just enough pictorial detail is given to make the passage morally suggestive. As gehenna, like paradise (4 Esd. iii. 4), was created before the world, according to rabbinic belief (Gfrörer, ii. 42-46), it naturally survived the collapse of the latter (ver. 11). Contrast with this passage the relentless spirit of 4 Esd. vii. 49 f. ("I will not mourn over the multitude of the perishing . . . they are set on fire and burn hotly and are quenched"). If John betrays no pity for the doomed, he exhibits no callous scorn for their fate. The order of xx. 13-15 and xxi. 1 f. is the same as in the haggadic pseudo-Philonic *De Biblic. Antiquitatibus* (after 70 A.D.) where the judgment ("reddet infernus debitum suum et perditio restituet paratecen suam, ut reddam unicuique secundum opera sua") is followed by the renewal of all things ("et exstinguetur mors et infernus claudet os suum . . . et erit terra alia et caelum aliud habitaculum sempiternum").

So much for the doomed. The bliss of saints occupies the closing vision (xxi.-xxii. 5). From the smoke and pain and heat it is a relief to pass into the clear, clean atmosphere of the eternal morning where the breath of heaven is sweet and the vast city of God sparkles like a diamond in the radiance of his presence. The dominant idea of the passage is that surroundings must be in keeping with character and prospects; consequently, as the old universe has been hopelessly sullied by sin, a new order of things must be formed, once the old scene of trial and failure is swept aside. This hope of the post-exilic Judaism (*cf.* Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22) was originally derived from the Persian religion, in which the renovation of the universe was a cardinal tenet; it is strongly developed in Enoch (xci. 16, civ. 2, new heaven only) and 4 Esd. iv. 27 f. ("if the place where the evil is sown pass not away, there cannot come the field where the good is sown"). The expectation (*cf.* on Rom. viii. 28 f.) that the loss sustained at the fall of Adam would now be made good, is hardly the same as this eschatological transformation; the latter prevailed whenever the stern exigencies of the age seemed to demand a clean sweep of the universe, and the apoca-

a Cf. xx. 11, En. xlv. 4-5, lxxii. 1.

XXI. 1. Καὶ εἶδον οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν·
ὁ γὰρ [a] πρῶτος οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ πρώτη γῆ ἀπῆλθαν,
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι.

lyptic attitude towards nature seldom had anything of the tenderness and pathos, *e.g.*, of 4 Esd. viii. 42-48 (*cf.* vii. 31). The sequence of xx. 11 f. and xxi. 1 f. therefore follows the general eschatological programme, as *e.g.* in Apoc. Bar. xxi. 23 f., where, after death is ended (very mildly), the new world promised by God appears as the dwelling-place of the saints (*cf.* also xxxii. 1 f.). The earthly Jerusalem is good enough for the millennium but not for the final bliss; the new order (xxi. 5) of latter (*cf.* above) coincides, as in Oriental religion (Jeremias, 45 f.), with the new year (*i.e.*, spring) festival of the god's final victory.—The literary problem is more intricate. With xxi. 1-8, which is evidently the prophet's own composition, the Apocalypse really closes. The rest of the vision, down to xxii. 5, is little more than a poetical repetition and elaboration of xxi. 1-8, to which xxii. 6 f. forms the appropriate conclusion, just as the doublet xix. 9 *b*, 10 (in its present position) does to xix. 1-8. When xix. 9 *b*, 10 is transferred to the end of xvii. (see above), the parallelism becomes even closer. Both xvii. (the vision of the harlot-Babylon, with her evil influence on the world, and her transient empire) and xxi. 9-xxii. 5 (the vision of the Lamb's pure bride, with her endless empire) are introduced alike (*cf.* xvii. 1, xxi. 9) and ended alike, though xxii. 6-8 has been slightly expanded in view of its special position as a climax to the entire Apocalypse. As xvii. represents John's revision of an earlier source, this suggests, but does not prove, a similar origin for xxi. 9-xxii. 5. He might have sketched the latter as an antithesis to the former; certainly the "editorial" brushwork in xxi. 9-xxii. 5 is not nearly so obvious and abrupt as, *e.g.*, in xviii. Upon the other hand there are touches and traits which have been held to imply the revision of a source or sources, especially of a Jewish character (so variously Vischer, Weyland, Ménégoz, Spitta, Sabatier, Briggs, Schmidt, S. Davidson, von Soden, de Faye, Kohler, Baljon, J. Weiss, and Forbes), delineating the new Jerusalem (*cf.* xxi. 1-2). In this event the Christian editor's hand would be visible, not necessarily in xxi. 22 (see note), but in the ἀρνίον-allusions, in xxi. 14 *b*, 23 (*cf.* xxii. 5), 25 *b* (=xxii. 5 *a*), and 27 (=xx. 15, xxi. 8, xxii. 3 *a*). Another set of features (xxi. 12, 16, 24-27 *a*, xxii. 2 *c*, 3 *a*, 5) is explicable apart from the hypothesis of a Jewish source, or indeed of any source at all. Literally taken, they are incongruous. But since xxi. 9-xxii. 5 may be equivalent not so much to a Jewish ideal conceived *sub specie Christiana* as to a Christian ideal expressed in the imaginative terms of a Jewish tradition which originally depicted an earthly Jerusalem surrounded by the respectful nations of the world, a number of traits in the latter sketch would obviously be inapplicable in the new setting to which they were transferred. These are retained, however, not only for the sake of their archaic associations but in order to lend pictorial completeness to the description of the eternal city. The author, in short, is a religious poet, not a theologian or a historian. But while these archaic details need not involve the use of a Jewish source (so rightly Schön and Wellhausen), much less a reference of the whole vision to the millennial Jerusalem (Zahn), or the ascription of it to Cerinthus (Völter) or a chiliastic Jewish Christian editor (Bruston), may not the repetitions and parallelisms, especially in view of xxii. 6 f., indicate a composite Christian origin, as is suggested, *e.g.*, by Erbes (A=xxi. 1-4, xxii. 3-17, 20, 21, B=xxi. 5-27, xxii. 1, 2, 18, 19) and Selwyn (xxii. 16-21, the conclusion of A=xxi. 2, xxii. 3-5, xxi. 3-6 *a*, xxii. 7, xxi. 6 *b*-8, or of B=xxi. 9-xxii. 2, xxii. 6, 8-15)? Some dislocation of the original autograph or scribal additions may be conjectured with reason in xxii. 6-21 (see below), at least. But the reiterations are intelligible enough as the work of a single writer, whose aim is to impress an audience rather than to produce a piece of literature. The likelihood is that John composed xxi. 9 f. as an antithesis to the description of the evil city which he had reproduced from a source in xvii., and that he repeated the incident of xxii. 8, 9 (as xix. 9, 10 at the end of xvii.), adapting it to its position at the close of the whole book as well as of the immediately preceding oracle.

CHAPTER XXI.—Vv. 1-8: the prelude to the last vision.

Vv. 1-2, the title: 1 *a b*=xx. 11 *c*,

2. καὶ τὴν πόλιν τὴν [b] ἁγίαν Ἰερουσαλὴμ [c] καινὴν εἶδον καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, [d] ἡτοιμασμένην ὡς νύμφην [e] κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. 3. καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς [f] μεγάλης [g] ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου λεγούσης,

"Ἰδοὺ ἡ [h] σκηνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
καὶ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν·

b xi. 2, Isa. lii. 1, Heb. xi. 16, xii. 22.
c iii. 12, Gal. iv. 26.
d xix. 7-8, Isa. lii. 1, lxi. 10.
e Ezek. xvi. 11 = "full of people" (Isa. xlix. 18).
f xi. 12, xvi. 1.
g xix. 5; *cf.* xx. 11.
h xiii. 6, Ezek. xxxvii. 27, Zech. ii. 10, viii. 8, *cf.* Isa. lvii. 15.

1 *c* = xx. 13 *a*. The absence of the sea from John's ideal universe is due not to any Semitic horror of the ocean, nor to its association with Rome (xiii. 1), nor to the ancient idea of its dividing effect ("mare dissociabile," "the unplumbed, salt, estranging sea,"), but to its mythological connexion with the primitive dragon-opponent of God, the last trace of whom is now obliterated. *Cf.* Sib. v. 159, 160, 447 (**ἔσται δ' ὑστατίῳ καιρῷ ξηρὸς πότε πόντος**), Ass. Mos. x. 6, 4 Esd. vi. 24, Test. Levi 4, etc., for this religious antipathy to the treacherous, turbulent element of water. "La mer est une annulation, une stérilization d'une partie de la terre, un reste du chaos primitif, souvent un châtiment de Dieu" (Renan, 449). Plutarch (*de Iside*, 7 f., 32) preserves the Egyptian sacred tradition that the sea was no part of nature (**παρωρισμένην**) but an alien element (**ἀλλοῖον περίττωμα**), full of destruction and disease. The priests of Isis (32) shunned it as impure and unsocial for swallowing up the sacred Nile. One favourite tradition made the sea disappear in the final conflagration of the world (*R. J.* 289), but John ignores this view. The world is to end as it began, with creation; only it is a new creation, with a perfect paradise, and no thwarting evil (Barn. vi. 13). His omission of the ocean is simply due to the bad associations of the abyss as the abode of Tehom or Tiâmat (*cf.* Oesterley's *Evol. of Messianic Idea*, 79 f., G. A. Smith's *Jerusalem*, i. 71 f., and Hastings' *D. B.* iv. 194, 195).

Ver. 2. **ἐκ** = origin, **ἀπὸ** = originator. This conception of the new Jerusalem as messiah's bride in the latter days is an original touch, added by the prophet to the traditional Jewish material (*cf.* Volz, 336 f.). In 4 Esd. vi. 26 (Lat. Syr.) "the bride shall appear, even the city coming forth, and she shall be seen who is now hidden from the earth"; but this precedes the 400 years of bliss, at the close of which messiah dies. In En. xc. 28 f. a new and better house is substituted for the old, while in 4 Esd. ix.-xi. the mourning mother rather suddenly becomes "a city builded" with large foundations (*i.e.*, Zion). These partial anticipations lend some colour to Dalman's plea that the conception of a pre-existent heavenly Jerusalem was extremely limited in Judaism, and that John's vision is to be isolated from the other N.T. hints (see reff.). For a fine application of the whole passage, see *Ecce Homo*, ch. xxiv. The vision conveys Christian hope and comfort in terms of a current and ancient religious tradition upon the new Jerusalem (*cf.* Charles on Apoc. Bar. iv. 3). The primitive form of this conception, which lasted in various phases down to the opening of the second century, was that the earthly Jerusalem simply needed to be purified in order to become the fit and final centre of the messianic realm with its perfect communion between God and man (*cf.* Isa. lx., liv. 11 = Tobit xiii. 16-17, Ezek. xl.-xlviii., En. x. 16-19, xxv. 1, Ps. Sol. xvii. 25, 33, Ap. Bar. xxix., xxxix.-xl., lxxii., lxxiv., 4 Esd. vii. 27-30, xii. 32-34, etc.). But alongside of this, especially after the religious revival under the Maccabees, ran the feeling that the earthly Jerusalem was too stained and secular to be a sacred city; its heavenly counterpart, pure and pre-existent, must descend (so here, after En. xc. 28, 29, Ap. Bar. xxxii. 3, 4, Test. Dan 5, etc.). In rabbinic theology, the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem was taken from Adam after his lapse, but shown as a special favour to Abraham, Jacob and Moses (*cf.* Ap. Bar. iv.). The Christian prophet John not only sees it but sees it realised among Christian people—a brave and significant word of prophecy, in view of his age and surroundings.

Vv. 3, 4. **σκην.** (chosen on account of its "assonance with the Hebrew to express the *Shekinah*," Dr. Taylor on Pirke

καὶ [i] αὐτοὶ [k] λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται,
καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἔσται.
4. καὶ [l] ἐξαλείψει πᾶν δάκρυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν,
καὶ [m] ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι·
[n] οὔτε πένθος οὔτε κραυγὴ οὔτε [o] πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι·
[p] ὅτι τὰ πρῶτα ἀπῆλθον."

5. καὶ [q] εἶπεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, "Ἰδοὺ, [r] καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα." [s] καὶ λέγει "Γράψον· ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι [t] πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί εἰσι." 6. καὶ εἶπέ μοι, [u] "Γέγοναν.[1] [v] ἐγὼ τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. ἐγὼ τῷ διψῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς [w] τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς [x] δωρεάν. 7. ὁ [y] νικῶν κληρονομήσει

i Gen. xvii. 8, Jer. xxxi. 33, 2 Cor. vi. 16. From Lev. xxvi. 11-12.
k On plur. see Acts iv. 27.
l vii. 17, xx. 14, Isa. xxv. 8, xxxv. 10.
m *Cf.* Justin, *Dial.* xlv. 14; Volz, 348; a Persian belief (Hübschmann, 232).
n Isa. lxv. 19, Jer. xxxi. 16, Ass.-Mos. x. 1.
o = pain, only in Apoc. in N.T.
p Isa. lxv. 17.
q By itself, only here in Apoc.
r Isa. xliii. 19, 2 Cor. v. 17, vi. 16-18, Barn. vi. 13.
s Similar asseverations in Dan. ii. 45, viii. 26, etc. a feature of the apoc. style.
t In sense of Ps. xix. 7, cxi. 7, etc.
u xvi. 7: On form Deissm. (192).
v (Emphatic, ἐγώ), *cf.* i. 8, xxii. 13, Isa. xli. 4, xliv. 6, xlviii. 12.
w *Cf.* John vii. 37 f., Just. *Dial.* lxix. etc.
x xxii. 17, John iv. 10-14.
y ii. 7; emphatic (αὐτῷ, αὐτός).

[1] The unusual aoristic (*cf.* Helbing, 67) termination of γεγοναν (ℵ^c A, S., Iren., edd.) has started the variants γεγονασιν (38), γεγονε (41, 94: "no doubt a conj. of Erasmus based on vg., his MS. 1 reading γεγονα," Gwynn), and γεγονα (ℵ* PQ, Syr., Arm., And., Areth., etc.; = ειμι, so Buresch in *Rhein. Museum*, 1891, 206).

Aboth iii. 3) is the real tabernacle (Heb. viii. 2, ix. 11). The whole meaning and value of the new Jerusalem lies in the presence of God (En. xlv. 6, lxii. 14, Test. Jud., 25, etc.) with men which it guarantees. The O.T. promises are realised (see reff.); God is accessible, and men are consoled with eternal comfort (*cf.* Enoch x. 22, καὶ καθαρισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ παντὸς μιάμματος καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ὀργῆς καὶ μάστιγος). If we were to read the passage in the light of Isa. lxi. 3-10, the tears wiped away would signify that the penitents were newly espoused to the Lord; but the context here implies tears of grief and pain, not of repentance. "There shall be no more labour, nor sickness, nor sorrow, nor anxiety, nor need, nor night, nor darkness, but a great light" (Slav. En. lxv. 9).

Ver. 5. The first and only time that God addresses the seer, or indeed (apart from i. 8) speaks at all. The almost unbroken silence assigned to God in the Apocalypse corresponds to the Egyptian idea of the divine Reason needing no tongue but noiselessly directing mortal things by righteousness (Plut. *de Iside*, 75; hence the deity is symbolised by the crocodile, which was believed to be the only animal without a tongue).

Ver. 6. "'Tis done, all is over" (sc. οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι or πάντα). The perfecting of God's work is followed, as in Isa. liv.-lvi., by a liberal promise of satisfaction to all spiritual desire, and the three ideas of consolation, eternal refreshment, and Divine fellowship are thus conjoined as in vii. 14-17. Compare the fontal passage in Philo, *de migrat. Abr.* § 6 πηγὴ δὲ, ἀφ᾽ ἧς ὀμβρεῖ τὰ ἀγαθά, ἡ τοῦ φιλοδώρου Θεοῦ σύνοδός ἐστιν. οὗ χάριν ἐπισφραγιζόμενος τὰ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν φησιν, Ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ. The promise implies (like Isa. xliv. 3, not lv. 1) that thirst is accompanied by readiness and eagerness to accept the boon, which is free (6) and full (πάντα) and filial (ver. 7). The thirst for God is opposed to the unbelief and vice which quench it, just as the victorious life is contrasted with the craven spirit which shrinks from the hardships and demands of faith. Similarly the life of strenuous obedience now enters on its majority; it comes into an estate of filial confidence to the great God, bestowed on all who acquit themselves nobly in their probation. By a rare touch (since iii. 22) in the Apocalypse, the individual Christian is singled out. Usually the writer is interested in the general body of Christians. Here, however, as in ii.-iii., religious individualism aptly follows the idea of personal promise and encouragement (*cf.* xxii. 17), as afterwards of judgment (xxii. 11-12).

Ver. 7. These boons (3-7), however, are reserved for the loyal; the third (son

ταῦτα, καὶ [z] ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς, [z] καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι υἱός. 8. τοῖς δὲ [a] δειλοῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις καὶ ἐβδελυγμένοις καὶ [b] φονεῦσι καὶ πόρνοις καὶ φαρμακοῖς καὶ [c] εἰδωλολάτραις καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς [b] ψευδέσι, τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ τῇ [d] καιομένῃ πυρὶ καὶ θείῳ, [e] ὅ ἐστιν ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος.

z 2 Sam. vii. 14, Ps. lxxxix. 26-27, Zech. viii. 8, 2 Cor. vi. 18.
a Heb. x. 38-39.
b ix. 21, xxii. 15, 1 Pet. iv. 15, Jas. v. 6. Rom. i. 29, Mk. vii. 21 = Mt. xv. 19.
c Eph. v. 5; ver. 27.
d Gen. xix. 24, Isa. xxx. 33, Ezek. xxxviii. 22.
e xx. 14; constr. Win. § 24. 8*b*.

of God) was a title applied to Augustus and the emperors generally throughout the Greek and Roman world. **κληρονομήσει** (here only in Apoc.) in general sense = "enter into possession of," "partake of". ("This place" of bliss "is prepared for the righteous who endure every kind of attack in their lives from those who afflict their souls . . . for them this place is prepared as an eternal inheritance," Slav. En. ix.). This is the sole allusion, and a purely incidental one, to that central conception of the messianic bliss as a **κληρονομία,** which bulks so prominently in apocalypses like Fourth Esdras and is employed in a cosmic sense by Paul as lordship over the whole creation (see Bacon, *Biblical and Semitic Studies*, Yale Univ. 1902, pp. 240 f.). The solitary allusion to sonship expresses the close relation to God for which this writer elsewhere prefers to use the metaphor of priesthood. Partly owing to the bent of his mind, partly owing to the stern circumstances of his age, he (like Clem. Rom.) allows the majesty and mystery of God to overshadow that simple and close confidence which Jesus inculcated towards the Father (Titius, 13, 14), as also the direct love of God for his people (only in iii. 9, 19, xx. 9).

Ver. 8. The reverse side of the picture (*cf.* xx. 12-15 and below on ver. 27): a black list of those who have not conquered. **δειλοῖς** = "cowards" or apostates, who deny Christ in the persecution and worship Caesar (Introd. § 6) through fear of suffering; "**δειλία** does not of course itself allow that it is timorous, but would shelter its timidity under the more honourable title of **εὐλάβεια**" (Trench, *Synonyms*, § x.). It embraces further all those who draw back under the general strain of ridicule and social pressure (Heb. vi. 4-8; 2 Ti. iv. 16, etc.), like Bunyan's *Pliable*, but unlike his *Mr. Fearing* (*cf.* 1 Macc. iii. 16).—**ἀπίστοις** not = incredulous (so *e.g.*, Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, 802[82], 3 cent. B.C.) but, as in Luke xii. 46 (*cf.* Sir. ii. 12 f.), = "faithless," untrustworthy, those who are not **πιστός** (i. 5, ii. 10, 13, 2 Ti. ii. 13). All **δειλοί** are **ἄπιστοι** (*cf.* Introd. § 6), but not all **ἄπιστοι** are **δειλοί.** There are more reasons for disloyalty to Christ than cowardice, and some of these are hinted at in the following words, which suggest that **ἄπιστοι** includes the further idea of immorality (as in Tit. i. 15, 16, where it is grouped with **βδελυκτοί**). Lack of faith is denounced also in Apoc. Bar. liv. 21, 4 Esd. ix. 7, etc. **ἐβδελυγμένοις** for **βδελυκτοῖς** (as **εὐλογημένος** for **εὐλογητός,** etc., *cf.* Field on Gal. ii. 11; Simcox, *Lang. N.T.* 128, 129), "detestable" because "defiled and fouled" by the impurities of the pagan cults (xvii. 4, xviii. 3, etc.; *cf.* Hos. ix. 10; Slav. En. x. 4) including unnatural vice. Murder (and fornication, Jas. ii. 11) in the popular religions of the ancient world caused ritual impurity and disqualified for access to God, unless atoned for.—**φαρμακοῖς** = "poisoners" or "sorcerers" (xxii. 15), *cf.* Dan. ii. 27 LXX, and above on ix. 21, where (as here and in Gal. v. 21) witchcraft or magic is bracketed with idolatry. Idolaters, in Apoc. Pet. 18, have a special place **πλείστου πυρὸς γέμων. ψευδέσιν** = "liars," primarily recreant Christians who deny their faith and Lord, or worship false gods (Rom. i. 25); but also untruthful Christians who cheat (Acts v. 3) and lie to one another (Col. iii. 9, *cf.* Apoc. xiv. 5); further perhaps to be taken in its general ethical sense (Slav. En. xlii. 13; *cf.* Did. v. 2) = Oriental duplicity.—**τοῖς δὲ**: as in LXX, the subject of the principal clause is thrown forward into the dative (Viteau, ii. 41, 42). The special standpoint of the Apoc. renders the terms of exclusion rather narrower than elsewhere (*cf.* Volz, 313). Thus there is no allusion to sins of omission, especially as regards justice and kindness between man and man (as Slav. En. x., xlii. 8-9, Matt. xxv. 41 f.—the former apocalypse finely excluding from heaven all guilty of "evil thoughts" and magic, all harsh or callous men, and finally all idolaters). The parallels with the rest of

9. καὶ ἦλθεν [f] εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας, τῶν γεμόντων τῶν ἑπτὰ πληγῶν τῶν ἐσχάτων, καὶ ἐλάλησε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ λέγων "Δεῦρο, [g] δείξω σοι τὴν [h] νύμφην τὴν γυναῖκα [1] τοῦ ἀρνίου." 10. καὶ [i] ἀπήνεγκέ με ἐν πνεύματι ἐπ᾽ [k] ὄρος μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν, καὶ ἔδειξέ μοι τὴν πόλιν, τὴν [l] ἁγίαν Ἰερουσαλήμ, καταβαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [m] ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, 11. ἔχουσαν τὴν [n] δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ φωστὴρ αὐτῆς [o] ὅμοιος [p] λίθῳ τιμιωτάτῳ, ὡς

f Cf. xv. 1, xvii. 1.
g iv. 1, xvii. 1.
h xix. 7, xxi. 2.
i xvii. 3; cf. Weinel, 202.
k Not a wilderness (xvii. 3). From Ezek. xl. 2.
l Contrast xi. 8.
m xx. 9, xxi. 2.
n xv. 8, ver. 23.
o Sc. ἦν.
p xvii. 4.

[1] την γυναικα a gloss from xix. 7? (Bousset, Könnecke, '39-40).

the Apocalypse, as well as the general style, indicate that xxi. 1-8 comes from the pen of the prophet himself; there is no evidence sufficient to support the conjecture that 5*b*-8 is a Christian editor's gloss in a Jewish original (Vischer, von Soden, S. Davidson, Rauch = 6 *b*-8, Spitta). The catalogue of vices, not unparalleled in ethnic literature (*cf.* Dieterich, pp. 163 f., 174 f., Heinrici on 2 Cor. vi. 4 f.), diverges from those of ix. 20-21 and xxii. 15. The second agrees with Sap. xiv. 22-28 in making idolatry the fontal vice, and with Did. v. in putting theft after **πορνεία** (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 4-5, Eph. v. 5, etc.). Paul, again, invariably starts with the blighting touch of **πορνεία** or **ἀκαθαρσία** (*cf.* Seeberg's *Catechismus d. Urc.* 9-29, and von Dobschütz, pp. 406 f.) as in xxii. 15. No special significance attaches to the lists of the Apocalypse beyond the obviously appropriate selection of idolatry (ix. 20) as the outstanding vice of paganism, with cowardice (xxi. 8) as the foil to victorious confession (xxi. 7, ii. 13, 17, xv. 2); note the division of xxii. 15 into the repulsive or filthy (first three) and the wicked (second three), corresponding to xxii. 11. The **κύνες** of xxii. 15 roughly answer to the "abominable" of xxi. 8. xxi. 1-8 are a summary of what follows: xxi. 1, 2=9-21, xxi. 3, 4=xxi. 22-xxii. 5, xxi. 5-8=xxii. 16-21.

xxi. 9-xxii. 5: the new Jerusalem (resuming the thought of ver. 2, *cf.* xix. 7), corresponding to the new universe (ver. 1). The fall of Jerusalem accentuated the tendency to rise from the expectation of a new or renovated city on earth to the hope of a heavenly, transcendent city (*cf.* Apoc. Bar. iv. 2-6, etc.), though the passionate desire for a restoration of city and temple in the messianic age was still strong (*cf.* *R. J.* 226 f., Volz, 334 f.). John introduces the definitely Christian identification of the heavenly Jerusalem with the bride of the messiah, and combines the various features of a renovated, a heavenly, and a pre-existent city—features which occasionally reflect the mythological background of such earlier ideas in Judaism. The whole conception, if not the passage itself, is satirised by Lucian (*Vera Hist.* ii.) in his account of the golden city with its emerald wall, its river, and the absence of night, to say nothing of vines **δωδεκαφόροι καὶ κατὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον καρποφοροῦσιν**. Vv. 11-21 describe the exterior, vv. 22-27 the interior.

Ver. 10: a fresh vision, marked by a new transport of ecstasy (*cf.* Ezek. iii. 14, xi. 1, etc.).—**ὄρος**, the vantage-ground of elevation from which the seer views the site and buildings. If the hill is the site of the city, it is a truncated cone like Cirta, or a terraced *zikkurat*. Ezra sees the vision of the descent of the new Jerusalem in a field of flowers (*cf.* 4 Esd. ix. 26 f., xiii. 35 f.), but John follows either the older tradition of Enoch (En. xxiv., xxv.) who visited a high mountain which, as his cicerone Michael explained, was the throne of God "where the great and holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit when he shall descend to visit the earth with goodness," or more probably the primitive association of paradise with a mountain (*cf.* Oesterley's *Evol. of Mess. Idea*, 129 f., Volz, 375).

Ver. 11. "With the dazzling splendour of God," *cf.* on ver. 3, Ezek. xliii. 5, Isa. lx. 1, 2. *Uxor splendet radiis mariti;* **δόξα**, here, as usually in a apocalyptic literature, denotes the manifestation and realisation of the divine presence. A realistic turn is given to the expression by the "shimmering radiance" of **ὁ φωστήρ κ.τ.λ.** (asyndeton); "her brilliance is like a very precious stone, a jasper, crystal-clear" (*i.e.*, transparent and gleaming as rock-crystal). The

λίθῳ [q] ἰάσπιδι κρυσταλλίζοντι· 12. ἔχουσα τεῖχος μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν, ἔχουσα πυλῶνας δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς πυλῶσιν [r] ἀγγέλους δώδεκα, καὶ ὀνόματα ἐπιγεγραμμένα ἅ ἐστι [s] τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. 13. ἀπ' ἀνατολῆς, πυλῶνες τρεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ [t] βορρᾶ, πυλῶνες τρεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ νότου, πυλῶνες τρεῖς· καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, πυλῶνες τρεῖς. 14. καὶ τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχων [u] θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα ὀνόματα [v] τῶν δώδεκα [v] ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου. 15. καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶχε μέτρον κάλαμον χρυσοῦν, ἵνα μετρήσῃ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῆς. 16. καὶ ἡ πόλις [w] τετράγωνος κεῖται, καὶ τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς ὅσον τὸ πλάτος. καὶ ἐμέτρησε τὴν πόλιν τῷ καλάμῳ ἐπὶ σταδίους δώδεκα χιλιάδων· τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ πλάτος καὶ τὸ ὕψος αὐτῆς ἴσα ἐστί· 17. καὶ ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῆς ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τεσσάρων [x] πηχῶν, [y] μέτρον ἀνθρώπου, ὅ ἐστιν ἀγγέλου.

q iv. 3.
r *Cf.* 2 Chron. viii. 14 From Isa. lxii. 6.
s vii. 4-8. From Ezek. xlviii. 31 f. (*cf.* En. xxxiv.-xxxv.).
t For form *cf.* Helbing, 33, Win. § 8, 2; more common in papyri than βορέας (Thumb, 65, 67, 56).
u Eph. ii. 20, Heb. xi. 10; *cf.* Isa. xxviii. 16.
v As in Asc. Isa. iii. 17, ix. 17, xi. 21.
w Like orig. Babylon, Herod. i. 178; figurative Hellen. term = "perfect" (Plato, *Protag.* 344A, Arist., *Eth. Nik.* I. x. 11).
x Contracted, Hellenistic genit. for πήχεων (Win. § 9, 6, Deissm. 153, Helbing, 44-45).
y Nom. absol. Vit. ii. 226, 332-3.

modern jasper is an opaque tinted quartz, only partially translucent at the edges. Perhaps, in reproducing Isa. liv. 11-12 (**καὶ θήσω τὰς ἐπάλξεις σου ἴασπιν καὶ τὰς πύλας σου λίθους κρυστάλλου**), the writer regarded both clauses as complementary (Cheyne); hence **ὡς λ. ἰ. κ.** Otherwise **ἴασπις** might represent an opal, a diamond, or a topaz, any one of which answers better to the description of "transparent and valuable". Flinders Petrie, however, suggests some variety of the dark green jasper.

Ver. 12. **ἔχουσα.** The constr. becomes still more irregular, the participles agreeing with an imaginary nominative, **ἡ πόλις,** sugg. by **ὁ φωστήρ.** The inscribed names denote the catholicity of the church and its continuity with the ancient people of God. A writer who could compose, or incorporate, or retain (as we choose to put it), passages like v. 9 and xiv. 4, is not to be suspected of particularism here. Even on the score of poetic congruity, the new Jerusalem implied such an archaic and traditional allusion to the twelve tribes. The angelic guardians of the gates are an Isaianic trait added to the Ezekiel picture.

Ver. 13. In one first century inscription (*cf.* Dittenberger's *Orientis Graeci Inscript. Selectae*, 199[32]) **ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς** and **ἀπὸ δύσεως** are East and West respectively.

Ver. 14. **ἔχων,** another rough asyndeton.—**θεμελίους κ.τ.λ.,** a symbolical and corporate expression for the historical origin of the church in the primitive circle of the disciples who adhered to Jesus (*cf.* on xxii. 19). It is not their names but their historical and apostolic position which is in the writer's mind. The absence of Paul's name is no more significant than the failure to emphasise that of Peter. For the objective and retrospective tone of the allusion, with its bearing on the question of the authorship, see Introd. § 8. Foundation-stones in an ancient building were invested with high, sacred significance. Here the twelve apostles correspond roughly to the twelve **φύλαρχοι** of the Mosaic period (Matt. xix. 28, Clem. Rom. xlii.-xliii.).

Vv. 15-17. The measures of the city are now taken, as in Ezek. xl. 3, 48, xlii. 16 f., to elucidate the vision (otherwise in xi. 1, 2). It turns out to be an enormous quadrilateral cube, like Ezekiel's ideal sanctuary, a cube being symbolical of perfection to a Jew, as a circle is to ourselves. Whether 1500 miles represent the total circumference or the length of each side, the hyperbole is obvious, but John is following the patriotic rabbinic traditions which asserted that Jerusalem would extend as far as Damascus in the latter days (Zech. ix. 1) if not to the high throne of God. In Sib. Or. v. 250 f. the heaven-born Jews who inhabit Jerusalem are to run a wall as far as Joppa. Further measurements in Baba-Bathra f. 75, 2 (*cf.* Gfrörer, ii. 245 f.; Bacher,

18. καὶ ἡ [z] ἐνδώμησις τοῦ τείχους αὐτῆς [a] ἴασπις·

καὶ ἡ πόλις χρυσίον καθαρὸν ὅμοιον [b] ὑάλῳ καθαρῷ.

19. [c] οἱ θεμέλιοι τοῦ τείχους τῆς πόλεως παντὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ κεκοσμημένοι· ὁ θεμέλιος ὁ πρῶτος [d] ἴασπις· ὁ δεύτερος σάπφειρος· ὁ τρίτος [e] χαλκηδών· ὁ τέταρτος [f] σμάραγδος· 20. ὁ πέμπτος [g] σαρδόνυξ· ὁ ἕκτος [h] σάρδιον· ὁ ἕβδομος χρυσόλιθος· ὁ ὄγδοος [i] βήρυλλος· ὁ ἔνατος [k] τοπάζιον· ὁ δέκατος χρυσόπρασος· ὁ ἑνδέκατος [l] ὑάκινθος· ὁ δωδέκατος, [m] ἀμέθυστος.

21. καὶ οἱ δώδεκα πυλῶνες δώδεκα μαργαρῖται·

[n] ἀνὰ [n] εἷς ἕκαστος τῶν πυλώνων ἦν ἐξ ἑνὸς μαργαρίτου·

καὶ ἡ [o] πλατεῖα τῆς πόλεως χρυσίον καθαρόν, ὡς ὕαλος διαυγής.

z Poetical form, (*cf.* Jos. *Ant.* xv. 9, 6) = "fabric" or "material". a Ver. 11. b *Cf.* on iv. 6, ὑ. like φιάλη, a genuine form of the κοινή (Thumb, 18, 75). c From Isa. liv. 11-12. d iv. 3. e Here only (N.T.). f iv. 3, *cf.* fragm. in Epiph., *Haer.* xxxi. 9. g Red and white onyx (LXX = יהלם). h iv. 3. i Pale sea-green felspar, sometimes aquamarine in colour. k Greenish-yellow gem (periodot ?) *cf.* Job xxviii. 19. l ix. 17; jacinth or sapphire. m Violet or purple. n Late and irregular idiom = καθ' εἰς (Blass, § 39, 2, § 45, 3); *cf.* Win., § 26, 9, ἀνά adverbial, like ἕως (Deissm. 139). o xxii. 2.

Agada d. Tann. i. 194 f., 392). As in the case of the tabernacle in Jerusalem of the Hexateuch, so here: the symmetry and harmony of the divine life are naïvely represented by Oriental fantasy in terms of mathematics and architecture. A wall of about 72 yards high seems oddly unsymmetrical in view of the gigantic proportions of the city, though it might refer to the breadth (Simcox) or to the height of the city above the plain. But the whole description is built on multiples of twelve, a sacred number of completeness. The wall is a purely poetical detail, required to fill out the picture of the ancient city; like the similar touches in 24, 26, xxii. 2, it has no allegorical significance whatever. *Cf.* Slav. En. lxv. 10: "and there shall be to them" (*i.e.*, to the just in eternity) "a great wall which cannot be broken down".—**μέτρον κ.τ.λ.**, another naïve reminder (*cf.* xix. 9, 10, xxii. 8, 9) that angels were not above men.

Vv. 18-21: the materials of the city. **ἐνδώμησις**, so an undated but pre-Christian inscription, **τ. ἐνδώμησιν τοῦ τεμένους** (Dittenberger's *Sylloge inscript. Graec.*[2] 583[31]), where the orthography is pronounced "nova" (see reff.).

While the city itself (or its streets, ver. 21) is supposed to be constructed of transparent gold like the house of Zeus **πολύχρυσον** (*Hippol.* 69), the wall appearing above the monoliths or foundation-stones is made entirely of jasper, which again is the special ornament assigned to the first foundation-stone (19, see on ver. 11). The Babylonian *zikkurats* were picked out with coloured bricks; but the exterior of this second city is to be what only the interior of a Babylonian sanctuary had been—brilliant as the sun—flashing with precious stones and gold and silver. In Yasht xiii. 3 the heavenly Zoroastrian palace of the sky also "shines in its body of ruby." The general sketch is suggested by Isa. liv. 11, 12, and even more directly by Tobit xiii. 16, 17 ("For Jerusalem shall be builded with sapphire and emerald, thy walls with precious stones, the towers and battlements with pure gold; and the streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl and carbuncle and stones of Ophir"). The Egyptian mansion of Life is also composed of jasper, with four walls, facing the south, the north, the east, and the west (*cf. Records of Past*, vi. 113). The twelve gems correspond upon the whole to those set in gold (*cf.* Ezek. xxviii. 13) upon the high priest's breastplate in P (Exod. xxviii. 17-20, xxxix. 10-13), which the writer loosely reproduces from memory. What the old covenant confined to the high priest is now a privilege extended to the whole people of God (*cf.* ver. 22); for the astrological basis and the relation of the two O.T. and the present lists, *cf.* Flinders Petrie in Hastings' *D. B.* iv. 619-621; Myres in *E. Bi.* 4800 f.; St. Clair in *Journ. Theol. Studies*, viii. 213 f.; and Jeremias, 68, 88 f. No occult or mystical significance attaches to these stones. The writer is simply trying to convey the impression of a radiant and superb structure.—**σάπφειρος** = lapis lazuli (sap-

22. καὶ [p] ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ·
ὁ γὰρ [q] Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ [q] παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστί, καὶ
τὸ ἀρνίον.
23. [r] καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐ χρείαν ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου οὐδὲ τῆς σελήνης ἵνα
φαίνωσιν αὐτῇ·
ἡ γὰρ [s] δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν,
καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον.

p Matt. xxiv. 2. John, iv. 21; also Jer. iii. 16 f.
q From Amos iv. 13.
r xxii. 5, from Isa. xxiv. 23, lx. 2, Zech. xiv. 7.
s Ver. 11; *cf.* 4 Esd. vii. 42. From Zech. ii. 5 (LXX), Ps. Sol. iii. 16.

phirus et aureis punctis collucet. Caeruleae et sapphiri, raroque cum purpura, Pliny, *H. N.* xxxvii. 39), a blue stone prized in Egypt and in Assyria, where it was often "used to overlay the highest parts of buildings" (*E. Bi.* 2710).—**χαλκηδών** = either a variety of dioptase or emerald gathered on a mountain in Chalcedon (Pliny), or more probably an agate (karkedrā Pesh. rendering of שבו = LXX **ἀχάτης** Ex. xxviii. 19), *i.e.*, a variegated stone, whose base is chalcedony. The modern chalcedony is merely a translucent (grey) quartz, with a milky tinge. **χρυσόλιθος** = a gem of some (sparkling?) golden hue (LXX = תרשיש), perhaps some variety of our topaz or beryl, which ranges from emerald-green to pale blue and yellow. The modern chrysolite is merely a hard greenish mineral, of no particular value. **χρυσόλιθος** and **χρυσόπρασος** (a leek-coloured gem) are probably varieties of the ancient beryl, unless the latter is the green chalcedony, and the former the modern topaz. **μαργαρῖται κ.τ.λ.** (on their value in the ancient world, see Usener's study in *Theol. Abhand.* 203-213): the conception is simplified from an old Jewish fancy of R. Jochanan preserved in Baba-Bathra, f. 75, 1, "Deus adducet gemmas et margaritas, triginta cubitos longas totidemque latas, easque excauabit in altitudinem xx cubitorum, et latitudinem x cubitorum, collocabitque in portis Hierosolymorum". **ἡ πλατεῖα**, generic = "the streets" (like **ξύλον**, xxii. 2), unless it has the sense of "forum" or "market-place" (as 2 Chron. xxxii. 6, Job xxix. 7 LXX). But the singular may allude to the fact that "the typical Eastern city had . . . one street which led from the void place at the entering in of the gate to the court of the king's palace" (Simcox). Philo (*quis haer.* § xliv., *leg. alleg.* § xx.) had already made gold emblematic of the divine nature diffused through all the world, owing to the metal's fusible qualities.

Ver. 22-xxii. 5: the life of the city. Ver. 22. The daily prayer of Jews at this time was "restore thou the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of thy house". But while this may have represented the popular religion of Judaism (Schürer, *Hist.* ii. 2, 174) which tenaciously clung to a restored temple as the religious centre of all future bliss, there were finer spirits who shared the Iranian repugnance to temples, possibly under a semi-Essene influence, and who seem to have partially anticipated the more spiritual outlook of the Apocalypse (*cf.* Baldensperger, 53 f.); the second temple, owing to the debasing strifes of the first century B.C. and the growing reverence for the law, never quite absorbed the religious consciousness as the first had done. The holy City is to be unlike many Chaldean cities where the temple was a dominating and distinctive feature, often indeed the original nucleus of the town. To the seer, earth suggests heaven not only by anticipation but by contrast.

Ver. 23. Another fulfilment of the O.T. ideal (Isa. lx. 19, 20). It is a Jewish-Christian symbol for Paul's thought—*God shall be all and in all.* So in 4 Esd. vii. [42] at the last judgment there is neither sun nor moon nor any natural light, "but only the splendour of the glory of the Most High". "As the *sun of righteousness* Christ has been able to vanquish the *sol invictus* of the Roman Cæsar-cultus" (Usener, *Götternamen*, p. 184). A cruder form of the idea occurs in the pseudo-Philonic *Biblic. Antiquit.* where "non erat necessarium lumen (for the night-march), ita exsplendebat genuinum lapidum lumen" (*i.e.*, of the jewels on the Amorite idols), jewels which were replaced by twelve precious stones each engraved with the name of one of the twelve tribes.

24. καὶ περιπατήσουσι [t] τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς,
καὶ οἱ [u] βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς φέρουσι τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτήν—
25. [v] καὶ οἱ πυλῶνες αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ κλεισθῶσιν ἡμέρας·
[w] νὺξ γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ—
26. [x] καὶ οἴσουσι τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς αὐτήν.
27. [y] καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ὁ ποιῶν [z] βδέλυγμα καὶ [z] ψεῦδος·
εἰ μὴ οἱ [a] γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου.

XXII. 1. καὶ [a] ἔδειξέν μοι ποταμὸν [b] ὕδατος ζωῆς, λαμπρὸν ὡς [c] κρύσταλλον, ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ [d] καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου

t Ps. lxxii. 11, Is. lx. 3 f., Ps. Sol. xvii. 34-35. u Ps. lxviii. 29, lxxii. 10; reproduced in 4 Esd. xv. 20. v Isa. lx. 11, Jos. *B.J.*, vii. 10, 4. w Zech. xiv. 7, En. lviii. 3 f., Slav. En. xxxi. 2. x From Isa. lx. 5, Tob. xiii. 11, Sib. iii. 772 f. y Isa. lii. 1, Ezek. xliv. 9. z xxi. 8, xxii. 15; *cf.* Hom. *Iliad*, iii. 278. a *Cf.* xiii. 8. a xxi. 10. b vii. 17. c iv. 6, ἅπ. λεγ. N.T. d iii. 21, v., 6, 13; *cf.* En. lxii. 14.

Vv. 24-26 further traits borrowed from Isa. lx. (see reff.).

Ver. 25. νὺξ κ.τ.λ. "for no night (when even in peace they would be shut, Neh. xiii. 19) shall be there".

Ver. 26. From the tradition of En. liii. 1 and Ps. Sol. xvii. 34-35 (where the Gentile nations seek Jerusalem φέροντες δῶρα . . . καὶ ἰδεῖν τὴν δόξαν κυρίου, ἣν ἐδόξασεν αὐτὴν ὁ θεός); *cf.* Apoc. Bar. lxviii. 5. The idea of 24 and 26 is of course literally inconsistent with those of xix. 17 f. and xx. 12 f., since on the new earth there were no residents except the risen saints. Both ideas were current in rabbinic eschatology (Gfrörer, ii. 238 f.), but the Apocalypse is entirely free from any such complacent estimate of Gentile outsiders (*cf.* En. xc. 30). The discrepancy here, as in xxii. 5, is imaginary. These details are simply poetical and imaginative, inserted from the older symbolism, in which they were quite appropriate, in order by their archaic and pictorial fulness to fill out the sketch of the future city. They have no allegorical significance.

Ver. 27. R. Jochanan (Baba-Bathra f. 76, 2,) said the coming Jerusalem would not be like the present one: in hanc ingreditur quicunque uult, in illam uero non nisi qui ad eam ordinati sunt. Citizenship similarly in John's new city is a matter of moral character and of divine election, not of nationality. The Lord's city is like the Lord's table, as the Ep. to Diognetus finely puts it (5) κοινή ἀλλ' οὐ κοινή, *communis* but not *profanus*, "common and open to all, yet in another sense no common thing." The trait is adapted from Slav. En. ix., where the garden-paradise of the third heaven is only for those loyal to their faith, humble, just, charitable and benevolent, blameless and whole hearted, while the hell of torture (x. 4-6) is reserved for all addicted to sodomy, witchcraft, theft, lying, murder, and fornication, besides oppression and callousness to human suffering. But βδ. and ψ. may be simply "idolatry" (as in LXX); the keynote of the book being struck once more (as in En. xcix. 9). In the Egyptian litany of the nine gods (*E. B. D.* 35) every petition ends with the words, "I have not spoken lies wittingly, nor have I done aught with deceit," and in Apoc. Bar. lxxix. 6 the seer accuses the Roman Empire thus: "by it the truth will be hidden, and all those who are polluted with iniquity will flee to it, as evil beasts flee and creep into the forest".

CHAPTER XXII.—Ver. 1. The river is suggested partly by Ezekiel's representation of the healing stream which was to issue from the new temple and flow through the dreary Ghor of the Jordan valley (xlvii. 1-12), partly by the reference (in a later apocalypse, Zech. xiv. 8) to perennial waters issuing from Jerusalem as the dwelling-place of God in the new age. John has no use for Ezekiel's idea that the stream would assist in the messianic transformation of nature. He changes the numerous trees on either side of the wady into the (generic) single tree of life, reverting as before (ii. 7) to the ideal of the Semitic paradise. Also, he drops the notion of the river sweetening the bitter waters of the Dead Sea. *Cf.* Pirke Eliezer, 51, aquae putei ascensurae sunt e limine templi atque scaturient prodibuntque. The Babylonian origin of the idea is outlined by Zimmern in *Archiv für Relig. Wiss.* 1899, 170 f. Unlike the

2. ἐν μέσῳ τῆς πλατείας αὐτῆς· καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐκεῖθεν [e] ξύλον ζωῆς, ποιοῦν καρποὺς [f] δώδεκα, κατὰ μῆνα [g] ἕκαστον [h] ἀποδιδοὺς [1] τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὰ φύλλα τοῦ ξύλου εἰς [h] θεραπείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν.

3. [i] καὶ πᾶν κατάθεμα οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι·
[k] καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται·
καὶ οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ [l] λατρεύσουσιν αὐτῷ·
4. καὶ [m] ὄψονται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ,
καὶ [n] τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν.

e From Ezek. xlvii. 12, and Slav. En. viii. 1-4.
f = δωδεκάκις (*cf.* Matt. xviii. 22).
g Win., §20, 12*b*.
h For -όν (Win., § 14, 13), *cf.* Simcox, *Lang.* *N.T.* 40.
i From Zech. xiv. 21; on futures, see iv. 8-11.
k "Hence": *cf.* Josh. vi. 18, vii. 12.
l vii. 15.
m Job xlii. 5, Ps. xvii. 15, 1 John iii. 2, Heb. xii. 14, *cf.* Baldensperger, 63.
n iii. 12, xiv. 1, vii. 3-4.

[1] Ti., Tr., WH (marg.), Bs. rightly read **αποδιδους** (with ℵQ, min., Areth.).

earthly Jerusalem with its inferior stream, the new city is to be richly equipped with conduits and all that makes a city prosperous and secure (Isa. xxxiii. 21).

Ver. 2. **πλατείας** ("street," or "boulevard") collective and generic (*cf.* Jas. v. 6) like **ξύλον**. Take **ἐν . . . αὐτῆς** with what precedes, and begin a fresh sentence with **καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ** (W. H.), **ξύλον** being governed by **ἔδειξεν** (from ver. 1). The river, which is the all-pervading feature, is lined with the trees of life. The writer retains the traditional singular of Gen. ii. 9, combining it with the representation of Ezekiel (yet note sing. in xlvii. 12); he thus gains symbolic impressiveness at the expense of pictorial coherence. Ramsay (*C. B. P.* ii. 453) observes, however, that the waters of the Marsyas were "probably drawn off to flow through the streets of Apameia; this practice is still a favourite one in Asia Minor, *e.g.*, at Denizli".—**κ. μῆνα,** the poetic imagination soars over the prosaic objection that months are impossible without a moon (xxi. 22).—**καρπὸν, κ.τ.λ.** To eat of the tree of life was, in the popular religious phraseology of the age, to possess immortality. In En. xxiv., xxv., where the prophet sees a wonderful, fragrant tree, Michael explains that it must stand untouched till the day of Judgment (**καὶ οὐδεμία σὰρξ ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἅψασθαι αὐτοῦ**). "Then the righteous and the holy shall have it given them; it shall be as food for the elect unto life." So in contemporary Judaism; *e.g.*, 4 Esd. vii. 53 and viii. 52 ("For unto you is paradise set open, the tree of life is planted, the time to come is prepared, a city is builded and rest is established,") as already in *Test. Levi*, 18, where the messianic high-priest is to "open the gates of paradise and remove the sword drawn against Adam, and permit the saints to eat of the tree of life". For the association of God's city and God's garden, *cf.* Apoc. Bar. iv.: for the notion of healing, Apoc. Mos. vi., Jub. x. 12 f., and the Iranian idea that (Brandt, 434 f.) the tree of many seeds had curative properties. John is therefore using the realistic and archaic language of Jewish piety to delineate the bliss of Christians in a future state where all the original glories and privileges of God's life with man are to be restored. The Christian heaven is to possess everything which Judaism claimed and craved for itself. *Cf.* the Christian addition to 4 Esd. ii. 12, 34, 35, 38 f.; also the famous hymn to Osiris (*E. B. D.*, ch. clxxxiii.: "I have come into the city of God—the region which existed in primaeval time—with my soul, to dwell in this land. . . . The God thereof is most holy. His land draweth unto itself every other land. And doth he not say, the happiness thereof is a care to me?").

Ver. 3. **κατάθεμα,** a corrupt and rare form of **κατανάθεμα** = anything accursed (lit. a curse itself, Did. xvi. 8), *i.e.*, abstract for concrete, here = "a cursed person," so Ps. Sol. xvii. 29 f.—**λατρεύσουσι,** unfettered and unspoiled devotion. The interruption of the daily service and sacrifice in Jerusalem on 17th July, 70 A.D., had sent a painful thrill to the heart of all who cherished the ideal of Acts xxvi. 7. No fear of that in the new Jerusalem!

Ver. 4. The ancient ideal of intimate confidence is also to be realised (*cf.* on Matt. v. 8 and Iren. *Adv. Hær.* v. 7). With this phrase and that of xxi. 22 compare Browning's lines: "Why,

o xxi. 25.
p xxi. 23; with accus. iii. 17.
q Dan. vii. 27, *cf.* Sap. vi. 21 (= nearness to God).

5. [o] νὺξ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι,
καὶ οὐχ ἕξουσι [1] [p] χρείαν φωτὸς λύχνου καὶ φῶς ἡλίου,
ὅτι Κύριος ὁ θεὸς φωτίσει ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς·
καὶ [q] βασιλεύσουσιν [r] εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

r Not merely for 1000 years (xx. 4).

[1] εξουσι (A, vg., Syr., S., gig., Tic.) Bentley, Lach., Al., Bj., is preferable to εχουσι (ℵP, And.), and the context, with its futures and personal pronouns, tells against the ου χρεια κ.τ.λ. of Q, min., S., Pr. (Ti., Düst., Bs.).

where's the need of temple when the walls | O' the world are that . . . This one Face, far from vanish, rather grows | Becomes my universe that feels and knows." The idea here is that reproduced in the seventh and supreme degree of bliss in 4 Esd. vii. [78] where the saints "shall rejoice with confidence, have boldness undismayed, and gladness unafraid, for they shall hasten to behold the face of him whom they served in life". By Oriental usage, no condemned or criminal person was allowed to look on the king's face (Esther vii. 8), In the ancient ch. lxiv. of *E. B. D.* (papyrus of Nu) the "triumphant Nu saith, 'I have come to see him that dwelleth in his divine uraeus, face to face, and eye to eye. . . . Thou art in me, and I am in thee,'" The Apocalypse, however, shuns almost any approach to the inner union of the individual Christian and Christ which distinguished both Paul and the fourth gospel; it also eschews the identification of God and man which was often crudely affected by Egyptian eschatology. No allusion occurs to the supremacy of the saints over angels (Ap. Bar. li. 12, etc.), though John is careful elsewhere to keep the latter in their place (see on xxi. 17, xxii. 9). He also ignores the problem of different degrees in bliss,—ὄψονται. In Chag. 5 *b* there is a story of a blind rabbi who blessed some departing visitors with the words, "Ye have visited a face that is seen and sees not: may ye be counted worthy to visit the Face which sees and is not seen". The Christian prophet has a better hope and promise. Compare, however, Plutarch's touching faith (*Iside*, 79) that the souls of men after death will "migrate to the unseen, the good," when God becomes their king and leader and where "they, as it were, hang upon him and gaze without ever wearying, and yearn for that unspeakable, indescribable Beauty".

Ver. 5. Philo (*de Jos.* 24) had already described heaven as ἡμέραν αἰώνιον, νυκτὸς καὶ πάσης σκιᾶς ἀμέτοχον. *Cf.* En. vi. 6.—Such teaching on heaven, though in a less religious form, seems to have been current among the Asiatic πρεσβύτεροι. Irenæus (v. 36, 1-2) quotes them as holding (*cf.* above on ii. 7) that some of the blessed τῆς τοῦ παραδείσου τρυφῆς ἀπολαύσουσιν, οἱ δὲ τὴν λαμπρότητα τῆς πόλεως καθέξουσιν· πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ Σωτὴρ ὁραθήσεται, καθὼς ἄξιοι ἔσονται οἱ ὁρῶντες αὐτόν, κ.τ.λ.

The epilogue (6-21) is a series of loose ejaculations, which it is not easy to assign to the various speakers. It is moulded on the lines of the epilogue to the astronomical section of Enoch (lxxxi. f.), where Enoch is left for one year with his children—"that thou mayest testify to them all. . . . Let thy heart be strong, for the good will announce righteousness to the good, but the sinners will die with the sinners, and the apostates go down with the apostates". Two characteristic *motifs*, however, dominate the entire passage: (*a*) the vital importance of this book as a valid and authentic revelation, and (*b*) the nearness of the end. The former is heard in the definite claim of inspiration (6 f., 16) and prophetic origin (8, 9) which guarantees its contents, in the beatitude of 7 *b* (*cf.* 17), and (*cf.* 21) in the claim of canonical dignity (18, 19). The latter is voiced thrice in a personal (7, 12, 20) and twice in an impersonal (6, 10) form. Both are bound up together (*cf.* 20 and i. 3). It is as a crucial revelation of the near future and a testimony to the authority and advent of the messiah (*cf.* 20) that this apocalypse claims to be read, and honoured in the churches. This general standpoint is clear enough, but the details are rather intricate. It is characteristic of the Apocalyse, as of ep. Barnabas, that the writer often leaves it indefinite whether God or Christ or an angel is speaking. Sometimes the divine voice is recognised to be that of Christ

8. [s] κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ [t] βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα· καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα καὶ ἔβλεψα, ἔπεσα προσκυνῆσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ [u] δεικνύοντός μοι ταῦτα. 9. καὶ λέγει μοι, "ὅρα μή· σύνδουλός σού εἰμι καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν τηρούντων τοὺς λόγους τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον."

6. καὶ εἶπέν μοι, "Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι [v] πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί· καὶ ὁ [w] κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν [w] πνευμάτων τῶν προφητῶν ἀπέστειλε [x] τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ δεῖξαι τοῖς [y] δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει.

7. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ.

[z] μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου."

s As in i. 9 (*cf.* Dan. xii. 5). t 2 Cor. xii. 2. u Win. § 14, 18. v 4 Esd. xv. 1-2 ("Speak thou in the ears of my people the words of prophecy, and cause thou them to be written on paper, for they are faithful and true"). w *Cf.* for phrase, partial analogies in Num. xxvii. 16 (LXX), Jub. x. 3, Dan. ii. 28, 2 Macc. iii. 24, Heb. xii. 9, 1 Cor. xiv. 32. x *Cf.* i. 1-2. y *i.e.*, the Christian prophets (i. 1), *cf.* Dan. ix. 10, 4 Esd. viii. 62. z *Cf.* Luke xi. 28, En. c. 6, civ. 12-13.

(*cf.* i. 10 f., iv. 1), or may be inferred from the context to be that of an angel (*e.g.*, xvii. 15, *cf.* 1 and xix. 9), perhaps as the divine spokesman (xxi. 5, 6, *cf.* 5 and 7). But frequently, even when the seer is addressed (x. 4, xiv. 13), the voice or Bath-Qol is anonymous (*e.g.*, xi. 12, xii. 10, xiv. 2, xvi. 1, *cf.* 17). In the epilogue, as it stands, it is impossible and irrelevant to determine whether Jesus (16) begins to speak at ver. 10 (so Spitta, Holtzm., Porter, Forbes) and resumes in 18-20 *a*. But, while 6-7, and 8-9 are both intended in a sense to round off the entire Apocalypse, and not merely the immediately preceding vision, 8-9 (a replica of xix. 9-10) stands closer to xxi. 9-xxii. 5 than does 6-7. No **λόγοι** in the last vision justify the reference in 6, whereas the specific **δεικν. μοι ταῦτα** in 8 echoes the cicerone-function of the angel in xxi. 9-10, xxii. 1. Vv. 6, 7 very probably lay originally between 9 and 10 (for the juxtaposition of **εἶπεν** and **λέγει** *cf.* xvii. 7, 15), where they definitely mark the beginning of the epilogue already anticipated in 8 (*cf.* i. 4, 9) and in the broadened close of 9 (contrast xix. 10 above). It is not necessary (though perhaps a later scribe may have thought so) to account for John's action in 8-9 by supposing that he mistook the *angelus interpres* for Christ. The **λόγοι** of 6, when this order is adopted, acquire their natural sense (*cf.* 10), and the three successive angel-utterances (8-9, 6-7, 10-11) have a proper sequence. It is needless, in view of xvi. 15 (*cf.* iii. 11) to omit 7 *a* as an interpolation (Könnecke). But 12-13 probably have been displaced from their original order (13, 12) and position after 16 (Könnecke), where 17 echoes 12 *a*, and 14, 15 carries on the thought of 11. Vv. 18, 19 are plainly editorial, interrupting the connexion of 17 and 20. In 11 Resch (*Agrapha*, § 133) attempts to prove that some logion of Jesus is quoted. On the "inconsistent optimism" of xxii. 13 and 15, *cf.* Abbott, p. 107.

Ver. 8. There is no trace of any reluctance on the prophet's part to return to earth, as in Asc. Isa. (Gk.). ii. 33-35.

Ver. 9. The warning against any Christian **θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων** is not, as in the parallel passage, an indirect exaltation of the prophetic order as equivalent to the angelic in religious function, but an assertion that even ordinary Christians who accept the Apocalypse are equal to the hierophant angel. Unlike Nebo, the angelic interpreter of Marduk's will in Babylonian religion, he is not to be worshipped, for all his importance. Precautions against angel-worship could hardly be more stringent. "The repetition of the scene is enough to show that it does not represent a natural ebullition of feeling and its correction, but that the narrative has a purpose . . . and that those who observed the practice made use of" John's name, or at any rate believed they could appeal to him as sanctioning their superstition (Weizsäcker, ii. 203-204).

Ver. 6. As in En. cviii. 6 (only mention of prophets in Enoch), "what God announces through the mouth of the prophets" relates to the future.—**πνευμ.** the plurality of spirits is an archaic detail (*cf.* i. 4) adapted also from the Enochic formula (xxxvii. 2, etc.), "God of the spirits".

Ver. 7. Here as elsewhere it is irrelevant to ask, who is the speaker? Angels

10. καὶ λέγει μοι, "Μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ [a] καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν.

11. [b] ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι·
καὶ ὁ [c] ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι·
καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι·
καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.[1]

14. Μακάριοι οἱ [d] πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, [e] ἵνα ἔσται ἡ [f] ἐξουσία αὐτῶν [f] ἐπὶ [g] τὸ [g] ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῖς [h] πυλῶσιν εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.[2] 15. [i] ἔξω οἱ [k] κύνες καὶ οἱ [l] φαρμακοὶ καὶ

a i. 3. b From Ezek. iii. 27, Dan. xii. 10 (LXX), *cf. Par. Lost*, iii. 198 f. c "Filthy" (*cf.* Mayor on Jas. i. 21): moral stains (Job xv. 16), not mere ceremonial impurity (ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι, in votive inscriptions). d iii. 4, vii. 14. e Mixed construction (*cf.* xiv. 13). f Accus. here and vi. 8, xiii. 7, xvi. 9; genit. ii. 26, xi. 6, xiv. 18. g *Cf.* ver. 2. h Loose extension of dat. instrum. i "Out with the (or, out ye)": so Düst., Benson, J. Weiss, Wellh., *cf.* xxi. 8, 27, 1 Cor. vi. 9-10, Introd. § 6. k Matt. vii. 6, Phil. iii. 2: = "praua concupiscentia" (Gfrörer, i. 404). l ix. 21, *cf.* Deut. xxiii. 18. On their punishment in the Hellenic world, *cf.* Rohde's *Psyche*, 366 f.

[1] The ample style of the Apoc. tells against the conjecture (Zahn, Nestle's *Einf.* 264-265; Bebb, *Studia Biblica*, ii. 209-210) that the orig. reading is preserved in Ep. Lugd. ο ανομος ανομησατω και ο δικαιος δικαιωθητω ετι, the rest being glossematic. The v. l. δικαιωθητω (38, 79, vg.) has been mechanically conformed to αγιασθητω.

[2] Instead of the well-supported ΟΙΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕCΤΑCΕ̄ΤΟΛΑCΑΥΤΟΥ (Q, min., Syr., S., Arm., Me., Areth., And., Tert., Tic., Cyp., *cf.* 1 Jo. v. 21; so de Wette, Düst., Bs.), ΟΙΠΛΥΝΟΝΤΕCΤΑCCΤΟΛΑCΑΥΤΩΝ (ℵA, 7, 38, vg., Aeth., Pr., Haym., etc., edd.) is to be read, the variant being possibly due to the feeling that some moral characteristic was needful after 11 (Ws.).

are the envoys and mouthpieces of God here as in the O.T., and therefore entitled to speak in his name or in that of Christ. "The Oriental mind hardly distinguishes between an ancient personage and one who appears in his power and spirit" (A. B. Davidson on Ezek. xxxiv. 23). In 4 Esd. v. 31-40 the angel is also addressed as if he were the Lord—the angelic personality evidently fading into the divine, as here, and the writer being equally unconscious of any incongruity in the representation (*cf.* Zech. iii. 1-4). As the "showing" of the ἅ δ. γ. ἐν τ. is (i. 1) an ἀποκ. of Jesus, he (or a word of his) naturally breaks in (7 *a*).—τηρῶν κ.τ.λ., an apocalyptic form of emphasis. *Cf. e.g.*, Slav. En. xlvii. 1-3 and xxxvi ("tell thou thy sons and all thy household before Me, that they may listen to what is spoken to them by thee . . . and let them always keep my commandments, and begin to read and understand the books written out by thee"). All apocalypses were meant to be transmitted to mankind, but the usual method of delivery is complicated (*cf.* En. lxxxii. 1, 2; Slav. En. xxxiii. 9, xlvii. 2, 3, etc.).

Ver. 10. The book of Daniel, the great classic of apocalyptic literature, is represented (*cf.* Slav. En. xxxiii. 9-11, xxxv. 3; En. xciii. 10, civ. 12, etc.) as having been providentially kept secret at the time of its composition, since it referred to a future period (viii. 26, xii. 4, 9). This was a literary device, to explain why it had not been divulged before. As John's apocalypse is for an immediate crisis, it is not to be reserved for days to come. It is not merely valid (7) but intended for the prophet's contemporaries (unlike Isa. xxx. 8, *cf.* Cheyne's note), though reserved, like most of its class, as esoteric literature for the "wise" (contrast 4 Esd. xiv. 38-48). Some interval, however, is presupposed between the vision and its fulfilment, otherwise it would be futile to write the visions down, and to arrange for their circulation throughout the churches. A certain career (7, 9, 18-19) is anticipated for the Apocalypse. But (ver. 11.) persistence in good and evil is about all the writer expects—a stereotyped feature of the apocalyptic outlook on the obduracy of the wicked and the perseverance of the saints. Apocalyptic never encouraged propaganda, and no radical or widespread change is anticipated during the brief interval before the end. As in Dan. xii. 10, 11, so here, the crisis simply accentuates and accelerates human character along previous lines. No anxiety is shown, however, as in 4 Esd. iv. 50 f., whether the prophet himself is to see the end.

Ver. 15. κύνες, an archaic metaphor,

οἱ πόρνοι καὶ οἱ φονεῖς καὶ οἱ εἰδωλολάτραι καὶ πᾶς [m] φιλῶν καὶ ποιῶν ψεῦδος."

16. "Ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς [n] ἔπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου μαρτυρῆσαι [o] ὑμῖν ταῦτα [p] ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις·

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ [q] ῥίζα καὶ τὸ γένος Δαυείδ,
ὁ [r] ἀστὴρ ὁ λαμπρὸς καὶ ὁ πρωϊνός.

m xxi. 27, *cf.* Asc. Isa. (Gk.), iii. 3, Dan. viii. 25. See Win. § 20. 11c.
n *Cf.* xxii. 6 (God).
o (Dat. = Heb. x. 15) "the prophets," as in ver. 6.
p = "for" (x. 11).
q v. 5: (the scion).
r ii. 28, Sir. l, 6, Test. Levi 18, En. xxxviii. 2, Isa. xiv. 12, and Ign. *Eph.* xix, with Luke i. 78 (Dalman, i. viii. 10).

coloured by the nomad's hatred of hounds; *cf. Arabia Deserta*, i. 337, 339 ("only the dog has no citizenship in the nomad life". "It is the only life mishandled by the gentle Arab, who with spurns and blows cast out these profane creatures from the tent.") Here **κύνες** are not merely impure pagans, but the impudently impure, possibly in the special and darker sense of "sodomites" (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 10; Deut. xxiii. 19, 20, collated with **πόρνη** and **βδέλυγμα**). *Cf.* on xxi. 8 and Cooke's *North Sem. Inscriptions*, p. 68. Such loathsome practices were not uncommon in the Oriental cults.

Ver. 16. Jesus in person now speaks in the colloquy (16, 13, 12) to ratify what has just been said. This apocalypse is not an individual fantasy (2 Peter i. 21). For the contemporary need of such accrediting, *cf.* Herm. *Sim.* ix. 22 and Asc. Isa. iii. 30, 31 (where in the last days "everyone will say what is pleasing in his own eyes. And they will make of none effect the prophecy of the prophets which were before me, and these my visions also will they make of none effect, in order to speak after the impulse of their own hearts.")—**ἄγγελον**, not John (Weiss, Wellh.) but the *angelus interpres* (*cf.* on i. 2 and 20).—**ὑμῖν**, the plural here and in ver. 6 (*cf.* i. 1) might suggest that John's apocalypse incorporated some visions of other members belonging to the prophets in the Asiatic circle or school (*cf.* the tradition about the co-operative origin of the Fourth gospel, in the Muratorian canon). But while any Jewish Christian sources may have been drawn from this quarter, the final authorship and authority is claimed by (or, for) John himself (*cf.* ver. 8).—**Δαυείδ.** Like most early Christians, John attached more weight to the Davidic descent of Jesus as messiah (Baldensperger, 82 f.), than Jesus himself allowed. Here Christ's authority in revelation is bound up with his legitimate claim to be messiah, and thus to inaugurate the new and eternal day of God. As **ἀνατολή** (the dawn = צֶמַח) was already a messianic symbol, and employed in LXX (Jer. xxiii. 5, Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12) to denote the messianic branch or stem, this double usage explains the imagery here (so Justin, *Apol.* i. 32). Jesus has not only the historic preparation of Israel behind him but the infinite future before him. In one sense he was the climax of Hebrew expectation; in another, he is of world-wide significance. In connexion with the heavenly Jerusalem it was natural that Jesus should be hailed as the scion of the David who had founded the first Jerusalem. The star-metaphor reflects the significance of the morning-star which meant the beginning of a new day for toilers in the Levant; but its eschatological outlook was taken ultimately from Babylonian astro-theology, where Nebo-Mercury (nebî = prophet), the morning-star, announced the new era, or from Egyptian theology where (*cf. E. B. D.* p. cxliii.) Pepi the dead king "goeth forth into heaven among the stars which never perish, and his guide the Morning-Star leadeth him to Sekhet-Ḥetep [the fields of peace]". The phraselogy brings out the conviction of the early church that the present trial was only the cold, dark hour before the dawn. Their faith in Jesus assured them that an eternal prospect of bliss awaited them, and that this vista of hope was bound up with the person of the risen Jesus (*cf.* ver. 13). The watchword was, sunrise and morning-star (*cf. Expos.* Dec. 1902, 424-441). Christianity was not some ephemeral Oriental cult, which had had its day; the cosmic overthrow meant a new era for its adherents. The Apocalypse thus closes, as it began (i. 5, 6) with a note of ringing emphasis upon the eternal significance of Christ in the divine plan and purpose.

13. [s] ἐγὼ τὸ [t] ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ,
ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος,
ἡ [t] ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος.
12. ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ,
καὶ ὁ [u] μισθός μου μετ' ἐμοῦ,
[v] ἀποδοῦναι [w] ἑκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ."
17. καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν, "Ἔρχου"·
καὶ [x] ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω, "Ἔρχου".
καὶ ὁ [y] διψῶν ἐρχέσθω,
ὁ [z] θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν.
[18. Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου·
ἐάν τις [a] ἐπιτιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά,
ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς [b] πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ·
19. καὶ ἐάν ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου
τῆς προφητείας ταύτης,

s God (xxi. 6, *cf.* i. 8), Christ (i. 17, ii. 8).
t *Cf.* Jos. *Ant.* viii. 11, 2, *Ap.* ii. 22, Philo: *de Somn.* 620 (of Logos), Plato, *Legg.* iv. 7. A common rabbinic symbol for God (Gfrörer, i. 285 f.).
u xi. 18, Isa. xl. 10, Sap. v. 15, 2 Pet. ii. 18, *cf.* Clem. Rom. xxxiv.
v Rom. ii. 5-6.
w *Cf.* i. 7 (πᾶς ὀφθ.), ii. 23, etc.
x The individual Christian (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 22). y xxi. 6 (Isa. lv. 1). z John iv. 14, vii. 37.
a Prov. xxx. 6, Jos. *Ap.* i. 8. b xv. 6-xvi. 21. c Jer. xxvi. 2, *cf.* Deut. iv. 2, xiii. 1, Barn. xix. 11, Did. iv. 13.

Ver. 13 gathers up the double thought of 16 and of 12. As the Christian ἔργα (ii. 2, 5, 19, etc.) are done within the sphere of faith, their recompense is a religious as well as a thoroughly moral conception (*cf.* Hastings' *D. B.* iii. 82, and Montefiore's *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 538). To the day's work, the day's wage. For the origin of this feeling on Syrian or Semitic soil, where the *fellahin's* work "was scrutinised before the wages were paid" by one who was "at once the paymaster of his dependents and their judge," *cf.* Hatch's *Hibb. Lectures*, pp. 224 f. and Dalman, i. § viii. 3. The reward, like the new Jerusalem, was safely stored in heaven. No fear of inadequate moral appreciation in the next world, at any rate!

Ver. 17. The promise of 12 *a* is caught up and answered by a deep "come" from the prophets in ecstasy (πνεῦμα personified, *cf.* ii. 7, etc.) and the Christian congregation.—νύμφη. Hitherto (xxi. 2, etc.) this term has been reserved for the church triumphant in the world to come. Now, with the memory of these oracles fresh in his mind, the prophet applies it to the church on earth, as Paul had already done.—καὶ ὁ ἀκούων κ.τ.λ., a liturgical note, like Mark xiii. 14 (*cf.* Weinel, 84, 85).—καὶ ὁ διψῶν κ.τ.λ., addressed to strangers who sometimes attended the Christian worship (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24). For this fine turn of expression (the double use of *come*), *cf.* Did. x. 6, "may grace come and may this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If anyone is holy let him come [*i.e.*, to the Lord's table]; if anyone is not, let him repent. Mārăna thā" (*cf.* below, ver. 20). The less likely alternative is to take ἔρχου here as addressed not to Jesus but to the outside world.

Vv. 18-19. Luther strongly objected to the extravagant threat of this editorial note. The curse is certainly not only an anti-climax like the editorial postscript in John xxi. 24, 25 (both indicating that either when published or when admitted to the canon, these two scriptures needed special authentication) but "an unfortunate ending to a book whose value consists in the spirit that breathes in it, the bold faith and confident hope which it inspires, rather than in the literalness and finality of its disclosures" (Porter). But the words are really a stereotyped and vehement form of claiming a canonicity equal to that of the O.T. (*cf.* Jos. *Ant.* xx. 11. 2, τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρῳχηκότος οὔτε προσθεῖναί τις οὔτε ἀφελεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὔτε μετα-

ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ [d] ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου
τῆς ζωῆς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως
τῆς ἁγίας, τῶν γεγραμμ-
ένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.]

20. Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα [e] "Ναί· ἔρχομαι ταχύ".
[f] ἀμήν· ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ.

21. ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων.[1]

d In *Apoc. Mos.* xvi. by overpowering Adam and Eve in temptation, the devil robs them "of the garden of delight and of eternal life".

e For the third time (7, 12): "Most assuredly, I am coming speedily".

f *Cf.* on xix. 4.

[1] Om. Pr.—Of the variants for παντων υμων (vg., Aeth.), either παντων των αγιων (Q, min., Me., Syr., S., Arm., And., Areth., Bs.) or preferably παντων (A, am., Lach., Ti., Düst., Ws.) seems more original than των αγιων (א, gig., Tr., Al., Simcox, WH, Bj., J. Weiss, Sw.): for a textual discussion see Nestle's *Einführung*, 125 f. (E. Tr., 157 f.) and Hastings' *D. B.*, iv. 733.—After Ιησου, Χριστου is added by Q, min., vg., gig., Syr., Arm., Aeth., Andr.

θεῖναι τετόλμηκεν). They are adapted from Enoch civ. 10 f. where the author expects his book to be a comfort and joy to the righteous, but exposed to perversion and alteration: "Many sinners will pervert and alter the words of uprightness" instead of refusing to "change or minish aught from my words". Similar threats to careless or wilful copyists especially in Irenæus (Eus. *H. E.* v. 20), and Rufin. pref. to Origen's περὶ ἀρχῶν (*cf.* Nestle's *Einführung*, 161 f.). This nervous eagerness to safeguard Christian teaching was part and parcel of the contemporary tendency to regard apostolic tradition (*cf.* xviii. 20, xxi. 14, etc.) as a body of authoritative doctrine, which must not be tampered with. An almost equally severe threat occurs in Slav. En. xlviii. 7-9, liv. (also iii. 3), so that the writer, in this jealousy for the letter rather than for the spirit, was following a recognised precedent (*R. J.* 125 f.), which was bound up with a conservative view of tradition and a juristic conception of scripture (Titius, pp. 206 f., Deissm, 113 f.). Rabbinic *librarii* got a similar warning in that age (*cf.* Bacher's *Agada d. Tann*, i. 254), and Christian copyists, if not editors, required it in the case of the Apocalypse, although apparently they paid little heed to it, for as early as the time of Irenæus there were serious discrepancies in the copies circulated throughout the churches. John had himself omitted a contemporary piece of prophecy (*cf.* on x. 4). But he explains that he was inspired to do so; this verse refuses to let others deal similarly with his book.

The prayer of ver. 17 is answered in ver. 20, which repeats the assurance of the messiah's speedy advent. This μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, in the prophetic consciousness (xix. 10), is specifically eschatological. The close and sudden aspect of the end loomed out before Judaism (*cf.* 4 Esd. iv. 26, 44 50, Apoc. Bar. xxiii. 7, lxxxiii. 1) as before the Christian church at this period, but it was held together with calculations which anticipated a certain process and progress of history. The juxtaposition of this ardent hope and an apocalyptic programme, here as in Mark xiii. 5-37 and 4 Esd. xiv. 11, 12, is one of the antinomies of the religious consciousness, which is illogical only on paper. In Sanhed. 97 *a*, a rabbinic cycle of seven years culminating in messiah's advent is laid down; whereupon "Rab. Yoseph saith, There have been many septennial cycles of this kind, and he has not come . . . Rabbi Zera saith, Three things come unexpectedly: the messiah, the finding of treasure-trove, and a scorpion" (*cf.* Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, 220).—Κύριε. The Lordship of Jesus is defined as his right to come and to judge (xxii. 12), which is also the point of Rom. xiv. 9-12 (*cf.* Kattenbusch, ii. 609, 658 f.). Ἔρχου, κύριε is the Greek rendering of the Aramaic watchword of the primitive church (*cf.* on ver. 17), which possibly echoed a phrase in the Jewish liturgy (*cf.* on 1 Cor. xvi. 22, and *E. Bi.* 2935, 2936).

Ver. 21. A benediction at the close of the reading (i. 3, xxii. 7) before the congregation, rather than an epistolary

epilogue to the Apocalypse. The epistolary form in which apocalypses, like historical and homiletical writings of the age, were occasionally cast, was connected with their use in Christian worship. Such open letters of pastoral counsel were circulated by means of public reading, and were indeed designed for that end. They were not to be rejected as merely local (*cf.* ii. 7, 23, xxii. 7-21; Mark xiii. 14 and 37), any more than their contents were to be arbitrarily treated by individuals (xxii. 18, 19) in accordance with their own predilections.

ABERDEEN: THE UNIVERSITY PRESS